



MAURA HEALEY
GOVERNOR

KIM DRISCOLL
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

ERIC PALEY
SECRETARY, EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Division of Occupational Licensure

One Federal Street, Suite 600
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2012

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

SARAH R. WILKINSON
COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL LICENSURE

BOARD OF BUILDING REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS
NOTICE OF VIRTUAL MEETING

Fire Prevention and Fire Protection Subcommittee

In accordance with the provisions of G.L. c. 30A § 20, notice is hereby given that the Fire Prevention and Fire Protection Subcommittee of the Board of Building Regulations and Standards (BBRS) convened a meeting in accordance with G.L. c143 § 97 on:

Meeting called to order on Wednesday, October 8th, 2025, at 9:36 AM
Meeting Minutes

Roll Call

Luke McKneally, BBRS Member	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Jake Nunnemacher, BBRS Member	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Marc LaPointe, DOL Appointee	<input type="checkbox"/> present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> absent
Tom Farland, Municipal Fire Official	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Carissa Lisee, Municipal Building Official	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Michael Yanovitch, Building Contractor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
David LeBlanc, Fire Protection Engineer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent
Eric Svahn, Architect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent post initial roll
Matthew Bourque, Developer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> present <input type="checkbox"/> absent

1) Review/Vote Meeting minutes for September 10, 2025 and September 24, 2025

Jake Nunnemacher motioned to accept September 10, 2025, meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Tom Farland. Discussion to address minor edits for Chapter 33 not Chapter 3 in section 3 as well as noting Eric Svahn present at 10:03 AM. A roll call vote was held incorporating the two changes, none opposed, none abstained. Motion passed.

September 24, 2025, meeting minutes not reviewed.

2) Review Assigned code sections – Chapters 4, 7, 9, 33, A2L and code proposals from 10th

Luke McKneally recommended that a copy of the tracker in pdf form be included for each meeting. Luke reviewed the updated tracker through last meeting. Luke will rename as a draft and call it end of meeting with date, save as pdf, to share with committee on a meeting basis.



Code Change Proposals – Code Red Proposal

Chair LeBlanc introduced the proposal for review. Zach Blanchard spoke about the proposed code change related to patient care suites in Group I2 Occupancy. The specific code section is 407.4.4.3. Mr. Blanchard explained the current code section requires an exit access door to be provided to all exit access corridors or horizontal exits. This code section imposes a 100-foot limitation on reaching that exit access corridor or horizontal exit. He stated the reason this code change proposal is being brought to the board is that this specific code section identifies 3 potential exit access configurations. One is to a corridor; another is to an exit; and the third is to an adjacent patient care suite.

The issue with this code section is that the 100-foot limitation is not permitted to be measured to an adjacent care suite. It can be utilized for a potential exit access from that suite, but you're not permitted to use that door for the 100-foot travel distance limitation.

Mr. Blanchard noted several different reasons this should be updated including the previous 9th edition of the Mass State Building code contains similar provisions relative to the 100 foot travel distance however, it placed no limitation on what type of exit access door you could actually measure the 100 feet to, bring alignment with other standards, and would allow for greater area of suites as well as configurations of suite design. No negative impacts identified.

Michael Yanovitch commented on the first sentence stating where you can egress, and then the second sentence is the qualifier regarding the 100-foot. He noted that when reading it as a building official, should not have it in the first sentence after quarters, horizontal exits and adjacent suites as the qualifier. He posed a question asking if we see any issues with locking arrangements going from one suite to the other? Do we see any possible conflicts with utilizing the adjacent suite as exit access?

Luke McKneally asked for clarification on the recommendation – is the suggestion that measurement needs to now be from whatever location through the adjacent suite and then to the access door?

Mr. Blanchard answered that this 100-foot travel measurement is strictly for an occupant to leave the current suite that they are in. They are still required to meet the overall 200-foot travel distance for any healthcare facility. This 100-foot travel distance is very, very specific for the travel distance to exit the suite that you are currently in but not necessarily get to a stair or exit to grade.

Chair LeBlanc clarified total travel distance and distance out of suite component.

Jake Nunnemacher expressed concerns about this being problematic and wanted to hear further comments to clarify and posed question about exit signage and locking mechanism.

Mr. Blanchard responded he would fully expect if that adjacent suite is being utilized as an exit access door from the suite originated in, he would expect that to be signed as an exit and any locking arrangement would need to meet the requirements of Chapter 10 for delayed egress or any kind of controlled egress, which Group I2 allows. The expectation is it would be signed as an exit and meet applicable locking arrangements for Chapter 10 as well.

Jake Nunnemacher made a motion to accept the Code Red Proposal to 780 CMR 407.4.4.3 for adoption into the 11th edition, Tom Farland seconded.

