

# PAC Negotiation Team Meeting with City Staff

## February 18, 2026

City Manager Amy Cunningham (**AC**),  
Asst City Manager Bill Rose (**BR**),  
PAC President John Hansen (**JH**),  
PAC Member Brad Witherspoon (**BW**)  
Serena Fisher note taker, February 18, 2026.

Bill Rose presented us with an agenda: goals, and expectations, and topic areas for discussion:

- A- Affordability, security, and sustainability
- B- Informal updates
- C- Resource [staff time and City money] allocations
- D- Budget
- E- Management and delegation agreements
- F- Communications
- G- Next steps

BR: Opened with setting expectations and the agreement that (A) affordability security, and sustainability our shared goals (SG). These discussions will work towards achieving these goals as we'll drill down deeper into the items.

BW: Some of the residents are upset about the ENA being ended and are concerned that as long as we remain in this relationship with the city, we need to build trust. To this end we seek info to share with the residents.

AC: Said she wants this as a foundation. City is a public agency and MVMCC population is special.

JH: We [MVMCC] are a nonprofit service organization.

BR: The key is how we share the information with the pack residents, the public at large and the [City] council and ways we do this.

(C) Communications are about resource allocation—time and money, so we need to focus on the things that yield the most affordability, security, and sustainability.

(D) Budget discussion.

(E) The city needs to retool the Delegation Agreement so it's more effective. (B, F) communications to maintain transparency with residents and the population at large. In the past it's just been the website.

BR: Expressed the issue that he is a team of 1 so there's no deep bench and things take a lot longer and cost more.

BW: We've shared information with you with regards what residents are looking for, but the words "affordability, security, and sustainability" have been repeated so many times they have lost their meaning; without specifics they're just empty words. This list [reference to

*Issues to Discuss With the city*] shows how the City can help secure and allay residents' fears with regard to affordability, security, and sustainability. The list came from our residence, so let's tie this list into our SG goals.

BR: Agreed, this was a helpful list that we [the City] have seen before.

Everyone agreed that it would be better to work this out without the attorneys because it was cheaper on both sides but some things like the title needed the attorney input

BW: Residents are scared about the potential sale.

AC: City Council explicitly stated they had no intention to sell us [MVMCC]

BW: There are specific measures the city can take to show this is true, like rezoning MVMCC as a Mobile Home Park. This is an important deliverable for the residents.

BR: This is familiar territory as my background is in planned development and custom zoning. We can amend the PD [current zoning is Planned Development] but what do you want to achieve by it?

JH: You'll create a greater sense of security if you zone it Mobile Home Park and it will take time and effort to change it again in future. We'd like to know what the legal, specific reasons are that you can't do it?

BR: The City would have to manage this process so think about the benefit; this action might not result in a greater feeling of security. He [BR] stated he hasn't had time to fully evaluate it, but he thinks their time is better spent pursuing something else.

BW: Karen Tiedemann [Goldfarb & Lipman Attorney] said we should be zoned as a Mobile Home Park. The concern is: Are we granted the protections as a Mobile Home Park by the state if we're not zoned as a Mobile Home Park? California's working on protections for mobile home parks to preserve them. Do we have these protections if we're not zoned as a mobile Home Park?

BR: PD calls out there are mobile homes on the MVMCC property.

BW: So why are we not listed in the city as a Mobile Home Park?

BR: This requires a major effort to get rezoning. If the PD calls out mobile homes as a use, we may have protections. It has to be reevaluated against the resources available. If the ultimate goal is for a community security, is rezoning the right and only way to do it. There might be other ways.

BW: If California moves through with protections for mobile home parks, we need to know MVMCC will be covered by these protections and any other current or pending legislation.

BR: And the MVMCC attorney will have to review this if we think rezoning, is the right way. Our attorney has to advocate for this.

BW: Our attorney can write this up, but your city attorney will have to agree to it. We will have to pay for the city attorney who is going to decide, so let's just go straight to the city attorney.

BW: The next item is the legal budget. We feel we should have a budget [line item on MVMCC Operational Budget] to pay for an attorney to review the PAC's contracts with the city. We

pay for the city attorney. We're not attorneys. So why should we pay out of our own pockets to have an attorney review contracts the City wants us to sign?

JH: Same as with the delegation agreement.

BR: Where would the legal budget come from?

BW: We do a budget every year and there's a budget line for legal.

BR: What is the purpose?

BW: It's a PAC budget for legal. How do you think it should be used?

AC: The legal budget is for tenant related issues. The legal fund supports questionable issues. Housing needs legal support for certain things.

