
From: Bee Hanson
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 1:47 PM
To: City Council; , City Clerk; Ramos, Emily Ann; McAlister, John; Clark, Chris; Kamei, Ellen; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Lieber, Sally; Ramirez, Lucas; , Neighborhoods; Hellman-Tincher, Micaela
Cc: contact@mvmha.com
Subject: Fwd: FW: Regarding Agenda Item 7.1 - Mobile Home Rent Stabilization

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello Council,

Alison forwarded Saulo Londono's WMA message to Council and asked if MVMHA would like to comment. We would, so I sent her the reply below.

Alison recommended forwarding my analysis of Mr. Londono's Supporting Links to his claim that City staff did a terrible job on their Council Report. I disagreed, so here is my take on the matter.

Bee
MVMHA

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

From: **Bee Hanson** >
Date: Mon, Jan 27, 2025 at 6:15 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Regarding Agenda Item 7.1 - Mobile Home Rent Stabilization
To: Hicks, Alison
Cc: [DrJKL](#), [Anna Marie Morales](#)

Alison,

Thanks for forwarding this WMA email complaining about Staff's work on the Council Report. I've read it all, and unlike WMA's Saulo Londono, I think they did a great job.

So I've spent many hours clicking on all the Supporting Links that Londono felt justified his complaints about the accuracy of the Council Report. I found that most of them do not support his claims. Maybe he thought nobody would check? I suspect Staff had much better resources, and they certainly had more skill in explaining and analyzing the data.

IMO, Londono did a very sloppy job of supporting his claims. Below I've gone into detail on exactly what I found when trying to verify each of his complaints.

Daly City

Municode has a section on mobile homes, but no specific increase is mentioned. There's just a board that generally reviews space rents when a complaint is filed, so it appears WMA might be correct about this one. I did a search for the 5% cap that Staff reports, but didn't find one. They must have much better resources.

Napa

Londono claims there is no ordinance, but does not provide any link at all to prove this statement - he just skipped over this one.

My Municode search did not find "rent stabilization" or "mobile home" at all. There is a list of ordinances, but not one on rent control. Staff says 60% of CPI.

Contra Costa County

Londono claims there's a County ordinance, but it appears the local city ordinances are the only ones that would be valid anyway, and Staff shows that County and City of Concord have the same statistics. (See the next two entries for Concord and Antioch.)

Concord

Londono's City of Concord link goes to the top of a long page with a TOC, not to a specific result -- and searching the content does not find what he's claiming.

It looks like he might have pulled his result from MHPOA's table, which states at the top that it might be out of date. But I did confirm Staff's result in Google's "AI Review".

"The Concord RSO limits rent increases to 3% or 60% of CPI. The City Council reviews the rent increase cap annually."

Antioch

Londono is right about Antioch exempting mobile homes, there's a section on Exemptions in the ordinance. But it does have Staff's result, 3/60/0.

Alameda County

Londono's link goes to a Municode section on vacancy control, and nothing in the ordinance supports his claim of 100% of CPI.

Fremont

Staff is definitely right on Fremont, 3/60/0. WMA claims that staff's "no floor" is incorrect, but that's only because it is not listed as one of the components of rent increases.

Londono's own link shows that list, which is where you would find a floor if it existed.

Rohnert Park

Staff is right on this one too. WMA contests Staff's 75% of CPI, but it's right there in his own link! I also did a search that found these 2 statements:

"The ordinance caps increases at 4.0%, so the annual space rent increase can never be more than 4.0%.

"AGA formula will revert to 75% of the CPI with a four percent cap."

Hope this helps.

Bee

MVMHA

From: Bee Hanson
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 1:35 PM
To: City Council; , City Clerk; Ramos, Emily Ann; McAlister, John; Clark, Chris; Kamei, Ellen; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Lieber, Sally; Ramirez, Lucas; , Neighborhoods; Hellman-Tincher, Micaela
Cc: contact@mvmha.com
Subject: Agenda Item 7.1: Modifications to MHRSO, Housing Element Program 3.2

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello and Welcome, New Council!

In the Stakeholder Input for this meeting, mobile home park owners have told you that Mountain View's mobile home ordinance has protected and served their Mountain View's renters well. Without consulting their residents, they've claimed that MHRSO has balanced the needs of both residents and park owners. We don't agree. Despite what you're hearing from the park owners, mobile home park residents do understand that it takes a significant financial investment to manage and administer the parks. Many of us even like our managers, and appreciate the fact that Mountain View's mobile home parks are generally very nice places to live. But we also know that maintaining the streets and amenities is expensive, and the park's employees who are doing the administration and providing security should be well paid for the great work they are doing.

We expect our rents to be used for these purposes, and we also feel that the park owners should be fairly compensated for their investments. But we've also reviewed the high rents in the Rent Registry, and calculated that some owners might be making windfall profits from the parks. In short, we don't feel that the expenses of residents and the compensation of park owners are fairly balanced.

Mobile home park owners have threatened to file hardship petitions that will raise our rents if their expenses exceed their revenues. But if that happens, they would deserve better compensation, and we would expect the Rental Housing Committee to approve upward adjustments in our rents.

