

**DELAWARE MANUFACTURED HOME RELOCATION AUTHORITY**

110 N. Main Street, Suite G  
Camden, DE 19934

Minutes of April 28, 2015

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

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

Absent: Joelle Polesky

Other Attendees: Kay Hoyle, Tenant Angola Beach  
Joan Peculski, Tenant Bon Ayre  
Richard Ruben, Tenant Bon Ayre  
Milton Stroup, Tenant Bon Ayre  
Jesse Garcia, Tenant Pot-Nets Coveside

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Mr. Crane called the meeting to order at 1.30 p.m. Mr. Crane explained that the Authority has decided to schedule monthly meetings, in addition to the regular meetings in order to vote on tenant applications for relocation benefits within the set time frame. Regarding the committees that had been formed to make recommendations to the Board, the question had come up if the Authority was in violation of open meeting laws. Mr. Crane further stated he would remove himself from both committees. Effective immediately Ms. Lantz would be on each committee with the other two Board Members.

**II. Review and Approval of new tenant applications Glasgow Court:**

**Dunfee:** Ms. Lantz stated Ms. Dunfee had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$8,400 to relocate her single wide home within Glasgow Court. The committee had approved her request for the maximum amount of \$8,000, which left the tenant with the remainder of \$400.

**Thomas:** Mr. and Mrs. Thomas had applied for non-relocatable benefits in the amount of \$3,500. Mr. Speraw had determined the home could not be relocated. The committee had approved the amount of \$3,500.

**Wilkinson:** Mr. and Mrs. Wilkinson had applied for abandonment benefits in the amount of \$1,500 which had been approved by the committee.

Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve all three applications for the benefit as presented. Mr. Strine seconded the motion. The Board approved all three applications unanimously.

### **III. Review and approval of new tenant applications Lakeland Park:**

**1. Hampton:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Hampton had applied for non-relocatable benefits in the amount of \$5,000. Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Wininger had determined the home could be moved. Ms. Lantz stated the appraisal was for \$7,000 and the amount approved by two members of the committee. was \$5,000. The Board discussed the application. Ms. Boucher disagreed approving since the Compliance Investigator said it could be moved. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve the non-relocatable benefit of \$5,000; Mr. Meldrum seconded the motion. The Board approved the motion 3-1-1, Ms. Boucher voted No; Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

**2. Elmasre:** Ms. Lantz stated Ms. Elmasre had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$8,000 to relocate her home within Lakeland. Two committee members had approved her request. Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve the application as discussed. Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. Ms. Boucher objected as she had no clarification on the law if a tenant could move within a park. The Board discussed the application. The Board approved the application in the amount of \$8,000 3-1-1, Ms. Boucher voted No; Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

Ms. Boucher thought the Authority was overly generous in reimbursing the movers, especially when a home was moved within a park and stated she was researching information she would bring to the next Board Meeting. Mr. Meldrum asked if the Authority could get a clarification regarding this. Mr. Crane explained the Authority's solicitor view regarding the law. Mr. Crane stated he had drafted a letter to the Department of Justice for an Attorney General's Opinion and he would ask Ms. Lantz to send out the letter today if the Board agreed. Mr. Crane proceeded to read the letter. The Board agreed to send out the letter.

**3. Crouser:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Crouser had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$8,000 to move his single wide home to South Wood Acres. The committee had approved his request 2-1. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve Mr. Crouser's application and Mr. Meldrum seconded the motion. The Board approved the application 3-1-1, Ms. Boucher voting No; Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

**4. Floyd Givens:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Givens had applied to relocate his double wide home within Lakeland Park for the amount of \$12,000. The mover had quoted the amount of \$11,500 to move the home and that is what the committee had approved 2-1. Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve the amount of \$11,500 to relocate Mr. Givens' home. The Board discussed the application. The Board approved the amount of \$11,500 to relocate the tenants home 3-1-1, Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voted No.

**5. Chery/Jeanty:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Chery and Ms. Jeanty had applied to relocate their home for the amount of \$8,000 as quoted by the mover. The committee had approved their application 2:1. Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve the application as presented. The Board discussed the

application. The Board approved the tenants request 3-1-1, with Mr. Strine abstaining due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voting No.

**6. Seymore:** Ms. Lantz stated that Ms. Seymore had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$12,000 to relocate her double wide home within Lakeland Park. The mover quoted the amount of \$11,500 to move her home and that was the amount the committee had approved 2:1. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve the amount of \$11,500 to relocate the home and Mr. Meldrum seconded the motion. The Board approved the amount of \$11,500 3-1-1 with Mr. Strine abstaining due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voting No.

