

Mark Brice Chakwin

Candidate for: Pacific Grove City Council

Email: mchakwin@outlook.com

Occupation: Retired U.S. Army Officer

Years in the Area: 30

Education: MIA, MBA, & "abd" on an incomplete PhD in Public Policy and Administration

HOUSING POLICY

What is your position on affordable housing? Please be specific with regards to policies you support or oppose

I like affordable housing. Housing requires a "whole solution" approach: a) putting people in housing, b) keeping people in housing; and c) ensuring a sufficient housing stock. City of PG (CPG) can be an enabler for a. doing more by designating a staff POC part of City website as a clearing house of information about federal, state and regional programs to assist new/low-income buyers or renters get into housing. For part b. CPG already has a small but good program to help low-income home owners repair /maintain their houses very inexpensively. Other government and NGO/Charity programs to support utilities, deposits and other costs exist -but need more exposure and city support. CPG does not build housing, but regulates housing development. By identifying zones that can be adjusted for increased density, promoting dual-use in commercial areas, and enacting policies to allow adoption of single-to-multiple unit housing -with careful review, the city can push forward on a scale appropriate for the size and already-built out conditions in Pacific Grove.

Do you support modifying city policies or regulations to make it easier and cheaper to build housing? If so, what specific policy changes do you support?

Yes, but not without careful public and city government (including planning commission, ARB, HRC, and City Council review). ADUs are an example of a success story in our town. Before ADUs were state sanctioned and promoted, CPG already had started to adjust its "granny unit" rules to recognize their legality, and to regularize them in terms of safety code and integration into the body of city housing. Policies that limit public review of housing projects should never be adopted for commercial property development or commercial housing developments. These large and high-impact initiatives will be disastrous without combining the voice of the people with the recommendations of expert staff. When I read "easier and cheaper" I see "less safe" and "lower quality" and I will not accept "easier and cheaper without careful critical review of the value, quality, and safety of any such initiatives.

Do you support requiring that "inclusionary housing" units be made permanently affordable, even upon resale? If not, please explain.

Yes. City of Pacific Grove already has promoted several infill /rehabilitation projects that have included size or discount bonuses for adding/including inclusionary elements. The Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH), has done several studies

on inclusionary housing which shows both the benefits and some techniques that cities - of all scales, could use to promote this trend in making housing more affordable. CPG already has certain properties which have deed conditions that ensure they will remain available to the low-mid income groups even if sold to new owners. A “one-time” inclusionary sale is counterproductive by inviting buyers to game the sales system and by removing a low cost unit from the inventory in an unplanned unpredictable manner.

Do you support requiring developers of hospitality, commercial and industrial projects that significantly increase demand for already scarce housing resources to pay housing impact fees to finance workforce housing or to build such housing themselves?

Yes, but with qualifications. The Mitigation Fee Act (Gov’t Code §§ 66000 – 66025), provide a course of action for cities -even small cities like Pacific Grove to reduce the impact of large projects coming in and potentially disrupting the resources of our community. It is good mechanism that should be used. However some studies [Cf. Raetz, Garcia, Decker, Kneebone, Reid, & Galante, (2019)] suggest that the utility of mitigation fees can be reduced or can be counter-productive and inhibit development in certain cases. Recommendations to ensure greater fee transparency and rethinking the structure of fee rates may mitigate these downsides.

How should local governments finance affordable housing?

Small cities are limited in their ability to finance affordable housing. Cities like Pacific Grove can’t afford to build or finance affordable housing. Nor can they take on the debt required to do so. They can offer (smaller) incentives to investors, contractors, and builders including, fee reductions, partial tax and zoning deferments, variances and certain licensing privileges. There are not many other long-term measures. Moreover, small cities like PG also can’t sustain significant direct consumer/resident funds disbursements supporting rent supplementals or deposit offsets that can make housing affordable if used.

Throughout Monterey County, local governments have approved ~21,000 single family homes that haven’t been built, and another ~13,000 are proposed. The median home price in Monterey County is ~\$850,000. Do you support adding more single family homes to the unbuilt pipeline or zoning for more affordable apartments, condominiums, and townhouses?

Pacific Grove is a built-out city. One can count on two hands the number of open lots that can be identified for any type housing. In-fill /rebuilding of current housing stock is the major housing activity in PG. If single family houses want to be (and they are) being rebuilt as bigger single family homes on the same lot -that is literally a trend in our town. I support that up to the point where “mansionization” takes over and huge boxes that stretch setback-to-setback are placed where sensible sized houses were before. PG also has hundreds of apartment buildings, many condominiums and several townhouse

complexes. I support enhancing all of those multi-unit dwellings with sensible upsizing -similar to the single family house that adds a dormer or even a story in rebuild

What other housing policies do you support or oppose?

In Pacific Grove I support repealing the condominium, planned unit development and timeshare code (CPG Ch 23.45) that was passed in a public referendum in 1982. At that time there was a push to limit any multiple unit/high-density projects. This code is obsolete and has interfered with normal density as well as high density development in our town. At a minimum it needs to be revised better to replace it. This action will take a public vote, since this section was approved by public referendum in the past.

WATER POLICY

What specific proposals do you support to ensure your community can meet its water demands without increasing the overdraft of the County's groundwater aquifers or violating the SWRCB's Cease and Desist Order regarding taking water from the Carmel River?

Pure Water Monterey (PWM) is a great short term solution to our water situation. According the MPWMD (6/15/20 letter to the California Coastal Commission) "PWM expansion is more than sufficient to lift the CDO. Based on pumping/ demand history, only approximately 800 acre-feet per year (afy) of new supply is required to do so. PWM expansion is more than sufficient." BoD MPWMD.6/15/20 Ltr to CCC). However, in the long term, my grand children will need more than this. A desalination plant on the scale Cal Am proposes, will be essential.

