Humboldt Mobilehome Owner's Coalition PO Box 2474, McKinleyville, CA



RESPONSE TO HUMBOLDT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PROPOSED RULES AND GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING MEASURE V

As listed, Items 1-9 are acceptable as is.

In the following items We request that additional language be added including:

Item 10) Posting of Ordinance and Other Materials:

"in the event that there are no materials required to be posted available anywhere for any space renter to review, the park owner will be subject to referral to code compliance unit through the civil penalty procedure."

Item 11) Tenant Representatives: We request the following-

- a. Only park residents who are not exempt under CA Code sec 798.17(a)(1)shall be allowed to vote for, volunteer for, or be elected as, a mobile home park Resident Representative. These are the park residents who pay the \$5.00 monthly fee and do not have a multi-year lease.
- b)The County shall send out annual notice to either the Park Representative from the previous year, or, in the event there was no previous park representative, all residents of the park, encouraging them to hold an annual election for a Park Representative (including election directions), or in the event that no election will be held, request a volunteer to call the county liaison.
- c) The only responsibility of the Resident Representative is to disemminate all information from the County regarding the Measure V ordinance to all other non-exempt residents in their park. In the event a park does not have a Resident Representative, the County shall communicate as necessary with all non-exempt residents.

We would also like to add the following:

Under 9101-11 PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FAIR RETURN PETITIONS

- a)A Park Owner ("the applicant") Shall refer to a single entity (either individual or corporation) only, and may not transfer to a new owner should the park be sold during the process of a Fair Return Petition. A new owner would have to wait another 12 month period to apply for a Fair Return Petition.
- 8. i) if the petition itself has been determined incomplete through the expert analysis process, the petition shall be deemed null and void. The petitioner shall wait for another 12-month period before filing another Fair Return petition.

IN GENERAL: All willful violations of this every part of this ordinance shall result in referral to the code compliance unit through the civil penalty procedure and appropriate fines shall be levied until compliance is accomplished.





Fwd: Welcome back

NewScott <jscott830@gmail.com>
To: Hilary Mosher <hilmosh@gmail.com>

Tue, Dec 11, 2018 at 1:18 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mushrush, Paula < PMushrush@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Date: Tue, Dec 11, 2018, 1:16 PM Subject: RE: Welcome back

To: NewScott <jscott830@gmail.com>

I absolutely don't like the ordinance. I think it negatively effects low income people. It was poorly written and is too vague. It was patterned after cities that have large parks and local government control. I am almost sure rent has raised more since adoption than any time prior to that. What's your experience?

I would like an amendment that closes the very the gaps in interpretation. I would like it to cover parks over 50 or 100, not ones over 10 units. It has been a travesty for those small parks in rural areas. To give perspective San Jose has the same number of parks with 11,000 units and the average park is in the 100's. We have 55 parks, and only one over 100 units. They have three staff members for their 55 parks (11,000 units), and it's paid for by the fees, averaging \$8/each. They also have legal jurisdiction over the parks. We have 44 parks over 10 spaces, with only 974 units, at \$5. That is ½ staff person for almost the same number of parks. The work is in the number of parks, not in the units. Anyway – we have problems unique to rural areas. We do not have legal jurisdiction over the parks.

So I do enforce what I can, but I can't enforce what isn't our jurisdiction, and I can't enforce something that is vague unless someone sues and then it is attorney's duking it out. So I believe that the rumor is wrong.

Thanks,

Paula Mushrush

(707) 268-3798