

REVISED Q&A 9/23/20

Q: What is Keep Winters Winters?

A: Keep Winters Winters (KWW) is an officially sanctioned campaign organization, authorized by the California Secretary of State. The objective of its supporters has been to use the initiative process to ensure that any private development plan that involves annexation of land outside the Winters City Limits must be subject to the approval of voters before it can proceed.

KWW is fundamentally about offering residents the opportunity to directly participate in the democratic process when it comes to deciding how, where, and in what ways Winters grows (or not) beyond the current City Limits.

KWW does not take any formal position on growth. It does take a position on who should decide whether a specific plan for development or annexation of land outside City Limits should occur. Very simply - we believe the people should decide.

Q: What is the status of the Keep Winters Winters initiative?

A: Following a series of very productive meetings between KWW steering committee members and City Staff and officials, agreement was reached on replacing the KWW initiative with a Joint Initiative. On July 21st the City Council unanimously approved placing the Joint Initiative on the November 3, 2020 General Election ballot and on August 7th the original KWW initiative was withdrawn and replaced by the Joint Initiative. The Joint Initiative will appear on the ballot as Measure A:

Shall an initiative measure amending the City of Winters General Plan to (1) establish and Urban Growth Boundary that would prohibit urban development outside of that boundary, subject to certain exceptions, and (2) adopt a community driven planning process that would apply to areas outside the City limits but within the City's sphere of influence, be adopted?	Yes
	No

The Joint Initiative (JI) preserves the intent of the original initiative while providing for community input on planning decisions and unifies KWW and City Officials in the conviction that passing the initiative will serve the community's best interests. The full language of the "Winters Urban Growth Boundary and Community-Based Planning Initiative", City Council Resolution No. 2020-42, can be viewed beginning on page 127 of the City Council packet at this link.

Q: What provisions were added to the Joint Initiative?

A: The JI still establishes an Urban Growth Boundary on the city limit line. What is new is that the JI provides for the establishment of a community driven specific planning

process. The City will appoint a committee of diverse stakeholders to develop a proposed specific plan that includes areas within the current Sphere of Influence and the area inside the city limits north of Moody Slough Road, to provide for an integrated, cohesive planning effort. This proposed specific plan must be approved by a vote of the people, and with voter approval the UGB would be extended to the outer limits of the specific plan area but not beyond the current Sphere of Influence (see definition below). Once established, this UGB may not be amended until November 3, 2040 except by a vote of the people.

Q. What are the objectives of the Joint Initiative?

A. The stated objectives of the Joint Initiative are as follows:

- Preserve the City's small town character and rural identity
- Preserve the City's agricultural heritage and ag economy and jobs
- Preserve open spaces and the natural environment
- Promote well-planned growth consistent with the limits of the City's infrastructure
- Promote sustainable job creation by encouraging infill development while revitalizing the Central Business District
- Support a community driven planning process that engages the entire Winters community
- Minimize traffic and reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions
- Encourage the City to continue meeting housing needs for all economic segments of the population
- Conserve water supplies and protect aquifers from overdraft

Q: Who is Behind KWW?

KWW has an informal management and decision-making structure, known as the KWW Steering Committee. The steering committee members are all active in the community and attuned to residents' interests, concerns, and priorities.

Members include: Bob Polkinghorn*, Chair, Corinne Martinez*, Emarie VanGalio*, Bill Lagattuta, Peter Hunter, Richard Rominger, Albert Vallecillo, Bob Schultz, David Springer, and Lily Starling.

* Signator on KWW Petition Submitted to Winters City Clerk

Q: What is the history of the KWW initiative?

A: It is important to give some context as to how the KWW movement started. In early 2019, the City Manager had nonpublic meetings with the representatives of the Bellevue North development group. The correspondence between the City Manager and Bellevue North is documented on the City's website [here](#). The correspondence revealed that City Staff had begun entertaining negotiations with a landowner/developer of 793 acres of land within and outside the City's Sphere of Influence that could accommodate housing for 7,500 individuals. The discussions progressed to the point that the City accepted a \$20,000 deposit to support staff time on the proposal when it was officially received. No formal proposal was submitted to the City.

