

1 **BRUCE E.STANTON (SBN 104925)**
2 **LAW OFFICES OF BRUCE E. STANTON**
3 **6940 Santa Teresa Bld, Suite 3**
4 **San Jose, CA 95119**
5 **Telephone: (408) 224-4000**
6 **Facsimile: (408) 224-4022**

7 **Attorney for Petitioners, Mobile Homeowners**

8
9 **BEFORE THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA**
10
11 **MOBILE HOME RENT CONTROL ORDINANCE**
12

13 In re:) **HOMEOWNERS' POST-HEARING**
14 NOMAD VILLAGE MOBILEHOME PARK,) **OPENING BRIEF**
15)
16)
17)
18) Hearing Dates: September 19-20, 2011
19 Hearing Officer: Stephen Biersmith, Esq.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Petitioners, NOMAD VILLAGE MOBILE HOMEOWNERS (hereinafter "Homeowners"), hereby submit the following post-hearing opening brief and legal points and authorities in support of their Petition filed herein.

1 **I.**

2 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Nomad Village is a 150-space mobilehome park located in an unincorporated area within the County of Santa Barbara (hereinafter "the County"), and subject to the County of Santa Barbara Mobile Home Rent Control Ordinance (hereinafter "the Ordinance") found at Chapter 11A of the Santa Barbara County Code of Ordinances. All spaces within the park are covered by the Ordinance; none are subject to long-term leases which are exempt from rent control. Space rents in the park range from a low of \$287.00 to a high of \$430.00. The average space rent in the park is approximately \$315.00, pending the outcome of this Petition. The noticed increase of

1 \$161.00 plus 75% of CPI for the last three years will thus result in more than a 50% increase in
2 rental cost for the average Homeowner, and for some shall be much larger.

3 The park land is owned by a family trust, but is leased to the park operator. For many
4 years, possibly as many as 50, a ground lease apparently governed this relationship. When that
5 lease expired in 2008, it was not renewed with the former park operator. The current operator,
6 Lazy Landing, LLC (hereinafter the "Park Owner"), signed a new 34 year lease effective August
7 1, 2008, which includes a monthly ground lease amount negotiated at the time of purchase that
8 calculates rent as a twenty (20%) percent of the gross rental income received by the Park Owner.
9 Due to the expiration of the prior long-term lease, the County reassessed the local property tax
10 due to a "change of ownership". Park Owner's Exhibit "G" confirms that notice of the
11 reassessment was sent by the County and received by the Park Owner on May 26, 2009. County
12 records indicate that the 2008 Supplemental taxes resulting from the reassessment were paid
13 (apparently without protest) on December 10, 2009 and January 4, 2010. Testimony during the
14 hearing confirmed that, to date, no actual assessment appeal has been filed by the Park Owner,
15 although it is alleged that the Park Owner desires to do this, and can obtain the permission of the
16 landowner in whose name the appeal would need to be prosecuted. It is undisputed that no
17 annual rent adjustment, or rent increase of any kind, has been charged to residents since the
18 current Park Owner assumed operations.

19 On January 26, 2011, Homeowners received a 90-day Notice of rent increase as required
20 by law. Although it, and its attachments, are not a model of clarity, and tend to mix and match
21 terms in such a way that it is confusing and difficult to decipher, it is apparent that three distinct
22 rent amounts are being sought. These are set forth in Park Owner's Exhibit "C" as follows:

- 23 1. A CPI-based increase to existing base rent calculated based upon 75% of the CPI, which

1 Constitutes the annual adjustment which is allowed by the Ordinance without a hearing. A
2 cumulative total of three years' worth of annual adjustment is included in the notice, since rent
3 has not been increased for three years. This amount differs for each homeowner, but
4 approximates \$7-10.00 per month. Homeowners have stipulated at hearing that they are not
5 challenging this specific portion of the increase.
6

7 2. An additional "permanent increase" to base rent in the amount of \$58.16, which is
8 derived from alleged increases in property taxes (\$25.59 see Item 1) and ground lease payments
9 (\$32.57 see Item 2). Homeowners have objected to these amounts.
10

11 3. An additional "temporary increase" which is styled as a 7-year pass through in the
12 amount of \$102.84, which includes interest at 9%. This amount is based upon four pass through
13 categories involving alleged capital expenses that are to be amortized over time, and not
14 considered as ongoing operating expenses; i.e. (numbers taken from Exhibit "C" para.s:
15 **Capital Improvements** (Item 3)- for various costs already incurred (\$90,000.00) and for costs to
16 be incurred in the future (\$370,000.00);
17

