Manufactured Housing Consensus Committee
Systems Subcommittee
10-18-11 Meeting
DRAFT MINUTES
Sheraton Suites, Alexandria, VA

Tech Systems Roll Call	
Members	Attendance
Mark Mazz	Y
Mike Lubliner	Y
Terry Nelson	Y – Joined late
Theresa Desfosses	Y
Leo Poggione	Y
Manuel Santana	Y
Mark Luttich – Chair	Y
Tim King	Y – Joined late
William Freeborne	N
Adam Rust	Y
AO	
Robert Solomon, NFPA	Y
Pat Toner	Y
Joe Nebbia	Y
HUD	
Jim Everett, DFO	Y
Henry Czauski	Y
Rick Mendlen	Y
Guests	
Dave Tompos, MHCC member	Y
Tim Sheehan, MHCC member	Y
Bill Stamer, MHCC member	Y
Ishbel Dickens, MHCC member	Y
Michael Wade, MHCC member	Y
Richard Weinert, MHCC member	Y
Frank Walter, MHCC member	Y
Jeff Legault, MHCC member	Y
Lois Starkey, MHI	Y
Mark Weiss, MHARR	Y

Highlights and Action items

- The Subcommittee voted to approve March meeting minutes (Motion S1 passed Unanimously)
- The Subcommittee voted to recommend that the MHCC reject Log 18 (Motion S2 passed unanimously)

- The Subcommittee voted to form a task group to investigate the standards in Log 20 and report back every month (Lubliner, Santana and Tompos volunteered; Motion S3 passed with 6 in favor)
- The Subcommittee voted to form a task group to compare the ASHRAE 62.2 standard and the current HUD standard and report back to the Subcommittee to inform discussion on logs 25, 30, 59 (Lubliner and Santana volunteered; Motion S4 passed)
- The Subcommittee voted to recommend that the MHCC reject log 63 (Motion S5 passed 5-2)
- The Subcommittee voted to recommend that the MHCC reject log 64 (Motion S6 passed 5-2)
- The Subcommittee voted to recommend that the MHCC accept log 71 (Motion S7 passed unanimously)

Discussion

The meeting of the Systems Subcommittee was called to order at 1:05 p.m. Eastern Time.

Motion S1: There was a motion to approve the March minutes and a Second. The minutes received unanimous approval.

The Subcommittee discussed log items that had been kept open or had been sent back to the Subcommittee from the MHCC.

Log 18
This item had been kept open, but no further work had been done on it. It was clarified that Log 18 would require every branch circuit 15 or 20 amps to have an arc fault protection, which is above and beyond the 2008 NEC.

There was a question whether the proponent had provided more info. The AO stated that they had not. The subcommittee notes say the log item would be kept open pending more information. No new information was requested or provided.

There was a comment from a subcommittee member in the producer category that Log 19, which would have required arc fault in bedrooms was rejected because it was covered by Log 4 (accepted in principle)

Santana would recommend that we reject log 18 – it is more than NEC requires and it seems unreasonable and MHCC voted on a similar request.

Motion S2 – Mr. Santana – made a motion to recommend to the MHCC that log 18 be rejected. Mr. Poggione seconded. Reason – log would require more than NEC and seems unreasonable; MHCC voted already on a similar proposal.

Discussion:
There was discussion on whether the subcommittee needed to follow up and ask for more information from the proponent.

Ms. Desfosses called the question on Motion S1. Mr. Poggione seconded.
Vote on the call to question passed.

Vote on Motion S2: Motion to reject log 18 passes – unanimous.

Log 20 – Was sent back to the Subcommittee by the MHCC. It deals with AAMA standards, and was sent back because the full committee did not know the impact of the standards.

Mr. Tompos had volunteered to look at the standard and did not see major changes in the proposed standard. The proponent had mentioned additional costs due to flashing requirements, but Mr. Tompos did not find that in his review.

There was a question from a Subcommittee member in the user category, on whether the updated standard would require pan flashing. Answer – it depends on the window manufacturer's instructions. There was further comment from a subcommittee member in the user category stating that window installation instructions are identical for modular, but they require pan flashing. The Subcommittee member discussed a presentation from Dupont on weather resistant barriers.

There was a comment from an MHCC member in the general interest category that numerous manufacturers do flashing the same way they do modular. It's cost effective for preventing water damage.

There was clarification that the 2002 standard was being proposed, not the 2008.

There was a suggestion from a Subcommittee member in the producer category to create a task group to review the standard and come up with a bullet list summary.

There was a suggestion from a Subcommittee member in the producer category that the task group might want to talk to a window manufacturer.

There was a comment from a Subcommittee member in the user category that some window manufacturers say that if they add pan flashing to installation instructions, manufacturers will buy from a competitor.

There was discussion on the cost of flashing.

Motion S3: Mr. Santana made a motion that the Subcommittee chair designates a task group to investigate the standards in Log 20 and report back every month. Mr. Poggione seconded.

