



Level I Developer Fee Study
for
San Mateo-Foster City
School District

August 6, 2020

Joan Rosas, Ed.D., Superintendent

Board of Trustees

Noelia Corzo, President
Kenneth Chin, Vice President
Rebecca Hitchcock, Clerk
Alison Proctor, Trustee
Shara Watkins, Trustee

Prepared by:

Jack Schreder & Associates, Inc.



2230 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
916-441-0986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
SCHOOL DISTRICT BACKGROUND.....	3
INTRODUCTION	4
SECTION I: DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION	7
Reconstruction.....	7
Reconstruction Need	7
Residential Development and Fee Projections	13
SECTION II: BACKGROUND OF DEVELOPER FEE LEGISLATION.....	18
SECTION III: REQUIREMENTS OF AB 1600.....	21
SECTION IV: REVENUE SOURCES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES.....	24
State Sources	24
Local Sources	24
SECTION V: ESTABLISHING THE COST, BENEFIT AND BURDEN NEXUS.....	26
SECTION VI: FACILITY FUNDING ALTERNATIVES.....	27
STATEMENT TO IDENTIFY PURPOSE OF FEE.....	27
ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL ACCOUNT.....	27
RECOMMENDATION.....	28
SOURCES	29
APPENDIX A: PER PUPIL GRANT AMOUNTS	APP 1
APPENDIX B: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL CALCULATIONS	APP 2

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Housing Projection Summary.....	8
Table 2: Student Generation Rates.....	10
Table 3: Projected Students from Proposed Development.....	12
Table 4: 25 Year Reconstruction Need.....	12
Table 5: Summary of Projected Residential Square Footage.....	14
Table 6: Facilities Cost per SF from Proposed Residential Construction.....	15
Table 7: Commercial/Industrial Generation Factors.....	16
Table 8: Commercial/Industrial Facilities Impact.....	17

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 reconstruction of school facilities provided the District can show justification for levying of fees.
- In January 2020, the State Allocation Board increased the amount of Level I developer fees that school districts are authorized to collect to \$4.08 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.66 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction.
- The San Mateo-Foster City School District has a fee sharing agreement with the San Mateo Union High School District which allows the High School District to receive 40 percent of the fee and Elementary School District to receive 60 percent of the fee. If one of the participating districts does not collect their full percentage, the other District may collect up to their justifiable amount, not to exceed \$4.08 for residential construction and \$0.66 for commercial/industrial construction.
- The San Mateo-Foster City School District is justified in receiving up to \$3.04 per square foot for residential construction and up to \$0.66 per square foot of commercial/industrial construction, with the exception of mini storage and agriculture. The mini storage category of construction should be collected at a rate of \$0.02 per square foot and agriculture at a rate of \$0.25 per square foot.
- In general, when possible, it is fiscally more prudent to extend the useful life of an existing facility than to construct new facilities. The cost to reconstruct facilities is approximately 41.1 percent of the cost to construct new facilities.
- The residential justification is based on the San Mateo-Foster City School District's projected reconstruction need of \$14,091,520 for students generated from new residential development over the next 25 years and the projected residential square footage of 4,636,012 over the same period.

- Based on the reconstruction 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 \$3.04 (\$14,091,520/4,636,012).
- Each square foot of commercial/industrial construction will create a school facilities cost ranging from \$0.02 to \$1.72 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.

SCHOOL DISTRICT BACKGROUND

The San Mateo-Foster City School District serves approximately 11,500 students in preschool through eighth grade at 15 elementary schools, two K-8 schools, three middle schools and a children's center. Many students identify as Hispanic or Latino (approximately 37%), followed by Asian (approximately 25%), then White (approximately 22%), with a small portion of other ethnic groups. Approximately 29 percent of students are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged and 24 percent of students are English Learners. While most of the District's English Learners come from Spanish speaking families, the San Mateo and Foster City communities are culturally and linguistically diverse, and home to over twenty languages. The District's vision is to "educate, inspire, and empower every student in every school every day to live, lead, and learn with integrity and joy." In addition to rigorous curriculum in the Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and the CA English Language Development Standards, the District also offers a variety of options, including International Baccalaureate, Spanish Immersion, Mandarin Immersion, STEM, and Montessori programs. Beyond academics, the District focuses on social-emotional growth and promoting healthy lifestyles, through positive reinforcement, unified interventions, and restorative practices. "The San Mateo-Foster City School District provides rigorous, high quality and equitable education while partnering with our families and community to support all students to achieve their full academic, social and emotional potential."

