

# **El Dorado Union High**

## **School District**

*4675 Missouri Flat Road*

*Placerville, CA 95667*

*530.622.5081*

## **2008 Developer Fee Justification Study**

*for*

## **El Dorado Union High School District**

***January 2008***

**Superintendent: Sherry J. Smith**

**Prepared by:**

**SchoolWorks, Inc.**

**3908 J Street, Suite 3**

**Sacramento, CA 95819**

**(916) 733-0402**

**(916) 733-0404-Fax**

**[www.SchoolWorksGIS.com](http://www.SchoolWorksGIS.com)**



***Facility Problem Solvers***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>Purpose and Intent.....</b>	<b>3</b>
	Burden Nexus.....	3
	Cost Nexus .....	3
	Benefit Nexus.....	3
<b>III.</b>	<b>Enrollment Projections.....</b>	<b>4</b>
	Student Generation Factor .....	4
	New Residential Development Projections .....	5
	Enrollment Projections.....	5
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Existing Facility Capacity .....</b>	<b>7</b>
	Classroom Loading Standards .....	7
	Existing Facility Capacity.....	8
	Unhoused Students by State Housing Standards .....	8
<b>V.</b>	<b>Calculation of Development’s Fiscal Impact on Schools.....</b>	<b>10</b>
	School Facility Construction Costs.....	10
	Impact of Residential Development.....	10
	Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development .....	12
	Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development.....	13
	Percentage of Employees Residing Within the District.....	14
	Home per Additional Worker .....	14
	Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact.....	15
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## **I. Background**

Education Code Section 17620 allows school districts to assess fees on new residential and commercial construction within their respective boundaries. These fees can be collected without special city or county approval, to fund the construction of new school facilities necessitated by the impact of residential and commercial development activity. In addition, these fees can also be used to fund the reconstruction of school facilities or reopening schools to accommodate development-related enrollment growth. Fees are collected immediately prior to the time of the issuance of a building permit by the City or the County.

As enrollment increases, additional school facilities will be needed to house the growth in the student population. Because of the high cost associated with constructing school facilities and the District's limited budget, outside funding sources are required for future school construction. State and local funding sources for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities are limited.

The authority cited in Education Code Section 17620 states in part "... the governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication or other form of requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities." The legislation originally established the maximum fee rates at \$1.50 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.25 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction. Government Code Section 65995 provides for an inflationary increase in the fees every two years based on the changes in the Class B construction index. As a result of these adjustments, the fees authorized by Education Code 17620 are currently \$2.97 per square foot of residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot of commercial/industrial construction.

This developer fee justification study demonstrates that the District requires the full statutory impact fee to accommodate growth from development activity. The District currently assesses a fee of \$2.63 and \$0.42 for residential and commercial/industrial construction, respectively. The increase represents \$0.34 per square foot and \$0.05 per square foot for residential and commercial/industrial construction, respectively.

## **II. Purpose and Intent**

Prior to levying developer fees, a district must demonstrate and document that a reasonable relationship exists between the need for new or reconstructed school facilities and residential or commercial and industrial development. The justification for levying fees is required to address three basic links between the need for facilities and new development. These links or nexus are:

Burden Nexus: A district must identify the number of students anticipated to be generated by residential, commercial or industrial development. In addition, the district shall identify the school facility and cost impact of these students.

Cost Nexus: A district must demonstrate that the fees to be collected from residential or commercial/industrial development will not exceed the cost of providing school facilities for the students to be generated from the development.

Benefit Nexus: A district must show that the construction or reconstruction of school facilities to be funded by the collection of developer fees will benefit the students generated by residential, commercial and industrial development.

The purpose of this report is to document if a reasonable relationship exists between residential or commercial and industrial development and the need for additional facilities in the El Dorado Union High School District.

Following in this report will be figures indicating the current enrollment and the projected growth occurring within the attendance boundaries of the El Dorado Union High School District. This projected growth will then be loaded into existing facilities to the extent of available space. Thereafter, the needed facilities will be determined and an estimated cost will be assigned. The cost of the facilities will then be compared to the area of residential or commercial and industrial development to determine the amount of developer fees justified.

