RESIDENT/REPRESENTATIVE FEEDBACK

Attendance:
In person - 111
On zoom – 84

• Presentation by City Staff:
  o Residents’ Requests:
    ▪ Allowable rent increase changed to 50% of CPI;
    ▪ Maximum increase cap changed from 6% to 3%
    ▪ Temporary freeze on annual Administrative Fee imposed by City on residents and park owners
  o Review of Ordinance

Speaker Comments:

• Willing to participate in Ad Hoc committee; has confidence in City Manager and staff
  o Ad Hoc members identified as Tom, Roger, and Joanne
• Question regarding timing for when parks will be hit with annual increase.
• Concerns about owners’ participation in Ad Hoc committee.
• Put money into her home but can’t tolerate yearly increases.
• Believes owner will need to do utility line improvements and concerned about resulting pass-throughs.
• Hasn’t heard anything about rent subsidies.
• Hardship concerns about facing increasing rents.
• Who will participate in Ad Hoc committee from owners’ side? Concerned if it includes attorneys.
• Concern re: owners’ willingness to fully participate in Ad Hoc committee.
• Thinks State HCD needs to get involved to ensure improvements to parks happen.
• CPI doesn’t reflect what park owners’ costs are - hardship concerns.
• Concerns about owners’ participation in Ad Hoc Committee.
• Concern about how the Ad Hoc Committee will be administered so that it is focused and stays on track.
• Mobilehomes are affordable housing.
• Brookwood Mobilehome Park is the most expensive, costs $2k (rent + utilities)
• When homes sold, rent goes down.
• Appreciate Ad Hoc idea.
- Concern about timing; their rents increase as of Oct. 1st
- Need to have rent increase levels reduced.
- Just bought home, was told rent was higher than it should have been; when called on it they lowered it.
- Why are they in SF CPI region.
- Who from owners will participate in Ad Hoc Committee.
- Concerns about owners’ participation.
- Never heard about rent subsidies.
- Hardship concerns.
- The park used the standard of income being 3 times the rent level.
- Same comment as above.
- Check State Mobilehome Residency Law for regs on this.
- Rents increases should be a flat amount, not a percentage.
- Social security increases don’t keep up with CPI increases.
- Hardship concerns.
- What will excess Admin Fee funding be used for.

**Zoom Comments:**

- Park owner leaves many vacant homes, losing a huge amount of income per month. He charges around the highest rents in the city. Only has half the number of needed maintenance workers and requires them to do work that should be done by outside contractor. He has refused to meet with residents as required by state law. If you won’t reduce the cap, please add exceptions for owners like this.
- Good faith negotiations will not be equitable because owners want money. In Petaluma, one mobile home park has rents into the $2,000 range (a month). The value of the homes has dropped dramatically. The renters have lost their investment values in their homes. The higher the rents the lower value of the homes.
- It is important to note that the fastest growing demographic of homelessness in CA is SENIORS. Without rent control, this tragedy will only get much, much worse.
- City of Petaluma has gone through the process of trying to stabilize mobile home park rents (at least in one park). Park owners hired attorneys to fight rent control. One Park owner threatens litigation at every turn. He is bulling everyone and the City is concerned about the cost to defend. Negotiations in good faith has been a myth.
- The parks in the city have received 100% of the CPI for a very long time. 20+ years. Surrounding areas have taken an increase of only 40%-50%. We need to change this! My space rent has increased 125% over the past 23 years. Other parks in Rincon area exceed this with improper pass thru. We need stabilization in our ordinance.

Meeting adjourned.