18 **Uncompensated Increases** (Item 4)- for the increased property taxes billed as a result of the
19 reassessment and increased land lease costs that were paid for a 33 month period from August,
20 2008 through April, 2011 (i.e. prior to the effective date of the noticed rent increase) and are now
21 sought pursuant to a theory described at hearing as "regulatory lag";
22

23 **Anticipated Professional Fees (Property Taxes)** (Item 5)- for estimated legal costs for
24 pursuing an assessment appeal;

25 **Anticipated Professional Fees (Rent Petition)** (Item 6)- for estimated attorney's and expert
26 fees to prosecute the instant administrative rent hearing and any forthcoming judicial
27 proceedings.
28

1 Homeowners also object to these amounts.

2 Meet and confer sessions and an exchange of incomplete information ensued with
3 authorized resident representatives, however no settlement or accord could be reached. Thus,
4 Homeowners timely filed a Petition pursuant to Ordinance sec. 11A-5 (b), contesting the rent
5 increase and requesting a hearing. The Petition was filed because the sum total of \$161.00
6 which exceeds the three years' of cumulative CPI increases, far exceeds 75% of the CPI, and is
7 thus reviewable under the Ordinance. The Ordinance does not require, nor do the County's
8 "Mobilehome Rent Control Rules for Hearings" mandate, that any particular basis for the
9 Petition be identified on its face. The County has verified that the Petition was indeed filed by a
10 homeowner majority, and that it is valid.

13 II

14 THE PARK OWNER'S OBJECTIONS TO THE PETITION SHOULD BE OVERRULED

15 Homeowners desire to confirm their response and opposition to a pre-hearing Brief filed
16 by the Park Owner which challenged the legality of the Petition. The Park Owner filed a
17 response to the Homeowners' Petition which sets forth two objections to the Petition. Although
18 not mentioned at the hearings, Homeowners position remains that each should be denied.

19 The first is rather confusing, but appears to allege that since the \$161.00 sought in
20 addition to the cumulative annual "75% of CPI adjustment" is not "rent", but has been labeled by
21 the Park Owner as something else, it is not reviewable. In fact, a portion of the \$161.00 is
22 requested to be permanent, and thus cannot be anything but base rent in character. It will be
23 charged monthly for the use of the mobilehome space, and clearly is part of the "noticed
24 increase" as that phrase is used in Ordinance sec. 11A-5 (a), (b) and (d). Review by a hearing
25 officer is not limited only to amounts which the Park Owner might choose to label as "base rent",
26
27
28

1 but applies also to a review of capital expenses or increased operating expenses which the park
2 owner might attempt to capitalize and pass through to the residents as a “temporary increase”.
3 Support for this appears in Ordinance sec. 11A-5 (a) (3), which requires that such amounts be
4 itemized in the notice of increase (which the Park Owner attempted to do), and again in sec.s (4)-
5 (6) thereof, which allow the hearing officer to award amounts to cover increased costs of capital
6 expenses, new or old, or capital improvements. Clearly the items which comprise the \$161.00
7 are subject to review once a hearing is requested, as here. Otherwise, a Park Owner could “end
8 run” the Ordinance by calling these increase amounts something else, and realize large increases
9 in monthly rental charges without any review. It is the entire “increase” which must be
10 measured, and here the \$161.00 amount is required to be reviewed. Thus, this objection should
11 be overruled. Since this issue was not raised at hearing, it was presumably waived.

14 Additionally, Park Owner appears to challenge whether the Petition was properly signed
15 by a Homeowner majority. The process of verification is delegated to the County Clerk, who in
16 this case has not rejected the Petition. Pursuant to Rule 4, the Petition is thus deemed verified.
17 Absent evidence to the contrary, the Clerk’s finding should control, and the objection be
18 overruled. Should the hearing officer wish to subpoena the Clerk or review the actual Petition to
19 verify signatures, Homeowners have no objection. But the word of the Clerk should control, and
20 Homeowners should not be made to produce at hearing every resident who signed the Petition in
21 order to verify same. By not raising the issue at hearing, the Park Owner appears to have
22 conceded this issue.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III