The San Mateo-Foster City School District serves students in San Mateo County, including the cities of San Mateo, Foster City, and a very small portion of Hillsborough. The City of San Mateo is the second largest city in the County, while Foster City is a newer city, with the third greatest population growth in the County of 9.5 percent from 2010 to 2015. According to the 2017-2019 County Profile for the County of San Mateo, the region is home to many industry leaders in bioscience, technology, hospitality, financial management, health care, transportation, and computer software. Some of the largest employers in the County are located within the District's jurisdictional boundaries, including Franklin Templeton Investments, Gilead Sciences, SurveyMonkey, and Visa, Inc. The region has long been known as a center for innovation.

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 reconstruction 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 I fee to \$1.65 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.27 per square foot for commercial and 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 \$0.31 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.

The next adjustment to the fee will occur at the January 2022 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.

In accordance with the decision in the *Cresta Bella LP v. Poway Unified School District* (2013 WL 3942961) court case, school districts are required to demonstrate that reconstruction projects will generate an increase in the student population thereby creating an impact on the school district's facilities. School districts must establish a reasonable relationship between an increase in student facilities needs and the reconstruction project in order to levy developer fees.

Purpose of Study

This study will demonstrate the relationship between residential, commercial and industrial growth and the need for the reconstruction of school facilities in the San Mateo-Foster City School District.

SECTION I: DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION

California developer fee law requires that before fees can be levied, a school 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 San Mateo-Foster City School District.

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 reconstruction/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. Developer fees may not be used for regular maintenance, routine repair of school buildings and facilities or deferred maintenance. The authorization to justify reconstruction of school facilities and extend the useful life of existing schools is contained in Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code Section 66001 (g). Based on studies such as this one, School districts are permitted to reconstruct existing or build new school facilities with developer fees as justified by this Study.

Reconstruction 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 reconstruction 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 reconstruct facilities.

Projected Development

The San Mateo-Foster City School District is located within the San Mateo County, Foster City, City of San Mateo, and Hillsborough Planning jurisdictions. All planning departments were contacted regarding projected development. According to the City of Hillsborough Planning Department, significant development is not projected in the small area of the District’s boundary located in their jurisdiction. The Foster City and City of San Mateo Planning Departments suggested referring to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), for a conservative 25 year projection. According to ABAG, a total of 3,100 new residential units are projected for the City of San Mateo and 430 for Foster City. According to the San Mateo County Planning Department, an estimated 30 new units are projected for a 25 year period in the small unincorporated area. The breakdown of the total units by unit type is based on recent projects submitted to the Planning Departments. A total of 3,560 new units may be constructed in the next 25 years. A summary of the projected units by housing type and jurisdiction is included in Table 1.

Table 1:
Housing Projection Summary

Planning Jurisdiction	Housing Type	Housing Units
Foster City	Apartments (76% of 430)	327
Foster City	Condos (10% of 430)	43
Foster City	Townhouses (14% of 430)	60
City of San Mateo	Apartments (65% of 3,100)	2,015
City of San Mateo	Condos (18% of 3,100)	558
City of San Mateo	Townhouses (10% of 3,100)	310
City of San Mateo	Single Family Detached (3% of 3,100)	93
City of San Mateo	Below Market Rate (4% of 3,100)	124
County of San Mateo	Single Family Detached (info. provided by County)	30
Total		3,560

Source: Foster City Planning Department, City of San Mateo Planning Department, San Mateo County Planning Department.

