

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

	I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
					Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
								Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
1	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E1-12	2/20/2015	To increase consistency in interpretations and application, the definition of "COMMON PATH OF EGRESS TRAVEL" has been modified.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
2	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E2-12 Part I	2/20/2015	The intent is for the consistent use of the defined terms for 'stair' and 'stairway' throughout the all the codes. Stair is used when talking about individual steps or stepped aisles.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
3	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E2-12 Part II	2/20/2015	The intent is for the consistent use of the defined terms for 'stair' and 'stairway' throughout the all the codes. Stair is used when talking about individual steps or stepped aisles. Stairway is used when the provisions are applicable to a series of steps, or flights and landings between stories.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
4	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E2-12 Part III	2/20/2015	The intent is for the consistent use of the defined terms for 'stair' and 'stairway' throughout the all the codes. Stair is used when talking about individual steps or stepped aisles. Stairway is used when the provisions are applicable to a series of steps, or flights and landings between stories.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
5	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E2-12Part IV	2/20/2015	The intent is for the consistent use of the defined terms for 'stair' and 'stairway' throughout the all the codes. Stair is used when talking about individual steps or stepped aisles. Stairway is used when the provisions are applicable to a series of steps, or flights and landings between stories.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
6	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E4-12	2/20/2015	The proposed modifications to these means of egress component definitions will provide necessary clarity for users who are designing or analyzing a means of egress system.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
7	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E5-12	2/20/2015	Consistency of language throughout IBC	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
8	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E7-12	2/20/2015	The original proposal deleted the phrase "and exit access doors." These are the exit access doors out of rooms, offices, banquet halls, conference rooms, etc. Exit signs have always been required at these locations unless complying with the exceptions. The term "Exits" is not inclusive of exit access doors.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
9	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E9-12	2/20/2015	This proposal editorially corrects the misuse of the terms "width" and "capacity" and places them in context with the intent of 2012 IBC Section 1005. Approval will reduce confusion and increase consistency in the determination of IBC means of egress sizing provisions.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
10	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E10-12	2/20/2015	All existing buildings using the performance compliance alternative should meet the accessibility provisions for existing building, not just those undergoing a change of occupancy.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment			
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility	
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N				
11	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E15-12	2/20/2015	This code change addresses two areas of concern that the committee may wish to consider separately: Egress on a given level and egress from one story or level through another by way or unenclosed exit access stairways.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
12	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E18-12	2/20/2015	Requirment clarification	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
13	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E-20-12	2/20/2015	The purpose of this proposal is locate the numbers to determine capacity all in assembly facilities in Section 1005.3 for means of egress outside the seating bowl, and to have Section 1028 deal with aisles (level, stepped and ramped) within the seating areas.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
14	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E29-12	2/20/2015	The exception is divided into two parts. The first is a relocation of the existing text of the exception. The second part adds the allowance for use of the self-luminous marking system already in the code in Section 1024. Because the illumination levels within an auditorium may not be brought up to sufficiently high levels between performances to charge the photoluminescent markings, only internally illuminated systems are addressed. The light levels produced would be the same as those required for the emergency egress identification provided by the markings in Section 1024. Handrail marking is not included in this proposal because it was not a part of the external illumination concept previously and because it would be distracting to individuals seated at essentially the same eye level as the handrails.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
15	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E33-12	2/20/2015	The requirement creates a level of redundancy needed to assure lighting levels.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
16	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E34-12	2/20/2015	This proposal corrects a small glitch in the 2012 code, and is otherwise editorial. The glitch is that a space for which two means of egress are required might not have an aisle or corridors, for example a gymnasium or horse practice arena. Therefore, Section 1006.3 would not require emergency lighting. The provision that requires emergency lighting when two or more exits are required is moved out of the list so that all such spaces will have emergency lighting. In addition, the proposal updates the terminology used for stairways and ramps.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