**THE PARK OWNER’S REQUEST FOR \$58.14 IN “PERMANENT RENT INCREASES”
IS EXCESSIVE**

**1. Ordinance Authority and the Applicability of the Maintenance of Net Operating
Income (MNOI) Formula.**

Contrary to the Park Owner’s assertion that the Ordinance “provides for rent increases for increased Park operating expenses” in the dollar-for-dollar fashion which appears on Exhibit “C”, the Ordinance does not specifically contain such authority. While the Hearing Officer is given ability in Ordinance sec. 11A-5 (i) to order an amount in excess of one-half of the automatic increase (i.e. 75% of CPI) to “cover operating expenses”, that section goes on to state that the Hearing Officer has discretion “to add such amounts as are justified by the evidence...” Subsection (f) thereof describes a laundry list of factors to be considered (i.e. which “may” be included), and again refers to “all relevant factors”. An alleged increase in one expenses category cannot be used to pass through that entire increase in a vacuum, dollar-for-dollar, without looking at all relevant factors. One such factor is the park owner’s income. While an increase in an expense item is relevant, it should be considered in a broader context; i.e. within a fair return formula which takes into account all expenses and income of the park owner. A direct pass through of a specific expense item is not authorized by the Ordinance; the pass through of a capital item (of which property taxes and lease payments are not) is allowed (and shall be discussed below in connection with the “Temporary Increases” which are sought.

There is no precedent in Fair Return theory or analysis for the kind of passing through of an expense charge “in total” such as the Park Owner seeks here. The Park Owner’s expert, Michael St. John, shows tacit agreement with this premise, since he employed with great care

1 parallel MNOI calculations referenced in Exhibit “D” which, although not specifically
2 referenced in the Ordinance, are a well recognized fair return theory adopted by many ordinances
3 and approved by the Courts. The Maintenance of Net Operating Income (MNOI) analysis has
4 been praised by commentators for both its fairness and ease of administration, and was approved
5 by a Court of Appeal in connection with a rent increase hearing in the City of Oceanside. *See*
6 *Oceanside Mobilehome Park Owner’s Assn. v. City of Oceanside (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 887.*
7 In 1998, in a case involving application of Escondido’s mobilehome ordinance (which, as with
8 the case of this Ordinance, listed factors to be considered in a fair return case but did not identify
9 a specific formula or methodology for calculating fair return), the court specifically upheld the
10 use of an MNOI approach, calling it a “fairly constructed formula” which provides a “just and
11 reasonable” return on investment. *See Rainbow Disposal v. Mobilehome Park Rental Review*
12 *Board (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1159.*

13
14
15 Ordinance sec. 11A-1 states that as an overriding purpose, the Ordinance is designed to
16 ensure that a park owner receives “a fair return on their investment”. An inquiry into fair return
17 is thus appropriate. Any fair return analysis should be fairly used, and MNOI fits the bill. The
18 fact that the park owner’s own expert has chosen this theory to verify the reasonableness of the
19 Park Owner’s requested increase amounts establishes that it can and should be used by this
20 Hearing Officer as an objective and court-tested standard by which the “reasonableness” of the
21 requested rent increase can be determined. As stated below, the MNOI theory that the park
22 owner has chosen, and which the Homeowners will accept as the standard to use, must, however,
23 be properly applied. In that regard, Homeowners have several objections and contentions. But
24 the overriding importance and use of the MNOI formula in concept cannot be understated, and
25 Homeowners’ position is this: In connection with the noticed \$58.16 “permanent” rent increase,
26
27
28

1 the hearing officer should not consider each of the separate categories labeled as items 1 and 2
2 on a dollar-for-dollar basis, but instead should include these two expense categories (if
3 appropriate) in a proper MNOI formula to establish a fair return, and thus a “reasonable” amount
4 for the rent increase. Both Dr. St. John and Dr. Baar have testified at length about the efficacy
5 and relevance of this formula, and have jointly validated its use here.