Vote on Motion S3: motion passes with 6 in favor to form a task group to investigate the standards in Log 20.

The Subcommittee chair asked for volunteers. Mr. Santana, Mr. Lubliner, and Mr. Tompos volunteered.

There was further discussion that if the 2008 version of the standard were adopted it would force manufacturers to change installation instructions.

There was clarification that the Task Group would look into the 2008 standard and what it requires. There was further clarification that there are three standards in log 20. When we review them we'll find out if these are the most current. First look at proposal and then look at

bringing up to the most current. There was further clarification that pan flashing referred to sill flashing.

Log 25, 30, and 59 were lumped together and involve ASHRAE standard 62.2. The Subcommittee had accepted them in principle adding that they would be a consumer option. , but the full committee sent back because they didn't know the details of the standard.

There was a suggestion to form a task group to examine this standard and report back to the subcommittee.

There was discussion on whether this should be tabled until the DOE energy standard is released. There was further discussion that DOE would not be dealing with this standard.

There was discussion of a past presentation to the MHCC by an ASHRAE representative showing the need for the 62.2 standard. There was further comment that ASHRAE gave permission to the MHCC to distribute an electronic copy of the standard.

There was a question on cost analysis. Answer – some of the proposals provided cost information.

There was a comment from an MHCC member in the general interest category that some of the differences between the HUD standard and the ASHRAE standard involve different levels of air intake. The HUD standard has higher levels, but 62.2 requires testing.

There was a comment from a Subcommittee member in the user category that HUD currently requires exhaust only and the fan has to be in the main living area. The 62.2 standard would get rid of that fan, but make it a quieter fan that costs more money. There is cost savings from reduced ducting. That cost goes to a better fan in the bathroom so the cost differential is offset conditionally.

Motion S4: Mr. Santana made a motion that the Subcommittee chair designates a task group to review this standard – strictly fact finding on what changes this standard would have to the HUD code – and report back to the Subcommittee. Mr. Mazz seconded.

There was discussion on whether the task group should collect cost, but a suggestion to collect only facts on the standard and discus cost at the subcommittee level.

There was a guest comment that there needs to be a threshold for cost info for any proposal that comes in. There was some agreement from the Subcommittee.

There was a comment that there was a task group on this issue a few years ago and that representatives from Broan, Nutone and Panasonic participated.

There was discussion of how many fans would be required by the standard.

There was a comment from an MHCC member in the general interest category that there are climate zone map conflicts between the current U_o maps and the 62.2 maps. There were also exceptions for authorities of local jurisdictions that raise preemption concerns. There was a response that ASHRAE has indicated they could provide a HUD-specific climate map and could work with HUD on interpretations to resolve the local jurisdiction issue.

Vote on motion S4: Motion passed to form a task group to compare the 62.2 standard with the current HUD standard.

Volunteers: Mr. Santana and Mr. Lubliner (will look for other interested parties)

Log 63 and Log 64 are still open and deal with exterior envelope penetrations.

There was a comment from a subcommittee member in the user category that this was adopted in NFPA 501 2008 and in 2010.

There was comment from a HUD representative that DOE indicated this was an issue they would deal with.

There was discussion on whether the group should deal with an issue that DOE will include in their rulemaking.

There was discussion on the location of the thermal envelope.

Motion S5: Ms. Desfosses made a motion to recommend that the MHCC reject Log 63. Poggione Seconded. Reason – DOE will take action on this issue.

Vote on Motion S5: Motion to reject passes 5 to 2.

Log 64 – is on insulation installation and avoiding compression and voids.

There was a comment from a Subcommittee member in the general interest category that the current standard allows it allows a percentage voids.

Motion S6: Ms. Desfosses made a motion to recommend that the MHCC reject log 64. Mr. Poggione seconded. Reason – DOE will likely deal with the issue.

Vote on Motion S6: motion to reject passes 5-2.

Log 71 was left open and deals with ANSI standards for various ratings of hot water heater measurements. The present standard does not allow a tankless water heater in a readily convenient way.

There was a comment from a Subcommittee member in the producer category that this is a very important issue.

Motion S7: Ms. Desfosses made a motion to recommend that the MHCC accept Log 71. Mr. Poggione seconded.

Discussion:

There was a comment from an MHCC member in the producer category that they can be installed but need an AC letter.

There was a comment from a Subcommittee member in the producer category that there might be more to this proposal. There appeared to be tables and other requirements on BTUs per hour.

There was a comment by a subcommittee member in the user category that this system may demand a bigger pipe.

The AO offered clarification that the MHCC didn't understand annual fuel utilization of efficiency, and that's why it was returned to the subcommittee.

Vote on Motion S7: Motion to approve passes unanimously

Motion S8: Ms. Desfosses made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Poggione seconded. Unanimous approval o adjourn at 2:29 p.m. Eastern Time.