
I-3 WORK GROUP

Meeting Minutes – October 13, 2026

Posted – October 14, 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 – 2:03 PM PDT

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

1. The meeting was called to order by Scott Woody and turned over to OSFM-CDA 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. Because Chief Garcia was unavailable, she turned the meeting over to Co-Chair Scott Woody.

B. [Agenda](#) / Minutes Review

1. The [September 29, 2026](#) minutes were noted as posted on the [CDA Work Group website](#).
2. Scott Woody indicated that on the website, under the I-3 Work Group section, minutes from previous meetings can be located, and each document contained a link to access the recording of that meeting. It was clarified that the notation on the minutes that they were created using AI technology was a citation for the recording transcription that is utilized by Adrienne Janowiak when she prepares the minutes.
3. Members with adjustments to the minutes were asked to send them to Scott Woody, Jena Garcia, and Adrienne Janowiak.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. [Charter](#)

1. Scott Woody reported that the charter was going through executive for approval and that there was nothing further to discuss.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Sub-Groups

1. Fire Rated Corridors – [Tony Pamintuan](#) and [Deepika Padam](#)
 - i. Deepika Padam reported that the subgroup held its first meeting that morning, attended by Alvin Wong (OSFM-FLS) and Maynard Feist (Lionakis) and made progress but has further homework. It will meet every other week and expects to report more at the next work group meeting. Tony Pamintuan stated that the attendees shared an understanding of what they are trying to change, discussed challenges seen in past courthouse and I-3 projects, and expect to have proposals by the next meeting. Deepika Padam added that the subgroup initially approached the topic from a Judicial Council of California (JCC) courthouse perspective. The discussion broadened to facilities such as police stations, CDCR facilities, and other facilities with in-custody holding. The subgroup aims to improve the language so that it is unambiguous, clear about intent, and free of conflicting direction. Scott Woody commended the subgroup for meeting within the short time available.
2. Small Management Yard – [Richard Traversi](#)
 - i. Richard Traversi reported no update. The first meeting had not yet been scheduled but was planned for the following week. He welcomed participants to send him their email addresses for the invitation. Scott Woody emphasized that, although the "small management yard" definition arises from a prison-institution context, input from private-sector designers and fire protection engineers was still wanted, since such yards could extend beyond state institutions.
3. Security Glazing – [Alvin Wong](#) and [Laura Wood](#)
 - i. Alvin Wong reported that Laura Wood had scheduled the first subgroup meeting for the following Tuesday from 2:00 to 3:00 PM PDT. Richard Traversi (CDCR) and Mark Grexton (CDCR) would be added to the invitation. Alvin Wong, who attended the Fire Rated Corridors Subgroup meeting, encouraged broad participation. He noted that the committee holds experience across many I-3 facility types, including police facilities, and that diverse views help avoid overly narrow perspectives.
4. Other Items
 - i. Scott Woody reported receiving items from David Solomon (DGS), described as cleanup and low-hanging-fruit items. He will review them and another subgroup may result. He will report back at the next meeting.
5. Additional Item (not on agenda): 2027 International Building Code, Section 408.9
 - i. Scott Woody announced that the 2027 International Building Code (IBC) had been published electronically by the ICC. Because it will be the base model code for the next triennial cycle, the work group needs to review the changes. He used Section 408.9 (formerly the windowless building provisions) as an example of a substantive change relevant to I-3 occupancies. The section now requires a smoke control system for areas where residents sleep in Conditions 3, 4, and 5. California's Condition 9, which covers correctional medical and mental health care, is not in the model code. If California adopted the model language as published, it

- would need to amend the section to add Condition 9. The term "windowless building" no longer appears in the model code.
- ii. Scott Woody reviewed the proposal history. A proposal on behalf of the State Fire Marshal (G69-25) originally added a "tenable environment" definition and referenced Section 909. That reference included an engineering analysis exception under Section 909.4. The committee struck the reference to Section 909 at the first hearing, citing simplification. The Code Action Committee modified the language further, producing the published text. He stated that the model code process confirmed that the provisions were intended for sleeping areas in Conditions 3, 4, and 5, not for temporary holding, courthouses, or other I-3 conditions. He asked members to research the question and said no recommendation was required at this meeting. A recommendation would be needed by the end of November, and he asked for input on whether to adopt the model language as is, adopt it with amendments, or retain California-specific provisions.
 - iii. Maynard Feist (Lionakis) objected to the new requirement, saying it contradicts the group's efforts to retain windowless-building exceptions and that smoke control systems in these facilities are very expensive and complicated. He said even deputy fire marshals had not agreed on how to test them. Given California's existing restrictions, he questioned whether the requirement was necessary. He also noted that the exceptions were reduced to a single exception for a direct exit to the exterior.
 - iv. Lorenzo Lopez (Nacht & Lewis) agreed. He said that at a minimum Condition 9 must be added, but that he wanted to read further. He observed that the requirement does not account for other built-in safety features, such as security electronics that can release all doors. He suggested a quantified exception, such as achieving egress within a set time while conditions remain tenable. He asked whether any exception remained and whether the State Fire Marshal's proposal had included exceptions based on locking and construction type. He later asked that language pointing to Section 909 be included, so that designers are not told that no exceptions exist.
 - v. Lisa Beaver (Vanir) took a solution-based view. She said Chapter 9 offers equivalency options for smoke control or smoke removal, including passive systems and exhaust as already used in existing institutions. She argued that smoke control depends on fire-driven buoyancy. California's restrictive provisions, such as Type I construction and limited combustibles, leave too little fire energy for buoyancy, so a smoke control requirement would "just be a way to spend money." She suggested the group evaluate the question from an engineering perspective.
 - vi. Andrew Thul (Woden) noted that in ICC-based jurisdictions elsewhere, these systems are generally simple air-change ventilation systems with one or two zones, unlike the California State Fire Marshal's rigorous historical expectations. He said a clear definition of an acceptable engineered system for California's detention typologies would be important, because such systems can be either very simple or very costly. Later, he observed that the ICC committee likely removed the clarifying

