

North County Mobilehome

# Digest

*SERVING Over 25,000 Residents  
in Carlsbad, Encinitas, Escondido,  
Oceanside, San Marcos & Vista*

**NOVEMBER 2018**

VOLUME 1 NUMBER 10



**SAVE on your AUTO and  
MOBILE HOME INSURANCE!**  
**(800) 660-0204** *See back cover for details!!!*

**THE MARKET IS HOT!!!  
WE NEED YOUR HOME.  
NOW IS THE TIME TO SELL!!!**

**Please Let Us Sell Your Home!  
Everything We Touch Turns to Sold \$\$\$**



**Present This Coupon For Your  
FREE APPRAISAL**

**#1 IN SALES FOR 28 YEARS IN A ROW**

**WE ARE EXPERTS IN MANUFACTURED AND MOBILE HOMES  
WE HAVE 30 FULL TIME LICENSED AGENTS TO SERVE YOU  
WE HAVE MORE BUYERS WAITING THAN AT ANY OTHER TIME**

**CALL NOW!  
760-471-1212**

**145 Bent Avenue - San Marcos, CA (760) 471-1212**

**5 LOCATIONS TO SERVE YOU!**

**San Marcos . Santee . Beaumont . Huntington Beach . Chula Vista**

**YOUR IN PARK SPECIALISTS SINCE 1990**

# *North County Mobilehome Digest*

## *Published by Mobilehome Magazine*

**Serving California's Mobile & Manufactured Housing Communities**

**Website: [www.mobilehomemagazine.org](http://www.mobilehomemagazine.org) / ([www.mhonet.org](http://www.mhonet.org))**

**Mobilehome Magazine, P.O. Box 3774, Chatsworth, CA 91313**

**Front Cover Photo: Supplied by Beverly Purcell**

**Frank A. Wodley, Editor/Publisher. To God Be The Glory**

**(818) 886-6479 / (800) 929-6061 E-MAIL: [fawodley@yahoo.com](mailto:fawodley@yahoo.com)**

**MobilehomeMagazine is not responsible for content contained in advertising**

## **The RENT CONTROL QUESTION**

The Union Tribune has taken a stand opposing rent control, both with articles and editorials and even the U-T ECONOMETER chipped in with a resounding 18 to zero opposition opinion. Not that I am surprised, after all, without real estate and auto advertising, the paper would probably fold within six months. They would find themselves in the same kind of fix most average citizens are in with a stagnate income growth and inflationist economy, highlighted by rising rents.

Do any of those 18 naysayers face the same kind of problems many renters are facing? Chances are, every single one owns their home, so renter problems are no concern of theirs.

Take my case for instance. My rental/housing costs in a mobile home park are consuming well over fifty percent of my retirement income. My social security income is super stagnate. I could not even come close to renting the average apartment with less than \$2,000.00 dollars a month income. New apartments in the \$1,700 to \$2,200 monthly range are being gobbled up by those earning \$50,000 to \$100,000 a year, and they are not the ones suffering and having to look for older, less attractive and barely affordable units.

You anti-poor people always bring up New York when you come out against rent controls. How about Santa Monica, right here in California? Raising rents an average of 8.4 percent in one year is nothing but greedy gouging by investors. Their operating costs may be up 2 or 3 percent, if that much. How about limiting increases to the increase granted to Social Security recipients? That would probably result in getting larger benefit increases so the investors could milk the system some more. The TV and print ads opposing Prop 10 are packed with whist might and will happen, when in fact the percentage of fulfilling these horrible things is more like 10 to 20 percent in reality. If opposition is legitimate then why resort to lies and deceit? I also wonder how many millions of dollars are flowing into pockets and campaigning against the removal of the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act passed in 1995. This act is one of the major causes of skyrocketing rents and homelessness. The people/investors/real estate businesses are using their obscene profits to defeat Prop 10.

