

**Oregon Manufactured Dwelling & Parks Code Review Committee
2008 Oregon Manufactured Dwelling & Parks Specialty Code
Regular Committee Meeting Minutes
- DRAFT -**

September 20, 2007

Members present: Phil Bond, Sheridan Custom Homes
Larry Medina, Fire Inspector, Bend
Done Miner, Oregon Manufactured Housing Association
John Moore, Inspector, Gresham
Jeff Payne, Park Owner/Developer
Mike Roberts, Building Official, Jefferson County
Travis Wright, Inspector/Plans Examiner, Klamath County

Members absent: Rick Torgerson, Skyline

Staff present: Andrea Simmons, manager of policy & technical services
Albert Endres, manufactured housing chief
Richard Baumann, policy analyst
Heidi Shamberger, structural para-technical specialist
Julie Waters, manager's assistant

Guests present: Mike Kammer, Manufactured Housing Services
Bill Eames, Chairman of MS&P Board
David Wade, D-MAC, Inc.
Steve McKinley, McKinley Service

I. Introductions

Andrea Simmons opened the committee meeting by leading committee members, audience members, and Building Codes Division (BCD) staff through introductions.

II. Overview of current process and procedures

Ms. Simmons notified the committee and audience members that the committee meetings are video recorded and broadcast live on the BCD website. The videos will then be archived on the BCD website for future reference.

Ms. Simmons requested audience members to come up to the presenter's table to submit comment to the committee for the purposes of the video recording. A timer will also be used for presenters in order to help the meeting progress.

Ms. Simmons explained the requirement of having a quorum during the committee meeting in order to take action on specific item.

Ms. Simmons led the group through the [2008 MD&P Code Adoption Timeline](#) handout. It is anticipated that there will be three or four committee meetings that take place between September and October. The completed committee work is anticipated to be presented to the MS&P Board during the March 13, 2008 meeting. Next, a rulemaking hearing will be scheduled for April, with an anticipated code publication date of August 1, 2008.

Ms. Simmons explained each bullet point in the [Division Goals and Priorities](#) handout. It is important for the Division to relay its goals and priorities up front during code adoption. The Board and the Division both need to have consensus in order for the adoption to take place.

III. Election of a chairman

Don Miner nominated Phil Bond for chairman of the committee. Mr. Bond accepted the nomination.

Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Begin review of code changes

Mr. Miner expressed concern to Ms. Simmons about the Division's goal of aligning the administrative chapters of all the specialty codes, specifically in reference to permits. Ms. Simmons reiterated the need for consistency across all the specialty codes. Mr. Moore explained some of the history behind the current compilation of the codebook. He also expressed concern for having provisions taken out of the code and replaced with references to other specialty codes. Ms. Simmons reiterated the need for reference to other specialty codes for consistency. She also explained how "text boxes" can be used for informational purposes only and are not actually part of the code. Mr. Miner agreed it is important to align the codes.

Mr. Endres explained the proposed code document, matrix of code changes, and the proposed code amendments that were provided for the committee members.

Item 1 (Correct metric designations throughout the code)

Motion was made to approve **Item 1**.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Simmons encouraged the committee members to identify themselves when they make a motion for the purposes of minutes and archived records. She also asked that audience members identify themselves for the record when they give public comment.

Items 2 – 4 (Editorial changes to the Table of Contents and Preface)

No motion needed.

Mr. Endres explained the system of editing the division created to show proposed changes for the code.

The committee took a short break.

Chapters 1 and 2 were tabled until the next meeting so that the committee has more time to review proposed changes.

Chapter 3

Item 22 (3-1)

Tabled.

Item 23 (3-1.1)

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 24 (3-1.3)

Mr. Miner explained the importance of retaining the current language regarding conservation.

Motion was made to place the current language in a text box as a reference.

Motion was withdrawn until statutes were verified.

Tabled

Item 25 (3-1.4)

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 26 (3-1.5)

Mr. Endres explained that the matrix should say, “this section is being moved to the permit section ~~4-5.3~~ **3-1.3**”

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

The committee took a short break.

Item 27 (3-3.6)

Mr. Endres explained that the examples listed are not a complete list and are eliminated to save space.

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 28 (3-2.3)

Mr. Endres explained that the language was not necessary.