For Peninsula Candidates:

Do you support expansion of Pure Water Monterey as an alternative to building the desalination plant approved by the CPUC in 2018 but now stalled before the Coastal Commission? Why or why not? On what estimate of water demand is your position based, the estimate made by MPWMD or by Cal-Am? If you support the Cal-Am desalination project, how large should it be? Who should pay for the excess capacity from the desalination project until demand materializes for its water, Cal-Am shareholders, business ratepayers, or residential ratepayers?

1. Support expanded PWM (PWM2) , but not in-lieu-of MWP. We will need both. This is even more important given state mandates/pressure to increase population density /housing.
2. Estimates: the estimates by MPWMD and Cal Am both appear to me to be shaded or shaped to justify their favored options. I can't confirm the veracity of one or the other. I generally use MPWMD figures. (e.g. MPWMD General Manager and approved on May 18, 2020 (Link: <https://www.mpwmd.net/wp-content/uploads/Supply-and-Demand-Analysis-Adopted-5-18-2202>)

3. Support Cal-Am desalination. So size? First part of size is cost: MWP est. cost is \$300 million. San Diego RWQCB/SDRWQCB recently (3/09/2022) approved another desalination unit with subsurface slant wells to the ocean floor "First facility in the nation to utilize one of the most advanced seawater intake methods to protect marine life." Estimated cost \$120 million w/ 5m gpd (https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/press_room/press_releases/2022/pr03102022-doheny-desal-plant.pdf) We need to realign MWP costs to be closer to San Diego. MWP size is 6.4 m gpd is prudent, but could be scaled back (given PWM2) to the 5m gpd size of the SD plant. 4. Cost should be leveraged: CalAm absorbing 66% and 33% covered evenly among all rate users on the system.

GROWTH POLICIES

Do you support the creation of "urban growth boundaries" or expansion of the existing boundary as a way to prevent urban sprawl, and to insure that future growth is compact, efficient, and protective of the environment? If not, what measures would you support to prevent urban sprawl? If yes, will you sponsor an urban growth boundary in the upcoming year, and make it one of your top three priorities?

This is not really relevant for Pacific Grove

Poorly planned, non-infill commercial developments and hotels create more trips and additional vehicle miles traveled on already overcrowded roads and highways. Both residents and visitors pay the price of delay and increased pollution. What specific traffic congestion relief solutions do you support?

1. specific traffic congestion relief solutions include:

Highway 156 needs to be widened to four lanes. This is not a new proposal.

Highway 1 from Marina to the expansion at Watsonville needs to be expanded to four lanes.

Highway 68 (eastern section) should be connected directly to Highway 101.

Highway 68 (eastern section) should have the 4 lane width extended through to Hwy 218.

2. The Lighthouse Ave entry into Pacific Grove must be re-worked. I don't have a solution but it is a current issue and will be worse in the future.

TRANSPORTATION POLICIES

Do you support roundabouts on Highway 68 and other roads? What other transportation policies or practices have you seen that local governments should incorporate?

1. Highway 68 already received its roundabout on Hwy 1. It is great!

2, The proposed Highway 68 roundabout at the CHOP is unnecessary given the off-lane/feeder land on the westbound road. Eastbound light still works.

3. The proposed Highway 68 roundabout at Congress Ave./Cedar Street Monterey near the high school is not prudent unless an elevated/subterranean walkway is constructed over the road. There is too much grammar and high school student traffic on that intersection to permit a non-stop traffic flow .
4. I can't talk about any other roundabouts proposed on Hwy 68 east.

CANDIDATE PRIORITIES

If you are elected, what will be your top three priorities?

1. Integrating public recommendations and public comment into the policy-making/approval process more than it done today.
2. Creating a venue in the City of Pacific Grove for local charities to meet -at city hall and cross-talk, promote their programs and even gain visible city support (little funding, but in-kind and awareness promotion and measures to recognize, facilitate) so that the efforts to help the poor homeless and those in need can be synergized by larger force than a stand alone NGO or charity.
3. expand the residential home improvement program that helps low income home owners keep their dwellings livable. We could spend 10x the amount we have today and still not reach all the low income homeowners who need help keeping their house livable.

What land use policies would you champion for the community?

1. I would support permitting smaller lot sizes for development -3000sft lots. We have some but need to adjust our code to permit a more regularized -and ubiquitous permission to let development occur on these old, small lots.
2. I would remove the 1 covered garage requirement from our code. It is not universally possible now, and recent ADU legislation has further weakened this standard.
3. We in Pacific Grove need a full revision of our General Plan. Last revised in 1994 there are countless sections (many dealing with land use) that are out of date and do not promote even sensible growth.

CANDIDATE QUALIFICATIONS

What accomplishments in your career or public service are you most proud of?

1. I served my country in the US Army for 34 years -from private through colonel. It was an honor and privilege no matter where I was and what I was assigned to do!
2. I served my county as Foreperson Pro Tem on the Civil Grand Jury 2019-20. Worked together with every type of person in our County community to solve community problems and to help keep local governments responsive.
3. Served eight years on City of Pacific Grove Planning Commission. Worked with, and learned from the six other commissioners, who brought tremendous legal, land, social

and business expertise to the commission. We helped the people make their homes better, we helped businesses grow and we preserved the environmental character of Pacific Grove -from the ESHAs to the forests in a manner that made getting our city's Local Coastal Plan approved without major obstacles.

Experience

Local Civic Experience

Planning Commission (8 years)

(member, secretary, ViceChair)

Civil Grand Jury (2019-20)

(Foreperson Pro-Tem)

Charity Volunteer (7 years)

(,multi-Help Roles: Food Cupboard/

Help-Line, grant writing!)

Monterey County Election Volunteer x2