



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services

Building Codes Division

1535 Edgewater Street NW

PO Box 14470

Salem, OR 97309-0404

(503) 378-4133

FAX (503) 378-2322

bcd.oregon.gov

November 2, 2009

***2010 Oregon Manufactured Housing Installation Code Committee
Tuesday, October 13, 2009
Meeting Summary***

****NOTE:** *The following minutes are a summary of the committee's discussion.
To review the meeting in its entirety, the archived video of the meeting is available
on the committee's Web site at the following link:
<http://www.bcd.oregon.gov/committees/10mdisc.html>*

Members Present: (Acting Chair) Rick Torgerson, Manufacturer
Jeremy Page, Manufactured Structures and Parks Board Member
Michael Kammer, Oregon Manufactured Housing Association
Don Miner, Oregon Manufactured Housing Association
John Moore, Inspector for City of Gresham
Jeremy Page, Manufactured Structures and Parks Board Member

Members Absent: Chair, Phil Bond

Guests Present: Steve Mckinley, McKinley Service
John Caul, State Fire Marshal

Staff Present: Albert Endres, Manufactured Home Chief
Richard Baumann, Policy Analyst
Dana Fischer, Building Code Para-Technical
Shauna Parker, Rules Coordinator

Introductions

Rich Bauman welcomed the committee and guests. He noted that Chair Phil Bond is absent and that Rick Torgerson will be acting as Chair for today's meeting. He further stated that the committee will be discussing code change proposals submitted by John Caul first, before general code review of draft 2 begins. He also noted that the committee will continue their review of Chapter 1, review Chapter 2, discuss tabled items and review other submitted code change proposals.

Code Change Proposal [MDISC 10-01](#)

Chapter 3 Pre-Installation, Foundations, Piers

3-2.5.2(3) and 3-2.5.3(3)

John Caul, State Fire Marshal explained the proposal, stating that National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 58 is the standard used in regards to propane installations and requires a maximum of 5 feet of flexible hose for gas connectors. He further explained that the Fire Marshal's Compliance Specialist that deals with residential and manufactured home installations brought the requirement to his

attention. Mr. Caul stated that at the time he did not feel the issue warranted a mid-cycle amendment, that the issue could wait until the code was up for adoption again. He also mentioned a concern that the requirement could be different if the code section is referring to the Fuel Gas Code. Mr. Caul then suggested if that is the case, Building Code Division (BCD) staff could make two sections; one dealing with the natural gas installation requirements and the other with the propane installation requirements. John Moore explained that the current 6 foot requirement is due to the fact that the hose is manufactured in either 3 or 6 foot lengths.

The committee discussed whether or not the current requirement of 6 feet is a maximum or a minimum requirement. Albert Endres stated he would consult the State Mechanical expert, Mike Ewert, for an answer.

***Tabled:** This section was tabled until an answer could be provided of whether the word “minimum” or “maximum” is used in the Oregon Mechanical Specialty Code (OMSC).*

Code Change Proposal [MDISC 10-02](#)

Chapter 11 Fire and Life Safety

11-4 and 11-4.1

Mr. Caul explained this proposal, requesting a new section be added in Chapter 11 for fire department water access and fire protection water supply. He explained that ideally the issue should be addressed at the planning stage, but commented that it often is missed.

Rick Torgerson, Chair asked how a water supply issue would be addressed if a home is going to be built on a rural site with the water supplied from a well but no electricity is hooked up yet? Mr. Caul answered that the local Fire Marshal would take into account the size of the home to determine if water could be transported via water tank but that a permanent water tank may be required to be installed next to the home.

Mr. Moore commented that a customer who is building a new structure, must, during the planning stage obtain approval from the local fire department ensuring there is a fire access road with a minimum of 25 feet wide. The committee continued to discuss current requirements for water availability/access found in the Fire Code versus what local jurisdictions require. A concern is whether the local water department is required to supply a water hook-up for Fire Department use or if it is the responsibility of the homeowner.

