I-3 WORK GROUP
Meeting Minutes – October 27, 2026
Posted – October 30, 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 – 2:04 PM PDT

A. Welcome/Introductions – Jena Garcia (OSFM-CDA)

1. The meeting was called to order by Jena Garcia 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 Jena Garcia.

B. Agenda / Minutes Review

1. The October 13, 2026 minutes were 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. Late in the meeting, Jena Garcia noted that no motion to approve the minutes had been recorded. The previous minutes were displayed on screen and a motion to approve was made by Laura Wood and seconded by Lorenzo Lopez. Consensus support was shown by raised hands, with no opposition and no comments to change. The motion carried.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Subgroups

1. Fire Rated Corridors – Tony Pamintuan and Deepika Padam
    i. Tony Pamintuan reported that the subgroup reached consensus to leave the intervening spaces code section unchanged. The group had begun elaborating on the temporary holding areas section and was taking suggestions for modified language. Several options were written down, and at least one more meeting would be needed to tighten the language. Scott Woody added background for members who had missed earlier sessions. The Judicial Council of California (JCC) is leading the effort

because the California provisions for temporary holding areas, such as the numeric thresholds for intervening spaces, corridors, and persons under restraint, are confusing, particularly for courtroom holding areas.

2. Small Management Yard – Richard Traversi
    i. Richard Traversi reported that the section was created a few code cycles ago but the program has since evolved. The 150 square foot provision was outdated because it referred to total area, while the program has added features inside the exercise yard. The subgroup changed the provision to 180 square feet of clear area, consistent with current California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) standards. In item 4, the 75 square foot figure was removed, leaving a maximum of 50 percent cover. At Scott Woody's suggestion, the fire protection system language was reoriented. Sprinklers and fire alarm systems are now required if the yard is within 10 feet of a building or structure, except for other small management yards. This eliminates the exception language and simplifies application. Items 1 and 2, both addressing noncombustible materials, were consolidated, and a new provision was added requiring 8 foot wide walkways from buildings to the yards. Richard Traversi stated there would be no additional cost. Scott Woody said the subgroup would prepare strikeout and added-language text with a justification and cost statement. He expected it to be ready for presentation at the next meeting in two weeks.
3. Security Glazing – Alvin Wong and Laura Wood
    i. Laura Wood reported on behalf of Alvin Wong, who was absent. The previous week's meeting covered the history of the transition from the Uniform Building Code to the International Building Code. Alvin Wong gave a deep dive on the model code version of security glazing, including the sprinkler question of deluge systems versus other heads. No language has been drafted, discussion remains at the concept stage, and Alvin Wong asked other members to bring their own research to the next meeting. The subgroup meets on alternating Tuesdays at 2:00 PM, and interested members should email Alvin Wong or Laura Wood to be invited.
    ii. Scott Woody explained that Section 408 contains two glazing provisions, a California provision in Section 408.13 and a model code provision. The subgroup is evaluating whether to eliminate or merge them. He also reported a side finding. The earlier I-3 group changes pointed to the correct ASTM standard but missed a separate security glazing provision in Chapter 12 for juvenile detention. Local detention facilities in that chapter retained outdated CDCR language that had been struck elsewhere. Scott Woody coordinated with Tonya Parker-Mashburn of BSCC and Richard Traversi of CDCR, and BSCC will revise the Chapter 12 language to align with Section 408.13. He acknowledged that the 2022 language had not been word-searched at the time. Maynard Feist cautioned that Chapter 12 contains different security grade levels and recommended not referencing only one of them. Scott Woody and Maynard Feist clarified that the relevant reference is the ASTM F1915 testing standard rather than a grade level.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Subgroups

1. Cell Tiers – Lorenzo Lopez
    i. Lorenzo Lopez presented a side-by-side comparison of the 2025 code and the model code definitions of cell tier. The model code defines a cell tier as levels of cells vertically stacked within a housing unit. The California language limits tiers to two levels per floor and provides that a tier is not a story or mezzanine. It also limits the aggregate tier area to 0.333 of the pod floor area when supported by nonrated construction and to 0.667 when the tier floor and supporting elements meet the floor fire rating.
    ii. Lorenzo Lopez explained the history. The "not a story or mezzanine" language originally spared tiers from floor rating requirements and the mezzanine 0.333 limit. A later change compromised on the two-tier area thresholds. The problem is that steel cell construction cannot practically meet rating requirements for the posts supporting the tier walkway. He and the subgroup concluded that the greater than 0.333 rating requirement is not truly necessary and suggested reverting to the model code and eliminating California's cell tier language. He said it would still need to be clarified that tier area is not limited, and what may be located on a tier (dormitories, accessory spaces, showers, custody stations) should be confirmed.
    iii. Lorenzo Lopez also raised a related definitional issue. California historically defined a "housing pod" (a single day-room installation) and a "housing unit" (several pods). The IBC now defines a housing unit as a single day-room installation, so the California definitions conflict. He proposed that California adopt the model code usage and suggested "housing wing" for a grouping of units, since existing language on intervening spaces refers to multiple housing units connected to a nonrated corridor.
    iv. Scott Woody agreed and encouraged the group not to be afraid of such spin-offs. He cautioned that new definitions require forward and backward passes through the code. Johannes Henneberque expressed agreement with reverting to the model code and asked why a grouping of housing units would need a separate name. He added that he would favor eliminating the intervening space language completely but expected to be outvoted. Lorenzo Lopez responded that without it, "everything's a corridor." Scott Woody said the intervening spaces topic would be parked for continued discussion in January. He noted that the model code allows corridor protection to be reduced through the Use Condition 3, 4, and 5 overlay provisions, such as smoke-tight openings and security glazing.
2. Security door assemblies for 408.10.3 – David Solomon
    i. Proposed Subgroup 5 – Security Door Assemblies. David Solomon proposed a new subgroup to update the language of Section 408.10.3 on security doors, starting from a missing word in the provision requiring smoke sealing per UL 1784. Maynard Feist asked what the underlying concern was and recommended including experienced participants. Lorenzo Lopez explained that the provision was added because security doors with thick frames and heads cannot be tested to the standard and

