

DELAWARE MANUFACTURED HOME RELOCATION AUTHORITY

1675 S. State Street
Dover, Delaware

Minutes of October 23, 2014

IN ATTENDANCE:

Authority: Mitch Crane
Andy Strine
Dorothy Boucher
William Dunn
Susanne Lantz (Executive Director)
Joelle Polesky

Absent: George Meldrum

Legal Counsel: William Denman

Other Attendees: Bobbie Hemmerich, Tenant McNicol Place
Joan Peculski, Tenant Bon Ayre
Richard Ruben, Tenant Bon Ayre
Isidro Garcia, Tenant Pot-Nets Coveside
John Walsh, Tenant Colonial East
John Morris, Tenant Camelot Meadows
Ed Speraw, Compliance Investigator

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Crane called the meeting to order at 1.30 p.m and asked everyone to introduce themselves due to the new Board Members, Joelle Polesky and Dorothy Boucher.

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Crane asked the Board to approve August 14, 2014 meeting minutes. Mr. Strine made the motion to accept the meeting minutes. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. The Board approved the August 14, 2014 meeting minutes unanimously.

III. Executive Directors Report:

Ms. Lantz stated she had transcribed the last minutes and emailed them to the Board and also drafted the agenda with Mr. Crane.

Ms. Lantz stated she approved the mileage for the Board members and forwarded do the accountant for payment; she also forwarded the approved invoices to BDO for payment.

Ms. Lantz requested a check disbursement from the DOR as the Operating Account needed to be replenished.

Ms. Lantz reviewed incoming tenant applications and corresponded with tenants in Glasgow Court; she forwarded the applications for approval to the Committee, or is waiting to receive required documents for incomplete applications, e.g. appraisal.

Ms. Lantz had the Summary Sheet for tenant benefits and the tenant applications translated into Spanish and mailed them out to the Spanish speaking tenants in Glasgow Court.

Ms. Lantz sent a letter to Community Owners, HOA's and DMHOA notifying them of the increase of the Trust Fund assessment to \$2.50 per tenant and landlord.

Ms. Lantz updated Demhra's website with approved meeting minutes and financial statements.

Ms. Lantz started looking for a new office after FSMHA informed DEMHRA the lease would not be renewed.

Ms. Lantz talked to the NCC Tax Division to find out if there was a way to reduce the tenant's penalty on the Property taxes due.

Ms. Lantz discussed the tenant list she had received from and with Glasgow Court when the tenant situation was not clear on the list.

Ms. Lantz created work orders for Mr. Speraw to go to affected streets in Glasgow Court and determine if home was relocatable or not.

Ms. Lantz worked with Ms. Kent from Falcidian in regards to the merger of FNBW with WSFS.

Ms. Lantz worked with the DOR on getting the checks issued solely to the mover after a home was relocated, instead of having to issue it to tenant and mover and trying to get the required signatures. Ms. Lantz stated it took Mr. Denman's involvement before the DOR acquiesced from requesting the tenant's application before issuing a check to the mover. Ms. Lantz further stated that by law the DOR did not need that information.

Ms. Lantz stated she then drafted a waiver letter, signed by the tenant and having permission from the tenant to pay the mover right out.

Ms. Lantz had forwarded a link to a W-9 form from DOR to the respective movers, as they needed to set themselves up as vendors in the DOR system, which allows DOR to issue the check to the mover.

Ms. Lantz received notification that Countryside Mobile Estates was up for sale and informed the tenants of the park accordingly.

Ms. Lantz updated the website with the new Board Member information and sent Dorothy Boucher the Board Package for the meeting

IV. Chair's Report:

Mr. Crane stated the Board of the FSMHA had notified the Authority the lease would not be renewed as of 30 November 2014, but was generous to offer the Authority an extension until office space could be found. Ms. Lantz had been looking for new office space with some assistance from Mr. Strine and Mr. Crane. Mr. Crane stated the new lease was on the agenda and has been approved. Mr. Crane

thought the rent in this office had been low and there had been no conflict of interest, although to the public it could appear as one renting from a community owner. Mr. Crane stated it had been a good arrangement.