7 **2. Specific Objections and Contentions Re: Park Owner’s MNOI Calculations**

8 A. Property Tax Increase Expense

9 Notwithstanding the foregoing, and the need to recognize this as but one expense which
10 should be inputted into a proper MNOI formula, the expense amount claimed by the Park Owner
11 should not be included in the MNOI calculation. The Exhibit “C” page 2 “Notes” attached to
12 state in footnote “1” that the tax amounts shall not be “passed through” if a challenge to the
13 assessment is successful (thus admitting that this increase is being attempted as a ‘pass through’
14 of a non-capital item, rather than included in a proper fair return formula). If there is any chance
15 that the reassessment was improper, and the increased tax is not even legally owed, then the
16 legality issue should be sorted out first via an assessment appeal, and no amount should be
17 allowed until any legal challenge is completed (although it appears that the park owner has not
18 yet even initiated any such challenge, and indeed stated that it is waiting for the Hearing Officer
19 to award its projected attorney’s fees first before it would do so!). Clearly the Park Owner’s
20 request in this regard is inconsistent. On the one hand, it seeks a “permanent increase” for a
21 property tax increase which it alleges to be wrongful and will purportedly seek to overturn. If
22 this were to occur, the Park Owner’s own expert admitted that the rent increase stemming
23 therefrom (i.e. \$25.59 per month) would need to be terminated and any amount paid to date
24 refunded. The complexity of this scenario, and the limited ability of individual Homeowners to
25
26
27
28

1 track the appeal process and enforce its results to ensure their refunds, highlights the unwieldy
2 nature of the request. The hearing officer would, as part of any award, be forced to deal with this
3 contingency, and would have to make this portion conditioned upon certain future events. But
4 the Park Owner styles this amount as being "permanent". At the same time, the Park Owner
5 seeks a \$50,000.00 pass through to pay for the proposed appeal of the permanent tax increase.
6 The Park Owner cannot have it both ways. Either the increase is "permanent" or it is not.
7 Because of its contingent nature, and the possible error of the County in making the increased
8 assessment, this item is premature, and should not be included in the MNOI calculation
9

10
11 B. Lease Payment Increase

12 As stated above, this item should also be treated as one expense amongst many
13 which, if allowable, should be inputted into a proper MNOI formula. But this is clearly an
14 expense which should not be included in Dr. St. John's analysis. The ground lease payment is
15 not an operating expense, but rather an investment expense incurred by the Park Owner in
16 connection with the acquisition of the park, the lease rights or whatever it acquired. It is a
17 payment from one owner to another, made in connection with the purchased right to control the
18 land. As such, it is a bargained for part of the purchase price, and not an expense. MNOI
19 calculations would typically not allow such an item, since it is circular in nature (i.e. an increase
20 in revenue increases the ground lease payment, which in turn requires an even greater increase in
21 revenue, and so forth), and thus iterative. A park owner would have no incentive to negotiate a
22 lower rent amount if it knew that the entire increases could be passed through to its tenants, and
23 if the park land were someday purchased this amount would go away. Any increase in ground
24 lease rent, which is thus capable of manipulation much like mortgage interest (which is
25
26
27
28

1 disallowed by the Ordinance) should not be considered as an operating expense when calculating
2 fair return.

3 Homeowner's expert, Dr. Baar, has extensive experience in connection with the drafting
4 and interpretation of mobilehome rent ordinances. He strongly opined that this category should
5 be excluded for each of the above reasons. He testified that where a mobilehome rent ordinance
6 allows such an expense, the ordinance specifically provides for such, and Exhibit "3" contains
7 examples of ordinances which do include such a cost. Significantly, the Santa Barbara County
8 Ordinance is silent on the subject. Dr. St. John testified that ground lease expense has been
9 allowed "many times" but "not all of the time", and admitted that it is "relatively rare" that this
10 sort of expense appears at all. He could not recall any specific cases in which he was involved
11 where such an expense was allowed, or when it was not allowed, or where he ever gave an
12 opinion that it should be allowed. Apparently this is the first case in which he has so testified.
13 Absent any such experience, the testimony of Dr. Baar in this regard is more persuasive to
14 disallow the ground lease expense.

15 Again, the circular nature of the ground lease rent formula means that ground rent will
16 always be increasing, and the fact that it is calculated not as a fixed expense, but as a percentage
17 of collected rents, means that it will also fluctuate from month to month. The Park Owner could
18 agree to re-negotiate the amount in order to obtain concessions elsewhere from the land owner,
19 with the knowledge that any increased amounts can simply be passed through to the
20 Homeowners. If revenues decrease due to vacancies, the ground lease payment will decrease.
21 And if the property were ever purchased it would go away completely. The presence of these
22 contingencies and variables, and the resulting complexity required for building them into any
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 conditional award that the hearing officer might need to fashion, compels a finding that this
2 expense must also be excluded.