Mr. Caul suggested his proposal language be listed in at “text box” rather than a new code section. Chair Torgerson also agreed that a “text box” may be a better way of listing the language and that the language may be more useful as a “note” of requirements that need to be met, as opposed to actual code language. He further stated that listing the language as a new code requirement could be confusing to someone who is trying to enforce the code because they technically may not have authority to enforce it. *The committee agreed the language should be added into the code as a “text box”.*

Motion to place the requirement in a “text box” which references the Oregon Fire Code.

Discussion: Mr. Baumann asked Mr. Caul to provide the information of what section the language is found in the current Fire Code. Mr. Caul replied he would email the information later in the day.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chapter 1, Administration

1-4 Permits

1-4.9 Installation Permits

Don Miner asked how this section relates to 1-7.1.1 where the language has been struck out. The set-up inspection previously referenced tie downs, earthquake bracing, utility connections and marriage line connections. He asked if the installation permit listed in 1-4.9 will specifically call out those items as well. Mr. Moore stated he believes those items are embedded in the installation permit.

Mr. Bauman replied that if the current 2002 code (MD&P) is compared to the proposed code, the language is the same and was not changed. Mr. Miner suggested adding the specific words “*earthquake bracing*”. Mr. Baumann asked for clarification if when permitting, bracing is listed separately. Mr. Moore answered if it stays within the perimeter of the home it is considered part of the set-up and is included in the permit. The committee continued to discuss how their jurisdiction handles the situation and *agreed that “bracing” should be added to Section 1-4.9.*

Motion to add “bracing” to Section 1-4.9 Installation Permits.

Motion approved unanimously.

1-4.4 Time Limitation of Application

Committee members voiced a concern that the language in this section has changed from one allowed extension of 180 days to one allowed extension of 90 days. Mr. Miner pointed out that this section pertains to permit applications and not to the expiration date of a permit (see 1-4.6 for permit expiration).

1-7 Inspections

1-7.4 Inspection Requests

Steve McKinley asked why the section does not list a time line of when inspections should be requested. He stated that currently an inspection must be called for within 10 days of the work being completed by the permit holder or an agent of the permit holder, which is the time line used to ensure inspections are requested and in a timely manner. Mr. Baumann replied that under the requirements of the permit, work of any kind must be completed within 180 days of issuance or the permit expires and referred the committee to Section 1-7.1.1 Set-up Inspections. Additionally, each jurisdiction operating a building inspection program must submit an operating plan detailing the times inspections will be performed.

1-7.1.1 Set-up Inspection

Mr. Baumann explained that it is the responsibility of the permit holder to see that work is completed and that inspections have been called for in a timely manner. The last sentence in the section states “*This inspection shall be performed prior to the under-floor area being enclosed by skirting or retaining walls*”.

Mr. Moore expressed concern that the section refers jurisdictions back to Section 1-4.9 and only allows items listed in that section to be inspected. Mr. Baumann replied the language states “*Installation permits include, but are not limited to*”, which gives the option to inspect other items if needed. He further stated that if an additional item does need to be inspected and is not included on the list, the

“Write-It-Cite-It” rule would come into play, which requires the inspector to list the code section pertaining to the item being inspected.

Motion to approve as modified Section 1-7.1.1 Set-up Inspection
Motion approved unanimously.

1-7.1.2 Other Inspections

Mr. Baumann explained that in the MD&P there is an allowance for the option of allowing another approved inspection entity to perform the under floor inspection if the local jurisdiction is unable to, if skirting has already been installed. Mr. Baumann explained that the intent of the language is to put the responsibility on the permit holder to see that an inspection area is open and easily accessible for the inspector to inspect.

Mr. Moore asked for clarification, asking if because of the way the section language is written, it means he could hire any approved inspection entity he wants to, if he does not want to deal with the local jurisdiction. Mr. Endres replied no, the intent is to allow the option of a licensed third party inspector if the local jurisdiction is unable to crawl under a home, due to policy or insurance restrictions. Committee members continued to discuss the issue of how soon skirting should be closed up and inspected in a timely manner. Members expressed a concern in how the language could be interpreted incorrectly by thinking a third party inspector can be hired at any time. Members asked to have the language revised for better clarification.