Mr. Crane thought there was still a problem with the Rent Justification process, he was not sure why. Mr. Crane receives strange calls and emails when tenants receive a rent increase notice. Mr. Crane stated maybe sometime in the New Year, with the help of the DOJ, an education program can be put together to educate the tenants on how this law works. Mr. Crane stated a couple of people that live in manufactured housing accosted him in a bookstore this past weekend and told him he was on their "expletive" list. Mr. Crane explained at the beginning of the year it was obvious there were problems with the Rent Justification law that needed to be amended as some of the things the law required the Authority was unable to do. One example was arranging the meetings. Mr. Crane contacted the Legislators, with the blessing of the Board, and asked that three things needed to be changed in addition to the last line of the bill, which had been confusing. Two arbitrators had made decisions contrary to each other on what that meant. Mr. Crane stated the changes were necessary for the Authority to operate effectively; Mr. Crane tried to do his best. There is still a lot of confusion and misunderstandings which was very unfortunate. Mr. Crane thanked Ms. Lantz what she has done with Glasgow Court, a problem community, and she makes it a relatively smooth transition. Mr. Crane also thanked Mr. Speraw for his thorough report. Mr. Crane stated Ms. Lantz was a staff of one who was dealing with the Glasgow Change of Use, the upcoming Change of Use, Rent Justification Matters, Right of First Offer, Bankruptcy issues with some communities and answering questions and maintains her composure. Mr. Crane stated he had no idea what the Board would do without her. Ms. Polesky requested that Ms. Lantz put this in the minutes. Mr. Crane agreed.

Mr. Morris suggested with all the calls coming in, it might be a good idea to hold a refresher course for the tenants. Mr. Morris stated DMHOA has one and he knows the Attorney General's Office already has one. Mr. Morris thought with one of those two organizations it would be good to offer something like that. Mr. Crane stated Mr. Speraw and himself held several joint sessions and it was strange what came out of it a few weeks later, people hear what they want to hear. Mr. Crane thought it was easier to have something in writing that people could refer to.

Mr. Strine asked if there were any news regarding arbitrations. Mr. Crane stated Mr. Ramunno from Bon Ayre had filed an appeal. Ms. Lantz stated she thought some arbitrations might be coming, but it depended on the tenants, she could not say for sure.

V. Approval of Financial Activity & Report July and August 2014:

Ms. Lantz asked if the Board Members had reviewed the financial statements? Ms. Lantz stated at the End of August there were 6.5 Million in the Trust Fund; about \$10,000 in the Operating Account and she had about \$372 in the Petty Cash. Ms. Lantz explained to the new members that the Board in 2009 decided to create Petty Cash in order for the staff to purchase office supplies or other necessary things, because there was no cash. Ms. Boucher made the motion to accept the Financial Statements and Mr. Strine seconded that motion. The financial statements were approved unanimously.

A. Approval of other Financial Matters:

1) Approval of Legal Counsel Invoice s for July, August and September 2014:

Mr. Crane stated the legal counsel invoices were approved by the Finance Committee and needed to be ratified by the Board. Ms. Boucher asked who was on that Financial Committee? Ms. Lantz replied Mr. Meldrum (who was not in attendance) and Mr. Strine. Ms. Boucher wondered how long were the members on the Committee? Mr. Crane stated as long as he asked them to be part of the Committee. Mr. Crane explained it was decided last year to form a committee was it was taking too long to approve and pay the legal counsel invoices. Mr. Crane also explained there also was a committee to negotiate payment plans for communities that are late and there is a committee that approves pay outs on the Change of Use plans. Ms. Boucher asked if they were listed? Mr. Crane stated no, but she would be part of one before the meeting was over. Mr. Strine made the motion to approve the legal counsel invoices. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. The Board approved the legal

counsel invoices unanimously.