Now, before you think I am a socialist or communist, let me assure I have been a staunch conservative for over 70 years, and never voted for even one Democrat for President. I also at one time owned rental property and apartments, all of which carried fair and reasonable rents. Rent control can be a necessary evil that keeps people in decent housing situations. Open your minds and hearts a little. VOTE FOR PROP 10 and call for an end to this rape of those on the lower end of the economic scale. Article by Lloyd Rochambeau

# OMHA NEWSLETTER, November, 2018

Oceanside Manufactured Homeowners Alliance, Inc. [www.omha4oside.com](http://www.omha4oside.com)

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE by *Bob Markley*

Here is the latest news on the possible sale of Rancho San Luis Rey as of press time. The owner, through the management company, has stated "There is no information on a sale. If a broker is chosen in the future, information will be given at that time." This does not necessarily mean that the park is not for sale. The park owner is an attorney and could avoid a broker's fee by arranging a sale herself. The homeowners are exploring what their actions could be, including putting together an offer for the residents to purchase the park.

A usually reliable source has informed me that Terrace Gardens has been sold for \$4.8 million and that the new owner intends to make improvements in the park.

**AB3066 was SIGNED INTO LAW** by the Governor on Sept. 26. It assesses an annual \$10 fee on the park owner for every lot in the park to fund the program. This fee can be passed through to homeowners, so you can expect to see that charge on your rent bill in 2019. This is a 5-year pilot program but could be extended by a future Legislature. You can read the Legislative Counsel's Digest and the full text of the bill here:

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB3066](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB3066)

**The Governor also signed into law AB 2056** that authorizes the Department of Housing and Community Development to make loans from the Mobilehome Park Rehabilitation and Purchase Fund to a qualified nonprofit housing sponsor or a local public entity to acquire or rehabilitate a mobilehome park where no less than 30% of residents at the time that the loan application is filed are low income. You can read the Legislative Counsel's Digest and the full text of the bill here:

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180AB2056](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB2056)

**The Governor also signed into law SB1130.** This bill will add manufactured homes to the State Property Tax Postponement Program to help seniors and disabled constituents stay in their homes. You can read the Legislative Counsel's Digest and the full text of the bill here:

[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180SB1130](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1130)

If you don't have internet access to read the above bills, ask a friend or neighbor who does, to help you.

**NEED AN ATTORNEY**, but don't know how to find one? The San Diego County Bar Association offers a free Lawyer Referral & Information Service. People there can refer you to a licensed attorney (not just a legal assistant) for FREE. You can learn more at their website:

<https://www.sdcba.org/index.cfm?pg=mainIris> Their phone number is (800) 464-1529. If you contact an attorney, you should first ask about a no-charge exploratory meeting, so the attorney can understand your situation and decide whether or not s(he) can help you. Be sure to discuss fees. Such exploratory meetings usually last 15-30 minutes.

**IS YOUR ELECTRIC BILL SKY-HIGH?** Many are, especially with the high temperatures in recent months. SDG&E offers two programs to help reduce electric bills:

- California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE). This program offers 30% or more discount on your electric bill every month.
- Family Electric Rate Assistance (FERA). This program is for households that don't qualify for the CARE program, and offers a 12% discount on your electric bill. There must be 3 or more persons in the household to qualify for this program.

Each program has income guidelines. Learn more and/or apply on-line at:

<https://www.sdge.com/residential/pay-bill/get-payment-bill-assistance/assistance-programs>

## IMPORTANT MEETINGS—MARK YOUR CALENDAR!

**CITY COUNCIL:** Wed., Nov. 28, Wed., Dec. 5, and Wed., Dec. 19, City Council Chambers

**OMHA COMBINED GENERAL MEMBERSHIP and BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS:** Nov. 16 at 1 p.m. in Rancho San Luis Rey's clubhouse #2, 200 N. El Camino Real, Oceanside 92058, and Dec. 14 at 1 p.m. in TRICO's clubhouse, 221 N. El Camino Real, Oceanside 92058.

