

**MHCC
General Subcommittee
Conference Call 4-14-11
Draft Minutes**

Roll Call: 1:05 p.m.
Meeting called to order: 1:10 p.m.

General Subcommittee Members:	
Steve Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Kevin Jewell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mike Lubliner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mark Mazz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Leo Poggione	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Theresa Defosses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bill Stamer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Greg Scott	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tim King	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mark Luttich	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dave Tompos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Administrative Organization:	
Phil Sapone, Newport Partners	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Others:	
Belinda Carlson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mark Weiss	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Lois Starkey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Adam Rust	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ken Shan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Michael Wade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Highlights and Action Items

- No votes were taken during this meeting

Discussion:

The Chair opened the meeting by stating that the intent of this conference call was to gather information and inform subcommittee members of all aspects of Log Numbers 2, 3, 10 and 11.

1. Adjustments to the Agenda:
 - There were no adjustments to the agenda.
2. Public Comments:
 - Mr. Weiss expressed concern about not being notified in a timely manner. He was emailed the agenda and handouts the morning of the meeting. He requested that all parties who make known their wish to be included subcommittee meeting notices should be made aware of them

in a timely manner. The Chair apologized and said it would not happen again. Mr. Sapone to pass along this concern/request to NFPA.

3. What was sold 2010:

- MHI discussed their December 2010 monthly report that shows the manufactured housing sales for the month and year. There was a comment that sales are at an all time low. The report also showed sales trends since 1959. Discussion among Subcommittee members focused on the downward trend of sales beginning in 1973, somewhat recovering in 1994, then continuing downward. The lowest sales volume recorded was in 2009 with a ½% uptick in 2010.
- Several subcommittee members in the producer category discussed the breakdown of the widths of their units. One noted that half of their single-section units are 14' while half are 16'. Another mentioned that 95% of their single section homes were 14' or less (many were 12' wide because of narrow lots. Another member said that most of their sales were 14' or less (30% were narrower than 14'). There was other testimony from a subcommittee member that in their area, homes delivered since 1995 are at least 14' wide.

4. Defining accessible housing: Mr. Mazz gave a very brief overview of the different levels of accessibility.

- Federally funded projects such as FEMA and Recovery Act projects required a percentage of the units to be fully accessible. These units must comply with the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS). Similar projects for State and local governments must comply with the 2010 ADA Standards. Fully accessible units have significantly higher requirements than those found in Logs 2, 3, 10, and 11. It includes an entrance with a level landing, wider doors, wider hallways, larger accessible bathrooms, accessible kitchens, and controls within reach.
- Visitability ordinances that are being adopted across the Country require far less. Generally, they require one zero-step entrance, 36" corridors, wider doors, and occasionally a larger toilet room. It appears that these ordinances apply to manufactured housing. Mr. Mazz said that the extent of applicability is being researched.
- Logs 2, 3, 10, and 11 require less than both concepts.

5. Purpose of the HUD Code:

- HUD Code Section 602 subsections (1), (2), and (8) were discussed. Points raised included:
 - In that the HUD Code must facilitate the availability of affordable homes and increase homeownership to all Americans, the HUD Code must also reflect the needs of prospective secondary purchasers.
 - In protecting the durability and affordability of manufactured homes, the HUD Code must address the needs of secondary purchasers.
 - Changes to the HUD Code must duly consider the affordability of manufactured housing.
 - Let the market drive the requirements.
 - One sized approach to accessibility across the board for private market purchasers is different than government mandates.
 - Not only are the costs to modify existing manufactured housing high, it is difficult to find contractors willing to make the modifications.
 - Resale value of a manufactured home is an important factor in bringing first-time homebuyers into the middle class.

