

Technical Structure and Design Subcommittee
of the Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee –
Draft Minutes
June 27, 2011 Meeting 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Subcommittee Members:	
Steven Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ishbel Dickens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Kevin Jewell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tim Sheahan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Michael Wade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Greg Scott	
Jeff Legault	
Frank Walter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Richard Weinert	
David Tompos – Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Adam Rust	
Bill Stamer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Organization:	
Phil Sapone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HUD:	
Rick Mendlen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Guests:	
Mark Weis, MHARR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lois Starkey, MHI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Administrative Organization proceeded with roll call at 1:00 p.m.

The Subcommittee Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Review of prior meeting's minutes:

Subcommittee members were asked to look at minutes from the June 15 call. There are some changes.

- Under Log 76, where it states a cost for the industry of \$3.5 million, it should actually be \$300 million. Also, the assumption of 2.5 lives saved in 2005 is assuming all deaths occur in manufactured housing. This is a clarification.
- Under Log 34, Kevin Jewell and Ishbel Dickens were the ones who abstained and they would like their names reflected there. The reason was because the description of the issue was unclear.

Mark Weis would like to know why he and other guests don't get copies of the minutes. The AO stated that he would pass along this concern to Robert Solomon. Frank Walter suggested that the minutes be posted on the website; perhaps that would be easier.

Technical Structure and Design Subcommittee
of the Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee –
Draft Minutes
June 27, 2011 Meeting 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Dave Tompos: Motion to accept the prior meeting minutes as amended.

Motion seconded.

Vote: Unanimous approval

Discussion of Log 77:

Issue noted with respect to the term 'journeyman'. This was noted and it was said that clarifying language would be provided to address these concerns.

- It was noted that there are some standards for work quality under the plumbing section, and that this could be used as an basis/example.

Discussion of Sprinkler Systems:

The reason this is being brought forward is because HUD wanted to know the Consensus Committee's opinion on this issue.

- In general, the recommendation to HUD is that they should adopt a proposal that would explicitly preempt an existing sprinkler standard.
- There would be two options; NFPA 13D or a prescriptive requirement (similar to IRC) if the manufacturer or consumer decides to install a fire sprinkler.

Rick Mendlen was asked to give his opinion regarding the ability of the code to preempt local sprinkler requirements. Rick said he is unable to give new information that would clarify this because there is nothing to report.

Frank Walter: Motion for subcommittee to adopt this proposal (the MHI proposal), and send to the full committee for recommendation to HUD.

Motion seconded.

One member noted that she would oppose the motion because she'd prefer to use prior language. She doesn't like the absolute language stating that NO fire sprinklers are required. She suggested this language be removed from the beginning of the section.

Frank Walter: Amendment to prior motion:

There was an amendment to the original motion to adopt MHI's original proposal and to strike out 'not required' and go back to the 'where required' language.

There was an issue noted regarding the requirements for factory testing of sprinklers.

Technical Structure and Design Subcommittee
of the Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee –
Draft Minutes
June 27, 2011 Meeting 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

There was a question on whether there will be additional testing once the sprinkler system is hooked up.

- A member gave an example of standards that stated that additional testing was done onsite on the entire system once it was installed, in addition to testing being done at the factory.

A concern was noted that if you're not going to preempt the requirements are you really going to have uniformity by establishing a standard for testing requirements anyway?

A suggestion was noted to go back and not have so much language changed for the two options (13D and IRC)

Frank Walter: Motion to table the outstanding motion with the current amendments.

Motion seconded.

Vote: Unanimous approval.

In response to this, MHI will go back and rework the recommendations for sprinkler systems based on the feedback received during the discussion and bring it back to the subcommittee once these changes have been made.

Clarification was made that certain language in the current proposal is preemption. So, to determine how HUD will respond to the issue of preemption it was suggested that a proposal supporting preemption should be recommended to them. This way, the committee can see where HUD stands on the issue of preemption.

There was a concern that trade associations were really driving the discussion of this issue. It was felt that this is a subcommittee issue so they should step aside and let the subcommittee lead the discussion.

Dave Tompos: Motion to adjourn the subcommittee meeting at 2:05 p.m.

Motion seconded.

Vote: Unanimous approval.