BW: We want to expand how we can use it. For example, if the city gives us a Delegation Agreement which is a legal document, likely reviewed by the City Attorney, how can we be required to sign it without an attorney reviewing it? We're not lawyers. The City has legal expertise, and we have to pass the hat in order to sign a legal document ~~with~~ legal representation. So, since the operating budget comes out of our rents, we should be able to hire an attorney who will look out for the residents' interests to work through the contracts with the city. We can stipulate this money is for contractual review and cannot be used for suing the city to get ownership of the park.

AC: How do other mobile home parks operate?

No one knows.

BR: It seems much of the Management and Delegation Agreements are bilateral agreements therefore appropriate to have each party have representation, the same with the rezoning issue. It seems that all roads lead to Management and the Delegation Agreement. Each party should have its own representation.

BW: You say "partnership", but we have even less resources than the city and we have to collect the dollars by passing the hat.

AC: These are public funds.

BW: The city's attorney represents the city's interests.

AC: City council's interests.

BW: They aren't here to represent the [MV] residents. The City has a budget for an attorney, but we don't. And if we need an attorney to represent the residents' side on issues, the residents shouldn't have to pay out of pocket.

AC: We cannot use city money for that.

BR: I see a higher purpose here. Understanding of the agreement may change. There are other ways to do things. We can't recommend with a straight face that the City Council agree to spend dollars for rezoning MVMCC as mobile home park. Also, is this the best use of our resources during these meetings when we have other items on the agenda to discuss?

BW: You constantly say that we're wasting time when we want to discuss specific items. The same phrase used during our negotiations to purchase the park. If there's a legal reason why we can't do something we want to know why. Is it because there's a legal reason or because you don't want to? All we're asking is for the reason why a decision is made. We treat the residents as adults not as children. So, if you say no we're not going to discuss this, we want

to know why. I try to represent both sides. I listened to both sides and try to understand so if there's a reason for something that it's not possible then let's discuss the reason for it.

BR: I agree, it comes back to allocation of resources. I might suggest 100% that we will consider everything. I can give you basic feedback. It's challenging and expensive to rezone. I suggest you itemize the top three to five items on your list so we can work on these in order to make meaningful action and progress. I don't see us doing all of this. I have a new staff member coming on in one to two months.

BW: These are our priorities. Since you know what the City can or cannot do, it's up to the city to go through the list and tell us what you can work on.

JH: To get to our objectives we've specified what will it take to meet our requests for our SG. If you don't have resources, then to meet these resources city needs to allocate more.

AC: Are these eight the only things that will satisfy these SG goals?

JH: These eight will get us a greater good will with residents.

BW: This list is what residents want. We don't know what's easy to do.

BR Let's start with these eight.

AC: Are there other things we should consider?

BW: The agenda you put together is general. What residents want to see is specifics to address affordability, security, and sustainability, so these eight are the top list. If City has other ideas, so-bring it on! We want something concrete so we can go back to residents and state this is how it addresses our SG.

AC: Which of the three is most important?

BW: "Security"- Everything that keeps the park in the city's hands and reinforces the City's claim of its intention not to sale the park to a for-profit corporation. To be very helpful, we need things to provide security.

BW. One last thing before we end this meeting. The Finance Committee is doing a deep dive of MVMCC's financials. We've gone back over 11 years of the 6/30 fiscal year end financials we received from Helsing and there's some things that are missing.

AC: We're well aware of this.

BW: We went to the city's finance website to compare its reporting of MVMCC's finances in the consolidated statements and found investment income being reported every year. However, on the financials the PAC has received investment income is missing for five of the past 11 years. No wonder residents think the city is stealing our money. We need to see the whole picture.

AC. Helsing is required to do accounting on the accrual basis based on government guidelines. We've struggled to get this from Helsing. It would help make city's finance team's work so much easier, but Helsing is not doing it according to government accounting standards.

BW: We want the final year end June 30th statements for the past 11 years going back to June 30, 2015.

AC: All the audits are online.

BW: But only the top line, no detail. The report from Helsing has detail.

AC: We will see what they have.

JH: We need to know the real numbers.

AC: Agree! OK!

BR: Next steps:

Public works does capital improvements and there'll be a new hire joining the team.

BR: I am in charge of city buildings. A principal management person is starting next month and will work closely with BR as his right-hand man. Glad to work on budget. I do think there are other things better that we can do now, and in the future to help with higher sense of security.

1: Budget

2: Itemize our list and get some internal input

3: The communications development director will weigh in on the rezoning.