- In that sales are at an all time low, the costs of any changes to the HUD Code must be considered.
 - The assertion was made that 1/5 of all households living in manufactured housing include someone with a walking disability
6. Log #3: Increasing exterior swinging door width:
- The group discussed log #3. Points raised were:
 - One subcommittee member in the producer category commented that their single-section and multi-section homes all have 36"-wide doors.. Back doors may be 34" doors.
 - Another subcommittee member in the producer category commented that they build 36"-wide doors.
 - Another producer was unsure of the door width.
 - MHI commented that 36" was probably ok for the industry, but more than one door might be a problem.
 - The IRC requires at least one 36" exterior swinging door. Typical Visitability ordinances require the exterior door at the zero-step entrance to have a 31 3/4" clear opening. For most exterior doors, that is a 36" door.
7. Log #11: Increasing the clear opening of exterior sliding door width:
- The subcommittee discussed Log#11 and the following points were raised:
 - Having an exterior swinging door as the primary entrance door is the norm for the industry.
 - One subcommittee member commented that they had never seen a sliding door as the entrance door.
 - The IRC does not address exterior sliding doors because it requires at least one swinging door. Typical Visitability ordinances only address a sliding door is it is the only zero-step entry, in which case it would have to have a 31 3/4" clear opening. For most exterior sliding doors, that is at a 72" rough opening.
8. Log #2: Increasing the hallway width:
- The subcommittee discussed Log#11 and the following points were raised:
 - One subcommittee member in the producer category commented that they build 42"-wide hallways in all their single-section and multi-section homes.
 - Another commented that 36"-wide hallways are the narrowest that they build.
 - Another subcommittee member in the user category stated that the narrowest hallways they had seen 36" (homes built since 1995).
 - One subcommittee member in the general interest category said for homes 14' wide and narrower, 36"-wide hallways create a problem, even if only part of the hallway must be 36" wide. The same problem was not apparent with 36" wide hallways in multi-section units.
 - It was noted that affordability is a major selling point for manufactured housing and if there is a decision to widen hallways, this has major repercussions.
 - The IRC is silent on hallway width. However, common industry practice has been to make hallways at least 36" wide. Typical Visitability ordinances require a 36"-wide hallway.
9. Log #10: Requiring a minimum ceiling height to 7'-0":

- The subcommittee discussed Log#10:
 - No one thought that ceiling heights was an accessibility issue. Rather, it seemed to be a convoluted-language problem. No one offered support for modifying the current language.
 - It was clarified that this change did not just deal with habitable space, but everywhere.
 - The IRC requires at 7'-0" ceiling with a few exceptions. Typical Visitability ordinances do not address the issue.

10. Statements/Thoughts of each Subcommittee Member:

- A subcommittee member in the general interest category expressed concerns that the group was using the IRC as a baseline for what should be in the HUD Code. The HUD exceeds the IRC in many ways. If the IRC were used as a baseline, then we should consider lowering the more stringent requirements.
- Another subcommittee member in the general interest category suggested several actions/modifications (these recommendations were later supported by a subcommittee member in the user category):
 - Log #3: Require a 36"-wide swinging exterior door
 - Rejecting Log #11: It proposes widening exterior sliding doors
 - Log #2: Widen hallways in single section units that are wider than 14' and all multi-section units.
 - Rejecting Log #10: It proposes raising the ceiling height
- A subcommittee member in the producer category stressed that we need to keep the manufactured homes affordable.
- Another subcommittee member in the producer category stated that the subcommittee should:
 - Allow the purchaser the choice
 - Be mindful of the individual
 - Be mindful of the cost problems with additional requirements
- Another subcommittee member in the producer category stressed:
 - Keeping the customers informed
 - That accessible manufactured homes are already on the market
- A subcommittee member in the user category suggested labeling each home with which accessibility features are included and excluded.
- A subcommittee member in the user category suggested that letting the marketplace set the standards do not always work.
- It was clarified that, for these Log items, that IRC requirements were mentioned not as a goal to be achieved in the HUD code, but rather a ceiling not to pass.
- A member of the public recommended that all doors be wider, and also recommended consumer disclosures

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.