

FINAL

State of Oregon

**MANUFACTURED STRUCTURES AND PARKS
ADVISORY BOARD**

Work Session Minutes

November 16, 2001

Recorder's Note: See separate minutes for Public Hearing before Work Session held this date.

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bill Eames, Chairman
William Peterson, Vice-Chairman
John Caul
Al Laver
Charles Lynch (Telephone Connection)
Bob Netter
Jeff Payne
- MEMBERS ABSENT:** Michael Erb (Excused)
Wallace Fort
Kim Kittle
Charles Lynch (Excused)
Bob Schriever
Phillip Sterling (Excused)
- STAFF PRESENT:** Larry Iverson, Chief Manufactured Structured and Park and
Board Secretary
Jim Hanson, Policy Analyst
Louann Rahmig, Rules Coordinator
Albert Endres, BCD
Al Rust, BCD
Debi Barnes-Woods, Division Board Coordinator/Recorder
- GUESTS PRESENT:** Don Miner, Oregon Manufactured Housing Association (OMHA)
John Sill, Champion
Barnev Martin, Silvercrest Homes
David Kaufman, OHCS
Ann Brown, OHCS
Don Woodley, Marion County
Frank Eld, Idaho Manufactured Housing Association (IMHA)

**I. WORK SESSION BEFORE THE BOARD ON PROPOSED
ADOPTION OF THE 2002 OREGON MANUFACTURED
DWELLING AND PARK SPECIALTY CODE EFFECTIVE
DATE OF APRIL 1, 2002.**

Chairman Eames called the Work Session to order at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held at the Building Codes Division, Conference Room "A", 1535 Edgewater N.W. Salem, Oregon.

Chairman Eames stated for the record, one of the board members, Charles Linch, has joined the work session via-telephone. Linch has received a faxed copy of the public hearing minutes for review.

Chairman Eames explained there were four individuals that spoke at the public hearing and will address the editorial changes first.

10-6.4

Retaining Walls and Fences. (c)

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 10-6.4(c). Chairman said that the suggestion was to modify the language to include: *within 10 feet of the intersection that it would not be over 2 feet high*. The better fit for this verbiage would be in section (b).

Larry Iverson, Chief Manufactured Structured and Park and board secretary, said that after review of the modification, he had determined that it might not be necessary. The concerns by Jeff Payne were that the two feet was in order to prevent obstruction from view. Chief Iverson said that in section (b), the issue is already addressed. "Fences, walls, hedges; or other obstructions shall not be constructed or located along driveways, streets, or intersections where they can block a driver's view of oncoming pedestrian or vehicle traffic;" Chief Iverson said that the intent of this was regardless of the height.

Chief Iverson said that the obstruction in (b) is a clear understanding although the language in (c), without modification, was with good intent. He said an individual could not fence their backyard within 10 feet of any walkway, sidewalk, or street that exceeds four feet. The top two feet must be 75 percent open in order to permit vision through the fence or wall.

Chairman Eames suggested that the language in (c) be modified as follows: Fences or walls within 10 feet (3 m) of the **intersection**, street, sidewalk, or walkway shall be a maximum of 4 feet (122 cm) high with 75 percent of the area in the upper 2 feet (61 cm) open to permit vision through the fence wall.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

10-2.1

Land Use. (a)

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 10-2.1(a). The suggestion was to add the word "reasonable" to make the section more clear.

Don Minor said that the law always presumes, that the Government will act *reasonably*.

Board member Payne said that under 10-2.1(a) 7., The establishment of open areas and green ways within the park; and 9., The location of play areas within the park; with inserting the word "reasonable", would provide the developer a better opportunity to negotiate with the City where those should go.

MOTION to modify 10-2.1(a) as follows:

The local planning department is given specific authority to establish **“reasonable”** criteria related to the following as long as the criteria for a park is not less than the minimum requirements in this code and not greater than the requirements for single family uses in the underlying zone:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3-2.4.1

Flood Hazard Areas. (b)

Chairman Eames asked Chief Iverson to review the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 3-2.4.1. Chief Iverson said that the intent of this modification was when manufactured dwellings are located in food hazards, certain conditions must apply. The manufactured dwelling would need to be above the base flood elevation level.