17	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E35-12	2/20/2015	The new exception 6 - In the event of an emergency and the lighting is lost you need to track down the problem and maintain emergency equipment. The expansion of areas to include the emergency equipment provides a higher level of safety for those trying to resolve problems with the system failure. The new exception 7 - large bathrooms are designed without natural light yet may have many doors (stalls), twists and turns that leave groups of people in a compromised situation with no ability to determine how to get out in an emergency.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
18	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E36-12	2/20/2015	The intent is to revise Section 1007.1 for consistency with the language in IBC 3411.6, and IEBC 410.6 and 705.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
19	IBC-MeansOfEgress E38-12	2/20/2015	In an unsprinklered building with unenclosed exit access stairways permitted between stories an area of refuge is require to serve the stairway, which will result in a closet type area of refuge at the top of the stairway with two-way communication inside. At this location, the area of refuge would not be connected to a stairway enclosure, and there is a real chance that it will end up being used as a closet. From a technical point of view, where do you put this area of refuge in relation to the open exit access stairway and how close does it have to be to the open stairway? Does the stair have to be enclosed because of the connection requirements in 1007.3? Since the two-way communication is now required at the elevator lobby it would be more logical to allow the occupants with mobility impairments to move to the elevator landing and use that communication device and move them away from the open stairway.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
20	IBC-MeansOfEgress E39-12	2/20/2015	This proposal is for the most part editorial and makes the language in the exceptions consistent. There is with one new items added and one relocation for added clarity.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
21	IBC-MeansOfEgress E41-12	2/20/2015	This is an editorial cleanup of this existing requirement. With the current language people often interpret Item "1 through 9" as a typo instead of not allowing #10. The reason to change "items 1 through 9 [excepting 10]" to specifically exempting Item 10 is to clarify that it is not appropriate to permit a platform lift installed due to exterior site constraints to serve as assessable means of egress. Whereas Items 1 through 9 in Section 1109.8 address very small spaces with minimal occupant loads, Item 10 would permit a platform lift to serve as an accessible route into a health care facility, senior apartment building, assisted living project, and other occupancies that may hold dozens of persons who need an accessible means of egress from the facility. The slow speed and long cycling time of a platform lift would make its use as an accessible means of egress for more than a few persons impracticable in an emergency.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
22	IBC-MeansOfEgress E43-12	2/20/2015	The intent of this proposal is to delete this requirement for platform lifts that serve as part of the accessible means of egress. The platform lift safety standard, ASME A18.1, has been revised to allow for platform lifts to penetrate a floor. Vertical openings are required in the IBC to be protected in accordance with Section 712. Platform lifts permitted as part of the accessible route into as space are addressed in ADA 207.2 and IBC 1109.8. While most are for a change in elevation that would not penetrate a floor, some provisions, such as non-public areas with 5 or fewer occupants, may involve a floor penetration.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
23	IBC-MeansOfEgress E45-12	2/20/2015	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/cc/ctc/index.html . Since its inception in April, 2005, the CTC has held twenty two meetings – all open to the public.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
24	IBC-MeansOfEgress E46-12	2/20/2015	The revision takes the code back to the understanding that exterior areas for assisted rescue are limited to the exits at the level of exit discharge, not anywhere open to the exterior. The current text for exterior areas for assisted rescue on levels other than the level of exit discharge has a problem with the separation requirements. Outdoor facilities are already protected from the accumulation of smoke and fumes by the nature of their construction.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
25	IBC-MeansOfEgress E48-12	2/20/2015	The purpose of this change is to clarify which elevator landings are required to have a two-way communication system where there are multiple elevators or banks of elevators on an accessible floor. The current language is clear where there is only one elevator, but if there are multiple elevators, it's unclear whether communication is required at one elevator, each elevator, or whether a communication device serving a bank of elevators would suffice. This change would require a single two-way communication at the landing for each single elevator or each bank of elevators on the floor. References to Sections 1007.8.1 and 1007.8.2 are also relocated as to more clearly apply to the communication system rather than the story of exit discharge.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
26	IBC-MeansOfEgress E51-12	2/20/2015	Freezers and coolers are used by employees that are familiar with their operation. Such doors would still need to meet the door opening force of section 1008.1.3. Section 1008.1.2, exception 1 indicates that private garages, office areas, factory and storage areas with an occupant load of 10 or less do not need to be pivoting or side hinged swinging type doors. Therefore, in such areas, an overhead type sectional door could be used as the egress door. I would expect a 60" swinging type freezer door to open easier than a sectional overhead type door.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
27	IBC-MeansOfEgress E52-12	2/20/2015	IBC/IPC does not specify a width for sauna or shower doors at this time. Since these doors are literally means of egress, the door would have to meet a 32" clear width. The exception is consistent with ADA 224.1.2.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