Mr. Baumann modified the language for section 1-7.1.2 to read *“If the under-floor area is enclosed by skirting prior to the set-up inspection, the authority having jurisdiction may require the permit holder to make all necessary arrangements to have the under-floor area inspected by a certified inspector”*. He stated this leaves it in the jurisdictions hands to either perform the inspection at additional costs because the under-floor is enclosed or allows them to hire a certified third party inspector to perform the inspection. Mr. Baumann asked the committee if the revision addresses their concerns. Committee members could not readily agree that the revised language would address the issue.

Committee members continued to discuss what language would address the issue. Jeremy Page stated that the average installer may not know what the time frames are for inspection time-lines and that the installer needs to know there is an option to cover. Mr. Miner commented that it may be concrete block used instead of vinyl skirting and a mason may have been scheduled weeks in advance. He suggested adding a *“text box”* in front of Section 1-7.1, which requires the operating plan to list inspection hours. Mr. Baumann read to the committee, the current Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 918-020-0090(8), which explains a jurisdiction's responsibility pertaining to inspections. He agreed to add a *“text box”* in Section 1-7. *The committee agreed to the language modification discussed above.*

Motion to approve as modified Section 1-7.1.2. Other Inspections, with the agreement to table for further discussion *“work hours”*.
Motion approved unanimously.

1-7.1.3 Final Inspection

The committee took a few minutes to review the new language.

Motion to approve the new language in Section 1-7.1.3 Final Inspection
Motion approved unanimously.

Break

The committee discussed the importance of having information in the code regarding installer tags. Mr. Baumann explained that installer tag requirements are found in OAR 918-515. After additional discussion, the *committee agreed that a new subsection should be added to “1-7.1.1 Set-up Inspection” which references “918-515-0300 Requirements for Installer Certification Tags” and “918-515-0310 Certification Tags Installation”, the OAR’s pertaining to certification tags.*

Motion to add a text box which lists certification tag requirements in Section 1-7 Inspections.
Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 1 Administration.
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 2 Definitions

The committee took a few minutes to review the definitions found in Chapter 2. Mr. Miner asked where the definition of “Cabana” is addressed in the proposed code. Mr. Baumann answered that cabana’s are listed in Chapter 10, Site-Installed Features. He further explained an amendment will be added for installation requirements of Ramada’s.

Motion to approve Chapter 2 Definitions.
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 3 Pre-Installation, Foundations, Piers

3-2 Geographical Requirements

3-2.1 Frost Line

Mr. Baumann explained that Section 3-2.1 was tabled at the September 29, 2009 meeting, with the suggestion that an additional subsection, 3-2.1.1, be added for “*monolithic slabs*”. Mr. Endres explained the added language was taken directly from the HUD standard.

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-2.1 Frost Line.
Motion approved unanimously.

Code amendment proposal [MDISC 10-01](#)

The committee re-opened discussion code change proposal MDISC 10-01, commenting whether or not the proposed language should read 6 feet or 5 feet and if it is a maximum or a minimum requirement.

Mike Ewert, BCD Residential & Mechanical Code Specialist explained that in both NFPA 58 and the OMSC it states “*shall not exceed*”, but both differ in that the OMSC states “*shall not exceed 6 feet*”, where as NFPA 58 states “*shall not exceed 5 feet*”. The committee continued to discuss the issue, receiving comments from Mr. Ewert. Mr. Miner stated he believes the proposed installation code should align with the Mechanical Code. Mr. Moore disagreed, stating the requirement should align with earthquake requirements. Mr. Endres asked the committee to confirm Mr. Caul’s verbal approval that the language could read “*more than 5 feet*”. The committee agreed. Mr. Baumann reminded the

committee that they can accept the code proposal and/or make recommended changes to it. The committee agreed that the language should remain as currently written.

Motion to disapprove code change proposal MDISC 10-01.

Discussion: Committee members continued discussion on “coiling” and “flexibility”.

Motion approved unanimously.

