I-3 WORK GROUP
Meeting Minutes – November 10, 2026
Posted – November 16, 2026

Contacts:
Chair – Jena Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III (Supv), (916) 531-7650, jena.garcia@fire.ca.gov
Co-Chair – Scott Woody, Supervising Architect, (916) 594-4627, scott.woody@fire.ca.gov
Support – Adrienne Janowiak, Office Technician, adrienne.janowiak@fire.ca.gov

I. CALL TO ORDER – 2:30 PM PST

A. Welcome/Introductions – Scott Woody (OSFM-FLS)

1. The meeting was called to order by Scott Woody and turned over to OSFM-CDA support staff for a brief announcement.
2. Adrienne Janowiak welcomed participants on behalf of Code Development and Analysis (CDA). She announced that the meeting would be recorded and that a link to the recording would be included in the meeting minutes. She asked participants to keep microphones muted unless called on, to use the raise hand feature, and to report technical issues in the chat, which CDA support was monitoring. She stated that AI note-taking tools were not authorized for the meeting. She reminded members to engage respectfully and professionally, with the goal of a collaborative environment focused on developing code proposals that improve fire and life safety. She then turned the meeting back over to Scott Woody.

B. Agenda / Minutes Review

1. The October 27, 2026 minutes were displayed and noted as posted on the CDA Work Group website.
2. Members with adjustments to the minutes were asked to send them to Scott Woody, Jena Garcia, and Adrienne Janowiak.
3. Motion to approve the minutes was made by Tonya Parker-Mashburn and seconded by Laura Wood. With no opposition, the motion carried.
4. The agenda was displayed and a motion to approve was made by Laura Wood and seconded by Alvin Wong. With no opposition, the motion carried.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Subgroups

1. Fire Rated Corridors – Tony Pamintuan and Deepika Padam
    i. Deepika Padam presented a draft proposal that had been emailed to the group. The subgroup had met that morning and closed with a consensus. Everyone participating in the biweekly meetings and not opposed to the language was listed as a proponent, and any agency not wishing to be listed was asked to contact her.

ii. Proposal. The proposal rewrites the temporary holding provision, currently Section 408.10.2.5. That section requires corridors serving temporary holding rooms to be 1-hour fire-resistance rated when the temporary holding occupant load is greater than 20. The proposed language provides that temporary holding areas in sprinklered buildings, not part of a temporary holding suite and with fewer than 20 occupants, are not required to exit into a 1-hour rated corridor.

iii. Rationale. Deepika Padam said the change would remove ambiguity between this section and Section 408.10.2.2 (intervening spaces). Designers and plan reviewers have interpreted the sections differently. Some applied the corridor-rating requirement to the corridor inside a central holding suite, which led to rated doors and glazing at significant expense. She said the intent, shown in a 2013 Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) shared by the Office of the State Fire Marshal, concerns the corridor into which a holding area exits. The change would reduce plan-review comments, permitting fees, and construction costs, and would affect any facility with temporary holding areas, not only courthouses.

iv. Discussion.

a. David Solomon asked whether "not part of a temporary holding suite" and "fewer than 20 occupants" both modify "temporary holding areas." Deepika Padam said the word "and" had been removed as redundant with "with." David Solomon suggested reordering to "with fewer than 20 occupants and not part of a temporary holding suite." Deepika Padam agreed this did not change the meaning, and David Solomon found it clearer.

b. Chrishana Fields asked whether the last sentence could be worded affirmatively, consistent with typical code language. Lorenzo Lopez suggested a bulleted criteria list. Deepika Padam responded that the original affirmative phrasing was the root cause of the misinterpretation, since it did not reflect the ISOR's intent.

c. Johannes Henneberque questioned whether the proposal clarified anything. The current language already requires a rated corridor only above 20 occupants, so he did not see why a "fewer than 20" statement was needed. He asked whether central holding is a temporary holding area and whether the issue could be handled by a code interpretation. Lorenzo Lopez explained that the provision was written around courthouse holding between courtrooms, which often has no direct access to a corridor or stairwell and exits through the courtrooms. He said a positive "must exit through" requirement had proven hard to write.