**III. Enrollment Projections**

The District enrollment over the past 5 years is shown in Table 1. The District will continue to change as the communities it serves are developed and grow. In 2003/2004 the District's total enrollment (CBEDS) was 6,981 students. The enrollment in 2007/08 was up to 7,285, or 304 additional students. This represents a four-year growth of 4.4%.

**Table 1**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**HISTORIC ENROLLMENTS**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
9	1833	1899	1888	1764	1698
10	1879	1834	1871	1885	1799
11	1666	1861	1803	1840	1864
12	1603	1649	1749	1726	1801
<b>9-12 Total</b>	<b>6981</b>	<b>7243</b>	<b>7311</b>	<b>7215</b>	<b>7162</b>
<b>K-12 Total</b>	<b>6981</b>	<b>7243</b>	<b>7311</b>	<b>7215</b>	<b>7162</b>
<b>Sec SDC</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6981</b>	<b>7248</b>	<b>7407</b>	<b>7344</b>	<b>7285</b>

This historic data will be the basis for the enrollment projections which will be presented later after a review of the development projections and the student generation factors.

Student Generation Factor

In calculating the impact of new development on the District, the District is not allowed to only use the cohort survival methodology to determine the justification of a developer fee. This is because the State methodology projects all growth, only a portion of which is from development. In order to ensure that new development is paying only for those students that are being generated by new homes and businesses, the District is required to project new building construction and apply the student generation factor of either the District or the State-wide average student generation factor to each home and/or business to determine development-related growth.

The student generation factor identifies the number of students per housing unit and provides a link between residential construction projects and projections of increased enrollment. The State-wide factor used by the Office of Public School Construction is 0.20 for grades 9-12. For the purposes of this report we will use the State-wide factor to determine the students generated from new housing developments. Table 2 shows the student generation factor divided by the various grade groupings.

**Table 2**

**EL DORADO UNION HIGH  
STUDENT GENERATION FACTOR**

<u>Grades</u>	<u>Students per Household</u>
9-12	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.2</b>

New Residential Development Projections

The District has experienced an average new residential construction rate of approximately 650 units per year. Projecting the average rate forward, we would expect that 3,250 units of residential housing will be built within the District boundaries over the next five years.

Enrollment Projections

To assess the ability of the El Dorado Union High School District to house students in future years, projections of enrollment are necessary. One method of projecting enrollment is the cohort survival method which is used by OPSC to determine eligibility under the State School Building Program.

The State method projects the total enrollment for the District. The State methodology weights change in more recent years more highly than in past years – leading to a conclusion that the most recent trend is the most likely future trend in enrollment growth. Using this projection method the might expect a total enrollment of 6,756 students.

To determine just the impact of residential development, a different projection is done. Applying the student generation factor of 0.20 to the projected 3,250 units of residential housing, we would expect that 650 students will be generated from the new residential construction over the next five years.

The District is required to use the development-based enrollment projection for the purposes of this study. This is utilized as the cost basis for development impact throughout this study, unless otherwise noted.

The development impact method allows the District to use 650 students of growth for purposes of establishing the cost of development impact to the District, although the State’s eligibility method shows no growth over the next five years. In total, the development impact methodology produces 1,056 additional students of enrollment.

**Table 3**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**COMPARISON OF FIVE YEAR ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS**

<u>Grades</u>	<u>State Cohort Projection</u>	<u>Development Projection</u>	<u>Difference</u>
9 to 12	6,756	7,812	1,056
New Enrollment	6,756	7,812	1,056

#### IV. Existing Facility Capacity

To determine the need for additional school facilities, the capacity of the District's existing facilities must be identified and compared to current and anticipated enrollments. The District's existing building capacity will be calculated using the State classroom loading standards shown in Table 5. The following "support-spaces" necessary for the conduct of the District's comprehensive educational program, were not included as "teaching stations," commonly known as "classrooms" to the public:

**Table 4**

El Dorado Union High School District  
List of Core and Support Facilities

Library	Resource Specialist
Multipurpose Room	Gymnasium
Office Area	Lunch Room
Staff Workroom	P.E. Facilities

Because the District requires these facilities as part of its existing facility and curriculum standards at its school, new development's impact must not materially or adversely affect the continuance of these standards. Therefore, new development cannot require that the District house students in these integral support spaces.

#### Classroom Loading Standards

The following maximum classroom loading-factors are used to determine teaching station "capacity," in accordance with the State legislation and the State School Building Program. These capacity calculations are also used in preparing and filing the baseline school capacity statement with the Office of Public School Construction.

**Table 5**

El Dorado Union High School District  
State Classroom Loading Standards

9 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> Grades	27 Students/Classroom
Special Ed	13 Students/Classroom

Existing Facility Capacity

The State determined the baseline capacity by either loading all permanent teaching stations plus a maximum number of portables equal to 25% of the number of permanent classrooms or by loading all permanent classrooms and only portables that are owned or have been leased for over 5 years. Since there were currently 178 permanent classrooms, the District is required to load a maximum of 45 portable classrooms excluding leased portables. The District owned 125 portable classrooms at its schools as shown in Table 6. This resulted in 80 portable classrooms that were not required to be loaded. To account for activity and changes since the baseline was established, the student grants for new construction projects funded by OPSC have been added.

**Table 6**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**Summary of Existing Facility Capacity**

<u>School Facility</u>	<u>Permanent Classrooms</u>	<u>Portable Classrooms</u>	<u>Chargable Portables</u>	<u>Total Chargable Classrooms</u>	<u>State Loading Factor</u>	<u>State Funded Projects</u>	<u>Total State Capacity</u>
Grades 9-12	173	122	44	217	27	770	6629
Special Ed, Non Severe	5	1	0	5	13	0	65
Special Ed, Severe	0	2	1	1	9	0	9
<b>Totals</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>223</b>		<b>770</b>	<b>6703</b>

As Table 6 shows, the total capacity of the District facilities is 6,703 students. This includes the 770 grants funded by the State for projects submitted and approved after the eligibility was established.

Unhoused Students by State Housing Standards

The unhoused pupils represent the difference between the projected fifth year enrollment and the capacity of facilities owned by the District. As allowed by law and required by the State, facility capacities are calculated by identifying the number of teaching stations at each campus. All qualified teaching stations were included in the calculation of the capacities. This next chart compares the capacity with the enrollment at each school to determine if there is available space for new students from the projected developments.

The enrollment used is determined based on the maximum seats needed to house the students within the existing homes.

**Table 7**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**Summary of Available District Capacity**

<u>School Facility</u>	<u>State Capacity</u>	<u>Space Needed</u>	<u>Available Capacity</u>
Grades 9-12	6629	7162	-533
Special Ed	74	123	-49
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6703</b>	<b>7285</b>	<b>-582</b>

The District capacity of 6,703 is less than the current enrollment of 7,285. The difference is 582 students. These unhoused students are currently housed in the non-chargeable portable classrooms. Since the schools are currently over capacity, all additional students will need to be housed in new facilities.

**V. Calculation of Development's Fiscal Impact on Schools**

This section of the study will demonstrate that a reasonable relationship exists between residential or commercial and industrial development and the need for additional school facilities in the El Dorado Union High School District. To the extent this relationship exists, the District is justified in levying developer fees as authorized by Education Code Section 17620.

School Facility Construction Costs

For the purposes of estimating the cost of building schools we have used the State School Building Program funding allowances. These amounts are shown in Table 9. In addition to the basic construction costs, there are site acquisition costs of \$100,000 per acre, \$175,000 per acre for naturally occurring asbestos abatement and approximately \$169,700 per acre for allowable service-site, utilities and off-site development costs.

**Table 8**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**New Construction Costs**

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Construction Cost Per Student</u>
High	\$22,854
Average	\$22,854

Impact of Residential Development

This next table compares the development-related enrollment projection to the available district capacity for each grade level and then multiplies the unhoused students by the new school construction costs to determine the total school facility costs related to the impact of new residential housing developments.

In addition, the State provides that each District shall be reimbursed for site acquisition costs, including appraisals, surveys and title reports. We have assumed that the per acre cost for new school sites is \$100,000. The State allows Districts to recover eligible site improvement costs estimated at \$169,700 per acre as an additional cost plus \$175,000 per acre for naturally occurring asbestos abatement. Recent changes in the State building program now also allow for general site development costs at \$28,728 per acre plus 3.75% of the student grants for grades 9-12. The District needs to acquire 17.33 acres to meet the needs of the students projected from new developments.

**Table 9**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**Summary of Residential Impact**

<u>School Facility</u>	<u>Development Projection</u>	<u>Available Space</u>	<u>Net Unhoused</u>	<u>Construction Cost Per Student</u>	<u>Total Facility Costs</u>
High & Cont.	650	0	650	\$22,854	\$14,855,100
Site Purchase: 17.33 acres					\$1,733,333
Site Improvements:					\$7,029,818
			<b>New Construction Needs:</b>		<b>\$23,618,251</b>
			<b>TOTAL NEEDS:</b>		<b>\$23,618,251</b>

The total need for school facilities based on the impact of the 3,250 new housing units projected over the next five years totals \$23,618,251. To determine the impact per square foot of residential development, this amount is divided by the total square feet of the projected developments. As calculated in the Developer Fee Permits, the average size home built has averaged 2,442 square feet. The total area for 3,250 new homes would therefore be 7,936,500 square feet. The total residential fee needed to be able to collect \$23,618,251 would be **\$2.98** per square foot. Since the State Maximum Fee is currently \$2.97 for residential construction, the District is justified in collecting the maximum fee.

#### Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development

There is a correlation between the growth of commercial/industrial firms/facilities within a community and the generation of school students within most business service areas. Fees for commercial/industrial can only be imposed if the residential fees will not fully mitigate the cost of providing school facilities to students from new development.

The approach utilized in this section is to apply statutory standards, U.S. Census employment statistics, and local statistics to determine the impact of future commercial/industrial development projects on the District. Many of the factors used in this analysis were taken from the U.S. Census, which remains the most complete and authoritative source of information on the community in addition to the “1990 SanDAG Traffic Generators Report”.

**Table 10**  
**EL DORADO UNION HIGH**  
**Summary of Commercial and Industrial Uses**

Type	Sq Ft per Employee*	% of Development**	Percent Resident Employee	Homes per Employee	Student Generation Factor	Average Cost	Cost per Sq. Ft.
Retail	382	20	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$5.76
Medical	197	5	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$11.17
Restaurant	125	15	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$17.60
Motels	1108	40	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$1.99
Warehouses	800	5	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$2.75
Office	221	15	46.3	1.040	0.2	22,854	\$9.96

\*Based on SanDAG Traffic Generator Report (Appendix C)

\*\*Estimates, based on countywide development

Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development

Results from a survey published by the San Diego Association of Governments (San DAG 619-595-5300) are used to establish numbers of employees per square foot of building area to be anticipated in new commercial/industrial development projects. These are supplemented by data from other sources for building types not reported in the San DAG study. The average number of workers per 1,000 square feet of commercial/industrial area ranges from 0.90 for motels to 2.61 for neighborhood shopping centers to 8.00 for restaurants.

### Percentage of Employees Residing Within the District

The 2000 U.S. Census data for the City of Placerville indicates that 46.3% of residents reported working in their community of residency. It is important to note that while most new residents are expected to commute to jobs outside of the community, workers in those businesses located in the District are much more likely to also live in the community. According to the Census, 46.3 percent of the residents who work outside of their homes commute less than 15 minutes to work. This report assumes that 46.3% of the workers in the District will also live in the District.

### Homes per Additional Worker

The 2000 U.S. Census data sampled various households and requested information on the number of workers per family. The number of homes per additional worker is derived from this data. The 2000 Census supports the conclusion that for each new worker generated by commercial development, 1.04 homes are utilized to house that worker. Based on this factor, each additional worker generates 0.096 new students requiring District housing.

The District expects to receive \$940,000 in commercial/industrial development fees over the next 5 years. This assumes annual commercial construction of 400,000 square feet of Commercial development per year. State costs for housing commercially generated students are the same as those used for residential construction. The cost factors used to assess the impact from commercial development projects are contained in Table 9.

Based on an average of one student per 6,453 square feet – and total square feet of commercial development of 400,000 – approximately 62 students per year will be generated from commercial development. Assuming 25% of the students generated from new employment are housed in the existing housing, then those are the students that create an impact on the schools. The students that are housed in new homes have already been accounted for in the residential fees. The resulting impact of commercial/industrial developments are accounted for in the next table.

**Table 11**  
 El Dorado Union High School District  
 Summary of Commercial/Industrial Impact

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Enrollment Impact</b>	<b>State Cost Per Student</b>	<b>Total Impact</b>
9 to 12	78	\$22,854	\$1,782,612
<b>Total Impact</b>	<b>78</b>		<b>\$1,782,612</b>

The total need for school facilities based on the impact of the 400,000 square feet of annual commercial/industrial development projected over the next five years totals \$1,782,612. To determine the impact per square foot of commercial/industrial development, this amount is divided by the total square feet of the projected developments. This totals 2,000,000 square feet for five years. The total commercial/industrial fee needed to be able to collect \$1,782,612 would be **\$0.89** per square foot. Since the State Maximum Fee is currently \$0.47 for commercial/industrial construction, the District is justified in collecting the maximum fee.

Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact

Education Code Section 17620 requires districts to find that fee revenues will not exceed the cost of providing school facilities to the students generated by the development paying the fees. This section shows that the fee revenues do not exceed the impact of the new development.

The total need for school facilities when combining both residential and commercial/industrial developments totals \$25,400,863. The amount the District would collect over the five year period at the maximum rate of \$2.97 for residential and \$0.47 for commercial/industrial would be as follows:

$\$2.97 \times 3,250 \text{ homes} \times 2,442 \text{ sq ft per home} = \$23,571,405 \text{ residential}$   
 $\$0.47 \times 400,000 \text{ sq ft per year} \times 5 \text{ years} = \$940,000 \text{ commercial/industrial}$   
 Total projected 5 year income: \$24,511,405

The income is less than the projected needs. In addition, the high school district only collects up to 39% of the total developer fees after sharing with the elementary districts. Therefore the income covers less than half the projected needs.

## VI. Conclusion

Based on the data contained in this study, it is found that a reasonable relationship exists between residential, commercial/industrial development and the need for additional school facilities in the El Dorado Union High School District. The following three nexus tests required to show justification for levying fees have been met:

Burden Nexus: New residential development will generate an average of 0.20 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade students per unit. Because the District has exceeded its capacity, all students generated by new development will require additional school facilities.

Cost Nexus: The cost to provide new and reconstructed facilities is an average of \$2.98 per square foot of residential development. Each square foot of residential development will generate \$2.97 in developer fees resulting in a shortfall of \$0.12 per square foot.

Benefit Nexus: The developer fees to be collected by the El Dorado Union High School District will be used for the provision of additional and reconstructed school facilities. This will benefit the students to be generated by new development by providing them with adequate educational facilities.

The reasonable relationship identified by these findings provides the required justification for the El Dorado Union High School District to levy the maximum fees of \$2.97 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction as authorized by Education Code Section 17620.



**El Dorado Union High School District  
2008 Developer Fee Justification Study**

- ✓ **SAB 50-01 - ENROLLMENT  
CERTIFICATION/PROJECTION**
- ✓ **CENSUS DATA**
- ✓ **USE OF DEVELOPER FEES**
- ✓ **SITE DEVELOPMENT COSTS**
- ✓ **INDEX ADJUSTMENT FROM THE STATE  
ALLOCATION BOARD MEETING**

*January 2008*

**A  
P  
P  
E  
N  
D  
I  
C  
E  
S**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**ENROLLMENT CERTIFICATION/PROJECTION**

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
 OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

SAB 50-01 (Rev. 01/01)

Page 3 of 3

SCHOOL DISTRICT <b>EL DORADO UNION HIGH</b>	FIVE DIGIT DISTRICT CODE NUMBER <b>61853</b>
COUNTY <b>EL DORADO</b>	HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA

**Part A. Enrollment Data - (districts or county superintendent of schools)**

Grade	3rd Previous 2004/2005	2nd Previous 2005/2006	Previous 2006/2007	Current 2007/2008
K	1,495	1,500	1,487	1,568
1	1,483	1,547	1,514	1,536
2	1,514	1,491	1,580	1,571
3	1,542	1,568	1,516	1,627
4	1,523	1,606	1,640	1,557
5	1,711	1,581	1,639	1,670
6	1,597	1,781	1,621	1,657
7	1,705	1,625	1,785	1,632
8	1,805	1,730	1,721	1,774
9	1,899	1,888	1,764	1,698
10	1,834	1,871	1,885	1,799
11	1,861	1,803	1,840	1,864
12	1,649	1,749	1,726	1,801
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,618</b>	<b>21,740</b>	<b>21,718</b>	<b>21,754</b>

**Part D. Special Day Class Enrollment - (county superintendent of schools only)**

3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current

**Part E. Number of New Dwelling Units** **3,250**

**Part F. District Student Yield Factor** **N/A**

**Part G. Five Year Projected Enrollment - School Facility Program**  
 Projections - (except special day class pupils only)

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
12,329	3,544	6,756	22,629

**Part B. Continuation High School - (districts only)**

Grade	3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current
9				
10				
11				
12				
<b>TOTAL</b>				

**Projections - special day class pupils only**

Elementary	Non-Severe	Severe	Secondary	Non-Severe	Severe
MR			MR		
HH			HH		
DEAF			DEAF		
HI			HI		
SLI			SLI		
VI			VI		
SED			SED		
OI			OI		
OHI			OHI		
SLD	#REF!		SLD	120	
DB			DB		
MH			MH		
AUT			AUT		
TBI			TBI		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>#REF!</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120</b>	

**Part C. Special Day Class Pupils - (districts or county superintendent of schools)**

Elementary	Non-Severe	Severe	Secondary	Non-Severe	Severe
MR			MR		
HH			HH		
DEAF			DEAF		
HI			HI		
SLI			SLI		
VI			VI		
SED			SED		
OI			OI		
OHI			OHI		
SLD	#REF!		SLD	123	
DB			DB		
MH			MH		
AUT			AUT		
TBI			TBI		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>#REF!</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>123</b>	

**Part H. One Year Projected Enrollment - State Relocatable Program**  
 Projections - (except special day class pupils only)

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
11,379	3,332	7,071	21,782

**Projections - (special day class pupils only)**  
 (includes Severe & Non-Severe)

Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
MR		OI	
HH		OHI	
DEAF		SLD	#REF! 121
HI		DB	
SLI		MH	
VI		AUT	
SED		TBI	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>#REF! 121</b>

*I certify, as the District Representative, that the information reported on this form is true and correct and that: I am designated as an authorized district representative by the governing board of the district. If the district is requesting an augmentation in the enrollment projection pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.42 (b), the local planning commission or approval authority has approved the tentative subdivision map used for augmentation of the enrollment and the district has identified dwelling units in that map to be contracted. All subdivision maps used for augmentation of enrollment are available at the district for review by the OSPC. This form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC). In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail.*

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_



#### QT-H4. Physical Housing Characteristics - All Housing Units: 2000

Data Set: [Census 2000 Summary File 3 \(SF 3\) - Sample Data](#)

Geographic Area: **Placerville city, California**

NOTE: Data based on a sample except in P3, P4, H3, and H4. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, definitions, and count corrections see <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf3.htm>.

Subject	Number	Percent
<b>Total housing units</b>	<b>4,206</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>UNITS IN STRUCTURE</b>		
1, detached	2,617	62.2
1, attached	254	6.0
2	168	4.0
3 or 4	367	8.7
5 to 9	216	5.1
10 to 19	98	2.3
20 to 49	199	4.7
50 or more	129	3.1
Mobile home	158	3.8
Boat, RV, van, etc.	0	0.0
<b>ROOMS</b>		
1 room	91	2.2
2 rooms	257	6.1
3 rooms	551	13.1
4 rooms	856	20.4
5 rooms	997	23.7
6 rooms	720	17.1
7 or more rooms	734	17.5
Median	4.8	(X)
<b>YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT</b>		
Built 1999 to March 2000	147	3.5
Built 1995 to 1998	207	4.9
Built 1990 to 1994	276	6.6
Built 1980 to 1989	678	16.1
Built 1970 to 1979	794	18.9
Built 1960 to 1969	536	12.7
Built 1950 to 1959	540	12.8
Built 1940 to 1949	342	8.1
Built 1939 or earlier	686	16.3
Median	1970	(X)
<b>BEDROOMS</b>		
No bedroom	108	2.6
1 bedroom	789	18.8
2 bedrooms	1,442	34.3
3 bedrooms	1,431	34.0
4 bedrooms	360	8.6
5 or more bedrooms	76	1.8
<b>SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	45	1.1
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	46	1.1

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3, Matrices H1, H23, H24, H30, H34, H35, H41, H47, and H50.

**QT-P23. Journey to Work: 2000**Data Set: [Census 2000 Summary File 3 \(SF 3\) - Sample Data](#)Geographic Area: **Placerville city, California**NOTE: Data based on a sample except in P3, P4, H3, and H4. For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, definitions, and count corrections see <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/datanotes/expsf3.htm>.

Subject	Number	Percent
<b>MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION AND CARPOOLING</b>		
<b>Workers 16 and over</b>	<b>4,045</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Car, truck, or van	3,681	91.0
Drove alone	3,042	75.2
Carpooled	639	15.8
In 2-person carpool	448	11.1
In 3-person carpool	112	2.8
In 4-person carpool	63	1.6
In 5- or 6-person carpool	16	0.4
In 7-or-more-person carpool	0	0.0
Workers per car, truck, or van	1.11	(X)
Public transportation	64	1.6
Bus or trolley bus	56	1.4
Streetcar or trolley car (público in Puerto Rico)	0	0.0
Subway or elevated	0	0.0
Railroad	0	0.0
Ferryboat	0	0.0
Taxicab	8	0.2
Motorcycle	10	0.2
Bicycle	0	0.0
Walked	151	3.7
Other means	0	0.0
Worked at home	139	3.4
<b>TRAVEL TIME TO WORK</b>		
<b>Workers who did not work at home</b>	<b>3,906</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Less than 10 minutes	1,096	28.1
10 to 14 minutes	712	18.2
15 to 19 minutes	459	11.8
20 to 24 minutes	369	9.4
25 to 29 minutes	108	2.8
30 to 34 minutes	278	7.1
35 to 44 minutes	167	4.3
45 to 59 minutes	327	8.4
60 to 89 minutes	244	6.2
90 or more minutes	146	3.7
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	23.8	(X)
<b>TIME LEAVING HOME TO GO TO WORK</b>		
<b>Workers who did not work at home</b>	<b>3,906</b>	<b>100.0</b>
5:00 to 5:59 a.m.	376	9.6
6:00 to 6:29 a.m.	273	7.0
6:30 to 6:59 a.m.	387	9.9
7:00 to 7:29 a.m.	697	17.8
7:30 to 7:59 a.m.	669	17.1
8:00 to 8:29 a.m.	363	9.3
8:30 to 8:59 a.m.	272	7.0
9:00 to 11:59 a.m.	437	11.2
12:00 to 3:59 p.m.	148	3.8
All other times	284	7.3

(X) Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Summary File 3, Matrices P30, P31, P33, P34, and P35.

## **Use of Developer Fees:**

A School District can use the revenue collected on residential and commercial/industrial construction for the purposes listed below:

- Purchase or lease of interim school facilities to house students generated by new construction pending the construction of permanent facilities.
- Purchase or lease of land for school facilities for such students.
- Acquisition of school facilities for such students, including:
  - Construction
  - Modernization/reconstruction
  - Architectural and engineering costs
  - Permits and plan checking
  - Testing and inspection
  - Furniture for use in the new facilities
- Legal and other administrative costs related to the provision of such new facilities
- Administration of the collection of, and justification for, such fees, and
- Any other purpose arising from the process of providing facilities for students generated by new development.

Following is an excerpt from the Education code that state that valid uses of the Level 1 developer fees. It refers to construction and reconstruction. The term reconstruction was originally used in the Leroy Greene program. The term modernization is currently used in the 1998 State Building Program and represents the same scope of work used in the original reconstruction projects.

**Ed Code Section 17620.** (a) (1) The governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the district, for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities, subject to any limitations set forth in Chapter 4.9 (commencing with Section 65995) of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code. This fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement may be applied to construction only as follows: ...

The limitations referred to in this text describe that maximum amounts than can be charged for residential and commercial/industrial projects and any projects that qualify for exemptions. They do not limit the use of the funds received.



**Determination of Average State allowed amounts for Site Development Costs**

<u>District</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Original OPSC Site Development</u>	<u>Inflation Factor</u>	<u>Current Site Development</u>	<u>Cost per Acre</u>
Western Placer Unified	19.3	\$6,033,312	1.75%	\$6,138,895	\$318,077
Roseville City Elem	21.6	\$1,780,588	26.09%	\$2,245,143	\$103,942
Elk Grove Unified	66.2	\$8,659,494	24.29%	\$10,762,885	\$162,581
Elk Grove Unified	76.4	\$9,791,732	21.68%	\$11,914,579	\$155,950
Elk Grove Unified	84.3	\$13,274,562	19.18%	\$15,820,623	\$187,670
Grant Joint Union High	24	\$2,183,840	23.40%	\$2,694,859	\$112,286
Center Unified	21.2	\$1,944,310	23.40%	\$2,399,279	\$113,174
Lodi Unified	13.4	\$1,076,884	21.68%	\$1,310,352	\$97,787
Lodi Unified	13.4	\$2,002,164	21.68%	\$2,436,233	\$181,808
Galt Joint Union	25	\$2,502,364	20.83%	\$3,023,606	\$120,944
Tahoe Truckee Unified	24	\$2,752,632	19.18%	\$3,280,587	\$136,691
Davis Unified	23.3	\$3,814,302	18.37%	\$4,514,989	\$193,776
Woodland Unified	50.2	\$8,664,700	20.83%	\$10,469,557	\$208,557
Sacramento City Unified	35	\$2,911,190	20%	\$3,493,428	\$99,812
Lodi Unified	47	\$7,652,176	19.18%	\$9,119,863	\$194,040
Stockton Unified	49.1	\$8,959,088	19.18%	\$10,677,441	\$217,463
Natomas Unified	38.7	\$3,017,002	19.18%	\$3,595,663	\$92,911
Rocklin Unified	47.1	\$11,101,088	2.35%	\$11,361,964	\$241,231
<b>Total</b>	<b>679.2</b>			<b>\$115,259,947</b>	<b>Average \$169,700</b>
					Min \$92,911
					Max \$318,077

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
State Allocation Board Meeting, January 30, 2008

INDEX ADJUSTMENT ON THE ASSESSMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report the index adjustment on the assessment for development which may be levied pursuant to Education Code Section 17620.

BACKGROUND

There are three levels that may be levied for developer's fees. The Level I fee is assessed if the district conducts a Justification Study that establishes the connection between the development coming into the district and the assessment of fees to pay for the cost of the facilities needed to house future students. The Level II fee is assessed if a district makes a timely application to the State Allocation Board (SAB) for new construction funding, conducts a School Facility Needs Analysis pursuant to Government Code Section 65995.6, and satisfies at least two of the requirements listed in Government Code Section 65995.5(b)(3). The Level III fee is assessed when State bond funds are exhausted; the district may impose a developer's fee up to 100 percent of the School Facility Program new construction project cost.

DESCRIPTION

The law requires the maximum assessment for development be adjusted every two years by the change in the Class B construction cost index, as determined by the SAB at its January meeting.

The assessment for development fees for 2004 and 2006 are shown below for information. The cost index for Class B construction increased 12.79 percent during the period of January 2006 through January 2008, requiring the assessment for development fees to be adjusted as follows:

Maximum Level I Assessment Per Square Foot

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>
Residential	\$2.24	\$2.63	\$2.97
Commercial/Industrial	.36	.42	.47

AUTHORITY

Education Code Section 17620 authorizes school districts to assess development fees within district boundaries to fund the construction or reconstruction of school facilities, subject to the limitations set forth in Chapter 4.9, commencing with Section 65995 of the Government Code.

Government Code Section 65995(b)(3) requires the maximum square footage assessment for development be "increased in 2000 and every two years thereafter, according to the adjustment for inflation set forth in the statewide cost index for class B construction, as determined by the State Allocation Board at its January Board meeting...effective as of the date of that meeting."

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the 2008 adjustment to the maximum Level I assessment for development to be effective immediately.

SPECIAL  
000179