In order to give the local jurisdictions some flexibility, or opportunity to act in the cases where the base flood elevation is unknown or unavailable, that the flood plain administrator will allowed to make the decision to establish a base elevation level.

MOTION to modify language as follows:

“When the Base Flood elevation has not been established within a flood hazard zone, the finished floor shall be elevated to the elevation established by the Flood Plain Administrator.”

Item 1 below (b):

unless **openings are provided per FEMA Technical Bulletin 1-93.** ~~the foundation wall is open on one end or side.~~

Item 2 below 1:

or openings are provided per FEMA Technical Bulletin 1-93. ~~unless the basement is open on one end or side (i.e., daylight basement)~~

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3-8.4.7

Foundation Walls.

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 3-8.4.7.

Chief Iverson said that it was agreed that it could be misleading if an individual relied on the drawings for guidance instead of the code.

Chief Iverson said that for the foundation walls, the footings are showing 6 by 18 inch. The UBC refers to the 18 inch footings only being required for 3-story buildings. It was said that a 12 inch footing was sufficient and a steel reinforcement was not necessary. It was suggested to leave the steel reinforcement in due to the long dimensions being used.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO MODIFY THE FOOTINGS TO 6 BY 12 INCH.

Further discussion was to modify the language for 3-8.4.7A, B, C, D, E, and F to recess or offset the bolt. The top cell plate would allow for the offset of that or, a recess of the bolt to be shimmed. A 2 by 4 that is often used to support the floor would fit down flush.

It was suggested to take this issue to the staff engineer on the proposal. If the loads are safe to recess, then the board should move forward on recommending the proposal.

It was suggested that in the figure 3-8.4.7E Pressure Treated Lumber Foundation Wall, and 3-8.4.7F Prefabricated Foundation Wall Detail that *stainless steel staples* be added to the language.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO ADD “OR EQUIVALENT STAINLESS STEEL STAPLES” TO THE LANGUAGE ON THE DRAWINGS.

3-8.4.7 (j), (k), (l), and (m)

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 3-8.4.7 (j), (k), (l), and (m). It was proposed to insert language “**if deemed necessary by the local jurisdictions.**” It was suggested to use this language instead as follows: “*These are requirements in areas of high ground water, in areas where high ground water is not a problem, these requirements may be waived by the authority having jurisdiction.*”

With further discussion it was suggested to illuminate (j) ~~Foundation walls shall be water proofed around the perimeter of the manufactured dwelling;~~ from the code. Then a new item (j) would say: “**In areas of high ground water, the following would apply; they maybe waived by the authority having jurisdiction in areas where high ground water is not a problem.**” Then delete (k) and insert “**1**”, and delete (l) and insert “**2**”, and delete (m) and insert “**3**”.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO MODIFY LANGUAGE AS SHOWN ABOVE.

3-8.4.7 (c)

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 3-8.4.7(c).

Chief Iverson said that in the code there is an allowance for an attachment of the house to the foundation by several methods. In some cases these methods maybe impossible. Chief Iverson explains that a third alternative is being proposed. The alternative would be the “tie down technique”, from the footing through the exterior I-Beam. The alternative would be in-bedded like a j-hook type of an anchor and a steel strap. This would give the installer a third alternate method of tie-down.

MOTION to modify language as follows;
“Foundation walls or **footings** shall be ~~structurally~~ secured to the ~~bottom side of the manufactured dwelling floor frame;~~

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3-8.4.5

Marriage Line Pony Wall. (c)

Chairman Eames reviewed the discussion from the public hearing pertaining to 3-8.4.5. The language “Shimming may be permitted between outriggers and other permanent obstruction”, was not understand due to it being physically impossible to nail a top plate to the bottom of the floor joist and also allow it to be shimmed down. It was proposed to add new language as follows: “**If shimming is utilized, secure the top plate to the shimming material in the same manner as the rim joist are secure.**” Delete “Shimming man be permitted between outriggers and other permanent obstructions;

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO USE THE PROPOSED NEW LANGUAGE AS WRITTEN ABOVE.

MOTION by Jeff Payne to recommend to the Administrator that the 2002 Oregon Manufactured Dwelling and Park Specialty Code as amended and the changes related in administrative rule be adopted effective April 1, 2002.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Eames adjourned the work session.

Debi Barnes-Woods
Boards Coordinator/Recorder