28	IBC-MeansOfEgress E54-12	2/20/2015	The proposal would eliminate design options for horizontal sliding doors. The definition could encompass room dividers. This proposal would only allow for one type of technology.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
29	IBC-MeansOfEgress E56-12	2/20/2015	The scope of the referenced standard, BMHA A156.27-11, states that the standard is not for custom installation. There is some concern that this could be interpreted as not requiring compliance with the standard with any custom installation. The ICC Standards Review Committee felt that there were some non-mandatory language in the standard. The committee felt that Table 1008.14.1 in the code aided code official in determining compliance for revolving doors.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
30	IBC-MeansOfEgress E57-12	2/20/2015	The definitions have some dangling clauses. Is the door supposed to close even if it is open only halfway. The text in 1008.1.4.2 added swinging and sliding in the door descriptions, but the types are not part of the definitions.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
31	IBC-MeansOfEgress E59-12	2/20/2015	Equipment spaces are utilized by personal familiar with the layout and function of such space. This would not constitute a hazard type situation stepping down from the equipment spaces.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
32	IBC-MeansOfEgress E60-12	2/20/2015	This new option for thresholds is limited the thresholds on the outside of a Type B units at a deck/balcony. This option allows for protection for water infiltration. This proposal also coordinates with the Fair Housing Act requirements.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
33	IBC-MeansOfEgress E62-12	2/20/2015	The proponent requested that the code change proposal not include the proposed revision to Section 1008.1.9.1. Coordination is needed with the ICC A117.1 standard and the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design. The revision to Section 1008.1.3 clarifies that the 5 lbs. force is applicable to the door opening force for interior doors and not applicable to the door hardware. Eliminates conflict with 1008.1.10.1 Item 4.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
34	IBC-MeansOfEgress E63-12	2/20/2015	The proposed change is consistent with an interpretation given by ICC staff that this condition is allowed to exist. The issue that this addresses is one where you have a restaurant door opening into a mall; the door to the mall could be the "main" exit but not be an "exterior" door.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
35	IBC-MeansOfEgress E66-12	2/20/2015	Increasing the scope to include Group I-1 assisted living facilities provides for sensible on-site security for residents in assisted living facilities where there may be elopement concerns for residents (i.e., Alzheimer or dementia wards). The CTC committee may need to put in a public comment to coordinate these limits with the Group I-1, Condition 1 and Condition 2 approved in G31-12.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	This change will increase cost.	Yes
36	IBC-MeansOfEgress E67-12	2/20/2015	The modification coordinates with the terminology used in the referenced standard, UL 294 and recognizes that locks are part of a system. The modification also coordinates with the suggested language clarifications brought up in E68. The updated language will improve consistency between the code and the industry. The switch in Item 3 is important for safety by reducing the change for system errors. The reference to UL294 would provide consistency between the different types of access control systems.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
37	IBC-MeansOfEgress E69-12	2/20/2015	While the issue of child abduction is important to consider, the proposal does not limit the exception to specific areas such as the nursery or pediatric wards.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
38	IBC-MeansOfEgress E70-12	2/20/2015	The modification coordinates with the terminology used in the referenced standard, UL 294 and recognizes that locks are part of a system. The modification also coordinates with the suggested language clarifications brought up in E71. Deletion of "immediate free egress" is consistent with the idea of delayed egress locking systems. The updated language will improve consistency between the code and the industry. The reference to UL294 would provide consistency between the different types of access control systems.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
39	IBC-MeansOfEgress E72-12	2/20/2015	The modification provides a consistency of terminology in the different locking requirements. The new Item 5 promotes a balance between on-site security and egress within Groups I-2 and I-3.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
40	IBC-MeansOfEgress E73-12	2/20/2015	The revised signage clarifies that the option for delayed egress locking systems can be on either the push or pull side of a door.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
41	IBC-MeansOfEgress E74-12	2/20/2015	The signage is necessary at doors with delayed egress locking systems for visitors within the Group I-1 facilities. Disapproval is consistent with committee action on E75-12.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
42	IBC-MeansOfEgress E77-12	2/20/2015	The allowance for access controlled egress systems to be used for Group I-1 and I-4 incorporates on-site safety with appropriate egress requirements.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	This change will increase cost.	Yes
43	IBC-MeansOfEgress E78-12	2/20/2015	The modification coordinates with the terminology used in the referenced standard, UL 294 and recognizes that locks are part of a system. The modification also coordinates with the suggested language clarifications brought up in E79. The revision to the title and the start of the section allows for a variety of types of sensors and electric locks. The updated language will improve consistency between the code and the industry. The reference to UL294 would provide consistency between the different types of access control systems.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
44	IBC-MeansOfEgress E80-12	2/20/2015	The sixth criterion is redundant and should be removed from the code. The first five requirements satisfactorily meet the needs for access-controlled egress doors. The doors are not secured from the egress side when the first five criterions are met.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