The School Facility Program allows districts to apply for reconstruction funding for permanent classrooms over 25 years old and portable classrooms over 20 years old, meaning that school facilities are presumed to be eligible for, and therefore need, reconstruction after that time period. It is therefore generally presumed that school facilities have a useful life span of 25/20 years before reconstruction/modernization is needed in order to maintain the same level of service as previously existed. The same would be true for reconstruction/modernization of buildings 25/20 years after their initial construction. 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 reconstruction/modernization needs are considered over a 25/20 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 reconstruct 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 reconstruct its facilities. Without reconstruction 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 reconstruction occur in order to continue to have available school housing for newly generated students. As part of these reconstruction efforts, the District plans to reconstruct existing schools or 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 are included in Table 2. The rates are based on student generation rates calculated for San Mateo-Foster City School District by Enrollment Projection Consultants in January 2020.

Table 2:
Student Generation Rates

Planning Jurisdiction	Housing Type	Housing Units
Foster City	Apartments	.18
Foster City	Condos	.18
Foster City	Townhouses	.18
City of San Mateo	Apartments	.04
City of San Mateo	Condos	.04
City of San Mateo	Townhouses	.12
City of San Mateo	Single Family Detached	.12
City of San Mateo	Below Market Rate	.7
County of San Mateo	Single Family Detached	.12

Source: Enrollment Projection Consultants.

Construction Cost

Based on the current construction of a new school in the District, the estimated construction cost is \$45,000,000 to house a capacity of 420 pupils, for a per pupil cost of \$107,143 (\$45,000,000/420). Construction costs are based on information provided by the District for the current construction of a new school.

Reconstruction Cost

The cost to reconstruct facilities is 41.1 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 \$12,451 per K-6 pupil to construct new facilities and \$4,741 to reconstruct facilities, which is 38.1 percent ($\$4,741/\$12,451$) 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 reconstruct facilities is 41.1 percent of the cost to construct facilities. The School Facility Program per pupil grant amounts are included in Appendix A.

The construction cost per grade K-8 pupil is \$107,143 and is outlined in Table 2. Therefore, the per pupil cost to reconstruct facilities per grade K-8 pupil is \$44,036 ($\$107,143 \times .411$).

25 Year Reconstruction Need

Based on student generation rates by housing type and the projected number of residential units, 320 grade K-8 students are projected from proposed new development. The calculation is included in Table 3.

Table 3:
Projected Students from Proposed Development

Planning Jurisdiction	Housing Type	Projected Units	Student Generation Rate	Projected Students
Foster City	Apartments	327	.18	59
Foster City	Condos	43	.18	8
Foster City	Townhomes	60	.18	11
City of San Mateo	Apartments	2,015	.04	81
City of San Mateo	Condos	558	.04	22
City of San Mateo	Townhomes	310	.12	37
City of San Mateo	Single Family Detached	93	.12	11
City of San Mateo	Below Market Rate	124	.7	87
County of San Mateo	Single Family Detached	30	.12	4
Total		3,560		320
Weighted Student Generation Rate			320/3,560	.0899

Source: Foster City, City of San Mateo, San Mateo County, Enrollment Projection Consultants, Jack Schreder & Associates.

The District's estimated reconstruction need generated by students from new residential development is \$14,091,520. The calculation is included in Table 4.

Table 4:
25 Year Reconstruction Need

Per Pupil Reconstruction Cost	\$44,036
Students Generated	x 320
Reconstruction Need	\$14,091,520

Source: San Mateo-Foster City School District, Office of Public School Construction, Jack Schreder & Associates, Foster City, City of San Mateo, San Mateo County, Enrollment Projection Consultants.

Residential Development and Fee Projections

To show a reasonable relationship exists between the construction of new residential housing units and the need for reconstructed/modernized school facilities, it will be shown that residential construction will create a school facility cost impact on the San Mateo-Foster City School District by students generated from the new residential development.

The San Mateo-Foster City School District is located within the San Mateo County, Foster City, City of San Mateo, and Hillsborough Planning jurisdictions. All planning departments were contacted regarding projected development. According to the City of Hillsborough Planning Department, development is not projected in the small area of the District's boundary located in their jurisdiction. The Foster City and City of San Mateo Planning Departments suggested referring to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), provided by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), for a conservative 25 year projection. According to ABAG, a total of 3,100 residential units are projected for the City of San Mateo and 430 for Foster City. According to the San Mateo County Planning Department, an estimated 30 units are projected for a 25 year period. A total of 3,560 units may be constructed in the next 25 years. Based on average square footages by unit type, the total square footage projected is 4,636,012. Table 5 includes the breakdown of square footage by unit type. An estimated 3,560 housing units, totaling 4,636,012 square feet of space, may be constructed in the District over the next 25 years.

