

Tourism, Resorts, & Economic Development

Mobile Home Park Purchase Regulations	
Pitkin County	
Preferred Contact:	Ted Mahon, Pitkin County, ted.mahon@pitkincounty.com
Co-Sponsoring Counties/Commissioners:	TBD
Who is your subject matter expert?	Levi Borst, Management Analyst, Pitkin County, 970.309.2330, levi.borst@pitkincounty.com"
Has this proposal been approved by your BoCC?	Yes
Have you reviewed the CCI Instructional Memo?	Yes
Describe the problem your proposal will solve.	Extend purchase timelines to 180 days for residents of mobile home parks to organize and purchase the land. Align mobile home purchase timelines with DOLA/state funding timelines. Add 'Boards and Councils' to notification requirements.
Areas of Impact:	General community advancement
What is the ultimate source of this problem?	1) Short timelines in statute don't allow for the necessary organization of mobile home park residents to complete all the necessary steps to purchase the land. 2) Some mobile home park sales have gone unnoticed as current requirements only require notifying the clerk. 3) Current timelines don't align well with DOLA funding timelines - making alignment of sourcing funds difficult.
What is your initial proposal to solve this problem?	Make adjustments to CRS 38-12-217 to make timeline adjustments regarding sales, as well as adding Boards and Councils to notification requirements.
Please provide sample language for this solution.	TBD
Are there any solutions that do not require state-level legislation? Has your county explored these alternatives?	No.
Has CCI or any other organizations sought a	Adjustments to CRS have been granted in the past without much objection, however we are seeing that further adjustments are necessary.

solution to this problem before?	
What possible organization(s) would support your proposed solution?	Local governments, housing advocates, non-profit and equity advocates.
What possible organization(s) would oppose your proposed solution?	Unknown, perhaps relators and housing investment companies.
Have you spoken with any legislators about your proposed solution? If so, what was their response?	Not yet.
What are the financial implications of this problem to your county? Are there any financial implications to this solution either?	The largest cost is the loss of lower cost housing; and subsequent cost to replace this housing. Preservation is often the most affordable means of securing lower-cost attainable housing. There are no direct cost implications to the county.
What are the financial implications of this problem to any other impacted parties? What are the financial implications of this solution to any other impacted parties? <i>Please consider any relevant Colorado State Departments.</i>	Impacts are far reaching. Specifically locals struggling with housing costs. Affordability ultimately affects everybody from businesses to residents and visitors alike. It impacts commuting issues and transit, as well as infrastructure and environmental concerns.
Staff Feedback	<u>Risk/Difficulties:</u> <u>Time Commitment:</u>