There might be something in the zoning area, for example, that might be best to put a mobile home overlay or straight zoning. We are not on the master plan and we [MVMCC] are a mobile homes. The clubhouse is on the master plan maybe lots of ways to do it.

BW: We found copies of the original documents from the Delegation Agreement workshop put on by the NFA in 1998, that outlined the responsibilities of the park management and PAC. When the City revised the Delegation Agreement in 2013, they took away most to the PAC's responsibilities. The city has a lot on its plate and can't manage it now.

BR: The desire is for people to feel secure and supported. No one likes a bunch of residents coming to City Hall unhappy. Progress is very important even if it's small, so let's get some wins in.

JH: Yes, we need wins for residents.

BR: If we can do two or three, the delegation agreement is very important. That will give us a win. The 2013 delegation agreement is old. I see the very specific concerns on part of the residents. The city says nothing to worry about, we are not planning to sell MVMCC, so I see need for residents to have tangible (proof).

JH: The demographic has been changing in the park as the retirees are now more master-class retired professionals, whereas the City hires more apprentice and some journeyman-class employees. We have more capacity to do the budget and make wise decisions than we did in the past.

BR: I worked for the city of Palo Alto. It was a joke among staff that residents could evaluate any of the documents better than city staff.

BW: To John's point about city having very limited resources, how can help make it easier for the city? We want a lot of things in the original delegation agreement; more decision-making capacity. Serena did a comparison of the [original and 2013] Delegation Agreements, and we have lost a lot of the management oversight. We live in the park and see what's going on and we should be the center of the information regarding the insurance. MVMCC is a massive entity.

BR: There has to be a better, simpler way to manage this.

JH: yes, first principles.

BR: I hope we can pivot to a point where everyone gets what they want, and we work well together and can take a victory lap.

BR: Based on what I know right now, but I am also aware that once I get more information it can change.

---

Bill said the next meeting will be in a month or so, when the new hire – his right-hand assistant comes on board. He is also covering Public Works manager until a new hire comes on board in a month or so. Clearly over extended.

---

---

AI Summary of the written notes:

Got it — thank you. I'll give you a **clean, structured summary of the key messages**, using **only the initials provided**, and I'll **clearly distinguish the City's positions, agreements, and opposition** to the requests raised by **JH** and **BW**. This is written so it can stand alone as an internal record or be shared upward if needed.

## **Negotiation Team Meeting – Key Messages Summary**

---

**Date:** February 18, 2026

**Note taker:** Serena Fisher

### **Participants:**

- **AC** – Assistant City Manager
- **BR** – City Staff / Lead Negotiator
- **JH** – PAC President
- **BW** – PAC Member

---

## **1. Shared Goals (Affordability, Security, Sustainability – “A, S, S”)**

- **BR** opened by stating that **SG are shared goals** between the City and PAC.
- **BR** emphasized that discussions would focus on **practical implementation**, not abstract agreement.
- **AC** reinforced that MVMCC is a **public asset serving a special population**, and that trust and stability matter.

**City position:**

✓ Agreement on shared goals

⚠ Emphasis on **resource limits and prioritization**

---

## 2. Trust, Communication, and Transparency

- **BW** stated residents are **upset and fearful**, particularly after the ENA ended, and that **trust must be rebuilt**.
- **JH** emphasized PAC is a **nonprofit service organization** trying to relay accurate information to residents.
- **BR** acknowledged communication failures and said transparency must improve, but noted communication requires **staff time and funding**.
- **BR** stated the City has relied too heavily on a **website-only approach**.
- **BR** emphasized he is effectively a **team of one**, limiting responsiveness.

**City position:**

✓ Acknowledges communication problems

✓ Agrees transparency is needed

⚠ States capacity constraints limit speed and scope

---

## 3. Resident Fear of Sale & Rezoning Request

- **BW** stated residents are **afraid of a potential sale**.
- **AC** stated **City Council has explicitly said it has no intention to sell MVMCC**.
- **BW** requested **rezoning MVMCC as a Mobile Home Park** as tangible proof of non-sale and long-term protection.
- **BR** acknowledged rezoning is “familiar territory” but questioned **what concrete benefit it would achieve**.
- **JH** stated rezoning would create **meaningful security** and make future changes harder.
- **BW** cited **Karen Tiedemann’s position** that MVMCC should be zoned as a mobile home park.
- **BW** questioned whether MVMCC receives **state mobile home park protections** if not zoned as such.