d. Scott Woody noted that California-amended triggers (100, 20, 9, and 6 occupants) had accumulated over the years and cross over between courthouses, CHP stations, stadiums, and BART stations. He said the subgroup was trying to clarify the intent without affecting every temporary holding area.

e. Alvin Wong shared the 2013 ISOR, where last sentence states that fire-resistance rating is not necessary for corridors serving temporary holding occupancies with an occupant load of 20 or

less. He explained that the confusion arose because a central holding suite of, say, 90 people qualifies as an intervening space under the less-than-100 provision, yet appeared to trigger the 20-occupant requirement. Johannes Henneberque said he then understood the problem to lie in the term "temporary holding rooms."

f. Joe Hayden suggested using "an occupant load of 20 or fewer" or "occupant capacity," so that the trigger depends on capacity rather than the actual number of people present.

g. Johannes Henneberque suggested replacing "room" with "area" in the original language to see if that resolved the issue. He also stated his support for eliminating the "intervening space" concept, which he said has caused significant problems in other sections.

v. Deepika Padam asked whether further detailed discussion belonged in this forum. Scott Woody advised that Johannes Henneberque work directly with the JCC team and proponents before their next subgroup meeting, and stated that a parking lot exists for January and later to address larger cleanup. No vote was taken. Scott Woody encouraged the subgroup, saying the proposal was "almost there."

2. Small Management Yard – Richard Traversi

i. Richard Traversi presented proposed language submitted on November 5 following several subgroup meetings. He said the section applies primarily to CDCR, and the changes were intended to update it for evolving program requirements. The changes were:

a. The maximum yard size was raised from 150 to 250 square feet to accommodate a table with stools, a pull-up bar, and possible future program elements. The square-footage reference for covering was removed, leaving a maximum of 50 percent of the fenced enclosure.

b. The two material provisions were consolidated into a single requirement for noncombustible materials. The Type IB reference and the fence-material provision were removed. Richard Traversi noted that the detention hardware and security requirements preclude lightweight construction in practice.

c. With former Exception 2 eliminated, a new requirement was added for walkways from each yard to the building served to have a minimum clear width of 8 feet. This reflects current practice, since incarcerated persons are cuffed and escorted to the yards.

d. The exception language was rewritten affirmatively, at Scott Woody's suggestion. Small management yards are to be located at least 10 feet from a building or structure, but not from other small management yards. A sprinkler system and fire alarm are required when the yards are within 10 feet.

e. The means-of-egress cross-reference was updated from Section 1027.5 to 1028.5, and "safe dispersal area" was changed to "safe dispersal areas."

ii. Richard Traversi reported no cost impact and said the changes should simplify review time.
iii. Discussion. Alvin Wong asked whether the 8-foot walkways applied on all four sides of the yards. Richard Traversi replied that the requirement applies to walkways between the building and the yards, that the yards are typically back to back to share utilities, and that at least 4 feet is typically maintained between them. He said the section was kept from being overly prescriptive to avoid design conflicts. Crystal Sujeski asked whether "walkway" is defined. Richard Traversi located the definition of "Walkway, pedestrian" ("a walkway used exclusively as a pedestrian trafficway") and suggested adding "pedestrian" to reduce confusion. Scott Woody said this was a small technicality and that the 8-foot width serves custody-officer safety in the I-3 setting. Hans stated that the language cleaned up the section and that he liked it.
iv. Action. Scott Woody called for a show of hands from the approximately 22 participants (excluding OSFM). Fifteen raised hands, well over half, and the proposal was moved forward by consensus. Richard Traversi was asked to email the final document to the three contacts on the agenda, and any further editing for English language or the "walkway" definition would be handled afterward.

3. Security Glazing – Alvin Wong and Laura Wood
   i. Alvin Wong reported that the subgroup missed a meeting and had rescheduled it for November 17. He said he would circulate draft language to the subgroup before that meeting. No further discussion took place.