**7. Urian:** Ms. Urian had applied to relocate her double wide home for the amount of \$12,000. The mover had quoted her the cost of \$11,500 to relocate her home. Ms. Urian was considering to move her home to St. Jones Landing or staying in Lakeland Park. No decision had been made so far as she was not sure if the home would fit on a lot in St. Jones Landing. The committee had approved the amount of \$11,500 2:1. Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Crane seconded the motion. The Board discussed the application. Ms. Boucher stated she would abstain as she did not have enough information to make an informed decision. The Board approved the application 3 yes and two abstentions. Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

**8. Germann:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Germann had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$12,000 to move his double wide home within Lakeland Park. The committee had approved the amount of \$11,500, as quoted by the mover, 2-1. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve the application for the amount of \$11,500; Mr. Meldrum seconded the motion. The Board approved to relocate her home for the amount of \$11,500 3-1-1 with Mr. Strine abstaining due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voting No.

**9. Randolph:** Ms. Lantz stated Ms. Randolph had applied for relocation benefits in the amount of \$8,000 to relocate her single wide home within Lakeland Park. Mr. Meldrum made the motion to approve the amount of \$8,000; Mr. Dunn seconded the motion. The Board approved the application 3-1-1, with Mr. Strine abstaining due to a conflict and Ms Boucher voting No.

**10. Andrew Givens:** Ms. Lantz stated Mr. Givens had applied to relocate his single wide home within Lakeland Park for \$8,000 as quoted by the mover. The committee had approved the amount 2-1. The Board approved the tenants request 3-1-1, Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voted No.

**11. Fleeger:** Ms. Fleeger had applied for non-relocatable benefits in the amount of \$5,000. Ms. Fleeger believes the home cannot be due to its condition. Mr. Wininger had inspected the home and thought in its poor condition it was not really worth to move it. The committee had approved her request 2-1. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve her request and Mr. Meldrum seconded it. The Board discussed the application. The Board approved the tenants request 3-1-1. Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voted No,

**12. Thompson:** The tenant had applied for non-relocatable benefits in the amount of \$5,000 for their single wide home. Ms. Lantz said the appraiser had valued the home at \$4,061.82 and the committee had approved that amount unanimously. Mr. Dunn made the motion to approve the non-relocatable benefit in the amount of \$4,061.82, Mr. Meldrum seconded the motion. The Board discussed the tenant's request. The Board approved the amount of \$4,061.82 3-1-1

with Mr. Strine abstaining due to a conflict and Ms. Boucher voting No.

**13. Hughes/Harris:** The tenants had applied to relocate their home for the amount of \$8,000 to Frederick Lodge. The mover had quoted \$8,000 to relocate the home and the committee had unanimously approved that amount. The Board approved the tenants request four yes, Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

**14. Holotanko/Williams:** The tenants had applied for abandonment benefits in the amount of \$1,500. The committee had unanimously approved that amount. The Board approved the amount of \$1,500 for the tenants to abandon the home four yes, Mr. Strine abstained due to a conflict.

**IV. Other Business that may come before the Board:**

Mr. Stroupe from Bon Ayre addressed the situation of the arbitration process and how three different arbitrations resulted in three different decisions. Mr. Stroupe explained that they were trying to work with Legislators to have the arbitration process changed. Mr. Stroupe said the arbitrations and appeals were costly to the tenants; the thought it would be desirable if the Authority could just assign the same arbitrator to the arbitration hearings. Mr. Stroupe said the tenants had an issue having to pay for the transcript if they wanted to file an appeal, it was getting very expensive. Mr. Crane responded the Authority was sympathetic to the situation; the Authority was not able to assign the same arbitrator to the arbitration, the community owner would have a valid point to object. Mr. Crane stated the Authority selected qualified arbitrators. Mr. Strine thought if the first arbitrator had decided against the tenants and that would be the same arbitrator for each arbitration, the tenants would quickly disagree with the same arbitrator. Mr. Stroupe thought the entire process caused more problems for the tenants. Mr. Crane explained the law was written this way and the Authority had to abide by that law and could not change the process.

**V. Public Comments:** The tenants present were given an opportunity to comment.

**VI. Adjournment:**

Mr. Crane stated he believed this was most likely his last Board Meeting, he had tried to do his best during this tenure. As there was nothing else before the Board, he meeting was adjourned at 2.35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Susanne Lantz  
Executive Director