CWUI WORK GROUP
Meeting Minutes – November 4, 2026
Posted – November 20, 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 – 1:00 PM PST

A. Welcome/Introductions – Jena Garcia and John Morgan

1. The meeting was called to order by Jena Garcia (OSFM-CDA), who was sitting in for Chair Crystal Sujeski, and she advised that Co-Chair John Morgan would be steering the meeting.
2. Becca Mansergh 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. Following the announcement, she turned the meeting over to John Morgan.

B. Agenda/Minutes Review

1. John Morgan confirmed the minutes and agenda were posted on the website (go to the Code Development and Analysis Work Groups website page for all agendas and minutes)
2. The minutes were displayed and a motion to approve the October 7, 2026 minutes was made by Bob Raymer and seconded by Greg Andersen. No objections were raised and the motion carried.
3. John Morgan then presented the agenda.
4. Dan Gorham asked that the Windows/Doors subgroup be allowed to present its proposals, citing the State Fire Marshal's timeline. Larry Williams asked whether the timeline requiring final proposals by the December meeting could be revisited, since the schedule for the CAC appeared to allow January or February and he did not want to rush work.
5. Jena Garcia explained that the agency faced a hard stop: rulemaking documents must be finalized by February 1 to enter internal approval processes, including economist review and new Building Standards Commission requirements. Initial proposals therefore had to reach the full work group no later than the December

meeting so they could be vetted at a final January meeting. She said the agency was willing to support an additional meeting if the chairs could.

6. Motion to approve the agenda was made by Bob Raymer and seconded by Kevin Scott. No objections were raised and the motion carried.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Subgroups

1. AB 2322 CH7A ASCE 7 – Paul Armstrong, Sunup Mathew, and Shamim Rashid-Sumar
    i. Sunup Mathew presented the subgroup's latest draft. It is a new section implementing AB 2322 for critical infrastructure. The subgroup reached consensus on the definition and the building groups within scope. It was still working on the exterior building elements and on an exception that redefines the ember-resistant zone and ember-resistant materials, with a building offset or perimeter to be set. The subgroup planned to meet on the 12th, 18th, and 25th for one hour each to finalize Section 504.12.1.
    ii. Paul Armstrong asked that all work groups follow the same methodology for cost statements. Jena Garcia said she would share the Building Standards templates for rulemaking documents and that the work group was not expected to perform the cost study, since the agency would approach its economist once the proposal was vetted.
    iii. Bob Raymer noted that the draft calls for two-, three-, and four-hour wall assemblies. Paul Armstrong replied that this comes directly from AB 2322 and applies to non-residential critical infrastructure in ASCE 7 Risk Categories III and IV. Bob Raymer said he would review the bill. Kevin Reinertson asked that the scope be displayed, and Helene Hardy Pierce noted that the reference in Section 504.12.1 should be to 504.12.2 through 504.12.5. Jena Garcia said all proposals discussed would be included in the minutes and posted once made accessibility compliant. Sunup Mathew would also send the draft to interested parties.

2. Roofing – Helene Hardy Pierce
    i. Eaves on roof coverings with voids. The subgroup returned to the language agreed in 2025 with edits. These specify that the enclosure be non-combustible so that it is not mistaken for non-combustible bird stops. The edits also move "or" for sentence structure, change the intent to resisting the intrusion of flames, embers, and debris, and add "debris."
    ii. Section 504.2.1 deck protection. The subgroup recommended revising item 2 so that an underlayment tested on its own need only pass the Class C burning brand test, not all three tests under ASTM E108/UL 790. Helene Hardy Pierce described the burning brand test as harsh, since 25 two-inch brands are placed on the deck and must burn out without igniting the underside.
    iii. Eric Banks was confused by the section numbers because he was viewing the last published edition. Helene Hardy Pierce clarified that the language was from the intervening revision. Kevin Reinertson posted in

the chat the language approved by the Building Standards Commission in the intervening cycle. No other comments were made.

3. Accessory Structures – Milad Shabanian
    i. Milad Shabanian reported that the subgroup had cleaned up terminology and was close to final drafts. It asked whether accessory structures within five feet of a building (Zone Zero) should be limited to non-combustible protection or allowed to match the building's construction.
    ii. John Morgan referred the subgroup to the Board of Forestry's draft Zone Zero rule text, noting that it is phased and that new accessory structures are either not allowed within five feet or must be built to the same standard as the house. Larry Williams said the draft prohibits outbuildings of 120 square feet or less in Zone Zero unless entirely non-combustible. It applies immediately to new buildings, with a three-year retrofit for existing ones. He favored proposing the requirement now, as other Title 24 provisions are already more restrictive than Title 14.
    iii. Kevin Reinertson presented a hypothetical of a compliant CWUI-type shed versus an inexpensive thin metal shed. He argued that the subgroup should do what is best for the code and let the full work group decide. Greg Andersen raised the legal question of authority between the Board of Forestry (vegetation) and the building codes, and the risk of conflict. Kevin Scott supported allowing construction equal to the main building, giving homeowners more options. The subgroup would bring the question to the OSFM. Jena Garcia posted the Board of Forestry document in the chat.