2) Approval of Compliance Investigator Timesheet & Mileage for Glasgow Court Inspection of Tenants homes 8-20-14 to 9-12-14:

Mr. Crane stated next were the timesheets and mileage for Mr. Speraw's travels to Glasgow Court as requested. Ms. Lantz said Mr. Meldrum and Mr. Strine pre-approved these timesheets. Mr. Dunn asked Mr. Speraw where he lived. Mr. Speraw stated in Longneck. Ms. Lantz thought it was quite a drive. Mr. Crane asked if the Board had any questions? As there were none Mr. Crane asked the Board to approve. The Board approved Mr. Speraw's timesheet and mileage unanimously.

3) Approval of BDO Invoice June and October 2014:

Mr. Crane asked Ms. Lantz to explain what services BDO offered. Ms. Lantz explained that BDO has one person that prepares the financial statements with the help of the DOR and then Ms. Lantz works with an accountant at BDO to pay invoices, etc.. The person that prepares the financial statements has to wait until they receive it from DOR. Essentially, Ms. Lantz explained, the financial statements are about two months behind. Mr. Crane said the Authority did not write it's on checks, but Mr. Crane approved check request. For example, the mileage reimbursement for the Board Members comes directly from BDO.

Mr. Crane asked if anyone had any questions, if not, was everyone in favor of approving the invoices from BDO for payment? The Board agreed unanimously.

VIII. Old Business:

1. Glasgow Court Update:

Mr. Crane asked Ms. Lantz if she had anything else to report. Ms. Lantz stated she had issues dealing with Glasgow Court. Ms. Lantz said she is having issues that in some cases Glasgow Court is not forthcoming with information. Ms. Lantz states Glasgow Court is sticking to the 60 day notice rule which causes problems for the tenants. Ms. Lantz said she had an issue where the tenant had abandoned his home and Glasgow Court denied knowing the tenant was gone. Ms. Lantz handed over the abandonment check and the tenant kept calling stating that Glasgow Court was demanding the next month's lot rent. Ms. Lantz said she emails Glasgow Court to find out if a tenant is gone; the tenant states they have informed Glasgow Court, whereas the office of Glasgow Court denies knowing anything about it. Ms. Boucher stated per regulations the money could not be handed over until the tenant had abandoned his home, what was the verification process? Ms. Lantz stated that was the issue she was dealing with, she would email Glasgow Court and Glasgow Court would state they had no notification from the tenant. Ms. Lantz stated she hears one thing from the tenant and another from Glasgow Court, whom is she supposed to believe? The tenants depend on that benefit check. Mr. Speraw stated in the past the Authority would make sure the tenant had moved from Point A to Point B. Mr. Speraw said what Ms. Lantz said was very true, he was receiving lots of calls from tenants stating the Glasgow Court office was not giving them any help. Mr. Speraw also stated the tenants would get invoices and then all in a sudden would get a new quote because the Authority had set a limit to the benefit, but he understood that.

Ms. Lantz stated at the August meeting with the tenants Mr. Carroll from the AG's office had promised the tenants the AG's office would look into the matter although Ms. Lantz has not heard if that had actually happened. Mr. Dunn suggested creating a letter that the tenant can take into the office that they can sign and Glasgow Court can sign and then a copy is being returned to the Authority. Mr. Strine agreed that some process needed to be in place and he thought Ms. Lantz was already doing that. Mr. Strine thought a letter stating the tenant had received the funds and they are vacating the home should be enough. Mr. Strine also thought it was a difficult situation that did not need to be difficult.

Ms. Lantz explained that she does send a letter to the tenant that they have been approved and some of the tenants do take that to the office, but then Glasgow Court does not seem to have it. Mr. Strine stated the trigger was then they received the check, not when they were approved.

