

**Marin Valley Mobile Country Club  
Resident Update  
December 20, 2025**

**RESPONSE TO CITY**

Here is the PAC Board's letter sent to the City of Novato on December 17:

Bill Rose  
Assistant City Manager  
City of Novato  
922 Machin Avenue  
Novato, CA 94945

*Transmittal via email from:*  
Park Acquisition Corporation  
(PAC)  
Marin Valley Mobile Country Club  
100 Marin Valley Drive  
Novato, CA 94949

Re: Response to December 11 Public Notice

Bill,

As always, on behalf of the PAC Board and the residents of MVMCC, I would like to once again express our appreciation for all your hard work in coordinating these in-person negotiations. Although the current negotiation process has not yielded the desired results as hoped for by most of the residents at MVMCC, we look forward to working with the City on the next phase of building a collaborative relationship.

As we wind down the negotiations for residents to purchase the park from the City, I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the statements contained in the City's December 11<sup>th</sup> notice "Exclusive Negotiating Agreement between City of Novato and MVMCC Residents Concludes."

First however, I wish to express the PAC's disappointment with the City's posting its official response regarding ending the Exclusive Negotiating Agreement on its website before sending a formal response to the PAC and MVMCC residents. As you can imagine we were besieged with calls and emails from residents who were upset, wanting to know what transpired. Only recently, we had a discussion with residents regarding the City's request for a

formal vote and our attorney's efforts to finalize the ballot language. This vote would reaffirm their commitment to self-ownership. However, the City's quick posting of the notice did not allow the PAC sufficient time to prepare a resident update.

We were also disappointed with some of the City's statements on the overall negotiation process as well as some of the misleading characterizations of the proposal submitted by the PAC. In particular, we would like to correct the following three statements from your December 11<sup>th</sup> Public Notice:

**“Throughout the process, both sides worked in good faith to evaluate options, identify areas of agreement, and understand the financial realities of resident ownership.”**

Without intentionally impugning the motivations of the City, there seemed to be very little evidence of - evaluating, identifying or understanding during our in-person meetings. For example, when we expressed our disagreement with some of items contained in the “Agreed Upon Facts” sheet handed out at the first meeting, there was little to no discussion as to what we disputed and why. Our submission of a revised fact sheet with detailed footnotes and supporting documentation prior to the second meeting was met with “we agree to disagree”. The same goes for the City's response to our initial request for a neutral third-party review of our respective appraisals, which it described as a “waste of time” followed by “the City stands by its appraisal”.

On behalf of the PAC finance committee, I take particular exception with the line “understand the financial realities of resident ownership”. The finance committee members have over 100 years of combined financial and accounting experience in diverse fields, including government and compliance. Our initial proposal contained **detailed 10-year operating, capital improvement and cashflow budgets**. The budget models were carefully crafted to align with the City's current general ledger used by the Helsing Group and thoroughly reviewed by Randy Keller with the California Center for Cooperative Development (CCCD), as a requirement to qualify for a loan and grant funding. If the financial information submitted by PAC reflected a lack of understanding of the realities of resident ownership, at no time during the negotiations did the City point to specific examples so that we could address their concerns, or benefit from their expertise.

**“During the ENA period, it became clear that the PAC does not have the financial capacity to purchase the property without compromising the affordability of the park for current and future residents. The PAC submitted**

**several purchase offers to the City throughout the negotiation process and each of them relied upon cost increases to the residents.”**

**This is a misleading statement-** The PAC’s initial offer of \$20 million involved a direct-sale installment financing plan similar to a lease to buy- paying the City \$500k annually. Under that financing arrangement, the 10-year annual resident rent/fee increase was projected at 2.5%- similar to the annual increases allowed under the City’s rent control protections. However, the City rejected that offer and mandated the PAC to arrange for a bank-financed loan even though it would result in substantial monthly fee increases for residents who joined the co-op as co-owners of the Park.

**“Their offers also required limited reserves which could result in additional direct costs to the residents, including but not limited to the potential for further increases through assessments, to fund future capital improvement or emergency projects.”**

**This is a misleading statement-** In the initial \$20 million proposal the PAC included a 10-year cashflow projection that showed an anticipated reserve balance of \$5.1 million. That’s over \$240,000 more than the total \$4.9 million in MVMCC reserves currently held by the City after nearly 28 years of financial oversight. In addition, the PAC’s 10-year Operating Budget included over \$1.15 million in contingency funds, as well as \$1.7 million in funding for tree maintenance and wildfire mitigation, which had been drastically reduced in the City’s final operating budget over the past few years. The PAC’s proposal also included a detailed 10-year Capital Improvement Budget of \$8.3 million which addressed among other issues, the clubhouse’s long-neglected ADA deficiencies. The PAC’S 10-year operating budget also restored funding of \$135,000 for the Park’s Humanitarian Fund, a one-time assistance program for residents that was defunded by the City.

By addressing these statements, we aim to clarify the PAC’s position and ensure that residents have a clear understanding of the negotiation process and the proposals submitted on their behalf.

The notice concludes with the City restating its “commitment to open communication, and continued collaboration with the PAC and all MVMCC residents to ensure the long-term affordability, security and sustainability of the park”. To that end, the PAC would like to propose two immediate actions the City can undertake as we enter this next phase of negotiations:

1. We propose amending the existing Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) by extending its term for an additional six months and revising the scope of work. During this extended period, both parties—the PAC and the City—would dedicate their efforts to updating the delegation agreement and collaboratively establishing robust safeguards aimed at preserving MVMCC

as an affordable housing community for seniors. Furthermore, as part of this extension, the City would formally agree not to consider or accept any unsolicited offers to purchase the park throughout these ongoing negotiations. This approach would provide the necessary time and stability for thoughtful, resident-focused planning and ensure that the best interests of MVMCC seniors remain the priority.

2. Review MVMCC's current P-D (Planned Development) zoning designation and make any necessary changes to rezone the property to limit it uses solely to mobile home park use. In addition to evaluating the existing zoning, the City should consider adopting supplemental local ordinances that reinforce tenant rights, limit potential redevelopment, and expressly safeguard the park's status as a mobile home community for seniors. These changes could include measures such as prohibiting conversion to other uses without resident approval, strengthening rent control provisions, and ensuring that any future amendments to the zoning or related ordinances are subject to a public hearing process with direct resident input. By proactively updating these legal frameworks, the City would provide MVMCC residents with long-term security, stability, and protection beyond the baseline offered by state law.

We trust that these recommendations will help guide the City Council in determining the kinds of commitments they are prepared to offer Park residents in lieu of transferring ownership of the Park to the residents. Thank you once again for your thoughtful review. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Respectfully,

Brad Witherspoon,  
PAC Board Member

CC: Novato City Council  
Amy Cunningham, City Manager  
Gary Bell, City Attorney  
Karen Tiedemann, PAC Attorney  
PAC Board