45	IBC-MeansOfEgress E81-12	2/20/2015	Allowances for Group I-2 to use electromagnetic locking systems is consistent with the approved changes to a variety of locking systems. This is also consistent with specific changes to Section 1008.1.9.9 in E77-12.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
46	IBC-MeansOfEgress E82-12	2/20/2015	The modification coordinates with the terminology used in the referenced standard, UL 294 and recognizes that locks are part of a system. The modification also coordinates with the suggested language clarifications brought up in E79. The revision to the title puts back the existing title. The updated language will improve consistency between the code and the industry. The reference to UL294 would provide consistency between the different types of access control systems.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
47	IBC-MeansOfEgress E84-12	2/20/2015	A potential interpretation of the requirements of 1008.1.10 is to not allow any other lock or latch where panic hardware or fire exit hardware is required. But 1008.1.9.9 allows an electromagnetic lock where panic or fire exit hardware is required by 1008.1.10. The proposed language clarifies electromagnetic locks are permitted where panic or fire exit hardware is required. The revision to the existing exception is correlative and editorial only.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
48	IBC-MeansOfEgress E86-12	2/20/2015	Using the phrase 'stepped aisles' helps differentiate 'stairways' from the current phrase 'aisle stairs'. This will improve clarity in the code language.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
49	IBC-MeansOfEgress E87-12	2/20/2015	This reorganization will reduce flipping back and forth in the code by separating 'aisle stairs' and 'aisle ramps' from 'stairways' and 'ramps'. Handrails and guards are referenced consistently where applicable. This proposal will add clarification of terms throughout the chapter. The committee does want the phrase 'aisle stairs' to change to 'stepped aisles' based on the committee action on E86.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
50	IBC-MeansOfEgress E88-12	2/20/2015	This proposal appropriately addresses the situation where assembly seating has a transition from 'aisle stairs' to 'stairways' in order to deal with changes in elevations are raised seating areas.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
51	IBC-MeansOfEgress E89-12	2/20/2015	The proposal allows for Section 1009.3, Exception 3 to be utilized in mixed occupancy buildings.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
52	IBC-MeansOfEgress E92-12	2/20/2015	This is a good editorial clarification that separates a unique landing situation from the main requirements for dimensional uniformity. This will encourage uniform application.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
53	IBC-MeansOfEgress E93-12	2/20/2015	The modification from 1/8 inch to 1/16 inch works with metal stairway construction and at the same time would not allow for sharp edges. The profile requirements proposed are logical. The new curvature would preserve tread depth and increase the design options for stairways.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
54	IBC-MeansOfEgress E102-12	2/20/2015	This responsibly incorporates the use of ladders to access limited spaces.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
55	IBC-MeansOfEgress E103-12	2/20/2015	The requirement matches federal requirements for hospitals already in place and improves the reliability of the exit signage. The committee suggested that perhaps better wording would to require what the signage needed to be connected to rather than an exception for batteries. This might limit the mis-interpretation that remote batteries might be an option.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
56	IBC-MeansOfEgress E104-12	2/20/2015	The proposed language could be interpreted to not allow a double handrail no matter how wide the stairway. This is needed for stairways with heavy traffic moving in two directions, such as schools during passing periods. The proponent should come back with a proposal that addresses limits for the typical double handrail.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
57	IBC-MeansOfEgress E108-12	2/20/2015	The proposal submitted a case that falls are a problem from both sloped and flat roofs. The added exceptions specified an alternative for guards that includes a ASSE standard, Z359.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
58	IBC-MeansOfEgress E109-12	2/20/2015	The proposed language provides precise measurement locations. The current language had requirements as exceptions. This is a good cleanup that will allow for more consistent interpretation.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
59	IBC-MeansOfEgress E110-12	2/20/2015	This proposal allows for corridors to move through an elevator lobby provided the corridor also connects directly to an exit at the other end. This adds design flexibility without a reduction in fire safety. This clarifies and coordinates corridor continuity and lobby enclosure requirements. This is coordinated with the fire service access elevator requirement for the stairway to be connected to the fire service access elevator lobby. There should be no conflict with fire department staging since the fire department does not typically stage on the fire floor, and the evacuation should mainly occur before the fire department arrives. This has been permitted in many areas of the country for a number of years, and no hazards have been identified with this configuration.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
60	IBC-MeansOfEgress E111-12	2/20/2015	The modification to footnote g is adding Group H for clarity since the new footnote is only applicable to Group H facilities. The table matches the requirements in Section 903.2.5.1 for Group H. The travel distance for Group H-4 is clarified.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
61	IBC-MeansOfEgress E116-12	2/20/2015	The modification to footnote d is adding Group H for clarity since the new footnote is only applicable to Group H facilities. The new footnote provides guidance specific to Group H sprinkler allowances. This is consistent with the committee action to E111.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
62	IBC-MeansOfEgress E117-12	2/20/2015	This solution for an increased travel distance is viable for large factories and warehouses. Ample evidence and fire modeling has been provided to verify adequate fire safety within these facilities.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