Chair LeBlanc asked if it would be the same code section in 2024 ICC, confirmed by Jake Nunnemacher.

Chair LeBlanc posed a friendly amendment. In the second sentence remove “a door” and replace it with “an exit access door”. The friendly amendment was accepted, striking a door and adding an exit access door. Mr. Blanchard did not have an issue with this change.

A roll call vote was taken for the slightly modified code change proposal. No objection to the changes. A roll call vote was held, and the motion passed unanimously.

Jake Nunnemacher made a motion to deny the request to put the Code Red Proposal for the 10th edition as it is deemed not urgent but more for convenience, Luke McKneally seconded. Jake

Nunnemacher acknowledged this is a good thing, but it just does not pass the urgent test because it is a limited proposal and there are many I2s.

A roll call vote was held.

Yes - Luke McKneally, Jake Nunnemacher, Tom Farland, Carissa Lisee, Michael Yanovitch, Eric Svahn, Matthew Bourke

No - David LeBlanc

The motion passed by majority vote.

Code Change Proposals – AIA Massachusetts

Chair LeBlanc introduced the proposal for review. John Nunnari spoke to the history of the proposed code change and then Andrew Kollar spoke to the specifics of the proposed code proposal.

John Nunnari outlined the purpose of this proposal is to establish a statewide firefighter building safety marking system within the State Building code. Rather than a patchwork of local mandates, this proposal adopts the model code approach aligned with nationally vetted standards of the ICC through their fire code and NFPA. Would preserve home rule Fire safety intent and ensure that regulatory uniformity, legal clarity and enforceability statewide. The proposal aims to resolve the conflicts between local ordinances and state law on building code authority, provide consistent evidence-based firefighter safety marking system grounded in the national model codes, and to reinforce the BBRS statutory role as the sole entity authorized to adopt and enforce the building code provisions across the Commonwealth. This was originally submitted when the BBRS was accepting public comments on the 10th edition. He outlined the advantages which included improved firefighter safety and emergency response. Andrew Kollar spoke to the intentions are the proposal and reviewed detail in depth.

Following the proposal presentation, the board commented that this proposal should be for the fire service and fire prevention code not BBRS and the building code.

Jake Nunnemacher motioned to not accept the AIA Massachusetts proposal 914 for the 10th and 11th edition and encourage the presenters to propose it to the 527 CMR 1 the MA comprehensive fire code, Matthew Bourque seconded. Jake Nunnemacher reiterated that it is not that anyone was opposed to the proposal but that he felt it is more appropriate in the fire code.

A roll call vote was held. The motion passed unanimously.

Code Change Proposals – Christopher Howe

Chair LeBlanc introduced the proposal for review. Related to existing for I4 occupancy to more correlate to licensing in the state and more closely match to previous editions to the code. Michael Yanovitch spoke to although not urgent to be accepted for 10th, it is useful to go back to the original code prior to 2021 10th edition change. Other board members agreed.

Tom Farland motioned to adopt this proposal to be reviewed for the 11th edition, Michael Yanovitch seconded.

A roll call vote was held.

Yes - Luke McKneally, Tom Farland, Carissa Lisee, Michael Yanovitch, Eric Svahn, Matthew Bourke

No - Jake Nunnemacher

The motion passed by majority vote.

Luke McKneally motioned to not consider this proposal for the 10th edition as it does not meet standards for life safety and urgency, Michael Yanovitch seconded.

A roll call vote was held. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair LeBlanc reported on the restructuring of the resource folder and noted that some documents will remain from meeting to meeting. He reviewed what is in the folder specifically.

Chair LeBlanc asked the subcommittee what should the next focus be on and suggested A2L's be reviewed at next meeting.

Jake Nunnemacher commented he believes the subcommittee should do the A2Ls at next meeting and dedicate meetings to the review.

There was discussion on the latest ASHRAE language. Executive Director Gropman will invite the submitters of the A2L proposals to the next meeting on October 29.

Chair Leblanc instructed the subcommittee to review these proposals ahead of next meeting.

There was further discussion on the concerns about A2Ls and changes needed to the 10th. Staff was asked to provide what the BBRs has approved to date. Chair Leblanc was asked to provide his summary of A2Ls as well. He did note the summary is very high level, not specific to MA. He will provide that to Executive Director Gropman to disseminate.

3) Discuss other matters not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting
none

Chair LeBlanc asked subcommittee if there were any other matters to discuss. No topic was raised.

Jake Nunnemacher motioned to adjourn meeting, Michael Yanovitch seconded. A roll call vote was held, none opposed, none abstained. Motioned passed.

Meeting adjourned at 12:16 PM.

Items relied upon

Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Code Change Proposals