Table 5:
Summary of Projected Residential Square Footage

Planning Jurisdiction	Unit Type	Projected Units	Average Square Footage	Total Square Footage
Foster City	Apartments	327	1,067	348,909
Foster City	Condos	43	1,790	76,970
Foster City	Townhomes	60	1,790	107,400
City of San Mateo	Apartments	2,015	1,067	2,150,005
City of San Mateo	Condos	558	1,790	998,820
City of San Mateo	Townhomes	310	1,790	554,900
City of San Mateo	Single Family Detached	93	1,900	176,700
City of San Mateo	Below Market Rate	124	1,067	132,308
San Mateo County	Single Family Detached	30	3,000	90,000
Total				4,636,012

Source: Foster City Planning Department, City of San Mateo Planning Department, San Mateo County Planning Department.

Based on the District's reconstruction need of \$14,091,520 generated by students from residential construction and the total projected residential square footage of 4,636,012, residential construction will create a facilities cost of \$3.04 per square foot. The calculation is included in Table 6. However, the Level I statutory fee for residential construction is \$4.08 per square foot and the District has a fee sharing agreement with the San Mateo Union High School District. The High School District may receive 40 percent of the fee and the San Mateo-Foster City School District may receive 60 percent of the fee. If one of the participating districts does not collect their full percentage, the other District may collect up to their justifiable amount, not to exceed \$4.08 for residential construction. Therefore, the District is justified in collecting up to \$3.04 per square foot of residential construction.

Table 6:
Facilities Cost per SF from Proposed Residential Construction

Reconstruction Need	Total Square Footage	=	Facilities Cost
\$14,091,520	/4,636,012		\$3.04

Source: San Mateo-Foster City School District, Jack Schreder & Associates, Office of Public School Construction.

Commercial / Industrial Development and Fee Projections

In order to levy developer fees on commercial and industrial development, a district must conduct a study to determine the impact of the increased number of employees anticipated to result from commercial and 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 and 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 and industrial development and the number of District households generated for every employee in 12 categories of commercial and 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. Forty percent of all employees who work in San Mateo and Foster City live in existing housing units. The forty percent adjustment eliminates double counting the impact. This adjustment is shown in the worksheets in Appendix B and in Table 7.

These adjustment factors are based on surveys of commercial and industrial employees in school districts similar to the District. When these figures are compared to the cost to house students, it can be shown that each square foot of commercial and industrial development creates a cost impact greater than the maximum fee, with the exception of mini storage and agriculture. These figures are multiplied by the weighted student yield factor to determine the number of students generated per square foot of commercial and industrial development. To determine the school facilities square foot impact of commercial and industrial development shown in Table 8, the students per square foot are multiplied by the cost of providing school facilities. The data in Table 8 is based on the \$44,036 per student cost to reconstruct facilities.

Table 7:
Commercial/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	.4	.08
Corporate Offices	2.68	.2	.4	.08
Commercial Offices	4.78	.2	.4	.08
Lodging	1.55	.3	.4	.12
Scientific R&D	3.04	.2	.4	.08
Industrial Parks	1.68	.2	.4	.08
Industrial/Business Parks	2.21	.2	.4	.08
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	3.62	.3	.4	.12
Community Shopping Centers	1.09	.3	.4	.12
Banks	2.82	.3	.4	.12
Mini-Storage	.06	.2	.4	.08
Agriculture	.31	.5	.4	.20

* Source: San Diego Association of Governments.