When the correspondence became public, many residents were alarmed by the discussions and the magnitude of the project being proposed. It was at that point that the idea of the residents of

the City and surrounding areas having a direct say in new developments began to emerge. These concerns prompted a series of three public meetings and the formation of the Keep Winters Winters Steering Committee. The Committee retained a Law firm to develop the initiative language which was approved by the City Attorney, and petitions were circulated and signed by 814 Winters residents. The nearly \$25,000 in cash donations from local residents that have been made to support the initiative demonstrates the level of interest in its passage.

Q: Have other cities passed similar initiatives? How have they worked out?

A: Well over 60 cities and counties in Northern California have established, maintained, and renewed their Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB) since the first one was implemented in Napa in 1996. The majority of these were established by citizens' initiatives and subsequent voter approval. Notably, in over a dozen cases, city councils adopted citizens' initiatives without placing them on the ballot for voter approval. Why? Because they made sense and the voices of their citizens mattered.

Most recently (June 2020), the Solvang (near Santa Barbara) City Council adopted the people's initiative, which had qualified for the November 3, 2020 ballot. In 2000, the City of Davis City Council adopted the original citizens' initiative after it had qualified for the ballot, and it is expected to be renewed for another 10 years in the upcoming November election. What cities find is that the perceived value of UGB's when first adopted is matched or exceeded by the actual value provided once passed.

The best California-based source for learning more about UGB's is the Greenbelt Alliance. Their website is located at [this link](#). They endorse Measure A.

Q: How does the “Sphere of Influence” differ from the City Limits?

A: Land in the Winters area can be divided in two ways: land inside the General Plan and land outside the General Plan. Land within the General Plan is further subdivided into land within the City Limits and Land within the Sphere of Influence (SOI).

The SOI is land adjacent to the City Limits and is under the jurisdiction of Yolo County (a map is available on page 145 of the City Council packet at [this link](#)). The General Plan provides a vision for how that land might be developed in the future, and it has been “pre-zoned” as a mix of private development and public projects. However, the pre-zoning carries no legal force and reflects only the vision of those who wrote the General Plan. Winters has one of the oldest General Plans in the state (originally completed in 1992).

Q: How does the Joint Initiative impact the City Limits or the SOI?

A: As originally drafted, the KWW Initiative would not have had an impact on land within the City Limits as established in the General Plan but would have changed the “pre-zoned” SOI land from a mixture of uses that include open space parks and recreation, low, medium and high-density residential, and commercial/industrial to “Open Space.” As amended by the JI, a joint committee made up of KWW members and City officials will work to update the existing zoning of undeveloped land within the City Limits that is north of Moody Slough Road and land that is within the SOI. Before this zoning change is adopted it will be placed on the ballot and voted on

by Winters citizens.

Q: How will this affect the General Plan?

A: The July 21, 2020 City Council vote approving Resolution 2020-42 amended General Plan Sections 2A and 2B to establish the UGB as being coterminous with the City Limits and classified lands outside the UGB as “Specific Plan” lands until such time as a new specific plan is approved by the voters. Upon approval by the voters the UGB will be extended to the outer boundaries of the SOI but no further.

Certain General Plan policies (1.A.12 – 1.A.15) were also modified. These new policies prohibit urban development outside the UGB except for public parks, public educational facilities, wastewater, sewer, storm drain, and water recycling facilities, and/or uses consistent with the General Plan “Open Space” land use designation. This change compliments existing policies encouraging infill development and a thriving business district and responds to the City’s needs over time.

Policy I.A.13 implements the UGB and adopts the Winters Urban Growth Boundary and Community-Based Planning Initiative which can be amended or repealed by the voters no sooner than November 3, 2040. Within certain restrictions the City Council may amend the location of the UGB if it determines that doing so is necessary to comply with State or federal law regarding the provision of housing for all segments of the community.

