BCAC Occ #10-1

1025.1 General. Approved luminous egress path markings delineating the exit path shall be provided in high-rise buildings of group A, B, E, I-1, M or R-1 occupancies where such occupied floors are located more than 75'-0" above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access. The egress path markings shall extend from such occupied floors to the level of exit discharge. In accordance with this section.

Exception: Luminous egress path markings shall not be required on the level of exit discharge in lobbies that serve as part of the exit path in accordance with Section1028.2, Exception 1.

Reason: The current language is confusing for mixed use buildings, especially where the floors above 75' did not require markings (e.g. R-2). The current text could be read to require stripes throughout the building that contained any of these occupancies.

This clarifies that the markings shall be provided where the listed required occupancies are at or above high-rise height. This also clarifies that the markings have to go all the way down to the level of exit discharge, even if the stairway extends through floors that do not have to have markings (e.g. R-2). Example, a 10 story apartment building with a pool on the roof would have to have markings all the way down. Example, a 30 story building with 10 floor of business and 20 floors of residential above would have markings on the bottom 10 floors. This will also address multi-complex buildings of different heights and uses by only requiring markings for exits serving those listed occupied floors.

Cost impact. Where the interpretation was that any high-rise with these occupancies had markings in the entire building, this would be a cost decrease, by not requiring markings and not have the maintenance of these markings.

Note: How is this currently being interpreted? With current text, could someone possibly think that a residential with an occupied roof or top assembly floor only used by residents would not require markings?