63	IBC-MeansOfEgress E118-12	2/20/2015	This proposal will coordinate aisles with corridor widths so occupants will have a consistent egress width for exit access as they move from corridors to open spaces and visa versa. This proposal is not dealing with aisle accessways, therefore the exception for non-public areas is appropriate.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
64	IBC-MeansOfEgress E122-12	2/20/2015	In Group I-2 facilities, for areas where movement of beds does not happen, this allowance for reduction in corridor width is appropriate. Tying this to both general use and the means of egress reminds the designer to look at both scenarios.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
65	IBC-MeansOfEgress E126-12	2/20/2015	The proponent asked for additional time to reconsider some of the language in the proposal. There may be a concern with use of the term 'fire separation' when dealing with a single building. Right angles may not be the correct way to measure protection at a curved wall.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment			
					Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
				Health Safety Welfare				Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N				
66	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E127-12	2/20/2015	This proposal clarifies the number of exits and separation of exits. There was some concerns regarding the additional sentence in Section 1015.2.2 regarding separation for the third and fourth exits. While not a specific measurement, the added language that says 'not blocked' should provide at least a limited indication of what would be an appropriate level of separation.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
67	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E128-12	2/20/2015	The added language would provide consistency between the requirements for a story and an occupied roof.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
68	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E132-12	2/20/2015	There is a question as to if there is a conflict with Table 1022.2.2 and Section 1021.2 for Group R-4 single exit provisions. Section 1021.2 Item 6 should be deleted until the issue can be fully discussed.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
69	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E134-12	2/20/2015	This issue will move the Group S allowance for increased travel distance from the table to a footnote. With the two option in the table, some users felt there was a conflict in the requirements rather than two options.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
70	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E136-12	2/20/2015	The proposal clarifies the path of egress travel by rewording the last sentence. The committee did identify that E127 deletes this section, however, if E127 is reversed, this is a good clarification.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
71	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E137-12	2/20/2015	The proposed enclosure language is already addressed in Section 1009.2.2.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
72	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E138-12	2/20/2015	The published change mistakenly printed two options to address the issue – one in the text and one in the exception. The errata showed the original proposal, with the allowance in the exception. The committee preferred the option of including the proposed text in the main paragraph. The proposal as modified will clarify that stairways can be used for both ingress and egress. There have been some misinterpretations with the current text that would limit the stairs to only be used for emergency egress and not allow normal use.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
73	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E139-12	2/20/2015	Enclosed atriums should be permitted as an option for an exit stairway enclosure.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
74	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E140-12	2/20/2015	This option permits exit passageways to be used on upper levels as horizontal transfer elements between stairway enclosures rather than only allowing them on the level of exit discharge. This is currently a common occurrence in high rise construction.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
75	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E141-12	2/20/2015	This proposed language is too restrictive for the exit passageway. It is not possible to build an exit passageway with no openings (i.e., lights, ventilation, sprinklers). Where interior exit stairways are connected by a passageway, a door should be provided for compartmentation of the exit path.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
76	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E143-12	2/20/2015	This completes the separation between penetrations and openings in Section 1022 and 1023 started last cycle. This is a good cleanup and encourages consistency.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
77	IBC-MeansOfEgress E144-12	2/20/2015	This signage is necessary for fire fighters when there is a fire service access elevator lobby. However, there could be some situations where there are two doors to the same level which do not have a fire service access elevator lobbies. There are also provisions that were approved by the General committee that would allow access to the fire service access elevator via a rated corridor. Additional revisions may be needed for further coordination.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
78	IBC-MeansOfEgress E145-12	2/20/2015	There are three basic alternatives for smokeproof enclosures. This deletion would clarify this and would be consistent with the definition for smokeproof enclosures.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
79	IBC-MeansOfEgress E148-12	2/20/2015	The exit passageway should be consistent with the exit enclosures. This added text is needed for coordination between equipment.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
80	IBC-MeansOfEgress E149-12	2/20/2015	The modification picks up language proposed in E28-12. The added language will clarify that not only must the lights turn on before occupancy, but stay on while the building is occupied. The 1 footcandle is adequate to charge photoluminescent stripes. This requirement also aligns with the UL standard for charging photoluminescent stripes as required in Section 1024.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
