

MAURA HEALEY
GOVERNOR



KIM DRISCOLL
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

ERIC PALEY
SECRETARY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**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

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

SARAH R. WILKINSON
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSURE

Subcommittee on Regulations Open Meeting Minutes March 25, 2026
Remote Teams Meeting

INFORMATIONAL NOTE: All votes were taken by roll call

This meeting was open to the public and began approximately at 10:05 AM.

Subcommittee member attendance:

Jeff Dougan (JD)- Chairperson

Carol Steinberg (CS)- Vice Chairperson

Patricia Mendez (PM)

Mike Kennedy (MK)

Paul Logan (PL)

Elizabeth Myska (EM)

Deborah Ryan (DR)

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, MK, PL, PM, EM, DR, AJ joins at 11:12 AM

High Color Contrast

- WJ: The carry-over item from last meeting was high color contrast.
- JD: I know people were talking about yellow last time, and there was an article sent around about reflectivity. I would love to hear others' thoughts on it.
- PL: Go with yellow.

- PM: I was not here last meeting, but in my role at the City of Boston we want yellow all the time and advocate for yellow.
- DR: Are we talking about detectable warnings?
- JD: We are looking at what “high contrast” means and people had suggested sticking to a singular color.
- EM: My vote would be for yellow, with a vision impairment I am able to detect that color. I think it is something that would be an attention-grabber. Very little research has been done on the blind and visually impaired community as drivers.
- CS: I think it is obvious to go with yellow. I just think another point is that the painted cross-hatching must be maintained.
- WJ: You need to pick which yellow. Because, “yellow” covers all shades and is an interpretable term.
- DR: I would find it helpful to separate the detectable warnings from the parking lot paint. My concern is if you have an access aisle connected to a crosswalk would the crosswalk then also have to be painted yellow? I think there are two separate issues.
- MK: If we change this language would this be saying that truncated domes must be yellow?
- JD: I like DR’s idea of separating out the detectable warnings.

Motion to Use Safety Yellow for detectable warnings by PL
2nd by MK

- WJ: The way this is proposed right now is everything must be safety yellow.
- CS: Could this be an issue covered by variances?
- WJ: I don’t see how anyone could get a variance for this unless they are bound by another statute. Or we would need a finding from a historical commission saying they cannot construct something using yellow.
- CS: Could WJ write up some exceptions that cover certain situations?
- CS: What if we said yellow or another high contrast color?
- PL: People cannot do the safety yellow for warnings made of cast iron or concrete?
- WJ: Definitely not the cast iron, the concrete could be painted, but then it would not be a slip-resistant surface.
- PL: What is an alternative color?
- WJ: For the cast iron there is really no alternative.
- DR: Stamped concrete would have to be painted with sand paint. I think light on dark or dark on light is the way to go with maybe a recommendation that yellow is preferred. 90% of the time you are going to get yellow, and most city/town detectable warnings are yellow. I don’t think there is enough research to back us requiring yellow, but we can recommend it.
- PL: I would like to think most cities and towns do the right thing, but they do not. If we don’t say safety yellow, we are going to see gray, Boston paver, red, an off-yellow...
- DR: I agree somewhat but there are two parts to detectable warnings, one is the color and the other is detectability under the foot.
- CS: But EM said yellow is important for detectability.

- DR: The Feds do not have a requirement for yellow. It is the contrast that is the requirement.
- CS: If we said yellow or another high contrast would that be sufficient?
- EM: I think from the sighted perspective, you're familiar with color and color contrast. For the visually impaired some of those people have never seen color, and some of them are not cane users. I span both categories having been a sighted person, yellow is still a color I can detect. The cast iron would deter me from crossing streets.
- CS: If people were asked, do you think the consensus would be yellow?
- EM: I don't know if people would have an answer because they have never been asked or had the opportunity to research.
- WJ: How does lining play into this? There are no rules about the colors of detectable warnings at present, but for PROWAG and ADAAG it is high contrast that is the requirement.
- PL: Should we require it? I am much more adamant now that we move forward with requiring yellow. We should be a leader on this and move forward with this.
- PM: Boston has been requiring detectable warnings on curb cuts and requiring that they be yellow.
- CS: Is there a problem legally if we go above and beyond PROWAG?
- WJ: I don't think picking safety yellow would necessarily give a substantially equivalent problem down the road.
- DR: I would be opposed to the motion not because I don't think it's good, but because we do not have data to support it.

