
CWUI WORK GROUP

Meeting Minutes – September 2, 2026

Posted – September 11, 2026



Contacts:

Chair - Crystal Sujeski, OSFM-CDA-Division Chief, (510) 846-1276, crystal.sujeski@fire.ca.gov

Co-Chair – John Morgan, OSFM-CWPM-ADD, john.morgan@fire.ca.gov

Co-Chair – Mitchel Baker, HCD representative, mitchel.baker@hcd.ca.gov

Support – Becca Mansergh, OSFM-CDA-Analyst I, (916) 956-1946, becca.mansergh@fire.ca.gov

Support – Adrienne Janowiak, OSFM-CDA-Office Technician, adrienne.janowiak@fire.ca.gov

I. CALL TO ORDER – 1:03 PM PDT

A. Welcome/Introductions – John Morgan

1. The meeting was called to order by Co-Chair John Morgan, who informed attendees that the meeting was being recorded and transcribed to assist with meeting notes

B. Agenda/Minutes Review

1. [August 5, 2026 Minutes](#)

John Morgan confirmed the minutes were posted on the website (go to the [Code Development and Analysis Work Groups](#) website page for all agendas and minutes)

2. Motion to approve the previous meeting minutes was made by Greg Andersen (Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety) and seconded by Marcelo Hirschler (GBH International) and the motion carried

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Sub-Groups –

1. AB 2322 CH7A ASCE 7 – [Paul Armstrong](#), [Sunup Mathew](#), and [Shamim Rashid-Sumar](#)

- i. Shamim Rashid-Sumar (National Ready Mix Concrete Association) reported on behalf of the subgroup, co-chaired with Paul Armstrong (American Wood Council) and Sunup Mathew (International Masonry Institute). The subgroup held full meetings on August 12th and August 27th, and a smaller task group focused on exterior wall ratings and alternatives met on August 27th and again on September 2nd.
- ii. Key activities included reviewing the previous cycle's proposal, identifying issues for consideration, and developing lists of alternatives to improve resiliency for critical infrastructure buildings. A definition for "critical infrastructure buildings" as it relates to the WUI Code was developed, and the group has been reviewing the list of buildings that fall under that definition. Comments were solicited from DSA and OSHPD, with outreach to the State Fire Marshal's office still pending regarding buildings under their jurisdiction. Shamim Rashid-Sumar noted that a solid action item remains to obtain OSFM's input on the building list.

- iii. The next subgroup meeting was tentatively scheduled for September 16th, noting a possible delay from the originally planned September 9th date. Sunup Mathew confirmed the summary was accurate. Steve Kessmann (Truckee Fire) requested a copy of the critical infrastructure definition, and Rashid-Sumar offered to share it directly. Milad Shabanian (Stantec) noted that a recent SFP conference had highlighted the gap this subgroup's work is addressing.
2. Roofing – [Helene Hardy Pierce](#)
- i. Helene Hardy Pierce (Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association) reported that the subgroup met on August 17th and again on August 31st. At the August 17th meeting, language was tightened in Sections 504.20.1 and 504.20.1 regarding eaves and roof covering voids, respectively. At the August 31st meeting, proposed language on fire retardant treated roof coverings was reviewed, with general agreement reached on approximately two-thirds of the proposals, incorporating fire retardant treated wood into roofing assembly language.
 - ii. Upcoming agenda items include language review for gutters, where current code requires the gutter itself to be noncombustible but is silent on debris guards and whether they must also be noncombustible. Two subgroup members were tasked with preparing language on this topic. The subgroup also reviewed Section 504.20.2, which was modified in the 45-day express language but created a circular reference issue that the group is continuing to resolve.
 - iii. The next roofing subgroup meeting is scheduled for September 21st at 1:00 PM. Helene Hardy Pierce shared her contact information in the chat for those wishing to join and acknowledged the subgroup members for their constructive participation.
3. Accessory Structures – [Milad Shabanian](#)
- i. Milad Shabanian (Stantec) reported that the subgroup meets every other Friday from 1:00–2:00 PM Pacific time. Two meetings have been held, generating substantive discussion around the distinctions between accessory buildings, accessory structures, and greenhouses. A proposal is currently under review to add definitional clarity around these structure types.
 - ii. The next meeting is scheduled for the coming Friday, and interested parties were invited to contact Milad Shabanian directly to be added to the distribution list. Marcelo Hirschler noted that the accessory structures subgroup may be proposing changes to an exception within the weathering/ignition-resistant materials section, and that coordination between the two subgroups would continue.
4. Weathering / Ignition-Resistant Materials – [Marcelo Hirschler](#) and [Chrishana Fields](#)
- i. Marcelo Hirschler (GBH International), presented on behalf of the subgroup, co-chaired by Chrishana Fields (OSFM – Code Development