3-2.5.1 Seismic Design Category C

Motion to modify code language in Section 3-2.5.1 Seismic Design Category C subsection (3) by increasing the flexible gas connector requirement from “2 feet” to “6 feet”.

Discussion: Mr. Baumann asked for a little more detail in the discussion, to better clarify the committee’s intent of the proposed language.

Motion approved unanimously.

3-3 Site and Stand Preparation

3-3.5 Soil Bearing Capacity

Mr. Baumann explained the section has been renumbered to 3-3.5. He then explained the language modification, which makes it the jurisdiction's responsibility to prove if the soil has a different soil bearing capacity than originally determined.

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-3.5 Soil Bearing Capacity.

Motion approved unanimously.

3-3.6 Moisture Barrier

Mr. Baumann explained the section has been renumbered to 3-3.6. He then explained the editorial change in subsection (2) where the language “with permanent tape” has been deleted.

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-3.6 Moisture Barrier

Motion approved unanimously.

3-7 Piers

3-7.1 General

The committee discussed subsection (1) which was tabled at the September 29, 2009 meeting. The committee asked that language be added requiring the manufacturer’s installation instructions to be followed when piers are installed, which includes referring the reader to the HUD's requirements for zinc coating requirements. Mr. Baumann stated that HUD is currently delaying the implementation of the zinc coating requirements. If the committee agrees with the language modification, the proposed code will be in compliance with HUD once they decide to implement the zinc coating requirements.

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-7.1 General subsection (1).

Motion approved unanimously.

3-8 Pier Caps, Shims and Wedges

3-8.2 Pier Shims

Mr. Endres reminded the committee that at the September 29, 2009 meeting, members discussed that 1½ inch thick solid concrete block is rarely used and that it tends to break easily. Due to the conversation, staff determined the requirement is not needed and agreed to delete subsection (1).

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-8.2 Pier Shims.

Motion approved unanimously.

3-9 Perimeter Piers

3.9.2(5) Recessed Perimeter Piers

Mr. Baumann explained the committee's request to have the language clarified for 4 inch by 4 inch beams in relation to how they are placed. Michael Kammer commented that he thought the committee agreed to add the word "minimum" into the section and asked for a motion to table the section for further discuss.

Tabled: *Mr. Endres agreed to table the section for further discussion until the end of the meeting.*

3-10 Chassis

Mr. Baumann explained to the committee that this section was not in the draft code reviewed at the September 29, 2009 meeting, but that staff felt it was important to include "Chassis" in the review process. He further explained the language was not modified, but was taken straight from the existing MD&P.

Mr. Miner requested that the second sentence in subsection (1) "*Axles, wheels, tires and hitches may be removed once the manufactured dwelling has been sited and supported*" be removed since it is duplicative and is already stated in the first sentence of the subsection.

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-10 Chassis, by removing the second sentence in subsection (1) "*Axles, wheels, tires and hitches may be removed once the manufactured dwelling has been sited and supported.*"

Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 4 Under-floor Enclosures

4-5 Non-Structural Skirting

4-5.2 Non-Structural Metal or Vinyl Skirting

Mr. Baumann explained the words "metal" and "vinyl" have been added to the subsections. The committee discussed the modified language making suggestions for further modification. The committee agreed to modify the language in subsection (4) to read "*.....bottom channels or alternate methods and secured.....*".

Motion to approve as modified Section 4-5.2(4) Non-Structural Metal or Vinyl Skirting.

Motion approved unanimously.

Lunch Break

Chapter 3 Pre-Installation, Foundations, Piers

3-9 Perimeter Piers

3-9.2(5) Recessed Perimeter Piers

Mr. Kammer rescinded his motion to table Section 3-9.2 subsection (5).

Motion to approve as modified Section 3-9.2 Recessed Perimeter Piers subsection (5).

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 3 Pre-Installation, Foundations, Piers.
Motion approved unanimously.

Code Amendment Proposal [MDISC 10-03](#)

4-7 Masonry Block Skirting

4-7.1(1) Masonry Block Skirting

The committee discussed concrete blocking in lieu of vinyl skirting in regards to how the code proposal request is written. They further discussed that concrete block wall requirements are found in the structural code.