Mr. Strine understood that even if they were approved, they could wait or could ask to receive their check within 30 days. Ms. Lantz stated she sends the tenant an approval letter explaining what the tenant must do, let her know that the tenant has moved and she verifies with Glasgow Court Management, the original signed title to the home and proof that the Property Taxes have been paid. Mr. Strine stated the abandonment becomes effective when they hand over the title, etc. that could be 2 or 5 month after approval. Mr. Denman explained that the tenant has to show that they have left before they receive the check. Mr. Morris stated this was discussed last month and he thought it was said once the normal procedure had been followed, Mr. Speraw would verify that the home was abandoned. Mr. Crane denied this agreement had been made. Mr. Strine stated it would be a dreadful waste of money to send out Mr. Speraw 167 times. Ms. Boucher thought there was a tenant and a landlord issue, but the money should not go out until they had moved out. Mr. Strine stated there was a cooperation problem. Ms. Boucher stated could we lock the tenant out once we have the title? Ms. Boucher wondered if they could sue the Authority if they handed over the title, collected their benefit and still lived there, what if something happened? Mr. Strine did not think the Authority had liability, we were just holding the title until the home was demolished. Mr. Garcia wondered why the Authority did not send Mr. Speraw to verify? Mr. Strine responded that Mr. Speraw lived 200 miles away and do go there 165 times was ridiculous in Mr. Strine's opinion. Mr. Strine thought the Authority was trying to make it as smooth as possible; a reasonable landlord would state, yes the tenant is gone. Mr. Dunn wondered if the Authority could send them a form letter where the landlord acknowledges that the tenant is gone, where the tenant and the landlord confirm the abandonment. Ms. Lantz stated she did not believe this would work. Ms. Lantz further stated she has received one application where the owner of the home is Glasgow Court, not the tenant applying for benefits. Ms. Lantz said Glasgow Court had advised the tenant that the Authority would move the home and once all that was done they could change the title into their name. Ms. Lantz could not get a hold of Glasgow Court by phone, she emailed them four weeks ago and is still waiting for a reply. Mr. Dunn asked the tenant then really had no right to any benefits. Mr. Crane said the tenant will not receive anything until the title is in their name. Mr. Strine suggested when the tenant hands over the title, the Authority sends a notice, which we are doing, to Glasgow Court stating that the home has been abandoned and Glasgow Court can do with it what they want, the rent effectively ceases on this day. Maybe send a copy of letter to the tenant with the check and be done with it. Mr. Strine stated the Authority did not need a cumbersome and expensive process. Mr. Crane thought the Authority could let them know that the check had been issued and the landlord could let them know if there was something different.

The Authority could look into it if the landlord would call and state the home still had people occupying it. Ms. Polesky thought that the wording could be that if I don't hear from you, you understand the ramifications of issuing the check; that this would put them on notice.

Mr. Walsh noted that this park had been selling homes to tenants within two month of sending the Change of Use notification you are not dealing with someone who is on the up and up.

Mr. Walsh thought this was unfortunately possibly not the last time and maybe the Authority should have a procedure in place. Mr. Speraw noticed a big problem up there is a lot of the homes have been abandoned years ago and now they are attempting to get money for that. Mr. Crane explained they would only get money for the homes that have been abandoned since the Change of Use. Mr. Strine stated the trigger for this would be that they have to be on the list and the tenant would have had to file for abandonment benefits.

Mr. Dunn was wondering how far along were we in the process? Mr. Strine thought 35 of 167 per Ms. Lantz, but he was thinking more.