- and Analysis), a detailed slide-based update. The subgroup has reached consensus on several items while significant disagreements remain on others.
- ii. Areas of consensus included: minor language issues, noncombustibility testing requirements (aligned with IWIC, exempting five material types from testing), and the restructuring of Section 503.2 to place general weathering requirements at the front of subsections, with specific subsections following. The group also agreed not to create a standalone definition for "surface treated material," concluding it would create more complications than clarity. Language was also cleaned up to clarify that the fire test need only be passed after weathering, as pre-weathering testing is a manufacturer's concern.
 - iii. Areas without consensus included:
 - a. Plastic lumber and wood plastic composites: The plastic lumber and wood plastic composite industry, represented by Alex Haldeman (JamesHardie), proposed eliminating all weathering requirements for their products. The subgroup's framework would require testing under ASTM E1354 before and after weathering per ASTM D6662 (plastic lumber) and D7032 (wood plastic composite). Marcelo Hirschler noted that a 14-year-old UL study presented in support of removing weathering requirements involved materials that would not comply with current California requirements, as none were tested to ASTM E2768 or the extended E84.
 - b. Paints, coatings, and surface treatments: Current code prohibits paints and coatings as an approved method. The subgroup has general agreement that this sentence should not be deleted without a substantive replacement, but there is no consensus on what the replacement should be. The subgroup's working proposal would require listed and labeled coated products to demonstrate compliance after weathering per ASTM D2898 Method B, require third-party inspection for field-applied treatments, and prohibit surface treatments on deck walking surfaces. Annebelle Klein (American Coatings Association) proposed allowing manufacturer's listing or evaluation reports as an alternative to D2898 Method B for weathering and proposed a third-party evaluation report pathway for field-applied treatments. Marcelo Hirschler noted that studies by IBHS/Forest Products Lab (involving Steve Quarles and Greg Andersen) and NIST have demonstrated a lack of durability in exterior coatings, which is the historical basis for the prohibition.
 - iv. The next subgroup meeting was tentatively scheduled for September 15th, 1:00–3:00 PM, though rescheduling was discussed at the meeting due to conflicts with the American Coatings Association's fall meetings in Washington, D.C. (raised by Annebelle Klein) and scheduling conflicts noted by Alex Haldeman. Chrishana Fields indicated she would coordinate directly with the involved parties to find an alternative date, with September 17th at 2:00 PM Pacific mentioned as a possibility.

5. Vents – [Kevin Scott](#)

- i. Kevin Scott (KH Scott & Associates LLC) reported that the subgroup met two weeks prior and has another meeting scheduled for the coming Friday at 10:00 AM Pacific. The current discussion topic is weathering of coatings on vents. No consensus or code language has been reached yet, and the subgroup continues to grow in membership.
- ii. Marcelo Hirschler (GBH International) raised a question for the group about whether there is documented evidence of a need to require weathering for vents. Kevin Scott responded that while direct evidence is anecdotal, there is evidence that coatings—particularly intumescent coatings—fail on other products due to weathering, and that this uncertainty warrants evaluation before drawing conclusions. Tim Earl (GBH International), who was about to raise the same point, confirmed agreement on the intumescent coating concern.
- iii. Kevin Scott's email was shared in the chat for those wishing to be added to the subgroup.