3 Even if this expense item is accepted, the calculation is incorrect. According to the
4 income and expense detail provided by the Park Owner in Exhibit , the actual paid lease amount
5 in 2008 was \$83,288.42, and not \$54,905.00. Thus, the actual differential between 2008 and
6 2009 is \$30,238.00. Together with the corrective calculation above, this yields a total difference
7 between 2008 and 2009 for Permanent Increases of \$68,293.68, which would result in a rent
8 increase of \$37.94 even if the Park Owner's 'stand alone' theory is accepted.
9

10 **3. Proper Application of the St. John MNOI Analysis**

11 As previously stated, Homeowners do not object to the use of the MNOI formula, and are
12 willing to accept it as the best fair return formula to be used in this case. But it must be properly
13 and accurately applied. The Park Owner's expert has presented an MNOI analysis which is
14 alleged to be a "supporting" or "verifying" calculation for the \$58.16 "permanent" increase. Dr.
15 St. John has conducted parallel MNOI calculations in Exhibit "D", which find as follows:
16

17 **Comparing a 1994 Base Year to a 2010 Current Year:**

18 -Indexing at 75%, the increase would be \$44.30.

19 -Indexing at 100%, the increase would be \$57.04.

20 **Comparing a 2007 Base Year to a 2010 Current Year:**

21 -Indexing at 75%, the increase would be \$55.53.

22 -Indexing at 100%, the increase would be \$57.09.

23 Of course these calculations include both items 1 and 2 from above as permissible expenses.
24
25
26
27
28

1 There are too many combinations that could result from the above for Homeowners to
2 calculate every conceivable scenario that could result; the final MNOI number will depend upon
3 a number of factors:
4
5

6 **Which Base Year should be used?** Dr. St. John admitted that it was “kind of a toss up” as to
7 whether 1994 or 2007 should be used, and admitted that his first choice was 1994 based upon the
8 most historical documentation then available. He only employed the “side-by-side” use of the
9 2007 calculation after reading Homeowners’ pre-hearing brief. Based upon the testimony of Dr.
10 Baar, Dr. St. John’s first instinct would appear to be the more correct one. Dr. Baar recalled how
11 in prior matters in which he has viewed Dr. St. John’s testimony, he has always taken the
12 position that the base year should precede the adoption date of the ordinance. Since 1994 is the
13 oldest available data, it would follow that 1994 should become the base year for purposes of this
14 hearing. Dr. Baar agreed with this.
15
16

17 **What indexing should be used?** Both experts agreed that it is common for ordinances to
18 provide for indexing at 75% of CPI when employing an MNOI analysis. Exhibit 2 evidences
19 this to be true. Because the Santa Barbara ordinance indexes the annual adjustment at 75% of
20 CPI, it follows that a 75% index should be used when applying MNOI.
21

22 Thus, the most accurate MNOI application is the one calculated using a base year of 1994
23 @ 75% indexing; i.e. \$44.30 according to page 4 of Table 3-B in Exhibit D. This needs to be
24 compared to the \$58.16 increase sought based upon the stand alone “dollar-for-dollar”
25 calculation, which is thus not an accurate fair return number. MNOI application establishes the
26 unreasonableness of the \$58.16 amount, even before any expense items are deducted.
27

28 From this \$44.30 amount, certain expense adjustments must also be made:

1 -When the property tax expense is removed (see above), the MNOI result is near zero.
2 -When the ground lease expense is removed (se above), the MNOI result is near zero.
3 -Dr. St. John admitted during the hearing that a \$2,500.00 expense item for Franchise Taxes was
4 pre-paid for 2011, and thus should be deducted from the 2010 expenses. This results in an
5 undisputed \$1.39 deduction from the \$44.30 figure above, even if all other expenses remain
6 included.
7
8 -Dr. St. John also identified a \$4,500.00 late charge that was incurred in connection with a bank
9 payment. Although he felt that this expense should still be included, it is clear that it should not
10 be, since it is a one-time, non-recurring expense which was within the Park Owner's power to
11 avoid. Deducting this amount from the \$44.30 figure, even if all other expenses remain
12 included, results in a further \$2.51 reduction.
13

14 Thus, even if expense items 1 and 2 are included, the correct MNOI total would be
15 \$40.40. This is the largest possible permanent rent increase that should be awarded, subject to
16 further reduction for the exclusion of property tax and/or ground lease expense. (Homeowners
17 will not perform those calculations here, but reserve the right to do so in their closing brief.)
18
19

