

MAURA HEALEY
GOVERNOR



LAYLA R. D'EMILIA
UNDERSECRETARY OF
CONSUMER AFFAIRS AND
BUSINESS REGULATION

KIM DRISCOLL
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

SARAH R. WILKINSON
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSURE

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Division of Occupational Licensure
Office of Public Safety and Inspections
Architectural Access Board**

One Federal Street, Suite 600 • Boston • MA • 02110
V: 617-727-0660 • www.mass.gov/aab • Fax: 617-979-5459

ERIC PALEY
SECRETARY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Subcommittee on Regulations Open Meeting Minutes July 22, 2026
Remote Teams Meeting

INFORMATIONAL NOTE: All votes were taken by roll call

This meeting was open to the public and began approximately at 10:02 AM.

Subcommittee member attendance:

Jeff Dougan (JD)- Chairperson

Carol Steinberg (CS)- Vice Chairperson

Patricia Mendez (PM)

Ana Julian (AJ)

Mike Kennedy (MK)

Paul Logan (PL)

Division of Professional Licensure Employees in attendance:

William Joyce –Executive Director (WJ)

Jamie Dalton- Board Counsel (JaD)

Molly Griffin – Program Coordinator (MG)

JD opened the meeting for Roll Call:

CS, AJ, MK, PL, PM, EM, DR

Items from Reconciliation of the Regs

- WJ: As part of the reconciling, I have discovered that the MN code is an amended version of A117-; which means it would required a license to use which is cost prohibitive. I will re-work these sections - please expect a 1–3-month delay.
- CS: What is involved in getting permission?

- WJ: We would have to pay the ICC a licensing fee, which I know we do not have budget for.
- JD: Is there anything the subcommittee can do to assist?
- WJ: I will circle back to you on that probably at the next meeting.

Public Comment on this topic

John Nunnari: I would suggest WJ reach out to somebody from the Department of Energy Resources, because they worked with the ICC years ago to make a blended building code with no cost. So, I suggest a conversation with DOER.

- WJ: Can you send me an email with that name?
- CS: Would it be retroactive if he can get permission that way?
- WJ: It wouldn't matter. I will keep the subcommittee up to date.

202

- WJ: Okay, these are the items I have picked up from the regulations that you need to look at again.
- WJ: Most of these are places where we are integrating PROWAG. At the time, you guys expressed an interest in having a separate work-performed section. It is pretty much a mirror of the language that is in the current code.
- DR: I would like it to be a little different, grammatically, saying "the work being performed" rather than "it."
- WJ: Okay, next 202.5; I added in the actual language people need to go through for the Mass Historic Website.
- JD: They don't have a direct webpage, right?
- WJ: They have a form that we link in the guidance already.
- DR: The Board is looking for something from MHC, right?
- WJ: Yes. Adds, "proposed work will have a negative impact on the historical fabric of the building or facility."
- WJ: We get 3 things in a MHC letter, whether this is a historic building, whether their project will have an impact, and whether the Board should grant the variance.
- WJ edits section. JD reads the section aloud.
- CS: Do we want to write a "written statement to that effect?"
- WJ: It's ultimately up to MHC. The Board takes it for what it is worth. This exists to let petitioners know they need to reach out to MHC, not so much to put the MHC on notice.
- WJ: Okay, last one is 202.7 I added the word "continuous" for clarity.
- JD reads 202.7 aloud. I'm good with that. Okay, we can vote on those sections as 1 motion.

Motion to Accept 202.1.1, 202.5, and 202.7 as edited by DR

2nd by PL

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
DR- yes
JD- yes
8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

206

WJ: Okay, next is 206.2.4. I think we can strike this last piece here of the section.

- CS:
- WJ: This last piece is redundant and unnecessary.
- JD: I agree.
- PM: I agree. I am still confused, and I don't see the list of exceptions.
- JD: Explains again what WJ sent.
- WJ: Okay, 206.3, I added this language. WJ reads it. I made explicit what the Board considers co-incidence.
- JD: Reads section aloud.
- CS: Where did you get this language? Are we dealing with existing regs?
- WJ: This language is what the Board has always meant when they say things have to co-incide. I made it explicit in my own language.
- JD: I personally think that this does add some clarification.
- WJ: Okay, 206.6.2. I think this was slightly different language.
- JD reads section aloud.
- WJ: You asked me to implement this language when we did this section.
- WJ: So this language is in the current draft, but was not in the draft, so I added it.
- JD: Okay, so we have three things we have reviewed so far.