- **BR** stated rezoning would be **time-consuming, expensive**, and staff-intensive, and said he had **not fully evaluated it**.
- **BR** stated the City is **not prepared to recommend rezoning** to City Council at this time.
- **BR** suggested there *may be other ways* to achieve security without rezoning.
- **BR** stated City attorneys would need to evaluate rezoning and advocate for it.

**City position:**

- ✗ Does **not agree** to rezoning at this time
  - ✓ Acknowledges concern
  - ⚠ Requests justification, alternatives, and prioritization
  - ⚠ Cites resource and cost barriers
- 

#### **4. Legal Representation & Legal Budget (Major Point of Opposition)**

- **BW** and **JH** requested use of the **PAC legal budget** to retain independent counsel to review City contracts (e.g., Delegation Agreement).
- **BW** emphasized residents should not have to “pass the hat” to review legal documents drafted by the City.
- **AC** stated the **legal budget is intended for tenant-related issues**, not contract negotiations with the City.
- **BR** acknowledged that **bilateral agreements normally require representation on both sides**, but did not commit City funds.
- **BW** stressed the City’s attorney represents **City Council interests**, not residents.
- **AC** emphasized these are **public funds** and questioned expanding their use. [public funds refers to the City’s position that MVMCC accounts are “city funds,” as opposed to the PAC’s position that MVMCC is an Enterprise Fund and that the MVMCC accounts are assets of the Enterprise Fund, not the City.]
- **BR** stated the City **cannot recommend** City Council fund rezoning or expanded legal review without strong justification.

**City position:**

- ✗ Opposes expanding PAC legal budget for contract review
  - ✗ Will not commit City funds for PAC legal counsel
  - ✓ Acknowledges fairness concerns in theory
  - ⚠ Maintains public-fund limitations
- 

#### **5. Requests for Clear “Yes / No” with Reasons**

- **BW** repeatedly asked that when the City says “no,” it must explain **whether the reason is legal, financial, or discretionary**.
- **BW** stated residents should be treated as **adults**, not shielded from reasons.
- **BR** agreed in principle and stated he would try to provide **basic feedback**, but reiterated **resource constraints**.
- **BR** requested PAC **prioritize 3–5 top items** instead of pursuing all requests simultaneously.

**City position:**

- ✓ Agrees to clearer explanations
  - ⚠ Requires prioritization
  - ⚠ Will not commit to addressing all requests
- 

**6. PAC’s List of Eight Resident Priorities**

- **BW** stated the list came directly from residents and represents **what residents need to feel secure**.
- **JH** stated the eight items would build **goodwill** and help meet shared goals.
- **AC** questioned whether the eight items were the **only way** to meet those goals.
- **BW** stated residents want **specific actions**, not general assurances.
- **BR** agreed to **start with the eight items**, but made no commitment to all.

**City position:**

- ✓ Will review the list
  - ✓ Open to partial progress
  - ✗ No commitment to full adoption
- 

**7. Financial Transparency & Missing Records**

- **BW** raised concerns about **missing Finance Committee records** and resident suspicion that money is being mishandled.
- **AC** acknowledged awareness of missing or incomplete information.
- **BW** requested **detailed year-end financials**, including interest income.
- **AC** stated audits are posted but acknowledged **detail may be lacking**.
- **AC** blamed accounting difficulties on **Helsing not using accrual-based accounting**.
- **AC** agreed more detailed numbers are needed.

**City position:**

- ✓ Acknowledges financial transparency problems

- ✓ Agrees more detail is needed
  - ⚠ Does not yet commit to specific deliverables
- 

## 8. Delegation Agreement & Management

- **BR** stated the **2013 Delegation Agreement is outdated** and a major opportunity for improvement.
- **JH** and **BW** emphasized PAC has **lost oversight authority** over time.
- **BR** agreed there must be a **simpler, more effective structure**.
- **BR** identified the Delegation Agreement as a **potential early “win.”**

### City position:

- ✓ Agrees Delegation Agreement needs revision
  - ✓ Sees this as a priority area
  - ✓ Open to progress here
- 

## 9. Next Steps (City Commitments)

- **BR** stated:
    - PAC should **itemize and prioritize** its list
    - City staff will seek **internal input**
    - Communications Development Director will weigh in on zoning options
    - New staff hires may improve capacity
  - **BR** emphasized importance of **small, visible wins**.
  - **JH** and **BW** agreed wins are critical to restore resident confidence.
- 

## 10. Overall City Stance (Clear Summary)

### City AGREES:

- Affordability, Security, and Sustainability are shared goals (SG)
- Communication and transparency must improve
- Delegation Agreement needs updating
- Residents need tangible progress

### City OPPOSES or DECLINES (at this time):

- Rezoning MVMCC as a Mobile Home Park

- Funding PAC legal counsel through City-controlled funds
- Committing resources without PAC prioritization

### **City CONDITIONS:**

- Progress depends on staff capacity
  - PAC must narrow and prioritize requests
  - Legal and financial constraints will govern decisions
- 

If you want, next I can:

- tighten this into a **2-page formal memo**
- extract **only City “No” positions** for advocacy
- map PAC requests vs City responses in a **one-page matrix**
- draft a **resident-facing summary** that is accurate but calm

Just tell me the next format you need.