81	IBC-MeansOfEgress E153-12	2/20/2015	The proposal clarifies the requirements for open ended corridors that are used as breezeways. There was a concern with the definition. Perhaps there should be clarification on what the ends of the corridor needs to be open too (i.e., the outside).	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
82	IBC-MeansOfEgress E154-12	2/20/2015	The idea of protecting the exterior stairway in a corner is valid, however, the proposed verbiage is confusing.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
83	IBC-MeansOfEgress E155-12	2/20/2015	The proposed change for a 45 minutes fire resistance rating is an increase without technical justification. Wired glass is typically considered equivalent to a 45 minutes fire protection rating.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
84	IBC-MeansOfEgress E159-12	2/20/2015	This proposal will work with E88. This provides technical criteria for the transition between 'aisle stairs' and 'stairways.'	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	Minimal impact	Yes
85	IBC-MeansOfEgress E160-12	2/20/2015	There was no technical justification provided for quicker vertical movement claimed in the reason or an increase in the dead end length.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
86	IBC-MeansOfEgress E161-12	2/20/2015	This text will appropriately deal with the real world situation of tolerances within assembly parabolic seats.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
87	IBC-MeansOfEgress E164-12	2/20/2015	The breaks and extensions for handrails in assembly seating are commonly misunderstood. This proposal improves handrail safety in assembly spaces. The new language improves understanding.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
88	IBC-MeansOfEgress E165-12	2/20/2015	This proposal clarifies requirements for perimeter guards around assembly seating areas. Use of the phase 'seatboards' is understood in these types of facilities.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
89	IBC-MeansOfEgress E167-12	2/20/2015	The revised language is more precise and appropriate for the general scoping of Chapter 11. This proposed language will also coordinate with the phraseology in the 2020 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

	I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
					Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
								Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
90	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E168-12	2/20/2015	The changes throughout the general exceptions will provide consistency in the terminology. The phrase 'complying with this chapter' makes it apparent that these are general exceptions for Chapter 11.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
91	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E169-12	2/20/2015	While the committee agreed with the proponents reason that existing buildings are covered in Chapter 34, the pointer to the existing building requirements in Chapter 34 for accessibility requirements is needed for the more casual user. Coordination with the IEBC may also be necessary depending on other code changes in regards to Chapter 34.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
92	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E171-12	2/20/2015	This is a valid exception for a variety of common practices in religious facilities. This proposal addresses concerns for area limits brought up on similar proposals brought forward during previous code change cycles.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
93	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E173-12	2/20/2015	While this language will differ from the exact language in the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design, the intent was specifically for highway toll-booths. This proposed language will limit the exception to what is line with the intent of the ADA. The current language is being interpreted to allow for variety of structures which could be considered an ADA violation.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
94	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E175-12	2/20/2015	Movement to Section 1107.6.2.1 is a more appropriate location for live/work units. This current requirement for a live/work units in not an exception, so it does not belong under 1103.2.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
95	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E177-12	2/20/2015	This is a simple but good clarification for accessible routes.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
96	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E178-12	2/20/2015	The exceptions in Section 1104.4 are more closely aligned with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Adding in the term 'mezzanines' provides additional clarification for major changes in level. This will coordinate with E185 for routes in residential and institutional facilities. The committee has some concerns on how the term 'government buildings' might be interpreted.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
97	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E179-12	2/20/2015	This will coordinate the door maneuvering clearances for Accessible units in hospitals with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design. The current language could be utilized for nursing home Accessible units, which would be a conflict with the 2010 ADA.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
98	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E180-12	2/20/2015	This clarifies the exceptions for press boxes within the existing text. This coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design. However, press boxes with separate stairway access should be also addressed.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
99	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E181-12	2/20/2015	This proposal eliminates redundant language in the code.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
100	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E182-12	2/20/2015	There was a concern that 'self-service storage facilities' may not be the only tenant that does not have to have an accessible entrance. Splitting the tenant entrances and dwelling unit entrances into two sections helps clarify the requirements for each type.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment			
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility	