20 IV

21 THE PARK OWNER'S ATTEMPT TO PASS THROUGH \$102.84 IN "TEMPORARY 22 INCREASES" SHOULD BE DENIED IN ITS ENTIRETY 23

24 Homeowners object to the increase amounts labeled as "Temporary Increases" in the
25 Park Owner's increase summary sheet (Items labeled as 3 through 6) based upon the following:
26

27 1. General Objections and Observations

28 Each of the items described in this section is sought as a "pass through"; i.e. the amount

1 requested is designed to be amortized over a seven (7) years, at nine (9) percent interest, to
2 reimburse the Park Owner for the cost of the item. This constitutes treatment of each as a capital
3 item, rather than a deductible expense. But to be treated as a capital item, in this case for the
4 most part where payment is sought before the expenses have actually been incurred, the
5 following must be true:
6

7 -The improvement or repair for which the increase is sought must be specifically identified, so as
8 to confirm that it is indeed a capital item, as opposed to a deductible expense.

9 -Ordinance definitions of a “capital improvement” and a “capital expense” must be met in order
10 to authorize the increase; i.e. the “addition or betterment” must be identified, or the “existing
11 facilities or improvements” for which the expected repair or replacement adds an expected life of
12 at least one year. Until the specific work is identified by type and cost, these definitions, found
13 in Ordinance sec. 11A-2, cannot be established.
14

15 -“Anticipated Professional Fees”, including legal fees, which are claimed as capital items in
16 items 3, 5 and 6 need to be specifically explained and accounted for, as well as supported by
17 good faith estimates or billings incurred. Such items are not considered as capital expenditures,
18 and thus cannot be amortized and passed through, where their inclusion would violate Internal
19 Revenue Service precedent. In Revenue Ruling 78-389 (1978-2 Cum. Bull. 125), the Service
20 found that legal expenses incurred in the prosecution of a suit to invalidate as municipal
21 ordinance that would prohibit the operation of a taxpayer’s business were deductible as ordinary
22 and necessary business expenses when they arose from the taxpayer’s business activities and did
23 not result in the acquisition or disposition of a capital asset. Thus, in general, these sought after
24 “professional fees” cannot be treated as capital items. Park Owner’s expert admits that he has
25 treated each such fee request the same as a capital item, based upon his belief that the Ordinance
26
27
28

1 authorizes him to do so by analogy. But there is no precedent or authority stated for this,
2 whether from the Ordinance language or elsewhere. These are clearly non-capital in nature, and
3 regardless of their amount should not be allowed.

4 The manner of amortizing each of the principal amounts, together with interest at 9%,
5 over 7 years is the product of an estimate made by Dr. St. John. However he testified at length
6 during the hearing about the hardship upon the residents that a shorter amortization period could
7 create, and stated that he would have “no objection to a 15-year amortization”. In this regard, in
8 the event that any of the “temporary” increase amounts are allowed, it is submitted that the
9 hearing officer should construct a parallel calculation which amortizes the amount at both 7 and
10 15 years, so that each resident can choose the option that best suits their financial capabilities.
11 This is particularly appropriate when amortizing road repair expenses, which are typically
12 amortized over a longer period of time.
13
14
15
16

17 **2. Specific Objections and Challenges**

18 Item 3: Capital Improvements

19 Item 3 of Exhibit 3 is labeled as “capital improvements”, which means that the definition
20 found in Ordinance sec. 11A-2 (a) must be established. It is unclear how or why \$50,000.00 of
21 “professional fees” would be required in connection with any proposed capital improvement,
22 especially since architectural and engineering costs have already been broken out separately.
23 Nor should they be allowed based upon the IRS authority cited above. This amount should
24 therefore be disallowed.
25

26 With respect to the claimed \$90,000.00 of “A & E” fees already incurred, the actual
27 amount would appear to be \$62,145.55 as verified by Exhibit “J”. Expense items listed on
28

1 Exhibit "J" which were incurred by the previous park operator, Nomad Village, Inc., are not
2 subject to reimbursement to the current.