AI Resident Update:

Absolutely. Below is a **resident-facing summary** written to be **accurate, calm, and steady**, avoiding jargon and blame, while clearly reflecting what was discussed and where things stand. It is suitable to share directly with residents.

---

## **Update for Marin Valley Residents**

### **Summary of Meeting with City Staff – February 18, 2026**

Representatives from PAC met with City staff to discuss residents’ concerns and next steps related to **affordability, security, and long-term sustainability** of Marin Valley.

The City acknowledged that residents are anxious and want **clear, concrete actions**, not just assurances. The discussion focused on how to move forward in a practical way, given limited City staffing and resources.

Below is a plain-language summary of what was discussed.

---

## **Shared Understanding**

- The City stated that **affordability, security, and sustainability** are shared goals.
  - The City said **City Council has no intention of selling Marin Valley**.
  - The City acknowledged that **trust has been strained** and that communication has not been sufficient.
  - Everyone agreed residents need **tangible progress**, not just words.
- 

## Residents' Key Concerns Raised

PAC representatives shared that residents are worried about:

- The **possibility of a future sale**
- Whether the park is **fully protected under state mobile home laws**
- Lack of **clear financial information**
- Signing legal agreements **without independent legal review**
- Feeling that decisions are made **without clear explanations**

PAC presented a list of **specific actions residents want** to help restore confidence and security.

---

## Rezoning the Park as a Mobile Home Park

- Residents asked the City to rezone Marin Valley as a **Mobile Home Park** to provide stronger, long-term protection.
- The City said rezoning would be **complex, costly, and time-consuming**, and that staff has not completed a full legal evaluation.
- The City did **not agree to rezoning at this time**, but said it would look at whether there are **other ways to provide protections**.

### What this means:

Rezoning is **not off the table forever**, but the City is **not prepared to pursue it now** and wants to focus on other steps first.

---

## Legal Review of City Agreements

- PAC requested the ability to use park funds to hire an attorney to review City agreements (such as the Delegation Agreement).
- The City said the current legal budget is intended for **tenant-related matters**, not contract negotiations with the City.

- The City did **not agree** to expanding the legal budget for this purpose.

**What this means:**

The City understands the concern but does **not currently support using park funds** to hire legal counsel for reviewing City contracts.

---

**Financial Transparency**

- PAC raised concerns about **missing or incomplete financial records** and confusion about interest income and balances.
- The City acknowledged these concerns and agreed that **more detailed financial information is needed**.
- The City said accounting issues have been complicated by how reports have been prepared in the past.

**What this means:**

The City agrees residents need clearer financial information and said it would look into what more can be provided.

---

**Delegation Agreement (How the Park Is Managed)**

- The City acknowledged that the **current Delegation Agreement is outdated**.
- City staff said updating this agreement could be one of the **most productive near-term steps**.
- Everyone agreed this could be an opportunity for a **real, visible improvement**.

**What this means:**

This is an area where **progress is likely**, and it may result in clearer roles and better oversight.

---

**Next Steps**

- The City asked PAC to **prioritize the top 3–5 resident requests** so staff can focus resources effectively.
- City staff will review those priorities internally.
- The City emphasized the importance of achieving **small but meaningful wins** that residents can see.

- PAC emphasized the need to bring **specific updates back to residents**, even if the answer is “not yet.”
- 

### **Bottom Line**

- The City says it is **not planning to sell the park**.
- The City agrees trust needs to be rebuilt through **clear actions and better communication**.
- Some resident requests were **not agreed to at this time**, mainly due to cost, staffing, or legal concerns.
- Updating the **Delegation Agreement** and improving **financial transparency** appear to be the most promising near-term areas for progress.

PAC will continue to push for **clear answers, written explanations, and concrete steps**, and will share updates as soon as they are available.

---

If you want, I can also:

- shorten this to a **one-page handout**
- adapt it for a **newsletter or website**
- create a **Q&A version** anticipating resident questions
- add a **“What we’re still asking for”** section

Just tell me the next format you need.