6. Chapters 2/6 – [Larry Williams](#)

- i. Larry Williams (Ventura County) reported that the subgroup met on August 13th with ten attendees. The group reviewed changes proposed in the previous cycle, identifying those approved versus those requiring further study, incorporated suggestions submitted during the 45-day express period that were not carried forward, and collected new items from subgroup members. A combined working document has been assembled as the basis for future meetings.
- ii. The subgroup will meet on the 1st and 3rd Thursdays, 2:00–3:30 PM, beginning the following day. Key topics include:
 - a. Addressing conflicts in WUI Code definitions related to the LRA high fire hazard severity zone and the application of Chapter 5 building requirements, stemming from emergency regulations and Health and Safety Code amendments.
 - b. Reviewing gaps in the WUI Code for the LRA high zone.
 - c. Updating the fire protection plan section, noting the document functions more as a report than a plan, and addressing the need for preliminary information to support environmental review.
 - d. Reviewing Sections 603 and 604 for various updates.
 - e. Monitoring the Board of Forestry Zone 0 regulations (final public comment was that day; approval expected within five days), with potential subsequent updates to defensible space sections.
- iii. Larry Williams raised three items for OSFM response:
 - a. The timeline for subgroups to submit final proposals to the full work group, noting Crystal Sujeski's tentative indication of late December.

- b. The Health and Safety Code mandate to discuss possible extension of WUI building requirements to the LRA moderate zone in the current triennial cycle.
 - c. OSFM's position on the 2027 IWUI Chapter 7 maintenance requirements, which proposes moving maintenance-related language out of individual chapters into a consolidated chapter.
 - iv. John Morgan noted these questions were on record and that OSFM would follow up. Chrishana Fields (OSFM – Code Development and Analysis) suggested in chat that OSFM staff be included on subgroup meeting invitations, which Larry Williams agreed to ensure.
7. Chapter 4 – [Matthew McKenna](#) and [Larry Williams](#)
- i. Matthew McKenna (Santa Clara County Fire Department) acknowledged that no subgroup meeting had yet been scheduled and took responsibility for that gap, indicating an update would be available the following month. Larry Williams (Ventura County) noted that Chapter 4 had originally been part of the combined Chapters 2/4/6 group before Matthew McKenna volunteered to lead it separately, and that some materials from the prior joint group would carry over. Larry Williams also flagged that Chapter 4 maintenance items may be affected by the proposed IWUI Chapter 7 reorganization.
8. Windows/Doors – [Daniel Gorham](#) and [Greg Andersen](#)
- i. Daniel Gorham (UL Research Institutes) provided a brief update, noting the subgroup meets monthly on the 3rd Wednesday. The most recent meeting was August 19th. Two primary work streams are in progress: (1) updates to SFM 12-78-2 (Version 2 of the draft report revision is in subgroup review), and (2) proposed revisions to Section 504.8 covering windows and doors.
 - ii. Daniel Gorham also raised the issue of glass block as a prescriptive base compliance option, noting that his preliminary review had not found a clear technical justification for its inclusion, and flagged this for subgroup discussion. He asked for guidance on how much effort to allocate to that question within this triennial cycle.
 - iii. Milad Shabanian (Stantec) added that the subgroup is separating editorial changes from technical changes to allow faster progress on formatting and restructuring of the exterior glazing and doors section. Technical items under active consideration include requirements for multilayer glazing assemblies and the glass block issue. Jennifer Hatfield (Fenestration & Glazing Industry Alliance) confirmed that FGIA is reviewing draft language and is also gathering input from skylight manufacturers on skylight-specific provisions, with feedback to be submitted ahead of the next subgroup meeting.
9. Exterior Walls/Eaves/Soffits/Under Floors – [Greg Andersen](#) and [Milad Shabanian](#)