3 In addition, any portion of this remaining amount that relates to repairs, maintenance,
4 upgrades or replacement of the sub-metered gas or electric system may not be passed through to
5 Homeowners, pursuant to the authority of the case of *Rainbow Disposal Company, Inc. v.*
6 *Escondido Mobilehome Rent Review Board* 64 Cal. App. 4th 1159 (1998) marked as Exhibit "4"
7 during the hearing. In that case, a \$200,000.00 amount was disallowed, based upon the authority
8 of a 1995 Public Utilities Commission Ruling (*Re: Rates, Charges, and Practices of Electric and*
9 *Gas Utilities Providing Services to Master-metered Mobile Home Parks* (1995) 58 Cal. P.U.C.
10 2d 709). In that decision, the Commission found that the sub-metered discount received by park
11 owners each month to compensate them for operating sub-metered systems includes "among
12 other things, a factor for investment-related expenses for all initial and ongoing capital upgrade
13 costs, and return on investment." During the hearing, Dr. St. John opined that costs related to
14 system upgrades should not be disallowed, since the discount in his opinion only covers repairs
15 or maintenance. Dr. St. John's resume gives no indication that he has any expertise in utility
16 matters, or that he has consulted in connection therewith. In fact, he admitted that, consistent
17 with the *Rainbow* decision, all income and expenses related to sub-metered utility systems are
18 typically excluded from an MNOI calculation. Clearly his opinion is directly contrary to both
19 California caselaw and Commission decision. Since expenses related to electric system upgrades
20 cannot be charged in a rent control jurisdiction, and such expenses found in this category must
21 also be excluded. Other than the first three entries which appear on Exhibit "J" relating to fence
22 repairs, and the sewer repair cost, all other expenses listed appear to bear some relationship to
23 electrical system upgrades, including the \$20,760.00 paid to Cusac Construction. For the above-
24
25
26
27
28

1 stated reasons, they cannot be passed through to Homeowners, and must be deleted from this
2 category. The total pass through amount appears to be \$22,192.50 for “A & E Fees” already
3 incurred.

4
5 The \$320,000.00 amount listed for future “Infrastructure” amounts is not identified. In
6 fact, the Park Owner testified that they were not yet sure what they were going to spend this
7 amount on. Until verifiable items are identified, so as to be confirmed as capital items that will
8 benefit the Homeowners, nothing can be passed through. Otherwise, there is no way for
9 Homeowners to verify if the designated work is being timely performed. As well, Exhibit M
10 identifies an estimate for \$270,945.00 to upgrade the electrical system, which cannot be passed
11 through pursuant to the authority stated above. The Park Owner testified that this work would be
12 done first, before any street repairs could be accomplished. Since it is unlikely that both could
13 be completed within 6 months, with the rainy season fast approaching, and the \$320,000 amount
14 does not match any of the larger street repair estimates submitted as a part of Exhibit “M”, this
15 entire, unquantified and vague amount must be denied. At minimum, it is premature.
16
17

18 19 Item 4: Regulatory Lag Amounts

20 This can only be described as a very creative category, and suffers from some of the same
21 infirmities as Items 1 and 2. For if a property tax appeal is successful, and the amounts
22 previously paid to the County are refunded, a commensurate refund would be due to
23 Homeowners. And if ground lease expenses are disallowed for the reasons set forth above, they
24 cannot be allowed to be charged here.
25

26 But the biggest problem with this category goes to its basic concept. Dr. St. John
27 admitted that he could cite no specific precedent for going back in time some 33 months (33 is
28

1 the correct total, not 34) to recapture expenses that the Park Owner never elected to bill to the
2 residents sooner. The result is unfair; i.e. residents are hit with a cumulative sum all at once,
3 now including interest, of which they had no prior knowledge. Dr. Baar testified that no more
4 than 12 months of this “lag” should be charged to the Homeowners.
5

6 If any amount is charged, then it must be based on 33 months instead of 34, resulting in a
7 .75 cent reduction from the \$32.74 amount being sought. The calculation presented for this item
8 4 incorrectly counts for 34 months, when instead the number of months from August, 2008,
9 when Park Owner acquired the lease rights, through April, 2011 (i.e. the last month before the
10 requested increase would take effect) is 33 months.
11

12 This category attempts to pass through retroactively, supplemental tax and land lease
13 allegedly incurred in 2008 and 2009, and for which the park owner chose not to previously seek
14 any increase during those years. There is no precedent in the Ordinance for such a theory, which
15 if allowed would enable a park owner to go back in time any number of years to allege that an
16 expense increase, or one-time payment of some type, had not been fully compensated. These are
17 not capital items, and are subject to the same analysis set forth in Headnote III above. These
18 amounts are compensated as a part of the three years of automatic CPI increases which will be
19 allowed by the Hearing Officer. They were never noticed when incurred, and recovery was
20 never sought when the expense was incurred. To allow them now would create a precedent for
21 retroactive recovery which would make such expenses difficult to track or prove, and which
22 would keep Homeowners at risk of having to pay rent increases to cover new expense item
23 whenever discovered, or whenever the park owner might get around to requesting them. This
24 would also create chaos and play havoc with prior increases ordered based upon facts and data
25
26
27
28