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 29 (3-2.3.3)

Mr. Endres explained that adding the language, “according to the following:” clarifies the intent of the code.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Mr. Eames asked Mr. Endres how the proposed change will work with the proposed HUD anchoring installation standards. Mr. Endres explained that the August 2004 HUD installation standard requires all homes to be anchored.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 30 (3-2.4.1), Item 31 (3-2.4.2), Item 32 (3-2.4.3), Item 33 (3-2.4.4), Item 34 (3-2.4.5)

Mr. Endres explained that adding a reference to the 2008 Oregon Residential Specialty Code (ORSC), in regards to flood hazard areas, creates consistency and eliminates duplicity in the codes. Mr. Moore and Mr. Miner questioned how relevant the flood hazard area provisions in the ORSC will be to manufactured homes. Mr. Baumann clarified that the reference to the ORSC will be for foundation, elevation, and engineering standards.

Mr. McKinley explained the difference in current provisions for flood plains and flood areas. He suggested the current language either remain in the Manufactured Dwelling code or be moved to the ORSC.

Mr. Endres explained that the 2008 ORSC will be effective April 1, 2008, which will allow time before the 2008 OMDSPC is adopted. Ms. Simmons agreed that the 2008 ORSC public hearing will take place in November.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes to **Item 30**. It was emphasized that the committee is relying on the Residential Structures Board to create consistency with manufactured dwellings, in regards to flood hazard areas. The motion was withdrawn until the committee could see the language that will be contained in the 2008 ORSC.

Mr. Baumann gave the committee a handout of the [proposed flood hazard provisions](#) for the 2008 Oregon Residential Specialty Code. Ms. Simmons reiterated that this is the current proposed language, but may change after the October 3, 2007 Residential Structures Board meeting. Staff will bring back to the committee any changes.

Mr. Roberts expressed concern about approving language that still has room for modification.

Mr. Baumann clarified that the committee can amend the motion at a later time, if needed.

Mr. Wright suggested adding, “unless prohibited by the local planning department” to the language for clarification.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes to **Item 30** and **Items 31 – 34**.

Ayes – 4

Nays – 3

Motion passes

Item 35 (3-2.5), Item 36 (3-2.5.1), Item 37 (3-2.5.1(d)), Item 38 (3-2.5.2)

Mr. Endres explained that **Items 35 - 38** were changed to be consistent with the other specialty codes.

Motion was made approve the proposed changes to Items 35 - 38.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 39 (3-2.5.2(a))

The committee discussed the definition of “tie-down” that is located in statute.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 40 (3-2.5.2(d)), Item 41 (3-2.5.3)

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 42 (3-2.5.3(d))

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 43 (3-2.6.2(b)(2))

Mr. Endres explained that this language in 3-5.9(c) is proposed to be relocated to the anchoring provisions.

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 44 (3-4.2)

Mr. Endres explained that this code is proposed to be an installation code. Cabanas are accessory structures. Accessory structures are not regulated by an installation code. Therefore, cabanas are proposed to be removed from this code.

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 45 (3-4.3(d))

The committee discussed the reason this language is in the code. The committee further discussed drainage issues.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Ayes: Bond, Medina, Miner, Payne, Roberts, Wright

Nays: Moore

Motion passes.

The committee took a lunch break.

Item 46 (3-4.3(g))

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 47 (3-4.3(h)), Item 48 (3-4.3(i)), Item 49 (3-4.3(j))

Mr. Endres explained that the correct code name should be, “Oregon Residential Specialty Code.” He also explained that placing an exact code section reference located in another code is difficult to keep accurate, due to the revision of the other codes.

Motion was made to approve proposed changes for **Items 47 - 49**.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 50 (3-4.5)

Motion was made to approve proposed changes.

The committee discussed the impact on local jurisdictions if the language, “highly expansive, compressible, or shifting soils” was deleted.

Motion was withdrawn.

Motion was made to approve the proposed deletion of “and cabana” but to leave in, “highly expansive, compressible, or shifting soils.”