IX. New Business

1. Office Space: Approval of Office Lease, Approval of Liability Insurance and estimated moving costs

Mr. Crane said the Authority by law had to be in Kent County. Ms. Lantz had been actively looking for office space and found space in Camden, that provides reasonable rent at \$570.00 a month plus utilities and would satisfy our possible future needs. Mr. Crane said it would make it easy for people to attend meetings that have a handicap, there are two conference rooms on the first floor. Mr. Strine stated the building is very charming. Mr. Denman stated we made changes to the lease and the landlord was agreeable to it. Mr. Denman said the lease stipulated the use of the conference room at least once a month and that the Authority was able to put notices and agendas in a inconspicuous area. Mr. Crane stated the office would be located on 110 N. Main Street in Camden. Mr. Crane stated there are kitchen facilities that we can use and there are outside areas, tables, etc. Mr. Strine stated the office was about 3 miles from this location. Mr. Strine made the motion to accept the lease as it was signed and Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. The Board agreed unanimously. Mr. Crane stated the plan was to move into the new location after the 15th of November and the next meeting would be at the new location.

Ms. Lantz stated she had contacted Two Men and a Truck, which is a smaller company in this area. Ms. Lantz said she estimated the cost to be less than \$1,000 she was trying to err on the side of the higher price. Mr. Strine thought it probably will be less. Ms. Lantz stated the movers charged \$140.00 an hour for 3 men. Ms. Lantz hoped they would pack up the files and thought it might take 3 – 5 hours, maybe. Mr. Crane wondered how much needed to be moved? Ms. Lantz explained what furniture she had that needed to be moved. Mr. Crane made the motion to use Two Men and a Truck. The Board agreed unanimously.

Ms. Lantz had looked into insurance as the new lease required the Authority to carry General Liability Insurance. Ms. Lantz stated the carrier would be Harford Insurance and the cost would be \$500 a year. Ms. Lantz said the lease required the landlord and tenant to be beneficiaries of the lease. Mr. Crane stated the price was reasonable. Mr. Crane made the motion to accept the insurance quote. Mr. Strine seconded the motion. Ms. Lantz asked did we need Property Insurance? Mr. Crane stated the Authority could look into this. The Board agreed unanimously. Mr. Dunn asked was renters insurance necessary? Mr. Strine thought not.

2. Lakeland Change of Use:

Mr. Crane said since Mr. Strine was the landlord of Lakeland he would not participate in any discussion regarding the park. Ms. Lantz explained that about 50 homes were affected. Mr. Strine stated the notification was sent last week, the park was right behind this building. Mr. Strine stated meetings had been scheduled, the tenants will be walked through the process and have until next October to move out. Mr. Strine thought maybe ten homes would be non-relocatable and one situation where the tenant had no title to the home and has lived there for 12 years and has never paid Property Taxes. Mr. Strine explained that his company would pay for a bulk proposal or the tenants could pay for it individually if they wanted. Ms. Boucher asked how many were effected and how many would be non-relocatable or could be relocated within the park? Mr. Strine stated 49 were affected and he anticipated 5 – 10 non-relocatable homes. Mr. Strine stated he would have a mover look at it and should know by the end of the week. Ms. Boucher was wondering why the Compliance Investigator was not used? Mr. Crane stated the Authority was not at that point in the discussion. Ms. Boucher asked will we use a verification? Mr. Crane believed the Authority would do what it normally does. Mr. Strine continued has offered the tenants, if they decide to stay in one of his parks, that he would coordinate the entire move. Mr. Strine explained the tenants could move wherever they wanted to, but the consensus at the meeting was the tenants wanted to stay in Lakeland. Mr. Strine has advised the tenants that not enough lots are available and he would let tenants with children have preference and stay. Mr. Strine thought all the tenants would stay with him. Ms. Boucher was surprised but stated she wanted to know what Mr. Strine's plans were and could see he was very thorough. Mr. Crane said he understood, but he did not want to deviate to much from the topic. Mr. Strine assured Ms.

Lantz it would go smooth. Ms. Lantz replied she was convinced it would be a pleasure and she was not worried about it in the least as she had worked with his staff on helping some of the Glasgow Court tenants. Mr. Crane said he had notified Representative Bennett and Senator Bonini, who did not respond. Mr. Crane stated that Mr. Strine needed to be replaced with Ms. Boucher on the Lakeland tenant applications. Mr. Crane stated it was strictly email and Ms. Lantz would send the email with the entire application and would make a recommendation.

