

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BOARD OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING

Arna Thibeau	)	
Complainant	)	
	)	Docket no. 005-95
v.	)	(on remand from Superior Court)
Theresa Desfosses d/b/a	)	
Hillcrest Estates MHP	)	

Hearing held on October 15, 1999 at Concord, New Hampshire.

**FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW  
AND ORDER**

The Board of Manufactured Housing (“the Board”) makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and issues the following Order in the above-referenced matter.

**PARTIES**

1. Arna Thibeau was at all times relevant to this matter, a lawful tenant of the Hillcrest Estates MHP, a manufactured housing community located in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.
2. Hillcrest Estates MHP (“the park”) is a manufactured housing community located in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.
3. Theresa Desfosses is the owner and operator of Hillcrest Estates MHP. For purposes of clarity, Ms. Desfosses and the park shall be treated in this Order as a unified entity and shall be identified as “Respondent.”
4. Philip Desfosses is Theresa Desfosses’ brother. In addition to serving as counsel for Ms. Desfosses in this matter, Attorney Desfosses also lives in a non-manufactured home at the park and serves as manager for the park.

## **ISSUES PRESENTED**

5. In this matter, Complainant seeks a determination with respect to the following issues:
  - a) Whether Respondent has charged or attempted to charge Complainant Thibeau for an upgrade to the electrical system at the park in violation of RSA 205-A:2, IX; and
  - b) Whether Respondent has failed to provide Complainant Walker with the name, address and telephone number of a manager or agent who resides within 10 miles of the park and otherwise conforms to the requirements of RSA 205-A:2, X.

## **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

7. This matter originally came before the Board for hearing on January 19, 1996. On April 25, 1999, the Board rendered a decision in which it found, inter alia, for the Complainant with respect to both items listed in paragraph 6 above. A Motion for Rehearing having been denied and Appeal to the Superior Court timely taken, the Respondent and the Board stipulated on August 27, 1998 that the case should be remanded to the Board for de novo hearing. A prehearing conference was held on December 7, 1998 for the purpose of narrowing issues, and this matter was scheduled to go forward for evidence and testimony with respect to the two issues listed above.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT AND RULINGS OF LAW**

8. At hearing, all parties stipulated to the facts as found at the original hearing of this matter. Notwithstanding said stipulation, the Board will briefly recite the facts which it deems relevant to its findings, rulings and Order herein. To the extent that there is any inconsistency between facts recited in this Order and facts recited in the 1996 Order, this Order shall control.

**A. Claim Under RSA 205-A:2, IX**

9. Complainant's first substantive claim involves Respondent's assertion that residents are or should be responsible for the costs of installing an upgraded electrical wiring system which runs from their external connection box to their homes by underground conduit.
10. The parties agree that the electrical system servicing the park is owned by the park; and that maintenance of the system -- at least to the external connection box -- has traditionally been understood by all parties to be the responsibility of the Respondent.
11. The parties further agree that, until 1995, in the older section of the park in which Ms. Walker resides, a connection box was placed relatively close to Complainant's unit and electrical wires running between the connection box and the Complainant's unit were aboveground.
12. At all times relevant to this matter, Hillcrest Estates Rules and Regulations Section IV(C) ("Responsibility For Repairs") stated that the "community is responsible only to the fuse box directly below the meter. All electrical cables from your home to this fuse box directly below the meter is (sic) your responsibility."
13. In or about 1995, Respondent undertook to upgrade the electrical system servicing the area in which Complainant resides. In connection with this upgrade, Respondent buried the main electrical wiring, repositioned the connection box onto a pole situated at a considerable distance from the Complainant's home, and installed the connection wiring between the fuse box and the home in underground conduits.
14. Thus, the effect of the upgrade with respect to the Complainant's home was to change an aboveground system with wiring running a short distance from a connection box to the resident's

unit to an underground system in which the underground link between the connection box and the unit extends for a distance of more than twenty feet.

15. The work will involve modifying the connection between the connection box and the Complainant's home includes installation of service breakers at the connection pole, excavation and burial of plastic conduits under the unit owner's lot, and running wires through the conduits to the meter box at the outside of the Complainant's home.
16. Ms Thibeau has submitted, and the Board accepts evidence that the cost of the work to be preformed as listed in paragraph 15 above was \$320.00. *See*, Complainant Exhibit A.
17. RSA 205-A:2, IX forbids a park owner from charging or attempting to charge tenants "for repair or maintenance to any underground system, such as oil tanks, or water, electrical or septic systems, for causes not due to the negligence of the tenant or transfer or attempt to transfer to a current tenant responsibility for such repair or maintenance to the tenant by gift or otherwise of all or part of any such underground system."
18. The question thus posed is whether, by converting the electrical system to an underground configuration, Respondent has created an "underground system" subject to RSA 205-A:2, IX, such that the park may not charge Complainant for its repair or maintenance.
19. The Board answers this initial question affirmatively. The Board finds that RSA 205-A:2, IX, is a statute designed for the protection of tenants and unit owners. Such protection is needed because underground systems are generally beyond the control of tenants, and because their repair and maintenance can be both complex and expensive.
20. Accordingly, the Board finds that the statute's purpose is best served by broadly construing its scope to include any system which, like the reconfigured electrical system in the park, is