**ACTION:** Sunday, Dec. 9, at 2 p.m. in Rancho San Luis Rey's clubhouse #2, 200 N. El Camino Real, Oceanside 92058.

### OMHA BOARD of DIRECTORS

President	Bob Markley	(760) 435-1126	Secretary	Vikki Schaffner	(406) 459-0953
Vice President	Thom Taylor	(760) 721-2429	Ombudsman	Sherrie Goldby	(760) 715-2161
Treasurer	Barry Horton	(760) 757-2337	Director-at-Large	Donna Cooper	(760) 453-7054

### OMHA PARK REPRESENTATIVES

PARK	Name	Phone No.	PARK	Name	Phone No.
Cavalier	Ken Rollins	unlisted	Mission View Manor	Donna Morel	unlisted
El Camino 76	Frank Crowley	(760) 685-2380	Mission View West	Donna Cooper	(760) 453-7054
La Salina	Vacant		Rancho Calevero	Bonnie Wright	unlisted
Laguna Vista	Thom Taylor	(760) 721-2429	Rancho San Luis Rey	Debra Johnson	(714) 651-8224
MiraMar	Patricia Olkowski and Dwight Johnson	(760) 717-9207 (360) 933-1754	Terrace Gardens	Larry Schrack	(760) 453-7297
			TRICO	Debbie Mastro	(760) 529-5322

"For years, OMHA, an ardent supporter of our Oceanside Mobile Home Rent Control Ordinance, has worked diligently and effectively in educating mobile home owners regarding their rights and responsibilities. I highly recommend that every Oceanside mobile home owner join!" *Esther Sanchez, Oceanside City Councilwoman since 2000*



**OMHA Oceanside Manufactured Homeowners Alliance, Inc.**  
2019 Membership Application (please print legibly)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Second Occupant \_\_\_\_\_

Park Name \_\_\_\_\_ Spc.# \_\_\_\_\_

Phone # \_\_\_\_\_

e-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

Annual dues \$10 (covers all eligible voters listed above)

Please make check payable to **OMHA** and bring to a meeting or mail to: **OMHA, P.O. Box 642, San Luis Rey, CA 92068**

**WANT TO GET SOME EXERCISE?  
WANT TO MEET NEW FRIENDS?**  
If so, contact your park's  
**OMHA Park**  
Representative and offer to  
help deliver the  
**OMHA newsletter in your park!**

NEWSLETTER EDITOR: Dr. Ginger Marable, 760-439-1786, drginger@cox.net

# SMMRA NOVEMBER DIGEST:

The San Marcos Mobilehome Residents Association held their Annual Meeting in September and the program was dominated by a presentation with an extensive Question and Answer period on the subject of buying your own park and escaping the clutches of investors who routinely flaunt and violate the Mobilehome Residency Law, Title 25, and even the City Rent Stabilization Ordinance. Oddly enough, a flyer advertising the offering of sale for El Dorado Estates turned later and will undoubtedly find interest in such a purchase by the Residents.

They very well could go through a conversion, just as seven other San Marcos parks did a few years ago. We wish them good luck and offer our support if they need it.

\* The SMMRA Political Action Committee (PAC) evaluated and endorsed Rebecca Jones for Mayor, Craig Garcia for District One Councilman, and Mike Sannella for District Two Councilman, believing they would be understanding and supportive of their citizens. It is also encouraging support of Jim Desmond for the County Board of Supervisors, Prop 6 to defeat the gas tax increase and Prop 10 to allow local communities to determine whether Rent Control would benefit their community and their citizens. VOTE, if you haven't already.

\* SMMRA is encouraging Homeowners to recruit or step up or volunteer to serve the community of residents to represent them in striving to gain enforcement of the laws intended to protect them. AB 3066 (Mobilehome Residency Law Protection Act) was signed by the Governor and will be implemented by the HCD next year. Homeowners need to learn how to use the law to attain justice which has evaded them for many years. It will need to be upgraded and improved to perfect it. The mere application of the laws should result in diminishing numbers of violations as Park Managers and Owners realize that their bullying and cheating will no longer be tolerated, and being shamed in front of their businesses is nothing to be proud of.

Sign up or convince your friends and neighbors to take up the challenge of protecting homeowners.