- i. Greg Andersen reported that the subgroup met on August 19th and again that morning (September 2nd). Two proposals are in development: (1) a proposal addressing conflagration fire scenarios and structures in closer proximity to one another, incorporating the wall covering provisions that were not carried forward in the previous cycle; and (2) a proposal addressing rafter tails. Draft language for both is under review, with the next meeting scheduled for September 22nd. Andersen also noted a companion proposal to address windows in conflagration fire scenarios, which will be shared with the windows/doors subgroup.
10. Projections/Decks (including awnings, etc.) – [Paul Armstrong](#) and [Greg Andersen](#)
- i. Greg Andersen (Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety) reported in the absence of Paul Armstrong (American Wood Council). The subgroup has been actively discussing a terminology issue: the terms "projections," "decks," "awnings," "appendages," "balconies," and "attachments" are used inconsistently, and the group is considering developing a definition to clarify the intent of prior language changes. It was also noted that the porch ceiling section is no longer represented and was expected to be covered under projections. The next meeting is scheduled for September 15th, which Greg Andersen will miss due to vacation; he indicated the group should proceed without him and he will participate in the following meeting. The subgroup also noted the relationship between this work and the retrofit subgroup's efforts.
11. Retrofit – [Marco Mack](#)
- i. Marco Mack reported that the subgroup held a meeting on August 19th. Next steps include distributing a draft scope and deliverables document to subgroup participants via email, with a follow-up meeting if clarification is needed.
 - ii. Marco Mack outlined the core philosophy of the subgroup: rather than prescribing mandatory retrofit requirements, the effort is focused on developing voluntary best practices with a tiered structure that enables property owners to understand levels of protection, pursue incremental improvements, and potentially receive credit for exceeding minimum standards. The framework envisions three tiers: below code minimum, at code minimum, and above code minimum.
 - iii. Key conceptual elements presented included: defining and communicating different types of fire exposure intensity (from low-to-moderate ember drift to high-intensity ember storms driven by wind and slope), developing guidance on yard mitigation that complements defensible space, referencing existing home hardening standards (including IBHS essential and enhanced levels), and framing wall-to-roof assemblies as an integrated system. The subgroup is also considering a retrofit maintenance component.
 - iv. Marcelo Hirschler (GBH International) asked for clarification on whether this work is intended as code language or guidance. Marco Mack indicated the most likely outcome would be a guidance document or best

practices appendix, potentially referencing appendix structures already in the current code (Appendix G on voluntary home hardening, as noted by Greg Andersen and Helene Hardy Pierce). Marco Mack suggested a simplified appendix outlining concepts and performance levels could be achievable within the current cycle.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sub-Groups

1. Exterior Sprinklers

- i. Kevin Scott (KH Scott & Associates LLC) reported that the newly formed exterior sprinklers subgroup held its first meeting the morning of September 2nd. Two potential paths were identified: (1) voluntary home hardening adoption by individual property owners, and (2) incorporating exterior sprinklers as a required additional level of protection in very high fire hazard severity zones.
- ii. The subgroup reached unanimous agreement that exterior sprinklers are not a replacement for ignition-resistant or fire-resistant construction; they are an additional layer of protection. Their primary function is to address ember accumulation risk, particularly combustible items such as patio furniture, umbrellas, and other materials placed within the defensible space zone that may not be regulated by code. Exterior sprinklers are not intended to provide protection against a direct flame front.
- iii. On water supply, Kevin Scott explained that exterior systems can operate at approximately 10 GPM, are zone-cycled rather than continuous, and are designed to pre-wet surfaces to reduce ignition probability. He noted that the system draw is comparable to domestic usage and would not run all zones simultaneously.
- iv. Kevin Scott also raised an independent but related concept: requiring an excess flow valve on domestic water supply lines for all structures in WUI areas, whether or not sprinklers are installed. The rationale is that when structures burn and supply lines are damaged, uncontrolled water loss can deplete community water systems. This was identified as an issue worthy of separate consideration.
- v. Larry Williams (Ventura County) raised the water supply concern more broadly, asking whether system design accounts for limited rural water supplies and community system impacts. Kevin Scott confirmed this was a central discussion item, noting the cycling approach and low flow design as mitigating factors.
- vi. Marco Mack noted informal experience in Santa Cruz with coordination between water districts and emergency responders to shut off meters during wildfire events, as well as experience with low-flow drip mist systems at eaves that provided effective pre-wetting with minimal water consumption. Marco Mack indicated he would follow up with Kevin Scott directly.
- vii. The subgroup meets again in two weeks. Kevin Scott's contact information was shared in the chat for those wishing to participate.