4. Weathering / Ignition-Resistant Materials – Marcelo Hirschler and Chrishana Fields
    i. Chrishana Fields reported, since Marcelo Hirschler was traveling, that the subgroup had progressed on paints and coatings and was still working on plastic lumber and wood-plastic composites. She presented three proposals:
    ii. Strike the current prohibition on paints, coatings, and stains and replace it with performance requirements.
    iii. Add a new section for surface-treated materials, covering factory-applied products weathered under ASTM D2898 Test Method B or another UV-inclusive method per an evaluation report. Field-applied products must follow the manufacturer's listing with special inspection. These products would not be applied to deck walking surfaces.
    iv. Renumber the weathering section.
    v. Kevin Scott offered editorial changes: use a period after Test Method B, correct "and/or," and clarify that a special inspection "is conducted" in accordance with CBC Chapter 17. Chrishana Fields accepted these as editorial. Kevin Reinertson praised the work group for achieving a performance-based path from nothing. Annebelle Klein supported the editorial changes.

5. Vents – Kevin Scott
    i. Kevin Scott presented four vent proposals in both California Code and 2027 IWUIC formats. He asked how they would be forwarded to the Building Standards Commission. Jena Garcia said OSFM would carry the amendments forward into the model code and welcomed seeing both versions.
    ii. Proposal 1 is editorial: ventilation openings "shall be fully covered with vents" complying with the referenced sections. Greg Andersen asked whether to vote. Kevin Scott preferred that the work group review the rationale first, and Larry Williams suggested presenting all items as a package at the December meeting. John Morgan agreed that non-controversial items would be ready for approval in December.
    iii. Proposal 2 covers vents other than roof ridge or field vents. It adds ASTM D2898 weathering before the flame and ember tests, with vents tested in both horizontal and vertical orientations. Tim Earl objected that ASTM D2898 was developed for fire-retardant-treated wood, that the ASTM committee had rejected expanding its scope, and that it may not suit plastics. Milad Shabanian said no plastic vents are listed to the relevant standard. Greg Andersen said weathering was a documented problem and that this was the best available whole-vent method. Kevin Reinertson said that if the standard proved too contentious, the option for ridge and field vents could be removed. Kevin Scott said over a dozen standards had been reviewed and none was better. In response to Eric Banks, he said all vents, including metal, would be weathered so every product is on equal footing.
    iv. Proposals 3A and 3B address roof ridge and roof field vents. 3A relies on a pending ASTM fire test and 3B retains prescriptive criteria, and only one would move forward depending on ASTM's progress. Both revise the 144-square-inch limit to apply to the roof deck opening and add an exception for slot-type vents with a smallest dimension of eight inches or less. 3A also removes the 10-foot lot-line requirement because vents would be tested. Tim Earl cautioned that the ASTM standard was unlikely to be approved before June 2027 and could slip to December or 2028. Kevin Scott said the subgroup would propose that the State Fire Marshal develop its own test standard rather than wait. He said the subgroup would revise the rationale based on comments.

6. Chapters 2/6 – Larry Williams
    i. Kevin Reinertson presented continuing items, noting that consensus items were presented in October. These included fire protection plan timing and contents (including slopes), and the repeal of State amendments now covered by the 2027 IWUIC. They also included vegetation and tree provisions that conflict with Board of Forestry and SFM regulations, relocation of maintenance provisions to Chapter 7, and accessory buildings.

ii. Larry Williams reported that the subgroup was meeting the next day and that Title 19 text in the fire code is out of date. He said a proposal was sent to OSFM for the fire code and to the Board of Forestry regarding the statutory Government Code definition of defensible space for LRA/SRA. Kevin Scott questioned why the existing definitions were insufficient. Larry Williams explained that the Government Code definition is statutory and cannot be changed without legislation. The topic was left for subgroup discussion.

iii. Greg Andersen said exterior walls and projections items would follow at the next meeting. John Morgan attempted a poll, which failed due to a Teams error, and asked participants to respond in the chat about a longer or split December meeting. Kathy Krafka Harkema noted that many proposals had not reached consensus and cautioned against putting everything into one day. Jennifer Hatfield noted that the ICC Fire Code Action Committee meets 3:30–5:30 PM Eastern on December 2, the same day as the next work group meeting. Based on the responses, John Morgan stated that two separate meetings would be scheduled, preferably with one in the morning, and that an amended link and agenda would be sent.

7. Chapter 4 – Matthew McKenna and Larry Williams
    i. Larry Williams reported that he had presented items in October. He proposed removing the defensible space definition in Section 403, as the Public Resources Code does not define it for fire safe regulations. He said the item would be brought to the full group after the next day's meeting, when Chapter 4 would be combined with Chapters 2 and 6.