\* The elections and an awakening in the City will very possibly result in finding ways to enforce the laws. An Ombudsman is sought to provide an easily identifiable resource to residents needing help with law violations by owners and managers, and also expecting the City to enforce their RSO Ordinance. 2019 has a promise of great progress for homeowners, and they need to stand up and be counted, and not capitulate to apathy.

Lloyd Rochambeau, SMMRA President



## **FREE MARKET AND MOBILEHOME RENT CONTROL**

(An Analysis by Coalition of Escondido Mobile Home Voters)

### **INTRODUCTION**

Often, the term “free market” is used in discussions concerning mobile home rent control. Opponents of mobile home rent control state that the “free market” should be a consideration in mobile home rent control. A closer examination of this argument will show that the term “free market” is not applicable to either mobile home rent control discussions or mobile home rent control hearings.

The definition provided for the term “free market” by investopedia.com is: A market economy based on supply and demand with little or no government control. A completely free market is an idealized form of a market economy where buyers and sellers are allowed to transact freely (i.e. buy/sell/trade) based on a mutual agreement on price without state intervention in the form of taxes, subsidies or regulation.

The explanation of “free market” provided by investopedia.com is: In simple terms, a free market is a summary term for an array of exchanges that take place in society. Each exchange is a voluntary agreement between two parties who trade in the form of goods and services. In reality, this is the extent to which a free market exists since there will always be government intervention in the form of taxes, price controls and restrictions that prevent new competitors from entering a market.

The above definition and explanation of the “free market” provide for a system of economy that clearly involves two parties (a buyer and a seller) negotiating for goods and/or services. Their ability to achieve an agreed upon price for those goods and services is the hallmark of the “free market” system.

Critics of mobile home rent control - which differs from apartment rent control - claim that owners of mobile home parks should be able to set space rents at whatever rate they want and their inability to do so violates the principles of the “free market.” This claim often creates controversy and confusion during mobile home rent control hearings and works to prejudice the position of mobile home owners because of its misapplication.

If the circumstances described in both the definition and explanation of “free market” existed in mobile

home parks today, then we would agree with the critics. Unfortunately those circumstances do not exist. Neither does there exist a two-party trade agreement for goods and/or services, nor is there a two-party, buyer/seller system in place.

## **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARK OWNER AND HOMEOWNER**

While it is true that the homeowner and the park owner sign a contract at the time of occupancy, that is the extent of the voluntary agreement between those two parties. The dynamic of the agreement changes almost immediately whereby the owner of the park has the majority of the bargaining power and the homeowner is left with very little effective recourse.

So great is the shift of power, that in his majority opinion, Justice Kleinfeld for the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in the Guggenheim v Goleta case said, "Because the owner of the mobile home cannot readily move it to get a lower rent, the owner of the land has the owner of the mobile home over a barrel." This tilt in power is exactly why rent control ordinances have been found necessary and have been upheld by many courts in the State of California, and in the United States Supreme Court. (Continued on page 8)

When a homeowner agrees to move their home onto an empty space, or buys an existing home, the balance of power shifts to the side of the mobile home park owner and equal balance is never regained by the homeowner. The owner of the park has the option to change the rules for living in a park at will. The owner can regulate the extent to which the homeowner must maintain the home and maintain the landscaping. They can regulate the number of cars that can be owned, who can visit and how often, how many days/nights a house guest can stay, the hours/days a guest can use any of the amenities, and much more.

Once the homeowner has established residency in a mobile home park, there is little negotiating that can be done with a homeowner or the park's management. There no longer exists a voluntary agreement between two parties for goods or services. The homeowner is dealt the hand by the park owner and is expected to play it, or face the penalty of eviction. In 1978, the California State Legislature recognized that there was a unique situation created by these dueling property rights and found it necessary to enact the Mobilehome Residency Laws (Cal Civil Code §798). In the code, they state: "...it is necessary that the owners of mobile homes occupied within mobile home parks be provided with the unique protection from actual or constructive eviction afforded by the provisions of this chapter."

These protections have been upheld throughout the years from their implementation in various state courts. They were even upheld in 1992 by the United States Supreme Court in the case of Yee v City of Escondido.