- text because Section 909 already permits an engineering analysis in lieu of an active system, making the repetition redundant.
- vii. Alvin Wong (OSFM-FLS) shared that recent large county jail projects reviewed by the State Fire Marshal's office used passive approaches. These projects invested in an initial rational analysis showing that the design fire, limited fuel loading, and high day-room ceilings kept the smoke layer above six feet and conditions tenable. They therefore did not install smoke control. He also asked whether the model language would be adopted automatically if the work group took no action. Scott Woody said that was his understanding, and Chrishana Fields (OSFM-CDA) confirmed it. Absent other direction from the group, the amendments in the 2025 California code, including Condition 9 and Section 909, would carry over to the next edition. She asked the group to correlate the 2025 provisions with the new model language.
 - viii. Chuan Hua (Lionakis) stated a preference to keep the existing California exceptions, including the Section 408.9.1 smoke venting provisions, because many projects rely on them. Scott Woody posed the question of whether Section 909 should be referenced and whether the exceptions should be retained and said CDA needs that input.
 - ix. Scott Woody noted that the commentary to the 2027 IBC had not been published. He also challenged private designers to consider how they would handle the requirement in other states, since the IBC applies nationally.

IV. ROUNDTABLE/PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Smoke detection in I-3 occupancies: Andrew Thul (Woden) raised ongoing discussion of the California amendment to I-3 smoke detection requirements, specifically language on smoke detector system zoning, notification, and annunciation. He said confusion exists and clarity would help. Scott Woody agreed to add the topic.
- B. Cell tiers (new Subgroup 4): [Lorenzo Lopez](#) (Nacht & Lewis) asked to add a topic on tier requirements. The code states that tiers are not mezzanines, yet a prior amendment subjected tiers to mezzanine requirements. He said the area of a tier typically exceeds the one-third mezzanine limit once cells and chases are counted, so the amendment required floor-type construction, including two-hour construction. He argued that this conflicts with the purpose of tiers and proposed returning to the model code. Scott Woody established a fourth subgroup on cell tiers, led by Lorenzo Lopez, to be posted in the meeting minutes. Maynard Feist (Lionakis) noted that "cell tiers" is a defined term and that the work might be a simple definition change. Lorenzo Lopez said he already had volunteers and needed State Fire Marshal representation. Laura Wood (OSFM-FLS) volunteered. Scott Woody noted that executive approval will require the group to work back from the final deadline, which Chrishana Fields (OSFM-CDA) would confirm, and that low-hanging-fruit topics could continue past the cycle deadline if needed.
- C. I-3 Condition 1 and Group R: Chuan Ha (Lionakis) asked whether the code should clarify which Group R subgroup applies to I-3 Condition 1, given the growing number of R subgroups and the fact that R-2.1 is already used for Group I-1. Chuan Ha said no separate subgroup was needed and the topic could be handled in an existing one. In the chat, Lorenzo Lopez (Nacht & Lewis) reported that R-4 is typically used, which limits rooms to 16 and requires a one-hour fire partition around them, and that

exceeding 16 rooms presents challenges. Scott Woody cited the code commentary, which describes a work release center as typically a Condition 1 facility. He noted that conservation camps, CDCR/CAL FIRE fire camps, and CDCR's R-2.2 release program may be affected and said the topic should be examined for whom it affects and benefits. Maynard Feist (Lionakis) questioned why Condition 1, with free egress, is classified as I-3 at all. No subgroup was assigned.

- D. Windowless buildings: Alvin Wong (OSFM-FLS) relayed a chat question from Michele Hausauer (Nacht & Lewis) asking whether the term "windowless buildings" had been removed from the ICC entirely. He confirmed by search that it no longer appears in the 2027 IBC. Scott Woody agreed. Maynard Feist (Lionakis) noted that the exceptions in current Section 408.9 reference windowless buildings. Scott Woody said a word search of Title 24 is needed. If California still needs the term, it must be defined and italicized as a California-only provision.

V. UPCOMING MEETING DATES FOR 2026

- A. Meetings are held every two weeks on Tuesday from 2:00 PM to 3:30 PM PDT.
- B. Upcoming meetings:
 - 1. October 27, 2026
 - 2. November 10, 2026
 - 3. November 24, 2026 (week of Thanksgiving)

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT – 3:00 PM PDT

- A. Scott Woody thanked members for their voluntary participation on behalf of the State Fire Marshal's office. No further comments were raised, and the meeting adjourned approximately half an hour before its scheduled end. The meeting minutes will be posted on the CDA website as soon as possible.

*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/YssR-5zLZgw>

Note: This document was created using AI technology