Some of the older residents in the parks can tell you they used to have a good relationship with the owners. Some of the earlier residents of Santiago Villa have even told me they were friends with our previous owner. But over the years park owners and their residents have developed an adversarial relationship, and it's not hard to figure out when and why those relationships started to cool. Each park has a different history and might have a different story today. I have lived in Santiago Villa since 1996, and because I'm friends with people who moved in decades earlier than I did, I know that history and have experienced the changes in our relationships with the owners and managers over the years firsthand. But if the MHRSO amendments we're hoping for pass Council tonight, and the owners agree to be transparent about their expenditures to the RHC, one of the payoffs would be a friendlier and more open relationship with the residents. Wouldn't that be great? Please agree to accept the Rental Housing Committee's recommendation to amend MHRSO. It would assure the residents, once again, that you care about their future, and it would protect them from the anxiety of feeling that one day they might end up on the street.

From: Marguerite Nguyen Lehman
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 9:00 AM
To: Kamei, Ellen; Ramos, Emily Ann; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Ramirez, Lucas; Clark, Chris; McAlister, John; City Council; Chen, Wayne
Subject: support lower AGA for mobile home residents

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear city council members,

I rent an apartment in Mountain View and want to voice support for a lower AGA for mobile homes. The rent control that we have for renters has helped me stay in Mountain View the past few years, and our mobile home neighbors deserve similar protections. Mobile homes are the most affordable option for home ownership. My dad raised me in a mobile home, after a divorce left him looking for a stable housing option. I had longtime neighbors and felt like I could call the mobile home park "home." Years later, the land rent kept going up, and despite the fact that my dad owned the home itself, he ended up leaving because of the continual increases in rent and changes in management.

Mobile home residents deserve to stay in their homes and shouldn't be priced out. Protect our neighbors and lower the mobile home AGA to keep Mountain View home.

Best,
Marguerite

--

Marguerite Nguyen Lehman
(they/them)

From: Cassandra Magana
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 6:33 AM
To: Kamei, Ellen; Ramos, Emily Ann; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Ramirez, Lucas; Clark, Chris; McAlister, John; City Council; Chen, Wayne
Subject: Support a lower AGA for Mobile Home Residents

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Mountain View City Council Members,

I want to thank the Council for prioritizing a review of the Annual General Adjustment (AGA) for mobile homes. We strongly urge you to amend the Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance (MHRSO) to:

1. Lower the AGA from 100% of CPI to 60% of CPI.
2. Eliminate the 2% floor for rent increases.

These changes are vital to maintaining affordability and preventing displacement. Lowering rent increases will allow long-time residents to remain in their homes and community, avoiding the heartbreaking reality of being forced to sell due to rising space rents.

As someone personally impacted, my family is currently being displaced from a mobile home park because of unaffordable rents. They have been fighting tooth and nail to stay in the city they have known their whole lives. This will be their second move in less than two years. Our story is shared by many others facing similar struggles.

We are confident staff will confirm that different AGAs for the CSFRA and MHRSO will not create administrative burdens. We urge the Council to act swiftly to protect vulnerable residents and ensure Mountain View remains an inclusive community.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

In Community,
Cassandra Magana (She/Her/s/Ella)
Non Profit Professional | Advocate

From: Ken White
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 2:05 PM
To: City Council; , City Clerk; Ramos, Emily Ann; McAlister, John; Clark, Chris; Kamei, Ellen; Showalter, Pat; Hicks, Alison; Lieber, Sally; Ramirez, Lucas; , Neighborhoods;
Cc:
Subject: Agenda Item # 7.1

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council Members:

As you no doubt are fully aware, mobile homes arrived in Mountain View in the 1960's as a source of low cost housing for the elderly, others with disabilities, and those whose work income made it economically challenging to rent elsewhere. That premise and purpose hasn't changed, yet the costs certainly have.

To provide you with a perspective of that increase, my first month's rent was \$221.83 (rent \$189; gas \$23; electric \$8; tax \$1) in 1981. The monthly changes from then to this month's are literally 600% more and quite obvious: \$1540 (rent \$1160; gas \$113; electric \$126; water \$24; gas uut \$3, elect uut \$4; sewer \$55; trash \$35). The rent alone makes up 513% of that increase.

As costs of living in California have risen demonstrably both locally and within surrounding communities, the residents of Mountain View who have figuratively and literally relied upon mobile homes to be their only assured ability of remaining a proud resident of this city can only hope that you see them as people first as opposed to an impersonal component of the total population.

If the owners of mobile home parks within the city limits were not assured of a profit from their investments, the quantity and quality of the parks would have both dwindled and decreased severely, but they have not. The parks have remained viable and the investment profits are increasing, unfortunately on the backs of the majority who are finding it difficult to continue to afford those expenses.

At what price and ultimate cost to individuals do your decisions matter? Tremendously and demonstrably, quite frankly. Will they directly affect a resident's financial decision to remain in Mountain View? No doubt. For those who can barely afford the expenses now, the future is bleak in terms of being able to afford to stay here and darker still by their financial inability to move elsewhere, whether it be for medical conditions, age, or other personal situations.

It is not our goal to eliminate profits by the owners of the mobile home park owners as that would be misguided, unethical, and self-serving. Instead we hope to find an honest understanding on both sides which take into deep consideration the financial trepidation of those who literally need their mobile homes to reside here and have them continue to be affordable to do so.

Sadly, compassion and understanding all too often become lost in the numbers, cast aside when dealing with individual circumstances, and too easily viewed as mere digits totaled on a page. I would hope and encourage you to look well beyond the numbers and learn more about both the owners and residents; discover more about the people, about the individuals and their personal situations, and allow humanity to be your guiding grace.

Thank you for your time,

Ken White