Interestingly, the shift in the balance of power - and therefore the need for special protections - is acknowledged by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in the court's majority opinion. The court found that the initial contract agreement between park owner and homeowner is a voluntary act entered into freely. In other words, the park owner has opted to rent his land to the tenant. She points out that while there are a number of rules by which the park owner must operate, there is no provision for rental amounts and increases. And since the park owner has the upper hand after the agreement has been signed, the ability of government to regulate rental amounts and increases is appropriate to protect the homeowners from unfair practices.

## **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARK OWNER AND HOMEOWNER AT TIME OF SALE**

As defined, a "free market" system would allow for two parties to reach an agreement on purchase price for a mobile home when the owner wishes to sell. The reality is that there aren't just two parties to the sale of a mobile home, there are three: the homeowner, the potential buyer and the park owner.

---

All transactions concerning the sale and purchase of a mobile home are controlled to a large extent by the

park owner. They do this in two ways. The first way is through the approval process, the second through the pricing of space rent.

The Mobilehome Residency Law (MRL) states that park owners may not withhold approval of a prospective buyer if they have “the financial ability to pay the rent and charges of the park unless the management reasonably determines that, based on the purchaser’s prior tenancies, he or she will not comply with the rules and regulations of the park.” The MRL does not, in this case, offer any protections to the homeowner/seller other than compensatory damages (if able to be proven) during this process.

It has been observed, and is a long standing tradition, that park owners will change their rental requirements on a case-by-case basis. The parks may require an enormous amount of money on deposit in reserve, they have been known to reject a long line of potential buyers for, what they call, a lack of creditworthiness, or they have changed the requirements for tenancy at will. The MRL unfortunately does not allow for any recourse in this matter.

The homeowner, who wishes to sell their mobile home, must face the fact that they will either not sell their home or will have to sell their home at a substantial loss. Clearly, the definition and explanation of “free market” do not include the manipulation of pricing by an outside, interested third party. And because, by law, the park owner must be allowed to give final approval of the new tenant and the sales transaction, there is no ability of the homeowner to remove the park owner from the equation.

It has been estimated that for every \$100 increase in space rent, the equity value in a mobile home is reduced by \$10,000. This is realized at the time of sale, and today, we see that manufactured homes in Escondido mobile home parks, that were purchased for close to \$100,000, are now are selling from \$45,000 - \$55,000. This is a direct result of park owner manipulation and vacancy decontrol.

The results of this practice can be seen in three mobile home parks in Escondido: Friendly Hills MHP, Sunset Terrace MHP and Vista Verde Estates MHP. All three of these parks are majority owned and rented by the park owners. The park owners have made the sales of mobile homes near impossible, and when the seller is desperate, the owner offers \$2,000 or \$3,000 dollars (well below market value) thereby taking ownership of the homes and taking advantage of the homeowners.

## **CONCLUSION**

An unique situation exists between the owners of mobile homes and the owners of mobile home parks. So unique is the situation, the California State Legislature, in 1978, enacted the Mobilehome Residency Law. Since its having been enacted, many cities in the state of California have adopted rent control ordinances.

State and federal courts have agreed that mobile home rent control is fair and legal. Mobile home park owners have charged that government has taken their property. The courts have determined that while park owners continue to allow tenants to rent their land, their voluntary involvement in the process (continuing to rent the land) precludes their ability to claim damages.

The presence of a “free market” in mobile home transactions exists for only the briefest period of time, almost immediately the balance of power shifts to the park owner. The concept of a “free market” does not ever exist in the sale of a mobile home. With this level of influence and power, it is obvious that the protections offered to residents through the rent control ordinance are necessary and that there is no “free market” to consider.

# PARK MANAGER: FRIEND OR FOE?



Many of us homeowners have an answer to that question. My guess is that any poll of homeowners would have negative opinions for somewhere between 40 to 70 percent of their managers. Have those managers really earned such a low opinion, or have they merely been so graded because of their boss, the Park owner? We have to be honest and recognize that the manager is the “pickle in the middle”, charged with keeping the owner happy (and their job intact), yet trying to deal with homeowners, service providers, mobile home salespeople, and all too often aging and deteriorating mobile home parks. It’s not an easy job, often underpaid, and almost always filled by untrained or inexperienced people.

