

From: Scott Meardon <SMeardon@communitygroup.com>
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2011 10:26 AM
To: !FHFA REG-COMMENTS
Cc: Scott Meardon; government@caionline.org
Subject: FHFA Proposed Rule on Certain Private Transfer Fee Covenants,
(RIN) 2590-AA41

April 11, 2011

The Honorable Alfred M. Pollard
General Counsel
Federal Housing Finance Administration
Fourth Floor
1700 G Street, NW
Washington, DC 20552

RE: Proposed Rule on Private Transfer Fee Covenants, (RIN) 2590-AA41

Dear Mr. Pollard:

I am writing to express my support for the Federal Housing Finance Agency's actions to stop investors from charging fees every time houses are sold in planned communities. These fees do not help our properties and do not help our communities. FHFA is right to prohibit this type of fee.

I am also pleased that FHFA understands that community associations use transfer fees and that these fees help lower the monthly association assessments and make sure our 300+ communities, representing 50,000+ homes, is properly managed and maintained. Associations have used transfer fees for decades. Community transfer fees are an important way that residents have decided to fund the services they provide their association members.

It is important for FHFA to understand that residents make up the associations that govern our communities. They hold elections for their association boards and vote on budgets and major decisions that affect their homes and community. This self-government is important to residents and we take pride that they can participate in deciding how their association is operated.

While I am pleased with many of the changes made by FHFA to its proposed guidance, there are provisions in the revised draft that are cause for concern. First, I am concerned that FHFA, by limiting the use of community transfer fee funds solely for maintenance and improvements, is taking away the elected board's authority to make operational decisions on how best to spend this money in support of their community. Community associations use these fees for maintenance, support, operations and the provisions of amenities. All these functions directly benefit and support the property upon which the fee is charged. FHFA attempts to do too much in its rule banning investor transfer fees by telling associations that those revenues can only be used for some direct-benefit purposes and not for others.

Another concern is that the draft requires that the associations allow non-residents use of the common areas and that we must charge a fee for this access. The associations may want to charge a fee for the use of their facilities, but this is their decision. Just because the community may vote for a new a transfer fee doesn't mean they give up their right to

decide how their common property is used or if and when they allow non-residents access to it.

Finally, FHFA's decision that a community can't vote to have a community transfer fee support property that is more than 1,000 yards from the main property line does not make sense. This limitation would be especially troublesome for larger communities that may consist of a master association and many smaller sub-associations. If an association owns property, they should be able to maintain, manage, and improve it with association funds. The physical location should not be relevant.

I understand that FHFA wants to protect homeowners and purchasers from unethical and undisclosed fees. That is a goal I firmly support. FHFA is doing a good thing banning fees that are paid to people with no connection to a property every time that property is sold and this makes sense. By going farther than this, FHFA is not helping.

Most States require all fees paid to an association be disclosed to a purchaser prior to closing. This is a best practice that is adopted across most of the country. If FHFA is concerned that people don't know about the fees that are paid to associations, then perhaps FHFA could consider adopting this State disclosure system.

Many States have passed laws to prohibit investor transfer fees while leaving in place fees that are reinvested in communities through their associations. FHFA should follow the States' lead and go after the problem—investor transfer fees. There is no justification to change how associations use transfer fees and FHFA will only cause problems by trying to tell residents how to manage their communities.

Sincerely,

Scott Meardon, CMCA, PCAM
President & CEO
CommunityGroup, AAMC
An Associa Company
3901 Westerre Pkwy, Ste 100
Richmond, VA 23233
(804) 727-3560
Fax: (804) 727-3653
www.communitygroup.com

Associa - The Leader in Community Association Management

Notice: This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Please virus check all attachments to prevent widespread contamination and corruption of files and operating systems. The unauthorized access, use, disclosure, or distribution of this email may constitute a violation of the Federal Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986 and similar state laws.

This communication does not reflect an intention by the sender or the sender's client or principal to conduct a transaction or make any agreement by electronic means. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements

for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature under the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, any version of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act or any other statute governing electronic transactions