3. Approval of Credit Card for Demhra Office:

Mr. Crane stated he suggested that Ms. Lantz look into a credit card for the office. Ms. Lantz has looked into it and attached the application with the Board Package. Ms. Lantz stated she was not sure if she was going to be the authorized officer, but what she did not like was the request to share her SSN with the bank. Ms. Polesky stated the Tax ID Number should be in lieu of the SSN, Ms. Lantz stated, she has asked the bank, who has explained that this information was still needed for the person signing the card, otherwise they will not issue a credit card. Ms. Lantz said the bank has reassured her that any credit used would not go against her personal credit history. Ms. Lantz said she has not many choices as far as pricing is concerned and a card would help her. Ms. Boucher was asking was there a way to get a debit card, she would lean towards that. Ms. Polesky stated any debt that would arise will go against the organization, not the employee. Mr. Denman thought there is a limit to the credit card, he did not know what the difference was. Ms. Lantz said with a debit card, anyone could wipe out the account if they have the pin number. Mr. Denman confirmed that this would be an issue. Mr. Crane stated would Mr. Denman take a look at the application? Mr. Dunn did not think debit or credit card made any difference, one of his debit cards was hacked, his bank notified him right away and the money was returned to his account. Mr. Crane said there is a legal difference regarding the liability regarding a debit vs. a credit card. Mr. Denman thought the credit card would be paid off right away in full, the interest would not be of any concern. Mr. Denman stated he would be happy to look at the application. Mr. Denman stated a Fidelity Bond would kick in if an officer would abuse the purpose of the card. Mr. Crane stated he would like to see if the Board approved the concept of getting a credit or debit card and Ms. Lantz would work with Mr. Denman on this. Mr. Dunn made the motion to go with whatever card proved more advantageous to the Authority. Mr. Strine seconded the motion. Mr. Morris wondered if there was any tax associated with this especially if Ms. Lantz's Social Security? Mr. Crane stated no. Mr. Dunn thought the card should be limited to \$2,000 maximum. The Board agreed unanimously on Ms. Lantz obtaining either card.

4. County Seat Gardens Delinquent – Ratification of Legal Committee decision to file suit:

Mr. Crane stated the Board needed to ratify the decision to take legal actions regarding County Seat Gardens. Ms. Lantz said the park was now almost 4 quarters behind. Ms. Lantz further stated Both she and Mr. Denman had sent letters. Ms. Lantz had spoken to Mr. Exantus in July and he had told her he was working on having his accountant pay the quarterly payments. Nothing has happened. Mr. Crane asked how many lots? Ms. Lantz stated unfortunately she did not know. Mr. Denman stated it was Exantus, he has filed suit. Ms. Boucher asked how much do they owe? Mr. Denman replied he did not have that number at the top of his head, he could get them that information. Mr. Denman stated they file quarterly reports. Ms. Lantz stated the last one they filed was in September last year. Ms. Boucher made the motion to file legal action against County Seat Gardens. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. Mr. Denman stated he thought it was less than \$2,000.

5. Notice of Sale Countryside Mobile Estates MHP:

Ms. Lantz said in early October she received notification that Countryside Mobile Estates was put up for sale. Ms. Lantz said DMHOA and the AG's office should have received that notification. Mr. Speraw confirmed that. Ms. Lantz has received a few calls from tenants, but no interest from the tenant side to purchase the park. Mr. Speraw stated no bank is going to finance this, the infrastructure was really bad.