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 51 (3-4.5(c))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 52 (3-4.7)

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 53 (3-4.7(g))

Mr. Endres explained that this change is more clarifying.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 54 (3-5.1(e))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 55 (3-5.2(c))

Mr. Endres illustrated to the committee that this change is updating the ASME standard to the correct year.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 56 (3-5.2(d))

Mr. Endres explained that this change is updating the currently referenced standard.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 57 (3-5.2(f))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 58 (3-5.3(d))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 59 (3-2.5.4)

Mr. Endres explained that the literal reading of the current code requires all of the items listed. The new proposed language adds clarification.

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 60 (3-5.8(a))

Mr. Endres explained that the change updates the standard for wood preservatives to the correct code. The committee discussed this code section and how it relates to pier caps.

Steve McKinley, McKinley Service suggested to the committee that pier cap material is suitable. Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 61 (3-5.8(c))

Mr. Endres suggested the committee leave the reference to number two lumber in section 3-5.8(c).

Motion was made to reject the staff recommendation for this code section.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 62 (3-5.8(d)), Item 63 (3-5.8(e)), Item 64 (3-5.8(f))

Mr. Endres suggested the committee reject the proposed changes that were redundant.

Motion was made to reject the staff recommendations for **Items 62 – 64.**

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 65 (3-5.8(g))

Motion was made to reject the staff recommendation.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 66 (3-5.8(g) and (h))

Motion was made to reject the staff recommendation.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 67 (3-5.12)

The committee discussed the significance of deleting the language, “cedar and redwood.” Mr. Moore suggested the committee should not make any changes that differ from the Oregon Residential Specialty Code or the Oregon Structural Specialty Code.

Motion was made to reject the staff recommendation.

Motion was withdrawn.

Tabled

Item 68 (3-5.12.1(h))

Mr. Endres explained that Figures I and J are duplicates. The Figure 3-5.12.11 in the matrix should be listed as Figure 3-5.14 L.

Tabled

Item 69 (3-5.121(j))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 70 (3-5.12.1(k))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 71 (3-5.12.2)

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Mr. McKinley suggested to the committee that 4” blocking is satisfactory.

Motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT - Item 72 (3-5.12.2(a))

Mr. McKinley showed the committee a pair of foundation piers that were under a home for 10 years, less than a quarter mile from the bank zone. He also suggested that foundation piers under homes located in a coastal area have deterioration issues.

The committee took a short break.

David Wade, D-MAC Inc., a manufacturer of foundation piers, suggested to the committee that the foundation piers Mr. McKinley presented have drainage issues. Mr. Wade explained that in California, foundation piers are placed on a piece of pressure treated lumber to create a buffer between the pier and the pad. Mr. Wade presented a copy of his [engineering specs for manufactured home support piers](#). Mr. Eames and Mike Kammer, Manufactured Housing Services, agreed with Mr. Wade that the deterioration of the piers was caused by drainage issues.

Motion was made to reject the proposed code amendment.

Mr. Moore commented that the reason for rejection is not because the code amendment does not have merit, but because drainage issues need to be addressed to eliminate the deterioration issues. He also made the suggestion that BCD focus on education for installers and inspectors to address drainage problems.

Motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT – Item 73 (3-5.12.3(e))

The committee questioned the definition of “structurally sound.”

Mr. McKinley suggested that a grade does not need to be specified as long as the lumber is structurally sound. The committee discussed whether or not structurally sound can be determined. The committee suggested modifying the proposed code amendment by changing “Structurally sound” to, “Free of loose knots, splits, or other visual defects.”

Motion was made to approve the proposed code amendment with modification. The code section would read, “One 1 ½” (38 mm) thick spruce, pine or fir board lumber free of loose knots, splits, or other visual defects;”

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 74 (3-5.12.4(c))

The committee questioned the use of strand board with exposure to moisture.

Motion was made to reject the proposed code change.

Motion passed unanimously.

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT – Item 75 (3-5.12.4(d))

Mr. McKinley commented that this language is the same as that used in **Item 73**, in reference to “structurally sound.”

Motion was made to approve the proposed code amendment as modified. The language would match that as modified in **Item 73**.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 76 (3-5.12.4(e))

Motion was made to approve the proposed changes.

Motion passed unanimously.

Item 77 (3-5.12.4(e))

Motion was made to combine 3-5.45.4 (d) and (e). Language will be adjusted by BCD staff.

Motion passed unanimously.

BCD staff will clean up Chapter 1 and the committee will continue on Chapter 3 and tabled items during the next meeting.

The committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m.