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N				
101	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E183-12	2/20/2015	The proponent requested disapproval so that they can work with the National Association of Home Builders to address parking for Type B units and single family and townhouse complexes with no accessible units. There was also a question if the percentage asked for was consistent with the Fair Housing Act requirements.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
102	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E185-12	2/20/2015	This coordinates with E175 regarding accessible routes between levels. This proposal addresses accessible routes between levels within residential and institutional occupancies. This is consistent with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible design and in addition has brought in some additional information from the Department of Justice Regulations specific to dorms and other housing typically associated with universities.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
103	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E186-12	2/20/2015	This proposal fills a gap between apartment living and nursing homes. The 10% is based on the anticipated need in assisted living facilities. This provision was lost when the definition for residential care facilities was removed during the last cycle.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	Increase	Yes
104	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E187-12	2/20/2015	While the committee agreed with the increase for Accessible units in jails as a coordination piece with the Department of Justice Regulations, they suggested that some additional guidance may be needed to clarify the term 'classification level.'	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
105	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E188-12	2/20/2015	This proposal will coordinate with how Group R-1 Accessible hotel rooms will be calculated with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
106	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E189-12	2/20/2015	The deletion removes redundant language for issues that area addressed for Group R-1 hotel rooms addressed elsewhere in the code or in the ICC A117.1. This will reduce the chance of possible conflicts between requirements over time.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
107	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E191-12	2/20/2015	The proponent asked for disapproval in order to allow them to work on coordination between the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and the Fair Housing Act for the new style of dormitories that look more like apartments than the old style dorm layouts.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
108	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E192-12	2/20/2015	The proposed language could be read to require bathrooms and kitchens within a sleeping unit. Adding the words "where provided within the unit" would address the concern.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	There should be no significant cost impact because the typical building situation in which a multistory unit may be located in a building with public elevator service most often already does include the primary living areas and the kitchen on the primary entry level. In those few situations where this may not be the case, this changed code language will make it clear, from the outset, before design and construction, that the story of the unit that is served by the building elevator will be the primary entry to the unit, will have rooms on this level that comply with the accessibility requirements, including an accessible kitchen and bathroom or powder room; thus assuring that costs, if any, will be minimal.	Yes
109	IBC-MeansOfEgress	E194-12	2/20/2015	The added language is better scoping language for the table and terminology used.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
110	IBC-MeansOfEgress E195-12	2/20/2015	Section 1109.8 broadens the application of platform lifts to speakers platforms to address where these platform appear in other uses. Section 1108.2.9 is a good cleanup of language, however, perhaps 'décor' should be stricken along with 'amenities' because this is also outside the scope of the building code review.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
111	IBC-MeansOfEgress E196-12	2/20/2015	This relocation of the text for visiting areas associated with prisoners, visitors and lawyers will result in the criteria being applicable to courthouses and jails. This is appropriate for both areas.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
112	IBC-MeansOfEgress E197-12	2/20/2015	A second accessible stall will not be required until a toilet room has 20 or more units in one toilet room, so will only affect very large facilities. This is consistent with accessible lavatory numbers. Accessible stalls are used by more than just persons using wheelchairs. Accessible stalls are often used by people with mobility devices such as walkers, canes and crutches, as well as families. This provides equity for access to accessible stalls.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	The code change will increase the cost of construction.	Yes
113	IBC-MeansOfEgress E198-12	2/20/2015	This proposal removes language that is covered in ICC A117.1. The exceptions are technical in nature, so ICC A117.1 is the appropriate location.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
114	IBC-MeansOfEgress E199-12	2/20/2015	The modification is due to a concern that a facility could literally count all the bariatric units to meet the required number of Accessible rooms. If other types of services are provided in the hospital, it is appropriate that at least some should be provided in other types of rooms and have bathrooms that comply with ICC A117.1. While this modification would not allow for the bariatric rooms to count as any of the Accessible units, a public comment might be proposed that would allow for a proportional number of Accessible units. In regards to the main motion, if bathrooms are specifically designed for bariatric patients, there are requirements in A117.1 that would not allow equity for bariatric patients and their unique needs (i.e., space from the centerline of the water closet to the wall). While there are not specific requirements for bariatric bathrooms in ICC A117.1 there are standards/guidelines in the industry that could be used as a basis for design of these facilities.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