6. Woodland Manor – no longer qualifies for Trust Fund:

Mr. Crane stated that the Authority only had jurisdiction over parks that had two or more leased lots, when they lease the land. Mr. Crane said the park has provided Ms. Lantz with information that the park no longer qualified for the Trust Fund. Ms. Polesky wondered if the park knew the ramifications? Ms. Lantz stated the owner has purchased the homes over the years, since the park has to register once the year and he returned his registration form stating he owns all the homes. Ms. Lantz verified through Kent County Levy Court. Mr. Morris wondered if the park still owed us money? Mr. Strine said the park had send the registrations and payments on time, as he owned all the homes, the park no longer qualified for the Trust Fund. Ms. Boucher asked, on the letter he had two lots numbered 11, did that make a difference? Ms. Lantz thought it was probably a mistake, she had verified with Kent County that the park indeed owed all 26 homes. Mr. Strine thought it was a typo, it was not worth worrying about. Ms. Boucher was stating she was just making sure.

7. Layton's Riviera:

Ms. Polesky stated there was some confusion regarding Layton's Riviera and one of her colleagues had been working on various issues with Layton's Riviera. Ms. Polesky could confirm the park was in foreclosure and the hearing was scheduled for January. Ms. Polesky stated under the statute there was no Right of First Offer for the tenants due to the foreclosure proceedings. Ms. Polesky said the park was scheduled for Sheriffs' sale a month from now. Mr. Morris asked that the owner was still renting property out. Ms. Polesky said she had questioned her colleague and he was not aware of that, also that there was no provision in the law that Layton's Riviera had to discontinue renting out the property. Mr. Garcia asked if Layton's Riviera was paying the assessment as there were still lessees on the property? Mr. Crane said Ms. Lantz had informed the Authority that it had been paid. Ms. Polesky stated she had not done an independent assessment, she just spoke with the AG's investigator and their attorney that was involved. Ms. Polesky thought Mr. Garcia probably had more information than she did at this time. Mr. Speraw said the information DMHOA had was that Mr. Marshall, who used to be their manager, now owns homes in the park and is renting them out and collecting cash as payment. Mr. Strine stated this had nothing to do with the Authority. Mr. Denman stated the foreclosure was postponed and the mortgage has been assigned to M&T Bank. Mr. Denman has been contact with the attorney that represents the bank in this foreclosure action. Mr. Denman had alerted him to the Right of First offer statute, he is in Maryland and was not aware of that. Mr. Denman guessed in this type of situation the bank would probably try to get the maximum price possible at the Sheriff's sale. Mr. Denman there is no way to avoid the foreclosure action; the attorney had his information to keep Mr. Denman informed. Mr. Denman's office did a lien search and found out foreclosure action was filed.

X. Public Comments:

Mr. Morris, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Garcia made comments as outlined in the minutes.

XI. Executive Session:

Mr. Crane and the Board thanked Mr. Morris for his service to the Authority.

Mr. Strine made the motion to go into Executive Session at 3.00 p.m. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. Unanimous approval was given by all members present by voice vote.

Mr. Strine made the motion to come out of Executive Session at 3.15 p.m. Ms. Boucher seconded the motion. Unanimous approval was given by all members present by voice vote.

Mr. Strine made the motion to accept the offer from Hilltop MHP for full restitution of the legal fees and that the Authority conditionally accept the numbers suggested, subject to the investigation of the numbers by the Authority that they pay what is owed over a 11 month period. Ms. Boucher seconded the motion.

Ms. Lantz stated she usually works with the DOR to find a payment plan that is acceptable as the numbers the parks propose sometimes cannot be divided by what works with the quarterly coupon. When she receives the check, she marks it on the payment plan and forwards to the DOR. The Board agreed unanimously.

Mr. Strine made the motion to increase the pay rate for Ms. Lantz to \$18/hr effective January 1st. Ms. Lantz stated that is what she was already receiving and she would request extra paid time off instead. Mr. Crane stated he would suggest the Board defer until the next meeting.

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE - ADJOURNMENT:

The Board has discussed and set the next meeting date to December 11, 2014 at the new location in Camden.

As there was nothing else before the Board the meeting was adjourned at 3.25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Susanne Lantz
Executive Director