There’s an old joke: “What’s the difference between a Park Manager and God?” The answer is “God does not think he is a Park Manager”. While humorous, it is a little harsh. But it is also very true in some cases.

I have lived in three mobile home parks over the last 28 years. My first experience was with

Rancho Carlsbad in Carlsbad, a park that experienced as much turmoil (especially over exploding space rents) as any I have known about. One of the owners lived in the park and the manager was a young lady named Kathy Griffith. Kathy began her employment as park manager in 1977. A large park with 504 spaces and about 700 to 800 residents. If you followed the 80/20 rule (80 % happy and 20% unhappy), Kathy would have had about 150 complaining residents to deal with. Kathy’s tenure of 18 years under a Park Owner ended when a group of residents managed to effect a purchase of the park in 1995, and now under resident ownership Kathy now has another 18 years as the community manager. You cannot possibly be a bad manager and have that kind of longevity.

What makes a good manager? Qualities such as compassion, civil, polite, fair, responsive, and a fair amount of intelligence. I would also argue that a manager should be able to read and understand and adhere to the Mobile Home Residency Law and Title 25. A bad manager would be one lacking the above qualities, and who lies, deceives and bullies people. There are some managers who take bribes and give favorable treatment to some mobile home salespeople. This should never happen, and fortunately it is the exception rather than the rule. There is no doubt that Park Managers have a difficult job. Being in the middle requires guts to challenge Park Owners when they become too oppressive with homeowners and intentionally ignore or violate the MRL and Title 25.

Their job, no matter whether they are deemed good or bad as a manager is made easier when the homeowners are apathetic or fearful of “rocking the boat” and making the manager or owner unhappy. I have lived in two other parks for a total of about 9 years. I would give both of those managers a 7 on a scale of 1 to 10. I have to admit



San Marcos Mobilehome Residents Association  
P.O. Box 2285 San Marcos, CA 92079-1015

### SMMRA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

PLEASE PRINT

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Spouse \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Park name: \_\_\_\_\_ Space # \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I want to volunteer for:

Membership Committee

Event Committee

Resident Representative

Political Action Committee

**\$10.00** Yearly Dues  **\$5.00** Legal Fund  **\$5.00** PAC Fund Contribution

**\$15.00** Family Dues

Check enclosed for \$ \_\_\_\_\_ payable to SMMRA and mail to: P.O. Box 2285 San Marcos, CA 92079-1015

that both were constricted by their Park Owners.

As I said before, managers are concerned about holding on to their jobs. Park Owners are concerned about their profits. I would never claim that Park Owners are not entitled to a decent profit margin. The truth of the matter is that mobile home parks are by and large, quite profitable. Most parks can be operated for about \$200.00 per month per space, and that includes funding for reserves. The proof of this is found in the HOA fees of land/resident owned parks. They range from \$125.00 to \$250.00 per space, with most being under \$200.00. Unlike apartment buildings, occupancy rates are about 99 percent in mobile home parks, thereby losing no income due to vacancies or turnover.

I come from a career in retirement community administration, and as such, I was licensed by the State as a Nursing Home Administrator and as a Residential Care Facility Administrator. In both case I had to know and follow tons of laws and regulations to hold those jobs. At one point I also worked in Property Management for Condo and common interest associations. While I was not licensed by the State, I still attained the CPM (Certified Property Manager) designation from the Institute of Real Estate Management.

Now I am not proposing such stringent type of qualifications for Park Managers, it would be a good idea to have some type of training and preparation for persons holding these positions. Perhaps someday, someone will come along and get something passed like the Davis-Stirling Act, but, so long as mobile home owners are considered less than other home owners, and Park Owners have control over our legislators we will have a difficult time to effect any meaningful change that will ensure protection of our civil rights and property rights.

