

My name is Nick Beers, and together with my wife Samantha we own and operate a couple of small mobile home parks in the mid-coast area. I am writing to express my concerns with this bill in its current form.

As a rough estimate of recent sale prices, Mobile Home Parks in Maine have been selling for an average of \$50,000-\$70,000 per pad. This bill will in all practical terms simply ban large investors from purchasing a Mobile Home Park in the state by essentially placing a 100% Tax on the sale.

While I can imagine how this bill likely started from a place of good intentions, I think there will be serious ill-consequences that should be considered.

- While considering this bill, please also consider that LD-1145 “An Act to Protect Residents Living in Mobile Home Parks” (also proposed this session) seeks to provide Mobile Home Park residents a legal First-Right-of-Refusal on any park to be sold in the state. By the time that any large investor could enter into a purchase contract, Mobile Home Park residents would have already refused the opportunity to purchase the park.
- There are likely instances where large corporate buyers are probably the best positioned to make major investments in infrastructure that seems to be reaching end-of-life in many parks in the state. A quick search of the BDN will yield numerous stories of water and sewer issues etc that can be enormously costly to repair. Large investors can make these needed investments out of pocket on the front end of their ownership while smaller investors may not be able to.
- Limiting the buyer pool for Mobile Home Parks is a dis-incentive for developers that would be interested in expanding existing parks and/or building new ones (like ourselves). This bill is a complete turn-off (for lack of a better term) for anyone interested in building out additional supply of this type of affordable housing.
- It seems appropriate to question the fairness of this proposal. Picking a property with a ‘specific use’ and imposing a tax on the sale to a ‘specific buyer’ order to fund the purchase of something else for an unrelated group of people seems targeted and unfair. It also feels like penalizing the property developer for building a mobile home park instead of an apartment building. Food for thought.

Overall, this bill seems over-the-top and unnecessary when considered in conjunction with LD-1145 and will likely have a dampening effect on much-needed investment into this sector of the affordable housing market.

For legislators and committee members that are interested in approaching the affordable housing problem from the angle of increasing supply, I would like to float an idea to you:

The "Regulation of Manufactured Housing" statute in Title 30-A Section 4358 can be improved to reduce the barriers & prohibitive costs associated with expanding the supply of mobile home park lots for the entire state, thereby creating more affordable housing. In our experience, the major barriers to expansion / new construction are low density requirements, paved road requirements, and a litany of local permitting hurdles. We would be happy to work with our local representatives to share ideas for improvement.

Thank you for your time,

Nick Beers