



## MANUFACTURED HOUSING CONSENSUS COMMITTEE

1.888.602.4663 | HUD.GOV/MHS

**To:** MHCC

**From:** Kevin Kauffman, AO  
Home Innovation Research Labs, 400 Prince George's Blvd, Upper Marlboro, MD 20774

**Date:** December 4, 2015

**Subject:** Final Results of MHCC Letter Ballot III – Actions as taken at August 18-20, 2015 MHCC meeting – Part 3280, 3282, and 3285 and MHCC Letter Ballot III A – Correction to Log 108 from August 18-20, 2015 MHCC Meeting

Below are the final results from the letter ballot of actions as taken at the August 18-20, 2015 MHCC meeting which took place in Washington DC.

[Ballot III – Actions as taken at August 18-20, 2015 MHCC meeting](#)

**21 Members Eligible to Vote**

**21 Ballots Returned**

The number of votes required to pass an item with a 2/3rds majority is based on number of ballots returned minus the number of abstentions. Because 21 committee members returned their ballots with votes and abstentions, the required number of votes to pass an item is 14. All items on this ballot received at least 14 affirmative votes, thus all items passed. The committee members were afforded an opportunity to change their votes based on circulation of the initial voting results and comments received.

The final voting results are summarized in the table below.

Ballot Item No.	Log No.	Section	MHCC Meeting Action	Affirm	Negative	Abstain
III-1	78	3280.304	Approve as Modified	21	0	0
III-2	90	3285.2	Disapprove	17	4	0
III-3	100	3280.204	Approve as Modified	21	0	0
III-4	106	3282.362	Disapprove	21	0	0
III-5	107	3280.2	Approve	21	0	0
III-6	108	3280.607	Approve as Modified	See Ballot III A Results		
III-7	109	3280.21	Disapprove	21	0	0
III-8	110	3280.211	Disapprove	21	0	0
III-9	111	3280.2	Disapprove	21	0	0
III-10	112	3280.4	Approve	21	0	0
III-11	117	3280.4	Approve	21	0	0

<b>Ballot</b>						
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Log No.</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>MHCC Meeting Action</b>	<b>Affirm</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
III-12	124	3280.714	Approve as Modified	21	0	0
III-13	125	3280.714	Approve	21	0	0
III-14	126	3280.715	Disapprove	21	0	0
III-15	127	3280.607	Disapprove	18	3	0
III-16	128	3280.211	Approve as Modified	20	1	0
III-17	129	3280.4	Approve	21	0	0

<b>Ballot</b>						
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>MHCC Meeting Action</b>	<b>Affirm</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Abstain</b>	
III-18	Proposed By-Law modifications as shown in Appendix A.	Approve	21	0	0	
III-19	Request that HUD send out guidance letter on anti-scald valves.	Approve	20	1	0	

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

[Ballot III A – Correction to Log 108 from August 18-20, 2015 MHCC Meeting](#)

**21 Members Eligible to Vote**

**21 Ballots Returned**

The number of votes required to pass an item with a 2/3rds majority is based on number of ballots returned minus the number of abstentions. Because 21 committee members returned their ballots with votes and abstentions, the required number of votes to pass an item is 14. All items on this ballot received at least 14 affirmative votes, thus all items passed. The committee members were afforded an opportunity to change their votes based on circulation of the initial voting results and comments received.

The final voting results are summarized in the table below.

<b>Ballot</b>						
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Log No.</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>MHCC Meeting Action</b>	<b>Affirm</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
III A-1	108	3280.607	Approve as Modified	21	0	0

## Ballot Item III-2: Log 90 - Section 3285.2

### MHCC Meeting Action – Disapprove (17 Affirm, 4 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

#### Comment(s) Received – 6

##### Affirmative – 2

- **Debra Blake** - For the record, some states use the alternate design prepared and certified by a registered professional engineer successfully – Arizona is one of those states.
- **Dominic Frisina** - This is within the scope of what an engineer is trained to do.

##### Negative – 4

- **Jeffrey T. Legault** - This Log Item should have been approved by the committee. A professional engineer who is familiar with the site is better suited to review the design.
- **Manuel Santana** - Placing additional burdens on the consumer with respect to site specific foundation designs is a disservice to the consumer. It will only add time delays and increased cost for no real-world benefit. If a lack of confidence in local professional engineers and general contractors is the driving factor behind this issue, then how can any structures be built safely in America today?
- **David Tompos** - Proposed language: “...and has been approved by the manufacturer ~~and the DAPIA.~~” The process of having a registered professional engineer design the foundation system and then be reviewed by the DAPIA is redundant and costly to the consumer. The local professional engineer also has knowledge of the local site conditions that may be unknown to the DAPIA. The consumer is protected by the professional engineer’s seal.
- **John Weldy** - The proposal should be passed. “Manufacturer approval” is not defined within MHCCS and provides no value and only cost home owners time and money in their effort of obtaining an acceptable alternative foundation/anchorage design.

##### Abstain – N/A

## Ballot Item III-4: Log 106 - Section 3282.362

### MHCC Meeting Action - Disapprove (21 Affirm, 0 Negative, and 0 Abstain)

#### Comment(s) Received – 1

##### Affirmative – 1

- **Manuel Santana** - While I am voting to disapprove this proposal it is with the understanding that label controls from IBTS to IPIAs will be alleviated to ensure that the supply of labels to manufacturers is not affected by a government shutdown or similar event.

##### Negative – N/A

##### Abstain – N/A

## Ballot Item III-15: Log 127 - Section 3280.607

**MHCC Meeting Action - Disapprove (18 Affirm, 3 Negative, and 0 Abstain)**

**Comment(s) Received – 3**

**Affirmative – N/A**

**Negative – 3**

- **Dominic Frisina** - A label is much more effective than another letter from HUD.
- **Greg Scott** - I voted incorrectly at the MHCC meeting.
- **David Tompos** - I believe that the testing could be easily overlooked by an installer and the cost to protect the consumer with a label is negligible. I recommend that the department include this item specifically to be certified by the installer under the installation program form HUD 309.

**Abstain – N/A**

## Ballot Item III-16: Log 128 - Section 3280.211

**MHCC Meeting Action - Approve as Modified (20 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)**

**Comment(s) Received – 2**

**Affirmative – 1**

- **David Tompos** - The HUD standard is a minimum standard and should not include section 3280.114 for sound transmission between units which is not required in the IRC model codes.

**Negative – 1**

- **Joseph Anderson** - I was not present when this item was discussed by the Committee. I appreciate the effort that went into this proposed change but I believe it is a mistake to create definitions (Dwelling and Dwelling Unit) for terms that are not even used in the statutory language.

**Abstain – N/A**

## Ballot Item III-19: Request that HUD send out guidance letter on anti-scald valves

**MHCC Meeting Action - Approve (20 Affirm, 1 Negative, and 0 Abstain)**

**Comment(s) Received – 1**

**Affirmative – N/A**

**Negative – 1**

- **Dominic Frisina** - A label is more effective and as I said another HUD letter.

**Abstain – N/A**