Lloyd Rochambeau, San Marcos. President, Lakeview Mobile Estates HOA

# YES ON PROPOSITION 10

THIS IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. Vote YES on 10 on November 6th.

It will take the chains off and allow cities to have more control to implement rent control.

## WE NEED EVERYONE TO VOTE YES ON 10

### What is Costa-Hawkins?

For over twenty years, the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act has been a disaster for California renters. A special-interest statewide law backed by the real estate industry that passed in 1995, Costa-Hawkins ties the hands of cities when it comes to protecting tenants from landlords who charge runaway rents:

- **Cities can't pass vacancy control**; if a tenant leaves or is forced out of a rent-controlled unit, a landlord can raise the rent however much they want for the new tenant.
- **Cities can't extend rent control** to any condos, single-family homes, and any housing built after 1995.
- **Cities that passed rent control before 1995** cannot even cover construction from the date their ordinance passed (i.e. 1979) up to 1995.

Since the 2008 crisis, Wall Street has snapped up tens of thousands of single-family home rentals across the state and nationwide. Thanks to Costa-Hawkins, Wall Street landlords can hike rents by thousands of dollars overnight.

Since Costa-Hawkins passed in 1995, tenants have paid ever increasing rents and been forced from their communities or into homelessness due to high housing costs. Our communities are suffering while real-estate profiteers squeeze tenants for higher and higher rents.

Repealing Costa-Hawkins is common sense: it lets cities decide what's best for them. Every city can make their own choices whether they want rent control and what buildings should be covered. It's time for Sacramento and the real estate lobby to stop dictating which properties are exempt from rent control, allow cities to choose vacancy control, and allow existing rent ordinances to be updated.

With housing costs completely out of control in California, now is the time to repeal Costa-Hawkins.

## Why is Sacramento protecting Costa-Hawkins?

Rent control is broadly popular with Californians, but real estate interests have the ears (and campaign dollars) of many legislators in Sacramento. In 2008, at the height of the biggest economic collapse since the Great Depression, Tenants Together formed around the fight against Proposition 98, where the landlord lobby tried (and failed) to abolish all rent control in California. Despite Costa-Hawkins being on the books for over a decade at that point, the real estate lobby wasn't satisfied.

In 2017, Assemblymember Richard Bloom (D-Santa Monica) introduced **Assembly Bill 1506** to repeal Costa-Hawkins. The landlord lobby, major donors in California politics, worked furiously to stop the bill from moving to the floor by pressuring elected officials to vote AB 1506 down. As hundreds of tenants from all over California looked on from the Capitol halls, the repeal died by just one vote in the Assembly Housing Committee.

Today, some of the same Wall Street landlords who snapped up foreclosed homes after 2008 are spending heavily to prevent Costa-Hawkins repeal from succeeding at the November 2018 ballot.

Tenants are fighting to make their voices heard, but we will only succeed when we organize together.

### FACT VS. FICTION

#### **Repealing Costa-Hawkins will not stop new construction.**

Rent control does not stop new construction. A recent Haas Institute Report found that "the six cities that had rent control in the Bay Area actually produced more housing units per capita than cities without rent control."

#### **Landlords will do just fine if Costa-Hawkins is repealed.**

Rent control laws are required by the courts to allow landlords a fair rate of return.

#### **Rent control is a proven way to stop rent gouging and displacement.**

Over a dozen cities in California have these protections.

Rent control works, and more cities are adopting it to address skyrocketing rents. In 2016 Mountain View, Richmond, and Santa Rosa passed new rent control measures.

From: <http://www.tenantsaltogether.org/campaigns/repeal-costa-hawkins-rental-housing-act>

## From Frank Wodley, VALLEJO Magazine Editor

I've been an advocate since 2004 when I started the Coalition of Mobilehome Owners - California. I've seen it all. Vote YES ON 10, it is important. Let the cities decide what's best for their residents. Our park owners and landlords make plenty of profit. Remember parks are labeled 'cash cows.'