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

Table 8:
Commercial/Industrial Facilities Impact

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>Cost Impact Per Sq. Ft.</u>
Medical Offices	\$1.35
Corporate Offices	\$0.85
Commercial Offices	\$1.51
Lodging	\$0.74
Scientific R&D	\$0.96
Industrial/Business Parks	\$0.53
Industrial/Com Park	\$0.70
Commercial Shopping Centers	\$1.72
Community Shopping Centers	\$0.52
Banks	\$1.34
Mini-Storage	\$0.02
Agriculture	\$0.25

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

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

Summary

The cost impact on the District imposed by new students to be generated from new residential, commercial, and industrial development is greater than the maximum allowable fees. Each square foot of residential development creates a school facility cost of \$3.04 per square foot. Each square foot of commercial and industrial development creates a school facility cost ranging from \$0.02 to \$1.72 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 the San Mateo Union High School District. The High School District may receive 40 percent of the fee and the San Mateo-Foster City School District may receive 60

percent of the fee. If one of the participating districts does not collect their full percentage, the other District may collect up to their justifiable amount, not to exceed \$4.08 for residential construction and \$0.66 for commercial/industrial construction.

Therefore, the District is justified in collecting up to \$3.04 per square foot of residential construction and up to \$0.66 per square foot of commercial/industrial construction, with the exception of mini storage and agriculture. The mini storage category of construction should be collected at the rate of \$0.02 per square foot and agriculture should be collected at the rate of \$0.25 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 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 2020, the State Allocation Board changed the Level I fee to \$4.08 per square foot of residential construction and \$0.66 per square foot of commercial and industrial construction.

The fees collected are to be used by the school district for the construction or reconstruction 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.

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 reconstruction 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 reconstruction. Finally, a relationship between needs and funding raised by the fee must be quantified.

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.

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 and 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.

Assembly Bill 3228 (Chapter 1602/Statutes of 1990) added Government Code Section 66016 requiring districts adopting or increasing any fee to first hold at least one open and 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.

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 which 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 reconstruct 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 reconstruct 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 reconstruct existing facilities.

SECTION IV: REVENUE SOURCES FOR FUNDING FACILITIES

Two general sources exist for funding facility construction and reconstruction - 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 reconstruction/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.

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 \$148 million bond in 2015. The projects included in the bond exceed available funds. Bond funds have been expended or are encumbered for only some of the current facility needs.

Developer Fees

The District's developer fees are dedicated to the current needs related directly to reconstruction and replacement of school facilities.

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 San Mateo-Foster City School District chooses to reconstruct and/or modernize facilities for the additional students created by development in the district and the cost to reconstruct 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 that 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 reconstructed 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 reconstruction costs. We suggest the District continue to participate in the State School Facility Program to access State facility funds.

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 reconstruction of school facilities. The District will provide for the reconstruction of school facilities, in part, with developer fees. Aedis Architecture completed a District Facility Master Plan in August 2020 which includes a summary of District facility needs totaling an estimated \$865 million, on which developer fees may be expended. Projects range from fire alarm upgrades, HVAC projects, kitchen upgrades, plumbing upgrades, replacement of portables, and restroom additions. A complete list of projects is included in the August 2020 Facility Master Plan. While modernization needs are a significant focus of current and projected facility needs, the District will also need to add facilities at existing sites as enrollment increases.

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 San Mateo-Foster City 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 & Building.

Association of Bay Area Governments, Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

Busselle, Tish. Advisor to the Superintendent, Measure X Projects, San Mateo-Foster City School District.

Cadiz, Jose-Noel. Director of Facilities, San Mateo-Foster City School District.

California Basic Educational Data System. California State Department of Education. October Enrollments, 2016-2019.

Collard, Gary. Lead Housing Analyst for Southern California. California State Department of Housing and Community Development.

County Profile, San Mateo County. 2017-2019.

Enrollment Projection Consultants, San Mateo Foster City Enrollment Projection, January 2020.

Gaffney, Patrick. Chief Business Official, San Mateo-Foster City School District.

Grundmann, Vikki. Planning Support Specialist, City of Hillsborough.

Klein, Julia. Principal Planner, City of San Mateo Planning and Building.

Local Control Accountability Plan. San Mateo-Foster City School District. 2019-2020.

Maier, Timothy. Associate Planner, Foster City.

Office of Public School Construction. Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act, 1998.

Rosas, Joan, Ed.D. Superintendent, San Mateo-Foster City School District.

San Diego Association of Governments. Traffic Generators, January 1990.

Schreder, Jack and Associates. Original research.

