



DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 445-8200
Website: www.fire.ca.gov



I-3 OCCUPANCY CODES WORKING GROUP MEETING NOTES – JULY 12, 2016

Attendees:

Sanjay Aggarwal
Greg Andersen
Carmelito (Lito) Cataylo
Gary Dungar
Maynard Feist
Chris Fowler
Josh Gibson
Hans Henneberque
Andrew Henning
Jeffrey Maddox
Robert McCormick
Paul R. Menard

Spencer Meyer
Robert Oates
Bill Robertson
Gordon W. Rogers
Shawn Sen
Michael Stewart
Nancy Timmins
Michael C. Vieira

Via Phone:

Aaron Greer
John Marhoefer

AGENDA TOPICS

Welcome

Welcome by Andrew Henning and Roll Call. A sign-in list is circulated to members in attendance. Members in attendance via phone are requested to send an email to Henning to confirm attendance.

Meeting Minutes Review

March 1st and April 11th meeting minutes were previously distributed – June meeting minutes not done.

Anticipate March and April minutes to be finalized prior to August 2nd meeting.

Any comments on March or April meeting minutes?

Motion to approve – motion 2nd. All in favor – no opposition.

Supplemental Code - Critical Timelines

Anything not finalized before the August 2nd, 2016 meeting will not be included in the 2016 supplemental code and will be pushed to 2019 Supplemental codes.

Goals and Information for July 11, 2016 Meeting

Working groups were requested to submit proposed code changes in BSC format. Out of the 5 groups, 2 groups were on-time but not in correct format, 1 group submitted changes 1-day late in flawless report format and 1 group neglected to submit any information.

Requested a volunteer to put all received information in proper format. All individual reports to be merged in to a single report. Have ready for draft review by August 2nd meeting. Hans Henneberque stepped up to take this project.

Clarification on Definitions:

3 page rational not needed for a small changes, big changes require an detailed rational.

Calification/no change in regulatory effect do not need rationale

Define if term is used in code and unclear

Be sure the definition is only a definition and not quoting regulations.

Definitions and requirements need to be separated.

Group 1 Document discussion

Change sobriety change to sobering – consistent with information in chapter 13.

- Provide short rationale to explain change.
- Ok to use the same rationale for separate code changes if the intent is the same.

Access to public ways

- Will need stand-alone rationale
- Be specific on our standards and how we arrived at this decision
- ADA cannot be less than federal standards – we are more restrictive, describe why.

I-3 specific to occupancy

- limited to staff – not open to public.
- Not more than 250 sq ft.

Definition for correctional medical mental health suite needs to be addressed.

- Group 2 and 5 need to get together to make sure no overlap.
- Chapter 2 and 4 add requirements for each suites
- 1015.2 shows entire code sections, use similar language to shipladder, riser height and tread depth.

- Need justification for everything.

Housing pod definition – 2nd sentence

- What's the difference between a pod and a dorm?
- Definition needs to be cleared up. Group agrees this needs to be defined.
- Housing pods contain sleeping areas, and may contain day room space, showers, toilet facilities and minor support spaces. – This needs justification – add pictures to report.
- Kicked back to group 1 and needs 1-3 paragraph (thesis) justification.

Group 2 Document Discussion

Occupancy suite definition

- Need to include cell complex suite and other types of suites
- Changing occupancy to occupancy suite which are not defined
- Insert 4 definitions to chapter 2 / similar to high rise definition chapter 2 of CBC
- 1 main heading and sub definitions for each type of suite
- Intake and medical are issues for the design team.
- Detention suites. Place an occupant load – reasonable number is less than 100.
- Revert back to group 2 and 5 to work out details.

Group 3 Document Discussion

- Exception #1 – Getting rid of the word staffing
- Exception 2 – no different than in current state code
- Exception 3 is new one - for larger court house holding areas – temporary central holding getting rid of word “sufficient staffing”
- Item 3.1 – occupants can be expected to have limited combustible items in their possession. Discuss in rationale the need for the change. Move to rationale.
- Exception 4 any court room holding with less 20 no proof necessary – exempt.
- Exception 5 – change to 5.5 got rid of staffing is sufficient and egress analysis.
- Added 5.6 no exhaust method to prove tenability needed but still need pressurization smoke control method.

Group 4 Document Discussion

Cell Tiers - Proposed language regarding mezzanine

- Add sentence regarding Non-rated construction. Keep with 1/3 – if rated go to 2/3.
- Recommend adding language regarding spoke barriers and penetration.
- Proposing adding code language definition for central control, control room, temporary hold control room and custody station. - Will provide justification later.
- Need to define what central control is – identify control room needs
- Delete temporary and merge the 2 together.
- Custody station purpose to supervise those in custody. Custody station is same as nurses station – took language from nurse station code and wordsmith to fit custody station.
- Hans will work with Gary to get justification for code change proposal.
- Suggestion to bring in I-3 storage room facilities greater than 100 sq ft will be addressed as incidental use. Current code is 1 hour and sprinklers.
- Kick back to the committee to address concerns and bring back to the table at August meeting. Committee to evaluate Type 1 construction exemption, when does it become an occupancy, add vehicle sallyport to table, add Jeff to sub-group to continue discussion.

Group 5 Document Discussion

- Strikeout Exception C and add new exception C for I-2 and 2.1 to distinguish I-3. Also add A occupancy.
- Address the inconsistencies in 1231, chapter 10 to determine occupant load.
- Use the term detention facilities.
- Agree to use Temporary foot holding - regardless of the footnotes (to be discussed at a later time)
- Day room – add justification regarding overcrowding – design cannot proceed future events.
- Footnote: Day room does not account for the accumulative occupancy.
- Load is based on number of beds. - Responsibility of the design professionals to calculate possibilities to increase occupancy load in the future.
- Pushed back to group to have discussion at next meeting.

Healthcare in Detention and Restraint

- Restraint shall not be permitted in any building other than I-3's.
- Definition not statutory – but regulatory
- Add facility type examples – state amendment uses that would follow under I-3.
- Show codes locations/section in CBC and CFC – make clear on each of the proposed code changes. Have a statement or note above each code section.

407.12

- Efforts to address locked I-2's.
- Limits height and area construction to the same as I-3's. The language is the same.
- If people are locked in the I-2's, it will need to have sprinklers.

408.21

- New condition adopts many of the I-2 requirements and makes them applicable to health care in the detention centers. Already in 408, just in different section.

Future meetings

August 2, 2016
9:00-4:00

- July 26, 2016 - Have reports to Hans by COB
- July 28, 2016 - Hans to have report to Andrew by COB
- August 2, 2016 - working meeting to read through rough draft of report

August 16, 2016
9:00-12:00

- Final read though of report

Meeting adjourned