Motion to disapprove code change proposal MDISC 10-03.

Discussion: Motion made due to the fact the proposal is a structural issue, not an issue for the proposed installation code.

Motion approved unanimously.

Code Amendment Proposal [MDISC 10-04](#)

4-7.1(5) Masonry Block Skirting

Mr. Baumann explained to the committee the proposal is for an amendment to masonry block skirting, which proposes to change the word “may” to “shall” and moves the language from a minimum requirement to a higher standard. The committee discussed load bearing walls and how they apply in regards to the proposal.

Motion to disapprove code change proposal MDISC 10-04.

Motion approved unanimously.

Code Amendment Proposal [MDISC 10-05](#)

4-8.2(8) Concrete Masonry Unit Retaining Wall Skirting

Mr. Baumann explained to the to committee the proposal refers to retaining walls, changes the word “may” to “shall” and adds additional requirements above and beyond minimum requirements. Mr. Moore stated that currently Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) walls do not have to be structurally supported as long as appropriate recessing of perimeter blocking has been done. He expressed his belief that the proposal makes the language say a “perimeter wall must be structurally supported”.

Motion to disapprove code change proposal MDISC 10-05.

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 4 Under-Floor Enclosures.

Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 5 Installation Procedures

5-2 Marriage Line Attachments

5-2.1.1(4) Ridge Beam Connections

Mr. Moore asked for clarification of whether the ridge beam is connected differently when the home is new versus a home that has been moved and is being put together for a second time. Mr. Endres replied there are two problems. Since Manufacturers differ in their methods for connecting ridge beam bolting areas and support columns areas, BCD staff did not believe all methods could be listed in the proposed code. For new homes (called “first installations”) it is better to direct installers to the original

installation instructions. For homes that have been moved (called “secondary installations”) the original installation instructions are not always available. BCD staff expressed belief that the modified language separates the two issues of “first” and “secondary” installations adequately.

Motion to approve as modified Section 5-2.1.1 Ridge Beam Connections subsection (4).
Motion approved unanimously.

5-2.1.2 Wall Connections

Mr. Kammer stated the language as modified in subsection (3) is unclear. The committee referred back to how the section’s language was modified at the first meeting. They continued to discuss different ways the language could be written. The committee agreed to an additional language modification in the first sentence of Section 5-2.1.2 Wall Connections to read “...*secured together at the ends of each adjoining wall section according to...*” and agreed to *delete subsection (3)*.

Motion to approve as modified Section 5-2.1.2 Wall Connections
Motion approved unanimously.

5-3 Weather Seal

5-3.1.3 Floor Seal

Motion to approved as modified Section 5-3.1.3 Floor Seal

Discussion: Mr. Miner asked what the word “adequately” means in subsection (5). Committee members discussed the question in relation to the section’s intent which is to prevent the entrance of rodents. The committee agreed to an additional change in the last sentence of subsection (5), changing the word “*prevent*” to “*resist*”.

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 5 Installation Procedures.
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 6 Electrical Connections

6-4 Electrical Crossover Connections

6-4.1(2) Crossover Connection

Motion to approve as modified Section 6-4.1(2) Crossover Connection
Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 6 Electrical Connections.
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 7 Plumbing Connections

7-6 Drainage System

7-6.3 Drain Piping Cleanouts

Mr. Baumann explained that language pertaining to a “*two-way cleanout fitting*” has been added. Mr. Kammer questioned why the cleanout is required “*underground*” and stated that jurisdictions currently do not allow clean-outs under homes. Mr. Endres replied that the requirement is in the MD&P. Committee members continued to discuss “cleanout” requirements and how the language is interpreted by jurisdictions and the benefit of a “two-way cleanout fitting”.

Motion to approve as modified Section 7-6.3 Drain Piping Cleanouts
Motion approved unanimously.

7-7 Underground Installations

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 7 Plumbing Connections, including the new language in Section 7-7.1 subsection (3).

Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 8 Mechanical Connections

8-5 Under-Floor Ducts

8-5.2.2 Extensions, Splices, and Sharp Turns

Mr. Baumann explained the changes are editorial and do not need approval from the committee. *The committee agreed to add the word “minimum” in front of “28 gage”.*

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 8 Mechanical Connections, which includes editorial changes.
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 9 Preparation Of Appliances

9-6 Water Heaters

Mr. Baumann explained new language was added in Section 9-6.2 and 9-6.3 pertaining to water heater drain pans. Committee members discussed the drain pan diagram and that it shows two drain holes and voiced concern over the pipe size, stating a 1 inch pipe size is large enough for small rodents or some types of bugs to get in and make nests. They expressed the need for piping to be screened. Mr. Endres replied that the HUD code is silent on the issue, so there is no guideline for determining if screening should be used or not.

Motion to approve as modified Section 9-6.2.
Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Section 9-6.3.
Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 9 Preparation Of Appliances
Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 10 Site-Installed Features

10-3 Other Structures

Mr. Baumann explained there are three sections that the committee will need to discuss, Sections 10-3.2, 10-3.3 and 10-3.4., plus a new Section 10-3.5, which was added after the September 29, 2009 meeting. BCD staff felt it was important to add language pertaining to Ramadas. The committee briefly discussed this section in regards to temporary steps, voicing concern of whether a permit is required or not. It was decided that the language should be modified to include language from the current 2002 code. Further discussion included where the language should be included.

*Mr. Endres suggested adding a new section to Chapter 1, calling it “Permits are not required for the following: ...”. It was agreed to add “Section 1-4.10 Installation Permits. Installation permits include, but are not limited to: ...”.

Tabled: Committee members could not come to an agreement of what should be included in the new Section 1-4.10. Mr. Baumann suggested tabling for further discussion and that the discussion happen via email. The discussion will include Chapter 1 and Chapter 10.

10-3.2 Porches, awnings, carports, cabanas, ramadas, decks, landings, stairs, ramps, guardrails and handrails.

Mr. Bauman explained this section was tabled at the September 29, 2009 meeting. Staff modified the language to include prefabricated awnings and carport attachments.

Motion to approve as modified Section 10-3.2 Porches, awnings, carports, cabanas, ramadas, decks, landings, stairs, ramps, guardrails and handrails, subsection (5).

Motion approved unanimously.

10-3.3 Dormers and Gables

Vice Chair Torgerson shared a discussion he had during the past week with several manufacturers in regards to dormers and gables. He further stated that the manufacturers he spoke with agree with the new language and would like it included in the proposed code. Additional committee conversation included discussion on dormer and gable attachment practices, when shingles are replaced what are the “load” issues, how is a “new live load” calculated, importance of using kiln dried lumber when manufacturing a dormer or gable and when engineering could be required.

Motion to approve as modified the new language in Section 10-3.3 Dormers and Gables.

Motion approved unanimously.

10-3.4 Temporary Steps

Mr. Baumann explained that the language in Section 10-3.4 is existing language in the MD&P. Mr. Moore asked if language should be added which requires the temporary steps to be removed after a specific a period of time. Chair Torgerson replied that in the first sentence it already states “for use during the installation” and “not intended for continuous use”.

Motion to approve as modified Section 10-3.4 Temporary Steps.

Discussion: Mr. Moore suggested adding “prior to final inspection” to the end of the section.

Motion approved unanimously.

10-3.5 Ramadas

The committee took a few minutes to review the section.

Motion to approve as modified Section 10-3.5 Ramadas

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified Chapter 10, including tabled Section 10-3.1 in which division staff will re-write the language and send it to the committee via email for approval, disapproval or modification.

Motion approved unanimously.

Chapter 11 Fire and Life Safety

11-1 Smoke Alarms

11-1.2

Mr. Baumann explained the modified language in the first sentence which includes the addition of “and OAR 837-045-0050” and “it is connected”. He also explained the addition of the “text box”, which is from the State Fire Marshal’s Administrative Rules.