4. Cell Tiers – Lorenzo Lopez
   i. Lorenzo Lopez was initially unavailable, and the group returned to him at the end of the Old Business items. Lorenzo Lopez reported that the subgroup had agreed to eliminate California-specific language in favor of model code language. Open questions included:
      a. Whether the term "tier" should remain limited to cells or be clarified to include dormitories, custody, and accessory spaces. Some disagreement existed within the group.
      b. Confusion over "housing unit," which as written can refer to either an R or an I-3 occupancy. Scott Woody's circulated language was expected to resolve this by creating specific I-3 requirements.
      c. Whether a definition is still needed to distinguish an individual housing unit (formerly "housing pod") from a whole housing wing, since certain requirements apply only to one or the other.
   ii. Scott Woody added that duplicate California and model code definitions exist and that OSFM is participating in the cleanup, with the goal of returning to model code language and removing unnecessary California terms.

5. Security door assemblies for 408.10.3 – David Solomon
    i. David Solomon reported that the subgroup had not yet met. A scheduling poll had been emailed, and interested participants were asked to contact him at the state email address given on the call. He presented preliminary edits:
        a. Section 408.1.2.7: add "to be locked" and change "shall" to "can" in the fourth bullet (no more than 6 occupants, secure interview rooms in the same fire area), for grammar and clarity.
        b. Section 408.3.6: replace "utilized" with "used."
        c. Section 408.1.3: clarify the reference to UL 1784. His reading was that the paragraph removes testing and labeling requirements under NFPA 252 or UL 10C where a door is required to be "smoke rated," a term not used in the CBC. He suggested NFPA 105, which is referenced in the CBC, in place of UL 1784, which is not.
    ii. Discussion.
        a. Johannes Henneberque cautioned that changing "shall" to "can" has significant code implications. He recommended reviewing the original ISOR for the 6-occupant limit and suggested "may" rather than "can." The Co-Chair agreed to review the ISOR and use "may."
        b. Scott Woody explained that the language derives from the former Appendix 3A exceptions, and that I-3 occupancies have an exception in Section 716.2.9.4 (labeling of fire door frames) that was effectively buried, so the proposal brings the intent forward. He noted that OSFM does not adopt Chapter 12 Sections 12-30 and 12-31.
        c. Alvin Wong clarified that Johannes Henneberque was referring to the Part 12 reference standards, which a former OSFM chief had suggested removing now that NFPA and UL test standards exist.
        d. Joe Hayden cautioned that Section 716.2.9.4 addresses fire door frames, whereas Section 408.1.3 addresses smoke doors. Smoke doors fall under NFPA 105 and fire doors under NFPA 80, so these are different standards with different requirements. He said UL 1784 is purely an air-leakage test, so striking that reference is appropriate. Scott Woody and Alvin Wong agreed the exception may have been misplaced and needs cleanup.
        e. Johannes Henneberque suggested removing the reference to Section 716 altogether, since a security door is not required to be tested or labeled but must meet the standard.
    iii. Scott Woody invited interested parties to join the subgroup and noted that broader smoke-tight door conflicts would be addressed in January and later.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. 408.9 Smoke Control (2027 IBC)

1. Scott Woody presented the 2027 IBC language, which originated from the chief's proposal to ICC and requires smoke control in sleeping areas of Conditions 3, 4, or 5. He suggested adding California's Condition 9. He confirmed for Deepika Padam that it does not apply to courthouse or temporary holding facilities, but only to areas where incarcerated or detained individuals sleep. The group understood adoption of the model language to replace the California smoke venting provisions of Section 408.9.1.
2. In support or favorable:
    i. Alvin Wong said "smoke control" does not mean only an active system. A passive design, such as the Los Angeles County Jail project that demonstrated through analysis that the smoke layer stayed above 6 feet, can qualify. He said the model language is less onerous than the high-rise provisions because it requires no pressure differential and simply requires the designer to demonstrate that the system works.
    ii. Johannes Henneberque supported the model language and said the historical problem of defining a "windowless building" would be eliminated. He said the Fire Protection Handbook provides design fires, and that performance-based design is workable and opens the door to flexibility.
    iii. Andrew Thul said the application is limited to day rooms, group activity spaces, and common spaces interconnected as one large volume, using smoke exhaust fans meeting Section 909 criteria. He said the group should ensure these terms are clearly understood so the requirement does not extend outside the housing unit.
    iv. Michael Lynch confirmed that he supplied the information relayed by Tamara Clarke. On projects outside California, smoke control was always required in prison day rooms under the model IBC.
    v. Scott Woody reported that other states follow this approach.
3. Concerns:
    i. Lorenzo Lopez noted that juvenile halls and some facilities have breakable or openable windows, which was the reason for the prior California language. He said confusion would persist until the basis for the calculations is settled (design fire BTU, combustibles in the space), and that a prescriptive approach would be preferable. Johannes Henneberque disagreed, calling the old breakable-window language dated and judgmental.
    ii. Richard Traversi said CDCR has legacy housing with openable windows and that the prescriptive method allowed small projects to proceed without engaging FPEs. He said it was unclear how the analysis could be kept simple, and that existing buildings were previously being reanalyzed without any change of use or occupancy.
    iii. Xiang Qin asked whether smoke control is necessary in noncombustible Type I construction, since little in the structure can burn. Scott Woody and Johannes Henneberque responded that the design fire is based on contents and people, not the structure.
4. A motion to vote was proposed and seconded, but because of time constraints no vote was taken. Scott Woody placed the item in the parking lot for further discussion at the next meeting