Policy 1.A.15 provides for the development of a North Area specific plan by a Specific Plan Committee that covers undeveloped areas in the City Limits north of Moody Slough Road and inside the SOI in a manner that makes sense for today and into the future. The committee will include members from each of the following groups:

- City residents at large
- City Council
- Planning Commission
- Keep Winters Winters
- Winters business community representatives
- Non-resident stakeholders

Before the specific plan can take effect and allow for relocation of the UGB it must be approved by the voters. In making any changes to the UGB the City Council is bound to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act. Additional related General Plan policies have been amended for consistency.

Q: If the Initiative passes, how will the process for getting new developments approved change?

A: The City will not accept proposals for development outside the UGB. Depending on the outcome of the specific planning process and the election to approve it, developers might be able to submit applications for development but they would still be limited to lands within the

existing SOI which would have to be annexed.

Lands outside the City Limits and UGB are under Yolo County jurisdiction. Both Yolo County and the Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) must review and approve annexations and incorporations. It is highly unlikely that development of lands outside of and adjacent to the UGB would be allowed by the County and LAFCO.

Q: I've heard there will be a negative economic impact to the City if this Initiative passes. Is that true?

A: First, voters will have the opportunity to weigh the pros and cons of adopting a specific plan that extends the UGB. Planning considerations will include economic impacts, so the Joint Initiative itself does not have any negative impact. Many have asked what the economic benefits of a development are. While each development will present different costs and benefits, generally, if a development is approved, then upon approval and initiation of developments, cities receive fees to cover costs for processing applications, making general plan updates, and facilitating CEQA review. These fees that come from the developer are in lieu fees for affordable housing, utility service, streets, parks, schools, police and fire protection, and permits and inspections. A 2015 study found statewide impact fees averaged \$23,455 per single-family home.

However, development fees provide only a short-term boost in revenue. Significant increases in population require expenditures for expansion of water and wastewater treatment facilities which draws against this pool of funds. Property tax revenues from new homes can offset city costs for many years, but studies completed on a large sample of cities by Urban planning firm Urban3 show that after one generation the cost to maintain streets, sidewalks, and utilities exceeds tax revenue. So residential development can have a ***negative*** economic life cycle cost. They also found that city centers provide most of the tax revenue, especially from older buildings that are converted to mixed-use or offices. Earthquake proofing our existing Main Street buildings would be a far better investment. Making use of the second story of these buildings is also recommended in the Winters Economic Development Report. Improving core area buildings will support the financial health of the community for generations.

Q: How will the Initiative affect traffic flow?

A: At the June 2nd Special City Council meeting the concern was expressed that if lands within the sphere of influence are not built out as planned and the Main Street loop is not completed, the traffic load on Railroad Avenue will be a serious problem. The 2017 Circulation Master Plan completed by Fehr & Peers illustrates that the impact of the completion of the Main Street loop on Railroad Avenue and other traffic corridors is inconsequential. If only the 183 acres of north area land that is within the City Limits is developed, the traffic load will be far lower than what is shown in the Circulation Master Plan, which is based on a population of 14,200 and development of all the land in the SOI. If Moody Slough Road is extended to the east as planned, traffic resulting from residential development of the 183 acre plot of land that is within City Limits and north of Moody Slough Road can be accommodated by Main Street and Timber Crest Road as well as Railroad Avenue.

Q: If the Initiative passes will it protect ag land?

A: The Joint Initiative on the November 3rd ballot will not affect land use within the UGB or the City Council's ability to change them. Yolo County has regulatory control of lands north of the UGB and has designated those lands as "Agricultural Intensive". The initiative will not affect those designations.

Under the current General Plan the 183 acres of actively farmed ag land inside the City Limits and the 210 acres of ag land within the sphere of influence (SOI) and even lands outside the SOI can be converted to residential and other non-ag uses without voter approval. The initiative provides for a community planning process that will include ag land inside the City Limits and lands within the current SOI. Only if approved by the voters in a separate election, the UGB could be established at the outer limits of the SOI, but ag lands in the SOI could still be protected as part of the planning process. The 270 acres of ag land included in the draft specific plan offered to the City by developer Bellevue North will remain outside the SOI and will be protected from development. The original Keep Winters Initiative was endorsed by the Yolo County Farm Bureau.