were exempted, and that the language helps avoid agency review issues. Scott Woody and Maynard Feist clarified that the doors must be built to the standard, with documentation, but are not tested or labeled. Jena Garcia supported cleaning up the wording for readability. The subgroup was designated "security door assemblies for 408.10.3," with David as lead. Chair Garcia reminded members that subgroup leads are responsible for scheduling meetings and copying the chair, co-chair, and support staff, and that staff can assist with scheduling.

IV. ROUNDTABLE/PUBLIC COMMENT

A. Proposal Deadlines and Process. Jena Garcia explained new agency processes. Initial draft proposals must be presented to the main work group at the first December meeting (December 8, 2026). Revisions and consensus approval must follow by January, ahead of a hard office deadline of February 2, 2027. No proposals will come through the subgroups without vetting and approval by the main work group, and she expressed hope that detailed debate would be resolved within the subgroups. She noted that the November 24 meeting, during Thanksgiving week, may lack the participation needed for approvals.

B. Proposals should be submitted in Word format in strikeout-and-underline style, along with rationale and cost. Scott Woody offered to send Tony Pamintuan an example. CDA will verify all proposed text against the first published edition of the model code, which is what the Building Standards Commission adopts. A fixed template will be developed after January. Because anything posted on the agency website must be accessibility compliant, work group drafts are attached to minutes with a caveat. Proposals will be taken by consensus straw vote by raised hand, and opposing views will be recorded. The State Fire Marshal considers all comments and may not support a proposal that the work group supports. Anything advancing then goes through a 45-day comment period. It will be included in the rulemaking package for the 2027 code cycle, effective January 1, 2029.

C. Smoke Control in Sleeping Areas (2027 Model Code). Scott Woody explained that the published 2027 model code replaced windowless building provisions with a requirement for smoke control systems in Use Conditions 3, 4, and 5 where incarcerated or detained individuals sleep, including day rooms and common spaces the sleeping area opens to. The group was asked to recommend to CDA whether to approve the language as written or to add Condition 9 (correctional medical and mental health care), as was done for windowless buildings in 2025.

D. Lorenzo Lopez said bars over standard windows can be broken, so he submitted suggested language. It would apply the requirement where there are no exterior windows or where glazing is detention grade. He also suggested simplifying the exceptions to focus on remotely released doors and an egress analysis showing evacuation within six minutes. Johannes Henneberque preferred keeping the language simple and performance-based, with design by a fire protection engineer (FPE) subject to peer review, noting that prescriptive language invites varied interpretations. Maynard Feist and Lorenzo Lopez countered that this places a burden on small counties and invites inconsistent plan-check interpretation. They noted that modern Type I, sprinklered facilities have little to burn and that direct exits to the exterior and rapid electronic release make evacuation fast. Scott Woody encouraged the group not to fear smoke control, noting that Section 909 allows passive or mechanical solutions backed by rational analysis.

E. Tamara Clarke agreed to investigate how designers in other states meet the new provision and report back within a week. Lorenzo Lopez asked that she include construction types. Scott Woody also asked whether other states build tiers higher than two levels or 24 feet, and Tamara Clarke said she had not seen that.

F. Model Code Definition of "Cell." Scott Woody asked whether the group supports the 2027 model code change, which defines a cell as a room in a housing unit used to confine "incarcerated individuals or detainees." Lorenzo Lopez and Tonya Parker-Mashburn noted that CDCR and BSCC use "incarcerated persons," and Tonya Parker-Mashburn said her agency's group chose that term deliberately. Johannes Henneberque asked how this definition affects jail cells outside a housing unit and temporary holding cells. Lorenzo Lopez noted that California already defines a "temporary holding cell room or area" (holding for less than 24 hours), which may use outdated terms such as "inmates." Laura Wood asked that program terminology be kept out of building code definitions.

G. Jena Garcia asked whether any statute requires particular terminology, and the group may want to evaluate the model code language to determine whether the CA amendments are still needed. Lorenzo Lopez noted that California also has a separate cell definition that mimics the model code and would need to be conformed. Scott Woody observed that earlier code cycles failed to reconcile old UBC Chapter 3A text, and Lorenzo Lopez added that relocating definitions to Chapter 2 created further conflicts, such as "nonambulatory." CDA was asked to research the origin of the California amendment, including the "not more than two" limit that Maynard Feist said stems from CDCR and BSCC. Laura Wood volunteered to lead the work with CDA archival support, and Lorenzo Lopez asked that the cell and temporary holding cell definitions be aligned. The topic will be added to the next agenda under "Definitions." No formal vote was taken.

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. November 10, 2026 **(2:30 to 4:00 PM PDT)**
    i. Changed due to SFM/AEC meeting scheduling conflict
2. November 24, 2026 (week of Thanksgiving)
3. December 8, 2026 (expected to be longer session)

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT – 3:29 PM PDT

A. Motion to adjourn was made by Scott Woody and seconded by Laura Wood. 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/kK38vZKzsz4

Note: This document was created using AI technology