

From: Sandra Hughes [<mailto:sandrah1263@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 7:47 PM

To: Wilson Regina

Subject: passage of the proposed HB3007

- I strongly support and urge passage of the proposed HB3007 – Opportunity for Tenants to Purchase Their Manufactured Home Parks
- There are already laws on the books which require landlords to negotiate with tenants and which both sides acknowledge don't work well for either landlords or tenants.
- The MH coalition worked this issue through about 20 drafts and over 3 years. The landlords agreed to it in 2011, then said they needed more time to understand it, then after another year and a half of review and many changes to address their concerns, in November 2012 simply refused to negotiate further. You can't negotiate with someone who refuses to talk.
- Among the significant compromises and improvements to current law in this bill are: (1) If a landlord gets an unsolicited offer, the landlord is free to accept that offer with no delay; (2) if a landlord decides to sell, without having first received an unsolicited offer, the landlord must notify the tenants and allow them to compete to buy the park; (3) the landlord can take the best offer; this is not a first right of refusal; and (4) tenants who want to compete to buy a park must meet certain requirements at short intervals or lose their right to compete.
- Park owners advertise their parks as communities, a place where you can retire and share your last years with good neighbors in a close and supportive community. That term, community, is a deliberate marketing strategy. Wouldn't it be the right thing for landlords to do, when they choose to sell their homes and cash out their investments, to allow their residents – their customers, the people they encouraged to invest in their communities by buying or moving their homes there – to COMPETE to buy it, at a fair and full price?
- Resident ownership (or nonprofit ownership) is the only way to limit future rent increases which make parks unaffordable for many, especially seniors living on fixed incomes.
- Also the only way to avoid the risk of closure, bad park management, failure to make repairs.

For a period from about 2002 to 2006, eight out of eleven mobile home parks within a 4 mile radius of our park, Seminole Mobile Estates in Aloha, Oregon, were closed for redevelopment. Any available spaces in other parks were very quickly taken. Many hundreds of residents, had to find other homes, and in the process experienced very heavy financial losses. Once a park is condemned, the homes therein become essentially worthless, and typically cannot be moved. In 2006, we, the residents, tried to purchase our park from the owners, but they would not sell. We dread the thought of an improving economy, as that will surely increase the likelihood, that our park will be also sold for redevelopment.

Yes, we are thankful for the legislation which has been passed since the time mentioned above. That legislation, while being somewhat helpful, is in reality a very small amount of help. For instance, the short time periods allotted residents to attempt to purchase their parks (ORS 90.820), are totally unrealistic. Even though our park has done

much research and preparation for such an event, it would be extremely difficult to be able to have 211 homes come together and successfully take action within the time period specified by the law.

Additionally, in the event of park closures, available spaces to move homes are typically almost non-existent, and it is all but impossible to move any mobile home more than a very few years old. For instance, in our mobile home park of 211 homes, probably less than 10% of the homes could be moved, and ours is not an old park.

If a Tenant is fortunate enough to find a place to move their home, and their home is one of the few suitable to be moved, then the actual cost of moving a home even a short distance is typically \$20,000-\$33,000 as experienced by persons in our p