substantially positioned underground. The Board further reasons that the plain language of the statute must apply to at least those portions of any such system that do in fact run under the ground.

21. Here, Respondent is attempting to assign to tenants the costs of upgrading the electrical connection between a repositioned connection box and their units. These costs relate directly to the placement of the wiring underground, and are increased both by the placement of the connection poles at a distance from the homes and by the very fact that the wiring now runs underground.
22. The Board believes that it would be contrary to the purpose of the statute to suggest that conversion of an existing above-ground electrical system to an underground system falls outside the scope of the statute. To the contrary, such action constitutes repair or maintenance to a system which is, by virtue of the repair or maintenance, unquestionably an underground system.
23. Respondent may argue, however, that its park rules establish that the tenant's responsibility for costs associated with the electrical system include the portion of the system which runs between the connection box and the home. *Hillcrest Estates Rules and Regulations, Section IV(C)*
24. The Board accepts that this rule may have reasonably apportioned costs associated with the park's electrical system as an above-ground installation -- that is, prior to the 1995 upgrade of the electrical system.
25. However, the rule cannot override the plain language of the statute when the system is converted to an underground configuration. Rather, the system now comes directly within the statutory proscription against charging tenants for repairs to underground systems. RSA 205-A:2, IX.

Accordingly, to the extent that the park rule is now inconsistent with the statute, the statute controls.

26. Therefore, the Board finds that, on the facts presented, Respondent is attempting to charge tenants for the cost of repair or maintenance to an underground system. Such an attempt violates RSA 205-A:2, IX.

**B. Claim Under RSA 205-A:2, X**

27. Ms. Thibeau's further claim arises under RSA 205-A:2, X. That statute prohibits park owners from failing to provide each tenant with the name, address and telephone number of a manager or agent who resides within ten miles of the park if the park owner does not reside within 25 miles of the park.
28. The Board finds that this matter is entirely controlled by its prior ruling in Walker v. Des-Fosses, no. 005-95 and adopts its findings, rulings and Order with respect to that matter herein..

**ORDER**

WHEREFORE, the Board issues the following Order:

A. The park shall bear the cost of all repair and maintenance to the park's electrical system with respect to the Complainant's lot, specifically including any underground wiring running from a connection box to the Complainant's meter box.

B. Ms. Thibeau is and shall be responsible for any and all costs associated with incidental connections to the circuit board panel.

A decision of the Board may be appealed, by either party, by first applying for a rehearing with the Board within twenty (20) business days of the clerk's date below, not the date this decision is received, in accordance with Man 201.27 Decisions and Rehearings. The Board shall grant a rehearing when: (1) there is new evidence not available at the time of the hearing; (2) the Board's decision was unreasonable or unlawful.

**SO ORDERED**

**BOARD OF MANUFACTURED HOUSING**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth R. Nielsen, Esq., Chairman

**Members participating in this action:**

Stephen J. Baker  
Richard R. Greenwood  
Rep. Warren Henderson  
Rep. Robert J. Letourneau  
Kenneth R. Nielsen, Esq.  
Jimmie D. Purselley  
Florence E. Quast  
Sherrie Babich-Strang

**CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the forgoing Order has been mailed this date, postage prepaid, to Arna M. Thibeau, 3203 Lafayette Road Unit 37, Portsmouth, NH 03801 and Philip R. Desfosses, Esq., Solomon & Desfosses, PA, 3201 Lafayette Road, Portsmouth, NH 03820.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Anna Mae Twigg, Clerk  
Board of Manufactured Housing

**BOARD MEMBERS CONCURRENCE**

**Arna Thibeau v. Theresa Desfosses d/b/a Hillcrest MHP  
CASE**

**October 15, 1999  
DATE**

---

STEPHEN J. BAKER

---

RICHARD R. GREENWOOD

---

REP. WARREN HENDERSON

---

REP. ROBERT J. LETOURNEAU.

---

SHERRIE BABICH-STRANG

---

JIMMIE D. PURSELLEY

---

FLO:RENCE E. QUAST

ORDERTHIBEAU.DOC