Roll Call Vote

CS- yes

MK- yes

PL- yes

PM- yes

EM- yes

DR- no

JD- abstains

5 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention- Motion Passes

- WJ: Do people have thoughts or feelings about striping?
- PL: It should be a high contrast yellow color.
- WJ: You just need to require it to be safety yellow.
- PL: Is that the way to go?
- WJ: If you want it to be yellow, you need to pick a shade.
- PL: Which color is better?
- WJ: I think they are essentially identical. (Safety and Federal Yellow)
- WJ: I think Safety Yellow because then we can point to the ISO in the references.

Motion to Require access aisles within parking lots to be high contrast Safety Yellow by PL

2nd by CS

- CS: I would love to see what it says now.
- DR: I just want to clarify, the requirement for safety yellow in an access aisle is so people will see it and not park in it, as opposed to having it for someone with a visual impairment, right?
- PL: That is correct. I have seen so many different colors used. Striped safety yellow is more in your face.
- DR: So, it is not about the accessible route from the spot to the entrance being protected, but it is more about don't park here.
- PL: That was my intent, yes.
- PL: I think adding the words "no parking" with a minimum 12 inches in height
- WJ: Why don't you try to work out some draft language and we can circle back to this next meeting?

Roll Call Vote

DR- yes

EM- abstains

PM- yes

PL- yes

MK- yes

AJ- abstains

CS- yes

JD- abstains

5 yes, 0 no's, 3 abstentions- Motion Passes

- WJ: Okay let's look at 1107.7.2. This will be renumbered to fit within section 200.
- JD: Reads 1107.7.2 (multistory units).
- WJ: We need to address the ground floor duplex units.
- DR: This talks about an elevator within a unit.
- JD: I like the idea of requiring lifts in multistory units.
- CS: I agree with you JD. Also, I need a break soon.
- JD: Okay, 5-minute break. - taken at 11:26 AM.
- WJ: I don't recall us intending to completely exempt multistory Type B units from requiring access at all.
- DR: If it's a multistory beginning on the ground floor, the entry must comply but not within the unit.
- WJ: Okay, that is my recollection as well.
- CS: I don't remember discussing this before.
- WJ: Edits 1107.7.2 and reads edited language.
- CS: How is this a Type B unit if there is no bedroom on the first floor?
- WJ: The general theme is age in place, but there are no real requirements.
- CS: It just makes no sense for a disabled person to only have access to the first floor.
- JD: That is what Federal Fair Housing allows.

- JD: Reads updated language. This mirrors FHA.
- DR: And this agrees with what we voted on at a previous meeting.

Motion to Accept the clarifying language added to 1107.7.2 by DR
2nd by AJ

- CS: Is living space defined anywhere?
- WJ: I don't think so.
- WJ: Would it be more appropriate to say sleeping area? How would this apply to a studio apartment? A studio with a loft?
- WJ: Be careful about using the word bedroom.
- PM: Can we use sleeping area?
- DR: I am not willing to use that term. I think we need to be as close to fair housing as possible.

Motion to Move the Question by PL

- JD: Any further comments at this point?
- PL Withdraws Motion to Move the Question
- WJ: We will circle back to this next time (1107.7.2).
- WJ: I was going to add clarity to the end of the Type A section (reads language).

Motion to Accept the clarification language by DR
2nd by PL

WJ: This is basically what we let you do for townhouses already.

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

Motion to Accept the February 25, 2026 Meeting Minutes by PL
2nd by MK

Roll Call Vote

JD- yes

CS- yes

AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
DR- abstains
7 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention- Motion Passes

- WJ: Next time, we will do section 100. It is important that you read it before the meeting.
- PL: Can we make sure to discuss 1107.7.2 at the next meeting?
- WJ: Certainly.

Public Comment

Kay Bell: I wanted to express my appreciation for the time you are devoting to small details that will have great impact. Some people know me a little bit, and I take minutes very seriously and we pass minutes very seriously, and this meeting is a demonstration of how important it is to read the minutes and make sure they capture what really happened at the meeting.

Motion to Adjourn by PL

2nd by DR

Roll Call Vote

JD- yes
CS- yes
AJ- yes
MK- yes
PL- yes
PM- yes
EM- yes
DR- yes

8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions- Motion Passes