Motion to Approve changes to 206.2.4, 206.3 and 206.6.2 by PL

2nd by DR

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes
EM- yes
PM- yes
PL- yes
MK- yes
AJ- yes
CS- yes
JD- yes
8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

226

- WJ: Okay, this is from ages ago. I have moved a piece from scoping into this section; it may need a little bit of wordsmithing.
- DR: I originally brought this up; we want to avoid restaurants installing all bar height seating.
- PL: I think we are on the same page of increasing the numbers.
- WJ: The way this is set up, 10% would need to fully comply and 50% would need to be at the right height.
- PL: If I can only use 1 table at a restaurant, it is a disgrace.
- MK: I wholeheartedly agree with you.
- WJ: We did already extensively discuss percentages when we talked about this in scoping.
- PL: Are you saying we can't make changes here?
- WJ: You can, but we already had this discussion.
- PL: I think we need to go back and address it.
- WJ: We are currently proposing to double our current requirement and increase 50% of tables to be at the right height. (not knee and toe clearances)
- DR: The height to me is the biggest issue.
- PL: I see your point. Bar seating at the bar does not need to be accessible.
- WJ: Currently you need the lower portion at the bar or provide a table in the same area.
- PL: Does this subcommittee have the power to mandate new bar seating to be accessible?
- WJ: We require a 5-foot portion of bars to be at the accessible height and knee and toe clearances.
- MK: Most places have a 5-foot space where you could roll under, but now that is the space where the wait staff get their drinks.
- WJ: We cannot talk about that, because section 900 is not on the agenda.
- CS: Before we had nothing like this?
- WJ: Nothing.
- CS: What does standing spaces mean?
- WJ: A bar or high top without seats or the restaurant is not providing seats.
- PL: Like at a wedding or fundraiser.
- CS: What height does 902.3 say, and should we say it in this section?
- WJ: 28 to 34 inches.
- CS: Do we need to set this out that it does not affect certain areas in this section?
- DR: It is together.
- WJ reads sections aloud.

Motion to Accept this as the right location (to move 226.1.2 to 226.1) by DR
2nd by PL

PM: Should we add the word "bar"?

WJ: Bar is a dining service where food or drink is provided. It is based on what ADAAG

uses. That might belong in the advisory booklet.

JD: Does section 900 cover this?

WJ: Yes.

CS: I still think this is confusing.

AJ: I am confused about the 10%.

WJ: The 10% is subject to the dispersion requirement.

AJ: I do not think this is clear.

WJ: It is not an exception but is the next subsection down.

CS: What if 226.1.2 moved up to be included in 226.1? What if you started with the 50%?

PM: I think the heading can be clarified to reduce confusion.

WJ: 902 gets referenced for multiple sections though.

PM: So, it's a piece of furniture you can move.

WJ: Yes. The chapter titles have no force; we lifted them straight from ADAAG.

DR: It's a little iffy.

PL: let's increase it to 20%.

WJ: We are already proposing to double our requirement. I think the right move would be to do that in the next code round.

PL: I could be dead the next time we do these.

WJ: The problem I see is we are going to be forced to choose the 50% and 20%. Which is more important?

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes

EM- yes

PM- yes

PL- yes

MK- yes

AJ- yes

CS- yes

JD- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- PL: I would like to change to 10% to 20%.
- WJ: The goal is to have these code rounds more regularly.

Motion to Change 10% to 20% in 226.1 by PL
2nd by MK

WJ: I would just say be careful. This is 4 times the Federal and our current requirement and I think we will get pushback on this.

PL: From?

WJ: The administration and people who do not like our regs.

PL: Is this going to be a lightning point?

WJ: It could be.

WJ: If we were not imposing the 50%, I think there would be a lot less trouble; doing both would draw fire.

MK: We have been dealing with groups that do not like 521 CMR. What about a compromise of 15%?

DR: I say we go to 20% and if we must back down, then we back down.

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

AJ- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- yes

JD- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

5-minute break taken at 11:28 AM

Meeting resumes at 11:33 AM

300

- WJ: Okay, section 300. It is just adding something from PROWAG. WJ reads section,
- JD: Anybody have any questions?
- WJ: This pretty much only comes up for crossing controls.

Motion to Approve the additional sentence in 305.5 by PL

2nd by PM

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

AJ- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- yes

JD- yes

7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, next is a replacement for 307.3. It is replacing this with its PROWAG version. This changes how it works.
- CS: What is a pylon?
- WJ: This is about cane detection. It goes into the ground like a post. It is like the base of a sign.
- EM: What would be the protrusion?
- WJ: It could be anything where it is not projecting from a wall, but from a post.

- EM: The cane is not going to pick that up.
- WJ: This is stricter than our current regs.
- AJ: Can DR clarify because the ADA still says 12 inches.
- DR: I am not sure, sorry.
- WJ: This took an existing thing and expanded it into 3 sections. We treat posts the same way we treat walls.

Motion to Accept the changes made in 307.3 by CS

2nd by PL

PM: Will the numbers be updated?

WJ: Yes, I will update these so they all correspond.

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes

EM- yes

PM- yes

PL- yes

MK- yes

AJ- yes

CS- yes

JD- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

400

- WJ: Next is 400- 404.3.1 is about clear width. This is specifically for power-operated doors.
- JD: Reads section aloud.
- WJ: You guys asked me to provide language on the common variance the Board receives about door leaves.
- MK: We encounter double doors all the time when we are doing ADA plans. A lot of the times, each door when it's open has only 27 inches of clear width. So, this is saying if there is an auto door opener that opens both doors it does not matter what the width of each door is?
- WJ: Yes. We get this variance every few months, and the Board grants this every single time.
- CS: What I encounter a lot is that only one leaf opens.
- JD: Then that door must be 32 inches.
- WJ: That would not be covered here.
- CS: Can we add the words "at the same time?"
- WJ: The problem is they may not be simultaneous?
- CS: How about at approximately at the same time?
- JD: I think it does add the clarification without adding another requirement.
- PL: I think it's clear.