Mr. Miner voiced concern about the language “manufacturers providing instructions” and asked if that is considered state law. He expressed belief that inspections and testing of smoke alarms should be completed according to Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) instructions, and federal law. Additional committee members agreed with Mr. Miner in that the requirement is part of the federal law and should not be in the state code. Mr. Baumann explained that if a transfer of home ownership happens between two people, and the home is moved (called a secondary installation), there is a Fire Marshal’s state requirement for a smoke detector to be installed. In this case, he explained, more than likely no one will enter the home to ensure the smoke detector was installed, so why should the requirement in the code be any different for the initial installation?

Motion to approve as modified Section 11-1.2, adding to the first sentence the requirement for the manufacturer to include instructions for fire alarm inspection and testing.

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approved as modified Chapter 11 Fire and Life Safety

Motion approved unanimously.

Motion to approve as modified the 2010 MDISC, including tabled Section 10-3.1 in which division staff will re-write the language and send it to the committee via email for approval or disapproval. The 2010 MDISC will be forwarded to the Manufactured Structures and Parks Advisory Board for their review.

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Baumann commented that there is one more discussion item, which is a requirement needed when rules are filed with the Secretary of State. He asked the committee to answer the following questions listed on the handout “[Questions for Rule Advisory Committees to Consider When Adopting Rules](#)”.

- *Is the state or any unit of local government likely to be economically affected by the rule change? If yes, how and to what extent?*
 - Mr. Miner asked if this applies to the MD&P. Mr. Baumann explained the new Federal requirement for “anchoring” is an example of an additional cost.
 - Mr. Miner and Mr. Moore believe there will be an added cost to jurisdictions and contractors because of the learning curve needed to use the new code.
 - Mr. Moore believes there will be added costs for additional training requirements.
- *Who else is likely to be economically affected by the rule change? How will they be affected?*
 - Mr. Baumann referenced the above discussion of added costs to jurisdictions and contractors for training requirements.
- *Assuming there is a fiscal impact estimate the number of small businesses and the types of businesses and industries affected by the proposed rules.*
 - Mr. Miner stated that people can view the code online at no cost.

- Mr. Kammer stated tie-down manufacturers will gain business due to retro-fitting requirements.
- *Assuming that there is a fiscal impact on small businesses, please provide a description and specifically address all of the following:*
 - *A description of expected reporting, record keeping, and administrative activities required to comply with the proposed rules.*
 - Mr. Miner does not believe there are any additional requirements for contractors.
 - Mr. Kammer commented on the extra check box on certificates for tie-downs.
 - *An estimate of the cost of professional services required to comply with the proposed rules.*
 - Mr. Miner believes there will be added training costs and costs for purchasing code books.
 - Mr. Moore believes there will be added costs if a third party inspector needs to be hired.
 - *An identification of the equipment, supplies, and labor and increased administration required to comply with the proposed rules.*
 - Mr. Miner again stated there will be an additional cost for purchasing code books and training. He also stated that in the MD&P there are questions answered that are not in the proposed code, which will now burden BCD staff with having to answer them.
 - Mr. Moore stated jurisdictions in general will incur more time spent researching code, when needing to use the “Write-It Cite-It” policy.

Mr. Baumann thanked the committee for their time and efforts. He explained the process that once the tabled items are resolved via email, the committee’s recommendations will be forwarded to the Manufactured Structures and Parks Advisory Board. The Board will take action on the committee’s decisions. The board will approve, disapprove or approve as modified the 2010 MDISC. Once the Board has made their recommendations, the proposed code will go to public hearing in late December and then come back to the division for final approval. He also stated the division hopes to forward the approved code to the Oregon Manufactured Housing Association (OMHA) for printing in early January 2010 with the proposed adoption date of April 1, 2010. He further explained that the division will also develop a schedule for training, hopefully providing some online training.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

**The committee discussed via email, “Section 1-4.2 Work Exempt From Permit” adding it as a new section (the following subsections were renumbered), and “Section 1-7.1.3 Final Inspection”. Both sections were approved as modified.*