B. 2027 IBC Cell definition
    1. Scott Woody reported that a search of the 2027 IBC found only two I-3-related changes, both previously raised with the group. He presented the 2027 IBC definition of "cell," whose only modification is the use of "incarcerated individuals or detainees" in place of "inmates or prisoners." He clarified that the vote was on whether to adopt the base model code language without California amendment, and that the vote only advises CDA.
    2. Discussion.
        i. Alvin Wong displayed the 2025 definition for comparison, and Scott Woody confirmed that there is no California amendment.
        ii. Deepika Padam stated that JCC had no objection.
        iii. Tonya Parker-Mashburn supported the change and noted that BSCC has changed all references in its sections of Title 24 from "inmates" to "incarcerated persons." Scott Woody suggested that if BSCC wishes to retain that terminology it can do so in Sections 12-30 and 12-31, and Tonya Parker-Mashburn confirmed that this is already done.
        iv. Alex Villalobos raised the point that patients committed for competency to stand trial are in an ambiguous legal state: they are detained but not incarcerated or sentenced, and are called patients. Deepika Padam added that her agency says "in custody," and that all of these terms mean the person is not free to go.
        v. Richard Traversi said CDCR saw no conflict with the model definition even though it uses "incarcerated persons" in its own program language.
        vi. Alvin Wong noted that the definition applies specifically to housing units in detention or correctional facilities, while individuals held elsewhere, such as in police stations, fall under temporary holding. Lorenzo Lopez agreed that "cell" is a detention term, and that medical or mental health facilities outside custody use "patient rooms."
    3. Motion to adopt the 2027 IBC definition of "cell" as published (with "incarcerated individuals or detainees") without California amendment was made by Laura Wood and seconded by Scott Woody. By show of hands, approximately 12 of 20 participants voted in favor, and Scott Woody declared the motion carried as a consensus of more than half.

IV. ROUNDTABLE/PUBLIC COMMENT

A. No separate roundtable or public comment period was held because of time. Comments from Joe Hayden and Michael Lynch were received during the related items above. Scott Woody encouraged subgroups to continue their work, and urged anyone with important topics to contact subgroup leads to join their meetings, while keeping the number of groups manageable. He said the group would continue into January and later to redefine Section 408 in California and return to the model code.

V. UPCOMING MEETING DATES FOR 2026

A. Meetings are held every two weeks on Tuesday from 2:00 PM to 3:30 PM PST.
B. Upcoming meetings:
    1. November 24, 2026 (week of Thanksgiving)
    2. December 8, 2026 (expected to be longer session)

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT – 4:07 PM PST

A. Motion to adjourn was made by Alvin Wong and seconded by Tonya Parker-Mashburn. The meeting was adjourned with no objection.

*Please subscribe to the “OSFM Committee and Workgroup Updates” mailing list to receive updates

If you would like to watch the recording of this meeting, please visit the link below:
https://youtu.be/DfZ7ZtxXNGQ

Note: This document was created using AI technology