B. Tiered Approach

1. The tiered approach was raised as a continuation of discussion from the prior meeting, where it was suggested that each subgroup consider tiered requirements as part of their work.
2. Greg Andersen (Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety) summarized the current state of discussion: if OSFM is seeking a tiered approach aligned with the International WUI Code structure, the clear principle is that the lowest tier must not represent a downgrade from what California currently requires. Additional tiers would add more restrictive requirements where appropriate. Greg Andersen cautioned that this is a large undertaking that likely extends beyond the current cycle and called for a deliberate plan if it is to be pursued.
3. Marco Mack noted that this concept aligns with efforts at the ICC's FCAC level and described a tiered framework concept he is developing around different fire exposure types and proximity to property lines—including the idea that less than three feet to a property line should involve entirely non-ignitable exterior construction, and that additional specifications could address water-resistive barriers in close-proximity scenarios.
4. Kevin Reinertson provided historical context, noting that a tiered approach for the high and very high fire hazard severity zones was contemplated when Chapter 7A was originally created over 20 years ago, but was never implemented due to policy changes. He expressed strong support for moving forward, characterizing the current California code as the appropriate floor for moderate zones, with escalating requirements for high and very high. Kevin Reinertson also identified conflagration/high-density scenarios as a fourth potential tier element.
5. Kevin Scott (KH Scott & Associates LLC) emphasized that whatever requirements are established for "very high" in the SRA should be consistent with "very high" in the LRA—the fire hazard level, not the jurisdiction type, should drive the requirement.
6. Marcelo Hirschler (GBH International) acknowledged support for the tiered approach conceptually but urged the group to pursue changes in coordination with the IWUI rather than in isolation, noting that California's historically different approach creates ongoing challenges. He pointed out that the IWUI public comment period (November 23 through January 12) presents a timely opportunity to submit proposals. Greg Andersen responded that both efforts can be pursued simultaneously, developing California code language and proposing to ICC are not mutually exclusive. Kevin Reinertson agreed, adding that progress in California could serve as a catalyst for improving IWUI Class 2 and Class 3 requirements at the national level.

IV. ROUNDTABLE/PUBLIC COMMENTS

- A. Greg Andersen (Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety) announced that all proposals submitted by the State Fire Marshal for the plumbing code and building standards commission were approved the prior week.
- B. Larry Williams (Ventura County) inquired about the status of pending information bulletins and interpretation requests from OSFM regarding application of WUI requirements in the LRA high and moderate zones, noting they are understood to be under executive review. John Morgan indicated OSFM would follow up.
- C. Greg Andersen suggested that as subgroups begin presenting their full proposals, the monthly meetings may need to be extended in duration beginning around the October or November timeframe.
- D. Shamim Rashid-Sumar (National Ready Mix Concrete Association) noted that several participants are calling in from eastern time zones and requested that if meetings are made longer, consideration be given to an earlier start time.
- E. Larry Williams suggested adding an extra meeting in November, and possibly December, to ensure the work can be completed before the anticipated late-December deadline, given the holiday period.
- F. David Horobin raised the topic of underground fire shelters/bunkers for properties in areas such as Topanga Canyon, where fire apparatus access is limited and elderly residents may be unable to evacuate. He noted a product under development in partnership with a Netherlands company. Milad Shabanian (Stantec) indicated the accessory structures subgroup had not yet discussed shelters but acknowledged the topic has potential for consideration. Greg Andersen suggested the retrofit subgroup may be the most appropriate home for this topic, given its focus on existing homes.

V. UPCOMING MEETING DATES FOR 2026

- A. Meetings are held on the first Wednesday of each month at 1:00 PM PDT
- B. John Morgan confirmed the standard meeting schedule and indicated that if adjustments are made to accommodate time zone equity and extended agendas, attendees will be notified in advance
- C. Next Meeting: October 7, 2026

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT – 2:59 PM PDT

- A. There being no further business, John Morgan adjourned the meeting

*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/-twdGyWqBTs>