Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee

Home Innovation Research Labs, 400 Prince George's BLVD, Upper Marlboro, MD 20774
Phone 1-888-602-4663 www.hud.gov/mhs

To: **MHCC**

From: **Kevin Kauffman**

Date: **October 3, 2014**

Subject: **Final Results of the MHCC Letter Ballot – Conference Call June 26, 2014 – Part 3280**

Below are the final results from the letter ballot of the items acted on at the June 26, 2014 MHCC conference call.

21 Members Eligible to Vote
18 Ballots Received
3 Ballots not Returned – Theresa Desfosses, Michael Lubliner, and Greg Scott

The number of votes required to pass an item with a 2/3rds majority is based on number of ballots retuned minus the number of abstentions. Because 18 committee members returned their ballots with votes and there were no abstentions, the required number of votes to pass an item is 12. All items on this ballot received 17 affirmative votes, thus all items passed. All committee members are afforded an opportunity to change their votes based on circulation of initial results of the voting. No such changes were received.

The final voting results are summarized in the table below.

Log No.	Section	Committee Meeting Action	Affirm	Negative	Comments
81	3280.403	Accept	17	1	1
82	3280.404	Accept	17	1	1
83	2380.405	Accept	17	1	1
84	3280.813(b)	Accept	17	1	2

All comments received are organized by Log Number and can be seen below.

Log 81 – Section 3280.403

Committee Meeting Action – Accept (17 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

Comment(s) Received – 1

Affirmative – N/A

Negative – 1

- **Steve Anderson** - There is an apparent double standard between the Users and the Manufacturers. None of these proposals have sufficient supporting documentation, including code books, etc. that are reviewable by all members of the committee. I cannot, with a clear conscience, accept the double standard and will not accept a proposal where I am unable to review the code and supporting documentation.

Abstain – N/A

Log 82 – Section 3280.404

Committee Meeting Action – Accept (17 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

Comment(s) Received – 1

Affirmative – N/A

Negative – 1

- **Steve Anderson** - There is an apparent double standard between the Users and the Manufacturers. None of these proposals have sufficient supporting documentation, including code books, etc. that are reviewable by all members of the committee. I cannot, with a clear conscience, accept the double standard and will not accept a proposal where I am unable to review the code and supporting documentation.

Abstain – N/A

Log 83 – Section 3280.405

Committee Meeting Action – Accept (17 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

Comment(s) Received – 1

Affirmative – N/A

Negative – 1

- **Steve Anderson** - There is an apparent double standard between the Users and the Manufacturers. None of these proposals have sufficient supporting documentation, including code books, etc. that are reviewable by all members of the committee. I cannot, with a clear conscience, accept the double standard and will not accept a proposal where I am unable to review the code and supporting documentation.

Abstain – N/A

Log 84 – Section 3280.813(b)

Committee Meeting Action – Accept (17 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

Comment(s) Received – 2

Affirmative – 1

- **Mark Luttich** - Submitter's reference to 2005 NEC, article 550.20(B) for Factory Built Homes and the proposed label language is incorrect. Article 550 is limited to "Mobile Homes, Manufactured Homes, and Mobile Home Parks". No such label is required for Factory Built Homes built to other articles of the NEC, and as such the proposal would not benefit Factory Built Home manufacturers as suggested by the proposal. I do agree the label for manufactured homes need to be updated to the language found in the NEC; however it should be exactly was written in Article 550.20(B) as follows:

  THIS CONNECTION IS FOR HEATING
  AND/OR AIR-CONDITIONING EQUIPMENT.
  THE BRANCH CIRCUIT IS RATED AT NOT
  MORE THAN ____ AMPERS, AT ____VOLTS, 60
  HERTZ, ____CONDUCTOR AMPACITY.

Negative – 1

- **Steve Anderson** - There is an apparent double standard between the Users and the Manufacturers. None of these proposals have sufficient supporting documentation, including code books, etc. that are reviewable by all members of the committee. I cannot, with a clear conscience, accept the double standard and will not accept a proposal where I am unable to review the code and supporting documentation.

Abstain – N/A