115	IBC-MeansOfEgress E200-12	2/20/2015	This proposal will prevent someone from placing the only accessible lavatory within the accessible stall. This is consistent with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
116	IBC-MeansOfEgress E201-12	2/20/2015	The current language is continuously misapplied, resulting in a reduction of accessibility for either wheelchair users or the standing users. The proposal would add clarity to the exception. Allowing for two spouts on one bowl would not be a violation of ICC A117., but would clarify that this can be one bowl that has clearances and two spouts complying with requirements for wheelchair and standing fountains.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)		Tech Feasibility Y or N	HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact				
117	IBC-MeansOfEgress E202-12	2/20/2015	The removal of this allowance for platform lifts is appropriate since the scoping for the tiered dining areas to have an accessible route is now 25%, rather than 100% (Section 1109.8). This option was originally put in the code when 100% of the tiered dining was required to be accessible. With 25%, this should be achievable with a ramp or level accessible route.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
118	IBC-MeansOfEgress E204-12	2/20/2015	The revision to the main paragraph simplifies the requirement. The allowance in the exception is reasonable for small stores and coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
119	IBC-MeansOfEgress E205-12	2/20/2015	This proposal removes redundant language in the codes.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
120	IBC-MeansOfEgress E206-12	2/20/2015	The proponent asked for disapproval in order to address scoping issues/differences between transient and non-transient lodging found in the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
121	IBC-MeansOfEgress E207-12	2/20/2015	Providing accessibility scoping requirements for gaming tables and machines is needed in locations such as Las Vegas and Atlantic City. However, the committee expressed a concern that 'type' might be interpreted as each type of game rather than a type of table or machine; or that this might be interpreted as applying to video games.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
122	IBC-MeansOfEgress E208-12	2/20/2015	This proposal for recreational facilities sets up a basic framework for accessibility to recreational facilities. This will work with subsequent proposals dealing with specifics for each type of recreational facilities. The changes to the accessible route sections in Section 1104.4 is correlative. Residential occupancies with shared recreational facilities should also be accessible.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
123	IBC-MeansOfEgress E209-12	2/20/2015	The exception for area of sports activity is appropriate. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
124	IBC-MeansOfEgress E210-12	2/20/2015	The exception for animal containment areas is appropriate. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
125	IBC-MeansOfEgress E211-12	2/20/2015	To the extent that amusement rides are addressed by the codes they should be accessible. Since mobile and portable amusement rides are not typically covered by the codes, the exception to Section 1110.4.8 is appropriate. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
126	IBC-MeansOfEgress E212-12	2/20/2015	To the extent that boating and fishing facilities are addressed by the code, they should be accessible. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes

IBC MoE Reviewing Subcommittee Recommendations to RAC Form

I-Code Sub Committee	Amendment to ICC 2012 No.	Processed Date	Pertains to:	Recommendation to RAC	Vote		Statue Reviewing Criteria			Comment		
				Y or N	For	Against	(Applicable? Y or N)			HSW	Econ	Tech Feasibility
							Health Safety Welfare	Econ & Financial Impact	Tech Feasibility Y or N			
127	IBC-MeansOfEgress E213-12	2/20/2015	The requirement to provide an accessible route to exercise machines is similar to current requirements for providing an accessible route throughout dining areas. Examination of the proposed layout for routes is within the scope of the building official's duties. This proposal does not require any changes or accessibility to the actual machines. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
128	IBC-MeansOfEgress E214-12	2/20/2015	The requirement provides appropriate exceptions for areas of miniature golf facilities while encouraging access. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
129	IBC-MeansOfEgress E216-12	2/20/2015	The current text requires pools to be accessible. This proposal basically adds exceptions for water slides and catchment pools. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
130	IBC-MeansOfEgress E217-12	2/20/2015	Where fixed firing positions are provided, the ICC A117.1 provides technical criteria for how to make them accessible. This also coordinates with 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design and ICC A117.1.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
131	IBC-MeansOfEgress E218-12	2/20/2015	This exception for parking signage is appropriate for assigned spaces. This also coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
132	IBC-MeansOfEgress E219-12	2/20/2015	Since this is typically a transient environment, adding signage for lockers within recreational facilities is information needed for person who may need the accessible lockers.	Y	3		N	Y	Y	None	Minimal impact	Yes
133	IBC-MeansOfEgress E221-12	2/20/2015	The proposal provides guidance as to the types of signage required. This also coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
134	IBC-MeansOfEgress E222-12	2/20/2015	Directional signage at single drinking fountains is keeping with the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Since this would only be required where drinking fountains serving seated and standing persons were not provided together, the impact will be minimal.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
135	IBC-MeansOfEgress E223-12	2/20/2015	The proposal provides guidance as to the types of signage required. This also coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes
136	IBC-MeansOfEgress E226-12	2/20/2015	The proposal provides guidance as to the types of signage required. This also coordinates with the 2010 ADA Standard for Accessible Design.	Y	3		N	N	Y	None	No impact	Yes