

Good Morning,

My name is Adam Krans, and I am the assistant regional manager for a large mobile home operator here in Maine. While I whole heartedly believe in the goal of preserving affordable housing, I must strongly oppose these bills.

Capping rent and fees at 10% over four years—just 2.5% annually—doesn't reflect the economic reality of running these communities. This bill only includes exemptions for increases in taxes, utilities, and specific types of infrastructure improvement, but ignores the steady rise in all other costs we deal with every year: insurance, winter plowing, tree work, septic pumping, legal fees, labor, and more. These are non-negotiable expenses. Rent control doesn't reduce them—it just limits our ability to keep up.

Over the past four years, the Northeast region has experienced the following inflation rates: 4.6 average

- 2021: 4.3%
- 2022: 7.5%
- 2023: 3.2%
- 2024: 3.5%

That's more than 18% inflation in just four years. This bill would allow rent to rise only 10% during that same time. That gap is not just unsustainable—it puts the basic operations of our communities at risk.

The exemption process doesn't fix this. It's burdensome, costly, and uncertain. We're expected to prove hardship to a board and notify every resident by certified mail, with no guarantee of relief. That's not a safeguard—it's a barrier.

This bill also discourages reinvestment. If we can't fund infrastructure repairs or upgrades through reasonable rent adjustments, they get delayed—or don't happen. That leads to declining conditions over time, which residents ultimately feel.

When revenue is capped but costs keep rising, operators are forced to avoid financial risk. That means being more selective with applicants. Residents with lower credit scores or inconsistent histories—people who genuinely need affordable housing—may be shut out. Ironically, this bill could end up excluding the very people it's trying to protect.

And we can't forget: this is a supply issue. Maine needs more affordable housing, and rent control only discourages new development and reinvestment in existing communities.

Finally, tying rent on vacant lots to "comparable communities" sounds fair, but it's vague and invites disputes. What counts as "equivalent amenities"? Who decides? That kind of ambiguity leads to conflict and legal battles, not clarity or fairness.

This bill imposes arbitrary limits that ignore economic realities and threaten the sustainability of communities residents rely on. I urge you to pursue policies that protect both affordability and viability. This bill does neither.

Thank you.