I live in Chatsworth and have been under rent control for the 20 years I've lived here in a mobilehome. Park owners make out just fine. There have been so many years when the CPI has been less than 3%, yet the park owners get 3% or more each and every year! Don't believe the NO ON 10 ads. This is no different from the days of propositions 90, 98, and 99 when the fat cats wanted to eliminate rent control by hiding behind eminent domain. Don't fall for their lies. **VOTE YES ON 10.**

# Local Vista Mobile Home Contractor

C-47 713835

ROOFING  
LEVELING  
NEW PIERS  
ROOMS  
WINDOWS  
DOORS  
BATHROOMS  
PAINTING  
DECKS STEPS  
AWNINGS  
OFFSET POSTS  
NEW BATHS  
ALL MOBILE  
HOME REPAIRS

**CALL US**  
For your Free  
Consultation



Working With Mobile Homes 40 Years  
We do most Everything. So...Just Call US



**760-822-1239**

**WHITEHURST**

WhitehurstMobileHome.Com

Mobile Home Specialist Inc.

## Advertising in The Digest

- Terrific customer service. We're available 24/7.
- Less competition from other businesses.
- Best rates for display ads - see reverse.
- All magazines are displayed online - including your advertising.
- No long term contracts. Pay month to month.
- Published Monthly
- Get in on the ground floor - be one of the first businesses to advertise and encounter little competition from other advertisers.
- Established Magazine.
- Quality magazine published exclusively for the mobile/manufactured-home community.
- Promoted by residents and resident groups state-wide.

**COMPASSIONATE HOSPICE INC.**

*We Provide Our Patients with:*

- MEDICAL EQUIPMENTS & SUPPLIES
- MEDICATION
- NUTRITION
- HOME CARE VISITS (BATHING/SHOWER)
- DOCTOR & NURSE VISITS

ALL ARE PROVIDED 100% ZERO COST TO PATIENT & FAMILY. COVERED BY MEDICARE & MEDICAL

**CALL NOW 24/7: 805-864-6162**

**PHONE: 805-520-6074**

**FAX: 805-520-6075**

# WANTED!

## Mobile Homes to Sell... All Ages, All Sizes, Sell Fast!

### Cole Realty & Mortgage

We **Buy** Mobile Homes

- 19 Top Sales Agents
- **#1 in Sales**
- Open 7 Days a Week
- Multiple Listing Service
- Largest Inventory
- 31 Years in Business
- **\$CASH** For Your Home
- **FREE** Market Analysis



# 760-598-8686



[www.ColeManufacturedHomes.com](http://www.ColeManufacturedHomes.com)

Email Us Now: [ColeMobileHomes@aol.com](mailto:ColeMobileHomes@aol.com)

186 S. Rancho Santa Fe Rd., San Marcos CA 92078

W

# MOBILE HOME INSURANCE *Low RATES!* LOCAL SERVICE!

VISA  
MASTERCARD

PAYMENT PLANS  
*Se Habla Espanol!*

**DISCOUNT for Combining  
Mobile Home and AUTO  
Insurance!**

- |                                       |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fire         | <input type="checkbox"/> Replacement Cost MobileHome |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wind         | <input type="checkbox"/> Replacement Cost Contents   |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Liability    | <input type="checkbox"/> Falling Objects             |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tornado      | <input type="checkbox"/> Lightning                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Theft         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Smoke Damage | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Damage                | <input type="checkbox"/> Workers'Comp. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Explosion    | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Payments            | <input type="checkbox"/> Vandalism     |

*Coverage available to \$400,000!*

## ***YOUR CHOICE:***

- **Replacement Cost Mobile Home**
- **Stated Value Coverage**
- **Cash Value Coverage**
- **Discounts for Home and AUTO**

*Hughes West-Brook is your Mobile Home Insurance Specialist.  
With us, Mobilehome insurance isn't a sideline. It's all we do. Give us a call!*

# HUGHES WEST-BROOK

*Fountain Valley, California*

## (800) 660-0204

www.hwbins.com sales@hwbins.com

# HWB

Insuring your home for  
**Over 40 Years**  
**Family Owned Since 1973**