APPENDIX A
PER PUPIL GRANT AMOUNTS

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 22, 2020

Grant Amount Adjustments

New Construction	SFP Regulation Section	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-19	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-20
Elementary	1859.71	\$12,197	\$12,451
Middle	1859.71	\$12,901	\$13,169
High	1859.71	\$16,415	\$16,756
Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.1	\$34,274	\$34,987
Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.1	\$22,922	\$23,399
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$15	\$15
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$20	\$20
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.71.2	\$33	\$34
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$61	\$62
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.2	\$43	\$44
Automatic Sprinkler System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$205	\$209
Automatic Sprinkler System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$243	\$248
Automatic Sprinkler System – High	1859.71.2	\$253	\$258
Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$646	\$659
Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.2	\$433	\$442

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 22, 2020

Grant Amount Adjustments

Modernization	SFP Regulation Section	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-19	Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-20
Elementary	1859.78	\$4,644	\$4,741
Middle	1859.78	\$4,912	\$5,014
High	1859.78	\$6,431	\$6,565
Special Day Class - Severe	1859.78.3	\$14,802	\$15,110
Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.3	\$9,903	\$10,109
State Special School – Severe	1859.78	\$24,672	\$25,185
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.78.4	\$151	\$154
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.78.4	\$151	\$154
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.78.4	\$151	\$154
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.4	\$415	\$424
Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.4	\$278	\$284
Over 50 Years Old – Elementary	1859.78.6	\$6,452	\$6,586
Over 50 Years Old – Middle	1859.78.6	\$6,824	\$6,966
Over 50 Years Old – High	1859.78.6	\$8,933	\$9,119
Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.6	\$20,565	\$20,993
Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.6	\$13,752	\$14,038
Over 50 Years Old – State Special Day School – Severe	1859.78.6	\$34,273	\$34,986

APPENDIX B

**COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL
CALCULATIONS**

San Mateo-Foster City 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	0.4	0.0003416	0.08
CORP. OFFICE	2.68	0.2	0.000536	0.4	0.0002144	0.08
COM. OFFICE	4.78	0.2	0.000956	0.4	0.0003824	0.08
LODGING	1.55	0.3	0.000465	0.4	0.0001860	0.12
R&D	3.04	0.2	0.000608	0.4	0.0002432	0.08
IN. PARK	1.68	0.2	0.000336	0.4	0.0001344	0.08
IN/COM PARK	2.21	0.2	0.000442	0.4	0.0001768	0.08
NBHD COMM SC	3.62	0.3	0.001086	0.4	0.0004344	0.12
COMMUNITY SC	1.09	0.3	0.000327	0.4	0.0001308	0.12
BANKS	2.82	0.3	0.000846	0.4	0.0003384	0.12
MINI-STORAGE	0.06	0.2	0.000012	0.4	0.0000048	0.08
AGRICULTURE	0.31	0.5	0.000155	0.4	0.0000620	0.20
STUDENT GENERATION RATE			COST PER STUDENT			
K-8	0.0899		K-8	\$44,036		
STUDENTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(YIELD FACTORS X ADJ HH/SQ. FT IN COLUMN F)						
	K-8					
MEDICAL	0.000031					
CORP. OFFICE	0.000019					
COM. OFFICE	0.000034					
LODGING	0.000017					
R&D	0.000022					
IN. PARK	0.000012					
IN/COM PARK	0.000016					
COM. SC.	0.000039					
COMMUNITY SC	0.000012					
BANKS	0.000030					
MINI STORAGE	0.000000					
AGRICULTURE	0.000006					
COSTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(STUDENTS/ SQ. FOOT X STUDENT COST/SQ. FOOT IN EACH CATEGORY)						
	K-8					
MEDICAL	\$1.35					
CORP. OFFICE	\$0.85					
COM. OFFICE	\$1.51					
LODGING	\$0.74					
R&D	\$0.96					
IN. PARK	\$0.53					
IN/COM PARK	\$0.70					
COM. SC.	\$1.72					
COMMUNITY SC	\$0.52					
BANKS	\$1.34					
MINI STORAGE	\$0.02					
AGRICULTURE	\$0.25					