

Submitter: Karen Newman
On Behalf Of: Lea Scalf
Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3054

I attended the hearing. Two park owners testified; both said:

The parks they own are a family business. One said his family has owned parks in Salem for 3 generations, the other said her family bought parks as an investment. Rate increases prior to 2019 were 4-5%, but after the bill passed they increased rents to 10 %.

Both told a story about Helga, who owns 22 acres and has run a park for decades; if this bill passes she may sell to developers to build homes on 1/4 acre lots. They cautioned that many owners will sell and park residents will no longer have a home.

I disagree.

Those owners did not testify about what they did with the huge profits they made since 2019. Most parks are in need of major infrastructure improvements. If they used those increases for improvements, wouldn't they have included that in their testimonies?

None of the parks represented by residents on Wednesday saw infrastructure improvements over the past few years of double-digit increases. Universally, the repairs were superficial, such as new paint for the clubhouses, where park managers have their offices; that was not for residents, but for park staff.

Park owners testified their parks were profitable for generations prior to 2019. Their argument of being forced to sell if rent increases are capped at 6% rings hollow. Additionally, multiple corporations owning multiple sites throughout the state are now pressuring owners to sign 30-year leases. That negates claims of parks being forced into closure.

My senior living park is one of many offering the 30-year lease; the corporation owns 16 parks in Oregon. All of them are being asked to sign; all new move ins are required to sign the new lease. A homeowner from Lincoln City, in a park owned by another corporation with multiple properties in Oregon is in the same position.

I refused to sign because of egregious portions of the lease, such as shifting the expense of maintaining and replacing carports and driveways to the renter when the owners have refused to repair them for the past fifty years, though obligated by contract to do so. My point is that several park owners are committing to the next thirty years, contrasted with two owners' testimony referencing a woman who said she would probably sell.

Let me give you a glimpse of how park owners manipulate law makers when they talk about the expense of maintaining parks. Title Ten code on park lighting (10-3.4) roughly translates to lighting mounted on metal poles that creates a safe place for residents with an average of 4.0 lux with photocells that turn on at dusk and off at dawn. When I moved to my park there were lollypop lights that were ancient; the last

few were removed about 2 years ago. My lease from 2017 says I must carry a flashlight after dark and provide flashlights for guests. Residents pointed out that this makes us easy targets in case of park intruders. Response from owners is one motion sensitive solar powered light from Home Depot mounted on a carport to cover an entire cu-de-sac. I estimate cost at \$30.

Owners narrative would be that they exceeded contractual obligations and invested an increase of 100% in capital improvements for safe lighting. (And no power bill!) No mention of Title Ten Codes, because there is no state or municipal office in charge of inspection, enforcement or ticketing violations. Title Ten has great laws that are updated annually, with absolutely no enforcement.

Driving thru my park in daylight one would see nice yards and homes that are well maintained except for rundown carports. Renters' responsibility is enforced, while park owners' responsibility is ignored or passed down to the tenants through neglect or intimidation.

We are not typical renters. No apartment complex has a 30-year lease. We are homeowners, responsible for maintenance, insurance, taxes, yard work (including very expensive tree trimming and removal fees). Most of us are retired and living on Social Security.

Thank you,
Lea Scalf