8. Windows/Doors – Daniel Gorham and Greg Andersen
    i. Dan Gorham reported that the subgroup met the previous day, would meet next on November 18, and had one proposal with consensus.
    ii. Layout proposal. Jennifer Hatfield presented a reorganization by product type under a new "fenestration products" section. It covers exterior windows, structural glass veneer, exterior skylights (adding a Class A fire classification option), operable skylights (screen mesh tightened from 1/8 to 1/16 inch), exterior glazed doors, and exterior doors. Glazing in exterior doors with less than 25% glazed area would meet the exterior glazed door requirements. A minimum-size exception, using a three-inch sphere from the residential code, remained under study. Vehicle access doors would move to a separate Section 504.9, with options developed with DASMA and a residential garage door operator subsection. The subgroup was still settling how to draft the vehicle access door exemption. Kevin Scott asked why the solid core door options specify 1-3/4 inch and 1-3/8 inch thicknesses, and Jennifer Hatfield agreed to take the question back to the subgroup, and it was confirmed the battery backup language was retained in Section 504.9.2.
    iii. SFM 12-7A-2 revision. Dan Gorham described a restructured test standard that adds definitions, a summary, a triplicate-replicate requirement, assembly conditioning, observations, a report section, and

revised acceptance criteria. These include no flame penetration and no opening larger than 1/8 inch. Bob Raymer asked for a strikethrough/underline version. Greg Andersen said so many sections moved that this would be confusing, and that a reasoning statement would be provided.

iv. Frame and exposure proposals (no subgroup consensus). Bob Raymer asked how the proposals would affect vinyl-frame windows, citing energy code compliance, cost, and insurance considerations. Greg Anderson presented a proposal requiring wall, eave, and glazing protection where exposed to another building within 30 feet (or 15 feet from the property line). Compliant glazing would be a rated window, non-combustible frames, or an assembly passing SFM 12-7A-2. Bob Raymer noted that nearly all new housing would fall within the thresholds. Kevin Reinertson questioned the data, stating that WUI-compliant subdivisions had not been lost to conflagrations, and said building-to-building and property-line distances should be treated consistently with the building code. Bob Raymer cited a CBIA/OSFM analysis showing strong WUI performance. Greg Andersen offered an exemption for developments built to Chapter 7A. Payam Bozorgchami raised human-nature factors such as stored items near structures.

v. Milad Shabanian presented a similar proposal with a fixed 30-foot distance, ignition-resistant materials on the exterior side of frames, and shutters and security screens as alternatives. Dan Parrish presented a preliminary proposal adding full-window non-combustible screens, citing 40–50% radiant heat reduction and ASTM E2886 ember testing results, as an option for new and retrofit construction. David Horobin's roller shutter presentation was deferred after Kevin Reinertson asked that presentations be held and Larry Williams questioned product presentations.

9. Exterior Walls/Eaves/Soffits/Under Floors – Greg Andersen and Milad Shabanian
    i. No report was given. Greg Anderson had left the meeting and stated earlier that he would follow up at the next meeting.

10. Projections/Decks (including awnings, etc.) – Paul Armstrong and Greg Andersen
    i. No report was given because the presenters were not present.

11. Retrofit – Marco Mack
    i. No report was given because the presenter was not present.

12. Exterior Sprinklers – Kevin Scott
    i. Kevin Scott presented a proposed revision to Appendix G adding a description of exterior wildfire sprinkler systems as an optional home-hardening measure. It is not a requirement and not a substitute for ignition-resistant or fire-resistant construction, and it addresses wind-

borne embers, not flame fronts. He cited 59 documented structures protected by exterior sprinklers in the Palisades fire, with two receiving damage, and noted that the subgroup agreed to protect the structure and 30 feet of defensible space. No standard yet exists, so no requirement was proposed. He said the item was ready for a vote. No comments or motions followed.

III. NEW BUSINESS

John Morgan stated that no new business had been proposed apart from requests for additional meeting times.

IV. ROUNDTABLE/PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dan Gorham thanked John Morgan and staff and asked when the proposals shown would be distributed. John Morgan and Chrishana Fields stated that materials would be sent out within about a week of the meeting.

V. UPCOMING MEETING DATES FOR 2026

A. Meetings are held on the first Wednesday of each month at 1:00 PM PST
B. Next Meeting: December 2, 2026
C. An additional or extended meeting date, with Chief Crystal Sujeski expected to attend, would be arranged for final proposals and voting. Minutes and documentation would be sent as soon as possible.

VI. MEETING ADJOURNMENT – 4:14 PM PST

A. Motion to adjourn was made by Helene Hardy Pierce and seconded by Chrishana Fields. With no opposition, the motion carried and 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/RzirG2ceau0

Note: This document was created using AI technology