Motion to Adopt 404.3.1 by PL

2nd by DR

Roll Call Vote

CS- no

AJ- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- yes

JD- yes

7 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay next is 409.3.1.
- JD: Reads section aloud.
- WJ: So, this section was in ADAAG but was not in our draft for some reason. This is just for residential elevators.

Motion to Approve 409.3.1 by PL

2nd by DR

MK: Are we talking about apartment complexes?

WJ: No, you only see these within a dwelling unit.

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes

EM- yes

PM- yes

PL- yes

MK- yes

AJ- yes

CS- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, 412- this is a lift straight from PROWAG and I have fixed the numbering already. This will fix a lot of variances the Board always gives for sidewalks.
- CS: I trust PROWAG.

Motion to Accept 412 by CS

2nd by AJ

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

AJ- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- yes

JD- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, 413- these are the routes you would get directed to if there is construction going on.

Motion to Adopt 413 by PM

2nd by EM

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes

EM- yes

PM- yes

PL- yes

MK- yes

AJ- yes

CS- yes

JD-yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay- 414 also is directly lifted from PROWAG.
- CS: This does not say what color they should be? Does what we voted on last time on color apply to this?
- WJ: Yes, I do need to fix that.

Motion to Adopt 414 by PM

2nd by PL

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

AJ- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- yes

JD- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, 416 (will be re-numbered) crosswalks.
- PL: Is 7 seconds minimum enough time?
- WJ: I think that is set under the UMTCD. But that is the minimum also.
- CS: What is UMTCD?
- WJ: The Uniform Manual for Traffic Control Design. This is just setting a floor; most streets are going to be longer than 7 seconds.

- CS: I think my problem is pedestrian; is it based off of people who are walking?

DR leaves at 12:16 PM

- CS: Is there a reason we should not raise the minimum?
- WJ: I don't think we have a good basis to raise it.

Motion to Adopt 416 by PM

2nd by PL

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

AJ- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

JD- yes

7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

500

- WJ: Okay, next is 503- passenger loading zones. This is also lifted directly from PROWAG.
- JD: I like what they did with this.
- CS: Does this control a public way when you're getting onto a bus how much distance there is?
- WJ: Most bus stops would be covered by transit terminals in 404.19. This would be at a bus station rather than a normal bus stop.

Motion to Approve 503 by PL

2nd by MK

MK: Could this also apply at like an outdoor mall where you pick up and drop passengers off?

- WJ: Only in places where there are specific spaces for embarking passengers; your standard mall area is likely more of a transit area.
- JD: And what about valet areas?
- WJ: Your average valet area would be covered
- CS: Would this affect areas where you have to travel through bike lanes to get to the bus?
- WJ: No.
- AJ: 521 requires a sign, does this?
- WJ: I think we may end up dropping that requirement.

Roll Call Vote

EM- yes

PM- yes

PL- yes
MK- yes
AJ- yes
CS- yes
JD-yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: 504.8 – this is from PROWAG but integrated into the stair section.

Motion to Accept 504 with the edit of changing 1 inch to 2-inch stripe and for this to apply to all stairs (eliminating the first clause) by PM

2nd by MK

AJ: I like it also, but should we say the stripe be 2 inches instead of 1?

- CS: Good idea.
- JD: What do people think about opening these requirements to stairs not in an assembly area?
- WJ: Do people want me to eliminate the first clause so that it applies to all stairs?
- AJ/PM: Yes.

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
JD- yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, 505.10- handrail extensions- we forgot to include the exception.

Motion to Accept the exception to 505.10 by PM

2nd by MK

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
JD- yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Do you want to point people to 414 from 705?

Motion to Point people to 414 in section 705 by PL

2nd by AJ
Roll Call Vote
EM- yes
PM- yes
PL- yes
MK- yes
AJ- yes
CS- yes
JD-yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay, 810- do you want to keep people in line with PROWAG or take them out of the PROWAG area (417 & 418) and move them into 810? I think you are better off keeping the PROWAG flow. This covers transit stops and train stations.

Motion to Point back to the 400 sections in section 810 by PL
2nd by PM
Roll Call Vote
CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
JD- yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

Motion to Accept the June 24, 2026, minutes with edits by MK
2nd by PL
Roll Call Votes
EM- abstains
PM- yes
PL- yes
MK- yes
AJ- yes
CS- yes
JD-yes
6 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention- Motion Passes

Motion to Extend the ISA discussion until the September 2026 meeting by CS
2nd by PL
Roll Call Vote
CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes

PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
JD- yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes

Public Comment

Michael Muehe: BCIL appreciates all the hard work being done by the subcommittee. BCIL would support the adoption of the traditional ISA or the dynamic ISA. They would also support 20% standard height seating. for restaurants. BCIL would also support a 2-inch stripe for 504.8.

Motion to Adjourn by PL

2nd by PM

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
JD- yes
7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes