



SUHSD
Sequoia Union High School District

Level I Developer Fee Study
for
Sequoia Union High School
School District

January 29, 2024

Crystal Leach, Superintendent

Board Trustees

Shawneece Stevenson, President
Sathvik Nori, Vice President/Clerk
Amy Koo, Member
Rich Ginn, Member
Carrie Du Bois, Member

Prepared by:

Jack Schreder & Associates, Inc.



4094 C Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
916-441-0986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
SECTION I: DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION	6
Modernization and Reconstruction.....	6
Modernization Need.....	7
Residential Development and Fee Projections	11
Extent of Mitigation of School Facility Costs Provided by Level I Residential Fees....	14
Commercial / Industrial Development and Fee Projections.....	14
Extent of Mitigation of School Facility Costs Provided by Level I Commercial/Industrial Fees	16
Summary	17
SECTION II: BACKGROUND OF DEVELOPER FEE LEGISLATION.....	17
SECTION III: REQUIREMENTS OF AB 1600	20
SECTION IV: REVENUE SOURCES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES.....	23
State Sources	23
Local Sources	23
SECTION V: ESTABLISHING THE COST, BENEFIT AND BURDEN NEXUS.....	25
SECTION VI: FACILITY FUNDING ALTERNATIVES.....	26
STATEMENT TO IDENTIFY PURPOSE OF FEE.....	26
ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL ACCOUNT	26
RECOMMENDATION.....	27
SOURCES	28
APPENDIX A: PER PUPIL GRANT AMOUNTS	APP 1
APPENDIX B: DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY	APP 2
APPENDIX C: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL CALCULATIONS.....	APP 3

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Projected Dwelling Units.....	8
Table 2: Construction Costs	9
Table 3: Projected Students from Proposed Development.....	10
Table 4: 25 Year Modernization Need.....	11
Table 5: Summary of Projected Residential Square Footage.....	12
Table 6: Facilities Cost per SF from Proposed Residential Construction.....	13
Table 7: Commercial and Industrial Generation Factors.....	15
Table 8: Commercial and Industrial Facilities Cost Impact	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Education Code Section 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other form of requirement against any development project for the construction or modernization of school facilities provided the District can show justification for levying of fees.
- In January 2024, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.
- The Sequoia Union High School District shares developer fees with its elementary feeder districts. The High School District collects 40 percent of the Level 1 Fee and its feeder elementary districts collect 60 percent of the Level 1 Fee.
- The Sequoia Union High School District is justified in collecting \$2.07 (40 percent of \$5.17) per square foot for residential construction and \$0.34 (40 percent of \$0.84) per square foot of commercial/industrial construction, with the exception of mini storage. The mini storage category of construction should be collected at a rate of \$0.03 per square foot.
- In general, it is fiscally more prudent to extend the useful life of an existing facility than to construct new facilities when possible. The cost to modernize facilities is approximately 42.2 percent of the cost to construct new facilities.
- The residential justification is based on the Sequoia Union High School District's projected modernization need of \$416,202,174 for students generated from residential development over the next 25 years and the projected residential square footage of 77,793,209.
- Based on the modernization need for students generated from projected residential development and the projected residential square footage, each square foot of residential construction will create a school facilities cost of \$5.35 ($\$416,202,174/77,793,209$).

- Each square foot of commercial/industrial construction will create a school facilities cost ranging from \$0.03 to \$2.41 per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction.
- For both residential and commercial/industrial development, the fees authorized by Government Code section 65995 are justified.

INTRODUCTION

In September 1986, the Governor signed into law Assembly Bill 2926 (Chapter 887/Statutes 1986) which granted school district governing boards the authority to impose developer fees. This authority is codified in Education Code Section 17620 which 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 modernization of school facilities."

The Level I fee that can be levied is adjusted every two years according to the inflation rate, as listed by the state-wide index for Class B construction set by the State Allocation Board. In January of 1992, the State Allocation Board increased the Level 1 fee to \$1.65 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.27 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

Senate Bill 1287 (Chapter 1354/Statutes of 1992) effective January 1, 1993, affected the facility mitigation requirements a school district could impose on developers. Senate Bill 1287 allowed school districts to levy an additional \$1.00 per square foot of residential construction (Government Code Section 65995.3). The authority to levy the additional \$1.00 was rescinded by the failure of Proposition 170 on the November 1993 ballot.

In January 1994, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$1.72 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.28 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 1996, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$1.84 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.30 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 1998, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$1.93 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.34 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2000, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$2.05 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.33 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2002, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$2.14 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.36 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2004, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$2.24 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.41 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2006, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$2.63 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.42 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2008, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$2.97 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2010, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment maintained the fee at \$2.97 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.47 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2012, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$3.20 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.51 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2014, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$3.36 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.54 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In February 2016, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$3.48 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.56 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2018, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$3.79 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.61 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2020, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$4.08 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.66 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In February 2022, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$4.79 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.78 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

In January 2024, the State Allocation Board's biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.

The next adjustment to the fee will occur at the January 2026 State Allocation Board meeting.

In order to levy a fee, a district must make a finding that the fee to be paid bears a reasonable relationship and be limited to the needs of the community for elementary or high school facilities and be reasonably related to the need for schools caused by the development. Fees are different from taxes and do not require a vote of the electorate. Fees may be used only for specific purposes and there must be a reasonable relationship between the levying of fees and the impact created by development.

Purpose of Study

This study will demonstrate the relationship between residential and commercial/industrial growth and the need for the modernization of school facilities in the Sequoia Union High School District.

SECTION I: DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION

Developer fee law requires that before fees can be levied, a district must find that justification exists for the fee. Government Code Section 66001 (g) states that a fee shall not include the costs attributable to existing deficiencies in public facilities but may include the costs attributable to the increased demand for public facilities reasonably related to the development project in order to refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with a general plan. This section of the study will show that justification does exist for levying developer fees in the Sequoia Union High School District.

Modernization and Reconstruction

Extending the useful life of a school is a cost effective and prudent way to house students generated from future development. The state of California recognizes the need to extend the life of existing schools and provides modernization funding through the State School Facility Program. For the purpose of this report, modernization and reconstruction are used interchangeably since many of the improvements are common to both programs, i.e. roofing, plumbing, heating, cooling, dry rot repair, infrastructure improvement, etc. Developer fees may not be used for regular maintenance, routine repair of school buildings and facilities, or deferred maintenance. The authorization to justify modernization and modernization of school facilities and extend the useful life of existing schools is contained in Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code Section 66001 (g). School districts are permitted to modernize or replace existing or build new school facilities with developer fees as justified by this Study. The District completed a Facility Master Plan in June of 2023 which includes a summary of District facility needs. Developer fees will be used to complete those projects included in the 2023 Master Plan which are necessary to maintain the existing level of service for students from new development. Projects will include, but not are not limited to, the upgrade of infrastructure systems, modernization of classrooms and replacement of outdated classrooms. While modernization projects are a significant focus of projected facility needs, the District will also have a need to add capacity with Developer Fees in the future as new housing units are constructed.

Modernization Need

As new students are generated by new development, the need to increase the useful life of school facilities will be necessary. In order to calculate the District's estimated modernization need generated by students from new development, it is necessary to determine the following factors: the number of units included in proposed developments, the District student yield factor, and the per pupil cost to modernize facilities.

Projected Development

The Sequoia Union High School District is located within the San Mateo County, City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, and the Town of Woodside planning jurisdictions. According to the City planning departments, Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) have increased significantly, and the allocation of unit types have changed due to the shortage of housing. For example, areas such as Woodside and Atherton where construction has primarily been single family homes now include projections for multi family units. A summary of projected units by housing type is included in Table 1. Appendix B includes a development summary.

Table 1: Housing Projection Summary

Housing Type	Housing Units
Single Family	2,585
Multi Family	27,714
Accessory Dwelling Units	573
Townhomes	<u>15,451</u>
Total	46,323

Source: City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, Town of Woodside, San Mateo County.

The School Facility Program allows districts to apply for modernization funding for permanent classrooms over 25 years old and portables over 20 years old, meaning that school facilities are presumed to be eligible for, and therefore need, modernization

after that time period. It is therefore generally presumed that school facilities have a useful life span of 25 years before modernization is needed in order to maintain the same level of service as previously existed. The same would be true for modernization of buildings 25 years after their initial modernization. In some cases, these older buildings may need to be closed entirely for the health and safety of students, teachers, staff, and other occupants. Aging infrastructure and building problems can profoundly impact a school's ability to safely remain in service and to continue delivering the instructional program to students at existing levels of service. Therefore, the District's modernization needs are considered over a 25 year period, and a 25 year projection has been included in the Study when considering the homes that will generate students for the facilities in question. Developer fees generated from future development may be used to modernize or construct facilities to house students from planned future development.

School facilities have a limited usable lifespan, and school districts must consider the lifespan for each facility when planning and determining student housing needs in the future. Residential developments will be built at different times over the coming years, and it is difficult to predict when construction on these projects will be complete. Additionally, the homes in these developments may be immediately occupied with families with school-aged children, or they may not be occupied by school-aged children for another five, ten, or fifteen years as young people who move in begin starting to have families. Thus, the District must be prepared to house students from new developments for the next several decades.

The District's current total student capacity will diminish over time if the District does not modernize its facilities. Without modernization of aging buildings, some facilities will become unavailable for the reasons described above, which will decrease the District's total student capacity. New development in the District necessitates that modernization occur in order to continue having available school housing from newly generated students. As part of these modernization efforts, the District plans to modernize existing schools and to replace some of its existing schools with new buildings on the same site as the existing schools become old, inadequate, and pose health and safety challenges.

Student Generation Rate

To identify the number of students anticipated to be generated by new residential development, student generation rates of .14 for single family detached units, .09 for single family attached units and .10 for multi family units have been identified for Sequoia Union High School District. The rates are based on a Residential Development Research Report prepared by PowerSchool on September 15, 2023.

Construction Cost

The estimated construction cost per 9-12 pupil is \$215,294. Construction costs are based on information provided by Cody Anderson Wasney Architects, Inc. With an estimate of \$366 million to construct a 9-12 school for 1,700 pupils, the cost per pupil is estimated at \$215,294. Table 2 shows the cost to construct facilities per 9-12 pupil.

Grade Level	Construction Costs
9-12	\$215,294

Source: Cody Anderson Wasney Architects, Inc.

Modernization Cost

The cost to modernize facilities is 42.2 percent of new construction costs. The percentage is based on the comparison of the State per pupil modernization grant (including 3% for Americans with Disabilities and Fire, Life Safety improvements) and the State per pupil new construction grant. For example, the State provides \$21,223 per 9-12 pupil to construct new facilities and \$8,315 to modernize facilities, which is 39.2 percent ($\$8,315/\$21,223$) of the new construction grant amount. In addition, the State provides a minimum of three percent for ADA/FLS improvements which are required by the Department of State Architect's (DSA) office. Based on the per pupil grant amounts and the ADA/FLS costs, the estimated cost to modernize facilities is 42.2 percent of the

cost to construct facilities. The School Facility Program per pupil grant amounts are included in Appendix A.

The construction cost per 9-12 pupil is \$215,294 and is outlined in Table 2. Therefore, the 9-11 per pupil cost to modernize facilities is \$90,854 ($\$215,294 \times .422$).

25 Year Modernization Need

Based on student generation rates by housing type and the projected number of residential units, 5,600 9-12 students are projected from proposed new development. The calculation is included in Table 3.

Table 3:
Projected Students from Proposed Development

Unit Type	Projected Units	Student Generation Rate	Projected Students
Single Family	2,585	.14	362
Multi Family	27,714	.10	2771
Accessory Dwelling Units	573	.10	57
Townhomes	15,451	.09	1,391
Total	46,323		4,581

Source: City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, Town of Woodside, San Mateo County, Jack Schreder & Associates.

The District’s estimated modernization need generated by students from new residential development is \$416,202,174. The calculation is included in Table 4.

Table 4:
25 Year Modernization Need

Per Pupil Modernization Cost	\$90,854
Students Generated	<u>x 4,581</u>
Modernization Need	\$416,202,174

Source: Sequoia Union High School District, Office of Public School Construction, Jack Schreder & Associates, City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, Town of Woodside, San Mateo County.

Residential Development and Fee Projections

To show a reasonable relationship exists between the construction of new housing units and the need for modernized school facilities, it will be shown that residential construction will create a school facility cost impact on the Sequoia Union High School District by students generated from new development.

The Sequoia Union High School District is located within the San Mateo County, City San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, and the Town of Woodside planning jurisdictions. According to the City planning departments, Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) have increased significantly, and the allocation of unit types have changed due to the shortage of housing. For example, areas such as Woodside and Atherton where construction has primarily been single family homes now include projections for multi family and accessory dwelling units. A summary of the projected units by housing type is included in Table 1 and Appendix B includes a development summary which includes a total of 46,323 residential units which may be constructed in District boundaries in the next 25 years. Based on average square footage by unit type, the total square footage projected is 77,793,209. An estimated 46,323 housing units totaling 77,793,209 square feet may be constructed in the District over the next 25 years. Table 5 includes a summary of square footage by unit type and planning jurisdiction.

Table 5:
Summary of Projected Residential Square Footage

Unit Type	Projected Units	Average Square Footage	Total Square Footage
San Carlos-Multi Family	3,727	1,950	7,267,650
San Carlos-Townhomes	4,743	3,227	15,305,661
East Palo Alto-Single Family	40	1,500	60,000
East Palo Alto-Multi Family	323	850	274,550
East Palo Alto-ADU	39	700	27,300
Atherton-Single Family	522	3,000	1,566,000
Atherton-Multi Family	348	977	339,996
Atherton-ADU	174	1,253	218,022
Belmont-Single Family	52	2,850	148,200
Belmont-Multi Family	1,525	1,700	2,592,500
Belmont-Townhomes	31	2,100	65,100
Redwood City-Multi Family	10,500	1,220	12,810,000
Redwood City-Townhomes	10,500	1,700	17,850,000
Menlo Park (connect Menlo General Plan Update)-Single Family	110	3,000	330,000
Menlo Park (housing element update project-Bayford)-Multi Family	3,183	977	3,109,791
Menlo Park (housing element update project-Bayford)-Townhomes	158	977	154,366
Menlo Park (housing element update-remainder of City)-Multi Family	5,155	977	5,036,436
Menlo Park (housing element update-remainder of City)-Townhomes	19	977	18,563
Portola Valley-Single Family	116	5,000	580,000

Woodside-Single Family	252	6,338	1,597,176
Woodside-Multi Family	372	977	363,444
Woodside-ADU	360	1,253	451,080
SMC (general)- Single Family	1,039	2,875	2,987,125
SMC (general)-Multi Family	11	1,850	20,350
SMC (north fair oaks area)- Single Family	454	3,100	1,407,400
SMC (north fair oaks area)- Multi Family	2,570	1,250	3,212,500
Total	46,323		77,793,209

Source: Jack Schreder & Associates, City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, Town of Woodside, San Mateo County.

Based on the District’s modernization need of \$416,202,174 generated by students from residential construction and the total projected residential square footage of 77,793,209, residential construction will create a facilities cost of \$5.35 per square foot. The calculation is included in Table 6. However, the Level I statutory fee is \$5.17 per square foot and the District has a fee sharing arrangement with its feeder elementary school districts. The High School district collects 40 percent of the fee and the feeders collect 60 percent of the fee. Therefore, the District is justified to collect \$2.07 (40 percent of \$5.17) per square foot of residential construction.

Table 6:
Facilities Cost per SF from Proposed Residential Construction

Modernization Need	Total Square Footage	Facilities Cost
\$416,202,174	/77,793,209	\$5.35

Source: Jack Schreder & Associates, City of San Carlos, City of East Palo Alto, Town of Atherton, City of Belmont, Redwood City, City of Menlo Park, Town of Portola Valley, Town of Woodside, San Mateo County.

Extent of Mitigation of School Facility Costs Provided by Level I Residential Fees

Based on development projections, an estimated 77,793,209 residential square feet may be constructed in the next 25 years. Based on the District's share of the statutory Level I fee of \$2.07 (40% of \$5.17) per square foot, the District is projected to collect \$161,031,943 ($\$2.07 \times 77,793,209$) in residential developer fees. The \$161,031,943 in total residential Level I fee revenue will cover only 39 percent of the \$416,202,174 in total school facility modernization costs attributable to new residential development over the next 25 years.

Commercial / Industrial Development and Fee Projections

In order to levy developer fees on commercial/industrial development, a district must conduct a study to determine the impact of the increased number of employees anticipated to result from commercial/industrial development upon the cost of providing school facilities within the district. For the purposes of making this determination, the developer fee justification study shall utilize employee generation estimates that are calculated on either an individual project or categorical basis. Those employee generation estimates shall be based upon commercial/industrial factors within the district or upon, in whole or part, the applicable employee generation estimates as set forth in the January 1990 edition of "San Diego Traffic Generators," a report of the San Diego Association of Governments (Education Code Section 17621). The initial study that was completed in January of 1990 (updated annually) identifies the number of employees generated for every 1,000 square feet of floor area for several development categories. These generation factors are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 indicates the number of employees generated for every 1,000 square feet of new commercial/industrial development and the number of District households generated for every employee in 12 categories of commercial/industrial development. The number of District households is calculated by adjusting the number of employees for the percentage of employees that live in the District and are heads of households. School facility costs for development projects not included on the list may be estimated by using the closest employee per 1,000 square feet ratio available for the proposed development.

In addition, an adjustment in the formula is necessary so that students moving into new residential units that have paid residential fees are not counted in the commercial/industrial fee calculation. According to the 2020 US Census, 24.7 percent of all employees in the District live in existing housing units. The 24.7 percent adjustment eliminates double counting the impact. This adjustment is shown in the worksheets in Appendix C and in Table 7.

When these figures are compared to the cost to house students, it can be shown that each square foot of commercial/industrial development creates a cost impact greater than the maximum fee, with the exception of mini storage. The data in Table 8 is based on the per student costs shown in Table 1. These figures are multiplied by the student yield factor to determine the number of students generated per square foot of commercial/industrial development. To determine the school facilities square foot impact of commercial/industrial development shown in Table 8, the students per square foot are multiplied by the cost of providing school facilities.

Table 7:
Commercial and Industrial Generation Factors

Type of Development	*Employees per 1,000 sf	**Dist HH Per Emp.	***% Emp in Exist HH	Adj.%Emp Dist HH/Emp
Medical Offices	4.27	.2	.247	.0494
Corporate Offices	2.68	.2	.247	.0494
Commercial Offices	4.78	.2	.247	.0494
Lodging	1.55	.3	.247	.0741
Scientific R&D	3.04	.2	.247	.0494
Industrial Parks	1.68	.2	.247	.0494
Industrial/Business Parks	2.21	.2	.247	.0494
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	3.62	.3	.247	.741
Community Shopping Centers	1.09	.3	.247	.741
Banks	2.82	.3	.247	.741
Mini-Storage	.06	.2	.247	.0494
Agriculture	.31	.5	.247	.12

HH=Household

* Source: San Diego Association of Governments.

** Source: Jack Schreder and Associates. Original Research.

*** Source: US Census Data, 2020

Table 8:
Commercial and Industrial Facilities Cost Impact

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>Cost Impact Per Sq. Ft.</u>
Medical Offices	\$1.90
Corporate Offices	\$1.19
Commercial Offices	\$2.12
Lodging	\$1.03
Scientific R&D	\$1.35
Industrial/Business Parks	\$0.75
Industrial/Com Park	\$0.98
Commercial Shopping Centers	\$2.41
Community Shopping Centers	\$0.73
Banks	\$1.88
Mini-Storage	\$0.03
Agriculture	\$0.34

**Sources: San Diego Association of Governments and Jack Schreder and Associates, Original Research.*

Table 8 shows that all types of commercial/industrial development will create a square foot cost justifying a commercial/industrial fee. Thus, a reasonable relationship between commercial/industrial development and the impact on the District is shown. Based on this relationship, the levying of commercial/industrial developer fees is justified in the District.

Extent of Mitigation of School Facility Costs Provided by Level I Commercial/Industrial Fees

Each square foot of commercial/industrial development creates a school facility cost ranging from \$0.03 to \$2.41 per square foot. The cost per square foot of commercial/industrial construction exceeds the District's 40 percent of the Level I commercial fee of \$0.34 (40 percent of \$0.84) in all categories of construction, with the exception of mini storage. Mini storage should be collected at \$0.03 per square foot of construction.

Summary

The cost impact on the District imposed by new students to be generated from new or expanded residential, commercial, and industrial development is greater than the maximum allowable fees. Each square foot of residential development creates a school facility cost of \$5.35 per square foot. Each square foot of commercial/industrial development creates a school facility cost ranging from \$0.03 to \$2.41 per square foot. The cost to provide additional school facilities exceeds the amount of residential and commercial/industrial fees to be generated directly and indirectly by residential construction. However, the District currently has a Level I Fee Sharing Agreement with its feeder elementary districts. The High School District collects 40 percent of the Level I fee and the feeders collect 60 percent of the fee. Therefore, the Sequoia Union High School District is justified to collect \$2.07 (40 percent of \$5.17) per square foot of residential construction and \$0.34 (40 percent of \$0.84) per square foot of commercial/industrial construction with the exception of mini storage. The mini storage category of construction should be collected at the rate of \$0.03 per square foot.

SECTION II: BACKGROUND OF DEVELOPER FEE LEGISLATION

Initially, the allowable developer fee was limited by Government Code Section 65995 to \$1.50 per square foot of covered or enclosed space for residential development and \$0.25 per square foot of covered or enclosed space of commercial or industrial development. The Level 1 fee that can be levied is adjusted every two years, according to the inflation rate as listed by the state-wide index for Class B construction set by the State Allocation Board. In January of 2024, the State Allocation Board changed the Level I fee to \$5.17 per square foot of residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot of commercial/industrial construction.

The fees collected are to be used by the school district for the construction or modernization of school facilities and may be used by the district to pay bonds, notes, loans, leases, or other installment agreements for temporary as well as permanent facilities.

Assembly Bill 3228 (Chapter 1602/Statutes of 1990) added Government Code Section 66016 requiring districts adopting or increasing any fee to first hold a public

hearing as part of a regularly scheduled meeting and publish notice of this meeting twice, with the first notice published at least ten days prior to the meeting.

Assembly Bill 3980 (Chapter 418/Statutes of 1988) added Government Code Section 66006 to require segregation of school facilities fees into a separate capital facilities account or fund and specifies that those fees and the interest earned on those fees can only be expended for the purposes for which they were collected.

Senate Bill 519 (Chapter 1346/Statutes of 1987) added Section 17625 to the Education Code. It provides that a school district can charge a fee on manufactured or mobile homes only in compliance with all of the following:

1. The fee, charge, dedication, or other form of requirement is applied to the initial location, installation, or occupancy of the manufactured home or mobile home within the school district.
2. The manufactured home or mobile home is to be located, installed, or occupied on a space or site on which no other manufactured home or mobile home was previously located, installed, or occupied.
3. The manufactured home or mobile home is to be located, installed, or occupied on a space in a mobile home park, on which the construction of the pad or foundation system commenced after September 1, 1986.

Senate Bill 1151 (Chapter 1037/Statutes of 1987) concerns agricultural buildings and adds Section 17622 to the Education Code. It provides that no school fee may be imposed and collected on a greenhouse or other space covered or enclosed for agricultural purposes unless the school district has made findings supported by substantial evidence as follows:

1. The amount of the fees bears a reasonable relationship and is limited to the needs for school facilities created by the greenhouse or other space covered or enclosed for agricultural purposes.

2. The amount of the fee does not exceed the estimated reasonable costs of the school facilities necessitated by the structures as to which the fees are to be collected.
3. In determining the amount of the fees, the school district shall consider the relationship between the proposed increase in the number of employees, if any, the size and specific use of the structure, as well as the cost of construction.

In order to levy developer fees, a study is required to assess the impact of new growth and the ability of the local school district to accommodate that growth. The need for new school construction and modernization must be determined along with the costs involved. The sources of revenue need to be evaluated to determine if the district can fund the new construction and modernization. Finally, a relationship between needs and funding raised by the fee must be quantified.

Assembly Bill 181 (Chapter 1109/Statutes of 1989), which became effective October 2, 1989, was enacted to clarify several areas of developer fee law. Assembly Bill 181 provisions include the following:

1. Exempts residential remodels of less than 500 square feet from fees.
2. Prohibits the use of developer fee revenue for routine maintenance and repair, most asbestos work, and deferred maintenance.
3. Allows the fees to be used to pay for the cost of performing developer fee justification studies.
4. States that fees are to be collected at the time of occupancy, unless the district can justify earlier collection. The fees can be collected at the time the building permit is issued if the district has established a developer fee account and funds have been appropriated for which the district has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

5. Clarifies that the establishment or increase of fees is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act.
6. Clarifies that the impact of commercial/industrial development may be analyzed by categories of development as well as an individual project-by-project basis. An appeal process for individual projects would be required if analysis was done by categories.
7. Changes the frequency of the annual inflation adjustment on the Level I fee to every two years.
8. Exempts from fees - development used exclusively for religious purposes, private schools, and government-owned development.
9. Expands the definition of senior housing, which is limited to the commercial/industrial fee, and requires the conversion from senior housing to be approved by the city/county after notification of the school district.
10. Extends the commercial/industrial fee to mobile home parks limited to older persons.

SECTION III: REQUIREMENTS OF AB 1600

Assembly Bill 1600 (Chapter 927/Statutes of 1987) adds Section 66000 through 66003 to the Government Code:

Section 66000 defines various terms used in AB 1600:

"Fee" is defined as monetary exaction (except a tax or a special assessment) which is charged by a local agency to the applicant in connection with the approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the costs of public facilities related to the development project.

"Development project" is defined broadly to mean any project undertaken for purposes of development. This would include residential, commercial, or industrial projects.

"Public facilities" is defined to include public improvements, public services, and community amenities.

Section 66001 (a) sets forth the requirements for establishing, increasing, or imposing fees. Local agencies are required to do the following:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee.
2. Identify the use to which the fee is to be put.
3. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
4. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.

Section 66001 (c) requires that any fee subject to AB 1600 be deposited in an account established pursuant to Government Code Section 66006. Section 66006 requires that development fees be deposited in a capital facilities account or fund. To avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the local agency, the fees can only be expended for the purpose for which they were collected. Any income earned on the fees should be deposited in the account and expended only for the purposes for which the fee was collected.

Section 66001 (d), as amended by Senate Bill 1693 (Monteith/Statutes of 1996, Chapter 569), requires that for the fifth year following the first deposit into a developer fee fund, and for every five years thereafter, a school district must make certain findings as to such funds. These findings are required regardless of whether the funds are committed or uncommitted. Formerly, only remaining unexpended or uncommitted fees were subject to the mandatory findings and potential refund process. Under this section as amended, relating to unexpended fee revenue, two specific findings must be made as

a part of the public information required to be formulated and made available to the public. These findings are:

1. Identification of all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to provide adequate revenue to complete any incomplete improvements identified pursuant to the requirements of Section 66001 (a)(2).
2. A designation of the approximate date upon which the anticipated funding will be received by the school district to complete the identified but as yet, incomplete improvements.

If the two findings are not made, a school district must refund the developer fee revenue on account in the manner provided in Section 66001 (e).

Section 66001 (e) provides that the local agency shall refund to the current record owners of the development project or projects on a prorated basis the unexpended or uncommitted portion of the fees and any accrued interest for which the local agency is unable to make the findings required by Section 66001 (d) that it still needs the fees.

Section 66002 provides that any local agency which levies a development fee subject to Section 66001 may adopt a capital improvement plan which shall be updated annually and shall indicate the approximate location, size, time of availability, and estimates of cost for all facilities or improvements to be financed by the fees.

Assembly Bill 1600 and the Justification for Levying Developer Fees

Effective January 1, 1989, Assembly Bill 1600 requires that any school district which establishes, increases, or imposes a fee as a condition of approval of development shall make specific findings as follows:

1. A cost nexus must be established. A cost nexus means that the amount of the fee cannot exceed the cost of providing adequate school facilities for students generated by development. Essentially, it prohibits a school district from charging a fee greater than their cost to construct or modernize facilities for use by students generated by development.

2. A benefit nexus must be established. A benefit nexus is established if the fee is used to construct or modernize school facilities benefiting students to be generated from development projects.
3. A burden nexus must be established. A burden nexus is established if a project, by the generation of students, creates a need for additional facilities or a need to modernize existing facilities.

SECTION IV: REVENUE SOURCES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES

Two general sources exist for funding facility construction and modernization - state sources and local sources. The District has considered the following available sources:

State Sources

State School Facility Program

Senate Bill 50 reformed the State School Building Lease-Purchase Program in August of 1998. The new program, entitled the School Facility Program, provides funding under a “grant” program once a school district establishes eligibility. Funding required from districts will be a 50/50 match for construction projects and 60/40 (District/State) match for modernization projects. Districts may levy the current statutory developer fee as long as a district can justify collecting that fee. If a district desires to collect more than the statutory fee (Level 2 or Level 3), that district must meet certain requirements outlined in the law, as well as conduct a needs assessment to enable a higher fee to be calculated.

The District is actively pursuing State School Facility Program funding.

Local Sources

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 allows school districts to establish a community facilities district in order to impose a special tax to raise funds to finance the construction of school facilities.

1. The voter approved tax levy requires a two-thirds vote by the voters of the proposed Mello-Roos district.
2. If a Mello-Roos district is established in an area in which fewer than twelve registered voters reside, the property owners may elect to establish a Mello-Roos district.

General Obligation Bonds

General Obligation (GO) bonds may be issued by any school district for the purposes of purchasing real property or constructing or purchasing buildings or equipment "of a permanent nature." Because GO bonds are secured by an ad valorem tax levied on all taxable property in the district, their issuance is subject to two-thirds voter approval or 55% majority vote under Proposition 39 in an election. School districts are obligated, in the event of delinquent payments on the part of the property owners, to raise the amount of tax levied against the non-delinquent properties to a level sufficient to pay the principal and interest coming due on the bonds.

The District passed a \$591 million bond in November 2022. The projects included in the bond exceed available funds.

Developer Fees

The District completed a Facility Master Plan in June of 2023 which includes a summary of District facility needs. Developer fees will be used to complete those projects included in the 2023 Master Plan which are necessary to maintain the existing level of service for students from new development. Projects will include, but not are not limited to, the upgrade of infrastructure systems, modernization of classrooms and replacement of outdated classrooms. While modernization projects are a significant focus of projected facility needs, the District will also have a need to add capacity with Developer Fees in the future as new housing units are constructed.

School District General Funds

The District's general funds are needed by the district to provide for the operation of its instructional program.

Expenditure of Lottery Funds

Government Code Section 8880.5 states: "It is the intent of this chapter that all funds allocated from the California State Lottery Education Fund shall be used exclusively for the education of pupils and students and no funds shall be spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing research, or any other non-instructional purpose."

SECTION V: ESTABLISHING THE COST, BENEFIT AND BURDEN NEXUS

In accordance with Government Code Section 66001, the District has established a cost nexus and identified the purpose of the fee, established a benefit nexus, and a burden nexus:

Establishment of a Cost Nexus & Identify Purpose of the Fee

The Sequoia Union High School District chooses to replace and/or modernize facilities for the additional students created by development in the district and the cost to replace and/or modernize facilities exceeds the amount of developer fees to be collected. It is clear that when educational facilities are provided for students generated by new residential, commercial, and industrial development, the cost of replacing and/or modernizing facilities exceeds developer fee generation, thereby establishing a cost nexus.

Establishment of a Benefit Nexus

Students generated by new residential, commercial, and industrial development will be attending district schools. Housing District students in replaced and/or modernized facilities will directly benefit those students from the new development projects upon which the fee is imposed, therefore, a benefit nexus is established.

Establishment of a Burden Nexus

The generation of new students by development will create a need for additional and/or modernized school facilities. The District must carry the burden of replacing and/or modernizing facilities required by the students generated by future developments and the need for replacing and/or modernizing facilities will be, in part, satisfied by the levying of developer fees, therefore, a burden nexus is established.

SECTION VI: FACILITY FUNDING ALTERNATIVES

The District does not currently have funds to provide for the shortfall in modernization costs. We suggest the District continue to participate in the State School Facility Program to access State facility funds and explore all facility funding sources.

STATEMENT TO IDENTIFY PURPOSE OF FEE

It is a requirement of AB 1600 that the District identify the purpose of the fee. The purpose of fees being levied shall be used for the replacement and/or modernization of school facilities. The District will provide for the replacement and/or modernization of school facilities, in part, with developer fees. The District completed a Facility Master Plan in June 2023 which includes a summary of District facility needs. Developer fees will be used to complete those projects included in the 2023 Master Plan which are necessary to maintain the existing level of service for students from new development. Projects will include, but not are not limited to, the upgrade of infrastructure systems, modernization of classrooms and replacement of outdated classrooms. While modernization projects are a significant focus of projected facility needs, the District will also have a need to add capacity with Developer Fees in the future as new housing units are constructed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL ACCOUNT

Pursuant to Government Code section 66006, the District has established a special account in which fees for capital facilities are deposited. The fees collected in this account will be expended only for the purpose for which they were collected. Any interest income earned on the fees that are deposited in such an account must remain with the principal.

The school district must make specific information available to the public within 180 days of the end of each fiscal year pertaining to each developer fee fund. The information required to be made available to the public by Section 66006 (b) (1) was amended by SB 1693 and includes specific information on fees expended and refunds made during the year.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the fee justification provided in this report, it is recommended that the Sequoia Union High School District levy residential development fees and commercial/industrial fees up to the statutory fee for which justification has been determined.

SOURCES

- Aozasa, Lisa. Deputy Director, San Mateo County Planning and Building.
- Bendix, Brittany. Consulting Town Planner (via M-Group), Town of Atherton.
- California Basic Educational Data System. California State Department of Education. October Enrollments, 2019-2022.
- Cheung, Clara. Information Services Manager, Sequoia Union High School District.
- Collard, Gary. Lead Housing Analyst for Southern California. California State Department of Housing and Community Development.
- De Melo, Carlos. Community Development Director, City of Belmont.
- Gaines, Melvin. City Manager, City of East Palo Alto.
- Leach, Crystal. Superintendent, Sequoia Union High School District.
- McClure, Brent. AIA, Principal, Cody Anderson Wasney Architects, Inc.
- Mendoza, Christabel. Consulting Assistant Planner (via M-Group), Town of Atherton.
- Office of Public School Construction. Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act, 1998.
- Porras, Lisa. Assistant Community Development Director, City of San Carlos.
- Rojas, Apollo. Planner, City of Redwood City.
- San Diego Association of Governments. Traffic Generators, January 1990.
- Schaan, Sage. AICP CEP, Planning Director, Town of Woodside.
- Schreder, Jack and Associates. Original research.
- Smith, Adrienne. Senior Planner, Town of Portola Valley.
- Smith, Tom. Principal Planner, City of Menlo Park.
- United States Census, 2020.

APPENDIX A
PER PUPIL GRANT AMOUNT

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2024

Grant Amount Adjustments

New Construction	SFP Regulation Section	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-23	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-24
Elementary	1859.71	\$15,983	\$15,770
Middle	1859.71	\$16,904	\$16,679
High	1859.71	\$21,509	\$21,223
Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.1	\$44,911	\$44,314
Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.1	\$30,036	\$29,637
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$19	\$19
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$25	\$25
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.71.2	\$43	\$42
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$80	\$79
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.2	\$57	\$56
Automatic Sprinkler System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$268	\$264
Automatic Sprinkler System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$319	\$315
Automatic Sprinkler System – High	1859.71.2	\$331	\$327
Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$846	\$835
Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.2	\$567	\$559

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2024

Grant Amount Adjustments

Modernization	SFP Regulation Section	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-23	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-24
Elementary	1859.78	\$6,086	\$6,005
Middle	1859.78	\$6,436	\$6,350
High	1859.78	\$8,427	\$8,315
Special Day Class - Severe	1859.78.3	\$19,396	\$19,138
Special Day Class – Non- Severe	1859.78.3	\$12,977	\$12,804
State Special School – Severe	1859.78	\$32,330	\$31,900
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.78.4	\$198	\$195
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.78.4	\$198	\$195
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.78.4	\$198	\$195
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.4	\$544	\$537
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non- Severe	1859.78.4	\$365	\$360
Over 50 Years Old – Elementary	1859.78.6	\$8,454	\$8,342
Over 50 Years Old – Middle	1859.78.6	\$8,942	\$8,823
Over 50 Years Old – High	1859.78.6	\$11,705	\$11,549
Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.6	\$26,948	\$26,590
Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.6	\$18,019	\$17,779
Over 50 Years Old – State Special Day School – Severe	1859.78.6	\$44,910	\$44,313

APPENDIX B
PROJECTED DEVELOPMENT

Sequoia Union High School District
Development Summary 2023

<u>Planning Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>Multi Family</u>	<u>ADUs</u>	<u>Townhomes</u>	<u>Avg. SF</u>	<u>Total SF</u>
San Carlos		3,727			1,950	7,267,650
San Carlos				4,743	3,227	15,305,661
East Palo Alto	40				1,500	60,000
East Palo Alto		323			850	274,550
East Palo Alto			39		700	27,300
Atherton	522				3,000	1,566,000
Atherton		348			977	339,996
Atherton			174		1,253	218,022
Belmont	52				2,850	148,200
Belmont		1,525			1,700	2,592,500
Belmont				31	2,100	65,100
Redwood City	0	10,500			1,220	12,810,000
Redwood City				10,500	1,700	17,850,000
Menlo Park (Connect Menlo General Plan Update)	110				3,000	330,000
Menlo Park (Housing Element Update Project-Bayfront)		3,183			977	3,109,791
Menlo Park (Housing Element Update Project-Bayfront)				158	977	154,366
Menlo Park (Housing Element Update Project-Remainder of City)		5,155			977	5,036,435
Menlo Park (Housing Element Update Project-Remainder of City)				19	977	18,563
Portola Valley	116				5,000	580,000
Woodside	252				6,338	1,597,176
Woodside		372			977	363,444
Woodside			360		1,253	451,080
SMC (general)	1,039				2,875	2,987,125
SMC (general)		11			1,850	20,350
SMC (North Fair Oaks Area)	454				3,100	1,407,400
SMC (North Fair Oaks Area)		2,570			1,250	3,212,500
Total	2,585	27,714	573	15,451		77,793,209

Sources: City of San Carlos, East Palo Alto, Atherton, Belmont, Redwood City, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, Woodside, San Mateo County.

Total Projected Residential Units

46,323

APPENDIX C

**COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL
CALCULATIONS**

Sequoia Union High School District						
Commercial/Industrial Calculations						
	EMP/ 1000 SQ.FT	DIST.HH/ EMP	HH/SF	% EMP IN EXIST HH	ADJUSTED HH/SF	ADJ % DIST HH/EMP
MEDICAL	4.27	0.2	0.000854	0.247	0.000210938	0.0494
CORP. OFFICE	2.68	0.2	0.000536	0.247	0.000132392	0.0494
COM. OFFICE	4.78	0.2	0.000956	0.247	0.000236132	0.0494
LODGING	1.55	0.3	0.000465	0.247	0.0001149	0.0741
R&D	3.04	0.2	0.000608	0.247	0.000150176	0.0494
IN. PARK	1.68	0.2	0.000336	0.247	0.000082992	0.0494
IN/COM PARK	2.21	0.2	0.000442	0.247	0.000109174	0.0494
NBHD COMM SC	3.62	0.3	0.001086	0.247	0.000268242	0.0741
COMMUNITY SC	1.09	0.3	0.000327	0.247	0.000080769	0.0741
BANKS	2.82	0.3	0.000846	0.247	0.000208962	0.0741
MINI-STORAGE	0.06	0.2	0.000012	0.247	0.000002964	0.0494
AGRICULTURE	0.31	0.5	0.000155	0.247	0.0000383	0.12
STUDENT GENERATION RATE			MODERNIZATION COST PER STUDENT			
9-12 (weighted avg. attached)	0.0989		9-12	\$90,854		
STUDENTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(YIELD FACTORS X ADJ HH/SQ. FT IN COLUMN F)						
	9-12					
MEDICAL	0.00002086					
CORP. OFFICE	0.00001309					
COM. OFFICE	0.00002335					
LODGING	0.00001136					
R&D	0.00001485					
IN. PARK	0.00000821					
IN/COM PARK	0.00001080					
COM. SC.	0.00002653					
COMMUNITY SC	0.00000799					
BANKS	0.00002067					
MINI STORAGE	0.00000029					
AGRICULTURE	0.00000379					
COSTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(STUDENTS/ SQ. FOOT X STUDENT COST/SQ. FOOT IN EACH CATEGORY)						
	9-12					
MEDICAL	\$1.90					
CORP. OFFICE	\$1.19					
COM. OFFICE	\$2.12					
LODGING	\$1.03					
R&D	\$1.35					
IN. PARK	\$0.75					
IN/COM PARK	\$0.98					
COM. SC.	\$2.41					
COMMUNITY SC	\$0.73					
BANKS	\$1.88					
MINI STORAGE	\$0.03					
AGRICULTURE	\$0.34					

Sequoia Union High School District
 Weighted Student Generation Rate

Unit Type	Projected Units	Student Generation Rate	Projected Students
Single Family	2,585	0.14	362
Multi Family	27,714	0.1	2771
Accessory Dwelling	573	0.1	57
Townhomes (single family attached)	<u>15,451</u>	0.09	<u>1,391</u>
Total	46,323		4581
Weighted Student Generation Rate	46,323/4,581		0.0989