1 then presented, which could be turned on its head by new “expenses” claimed in later years for
2 the same periods.
3
4

5 Item 5: Anticipated Professional Fees – Property Taxes

6 This is clearly not a capital item, since it does not relate to the acquisition or disposition
7 of a capital asset, and because it is prospective as per its definition it has not yet become an
8 expense of the Park Owner. If actually incurred, the Park Owner is free to include this amount in
9 a future rent notice, where it can be properly analyzed and adjudicated under the Ordinance.
10 Furthermore, no basis for the expense has been disclosed; i.e. it is unknown who the fees would
11 be paid to, what they would seek to accomplish and what good faith basis, if any, exists for
12 achieving any benefit to the Homeowners. The fact that the Park Owner has not, to date,
13 initiated any such challenge speaks volumes about the confidence level in such a pursuit, and
14 how Homeowners would in any way be “bettered” by such a cost. Homeowners cannot be
15 expected to fund what could turn out to be fruitless legal challenges, and provide the Park Owner
16 with the equivalent of an attorney’s fee guarantee, even if the Park Owner were to lose.
17
18

19 During hearing, the park owner admitted that to date, no actual steps have been
20 undertaken in furtherance of the appeal. According to the website maintained by the County of
21 Santa Barbara, which has posted the Rules of the Assessment Appeals Board, any appeal must be
22 filed no later than November 30th of the current year for “regular” assessments, and within 60
23 days after notification for “supplemental” assessments. Because Exhibit “G” confirms
24 notification to the Park Owner on May 20, 2009, and the Park’s records show the supplemental
25 taxes paid in full by early 2010, the time for filing any appeal would appear to be long gone. As
26 such, this category cannot be allowed.
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

This category still represents a complete unknown at this point. But it can be inferred, due to the huge amount projected that it encompasses not only the legal fees require for this 2 day hearing, but also fees to fund a projected appeal through the courts if the Park Owner were to lose all or any portion of its case at the administrative level, as well as for any remanded hearings. For that reason, all of the same arguments set forth in item 5 above would apply to this item. Any fees incurred for appeals or remand can be awarded on remand. But they cannot be claimed before any such expenses are incurred, as they are not capital items capable of being monitored during the six-month period described in the Ordinance. Treating this item the same as a capital item by analogy simply does not work.

During his testimony, Dr. St. John could not estimate what fees he would charge through the hearing process. Nor were any other billings entered into evidence to support attorney's fees (Counsel for Park Owner has agreed to provide same with his opening brief). This is still thus an unknown, for which Homeowners will reserve comment in their closing brief. But Dr. Baar testified very clearly that \$125,000.00 was a hugely excessive amount for fees in a hearing such as this, and Exhibit 5 shows that fees of less than \$50,000.00 would be routine in a hearing such as this. Homeowners reserve the right to argue this item further once counsel's actual, itemized fees are received.

23


24

Only the CPI portion of the increase is deemed “automatic” based upon evidence or authority presented thus far by the park owner. All other portions of the requested increase; i.e. the \$161.00 amount, must be reviewed by the Hearing Officer before they can become an

1 ongoing part of the monthly rental cost, whether as base rent or a pass through. Homeowners
2 objections to the amounts sought are based not only upon methodology, but also upon errors and
3 inconsistencies in the calculations themselves. Homeowners cannot at this point even begin to
4 calculate all of the different amounts which might be awarded if only certain mistakes are
5 corrected or certain re-calculations are made. But they need not do so in any case, for the bottom
6 line is this: If the mutually accepted MNOI formula is properly applied, with the ground lease or
7 property tax cost extracted, the amount to be granted for the "permanent" base year rent increase
8 above and beyond what is automatically allowed is "zero". And if the "temporary increases" are
9 confined to legitimate capital items which have been properly identified and estimated by
10 reasonable cost, then the allowable amount of any such pass throughs is also at or near "zero".

13 For these reasons, and reserving the right to make additional arguments in their closing
14 brief, Homeowners respectfully request that the Petition be granted and the \$161.00 requested
15 increase be denied.

18 Dated: October 19, 2011


BRUCE E. STANTON, Esq.
Attorney for Homeowners