

H. LeVasseur Open Farm BOS  
12/10/2019

December 9, 2019

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to the Board of Supervisors to voice my concern regarding the vulnerability of our mobile home owners' community in El Dorado County who potentially face the loss of their homes due to inordinate space rent increases by park owners such as an LLC (Limited Liability Corporation).

We have lived at Greenstone Estates since 2016. Our original rent at that time included water, and garbage. Our space rent has been charged separately since 2017. With increases in rent and now water and garbage charges, we now see a 27% increase in these monthly costs as of December 1, 2019.

For our community of 4000 mobile homeowners, seniors as well as veterans and disabled, widows and widowers, such an increase in 3 years could be devastating. The choice of a move to Ponte Palmero or Gold Country, an apartment, or in with extended family may not be possible.

My husband and I have lived in El Dorado County since 1983. I worked at Marshall Medical for 27 years. Our children attended Charles Brown, Ponderosa and Charter schools here. We chose to sell our home and downsize to Greenstone Estates in 2016. For us the merits of this move included: affordability, a single level home, an established community, a smaller more manageable space in a similar environment and safety. We focused on these factors and ultimately, considering that should one of us die or become seriously ill, the other spouse would have the option to remain home and independent.

A space rent stabilization ordinance in El Dorado County protects this group of vulnerable citizens ensuring reasonable rent increases, and profits for park owners.

Sincerely,

  
Helen LeVasseur

4700 Old Frenchtown Rd. Space 100

Shingle Springs, CA 95682

# CALIFORNIA BROWN ACT

PREAMBLE:

M. LANC OPEN Forum  
BUS 12/10/2019

"The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know. The people do not yield their sovereignty to the bodies that serve them. The people insist on remaining informed to retain control over the legislative bodies they have created."

## CHAPTER V.

### RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC

§54954.3 Public's right to testify at meetings. (c) The legislative body of a local agency shall not prohibit public criticism of the policies, procedures, programs, or services of the agency, or of the acts or omissions of the legislative body. Nothing in this subdivision shall confer any privilege or protection for expression beyond that otherwise provided by law. Care must be given to avoid violating the speech rights of speakers by suppressing opinions relevant to the business of the body.

As such, members of the public have broad constitutional rights to comment on any subject relating to the business of the governmental body. Any attempt to restrict the content of such speech must be narrowly tailored to effectuate a compelling state interest. Specifically, the courts found that policies that prohibited members of the public from criticizing school district employees were unconstitutional. (*Leventhal v. Vista Unified School Dist.* (1997) 973 F. Supp. 951; *Baca v. Moreno Valley Unified School Dist.* (1996) 936 F. Supp. 719.) These decisions found that prohibiting critical comments was a form of viewpoint discrimination and that such a prohibition promoted discussion artificially geared toward praising (and maintaining) the status quo, thereby foreclosing meaningful public dialog.

Where a member of the public raises an issue which has not yet come before the legislative body, the item may be briefly discussed but no action may be taken at that meeting. The purpose of the discussion is to permit a member of the public to raise an issue or problem with the legislative body or to permit the legislative body to provide information to the public, provide direction to its staff, or schedule the matter for a future meeting. (§ 54954.2(a).)