MVLA
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Level I Developer Fee Study for Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District

July 27, 2020

Nellie Meyer, Superintendent

Board of Trustees
Sanjay Dave, President
Fiona Walter, Vice President
Catherine Vonnegut, Clerk
Phil Faillace, Trustee
Debbie Torok, Trustee

Prepared by:

Jack Schreder & Associates, Inc.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

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'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 Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District currently has a Level I Fee Sharing Agreement with its feeder elementary school districts. The elementary school districts collect 66.67 percent of the Level I Fee and the High School District collects 33.33 percent of the Level I Fee.

- The District is justified to collect $1.36 (33.33 percent of $4.08) per square foot of residential construction and $0.22 (33.33 percent of $0.66) 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 $0.06 per square foot.

- The justification is based on this study's findings that the District currently exceeds its capacity and will continue to do so through the 2024/25 school year.

- Each new market rate multi-family residential unit to be constructed in the District is projected to average 1,200 square feet and will generate an average of .047 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- Each new below market rate multi-family residential unit to be constructed in the District is projected to average 1,200 square feet and will generate an average of .312 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- Each new market rate condo/townhome residential unit to be constructed in the District is projected to average 1,600 square feet and will generate an average of .018 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- Each new below market rate condo/townhome residential unit to be constructed in the District is projected to average 1,600 square feet and will generate an average of .312 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- Each new single-family detached residential unit to be constructed in the District is projected to average an estimated 2,200 square feet and will generate an average of .1098 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- The average square footage of the five types of new residential units (multi-family market rate, multi-family below market rate, condos/rowhouses market rate, condos/rowhouses below market rate, and single-family detached) to be constructed in the District is 1,236.07 square feet and will generate an average of .0741 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house.

- Each square foot of residential construction will create a school facilities cost of at least $9.63 per square foot of new residential construction.

- Each square foot of commercial/industrial construction will create a school facilities cost ranging from $0.06 to $5.17 per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction.

SCHOOL DISTRICT BACKGROUND

The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District serves approximately 4,500 students in ninth through twelfth grade at two comprehensive high schools, an alternative high school, an adult education center, the Freestyle Academy for Arts & Technology, and Middle College. Most students identify as White (approximately 37%), followed by Hispanic or Latino (approximately 26%), then Asian (approximately 23%), with a small portion of other ethnic groups. The District serves a diverse community of professional and working-class families and its comprehensive high schools are consistently ranked in the top 1% of high schools nationally. Both comprehensive high schools have received the maximum six-year accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and the alternative high school has been named a Model Continuation School by the California Department of Education. The District offers over 40 Advanced Placement and Honors classes and 98 percent of graduates matriculate to college. The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District is "committed to creating a community of learners with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to combine personal success with meaningful contributions to our multicultural and global society."

The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District serves students in Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, and a portion of unincorporated Santa Clara County, located in the Silicon Valley region of California's Bay Area. According to the Santa Clara County Economic Forecast, the greatest economic sectors of employment in the region, as of 2018, are professional & business services, healthcare & education, and manufacturing. It is projected that the greatest job growth, through 2024, will occur in the professional & business services, education & healthcare, and information sectors. The City of Mountain View is home to pioneering and leading companies in the high-tech, bio-tech, life sciences, and telecommunication fields. Along with numerous others, the following companies are headquartered within the Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District's boundary: Google, Microsoft, Synopsys, Pure Storage, Omnicell, and Intuit. The City of Mountain View is known as the "start-up" community of Silicon Valley, a center for innovation made possible by a combination of accelerators, co-working spaces, and the institutional support of NASA Ames Research Park and other nearby educational institutions.

INTRODUCTION

In September, 1986, the Governor signed into law Assembly Bill 2926 (Chapter 887/Statutes of 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 maximum fee that can be levied is adjusted every two years according to the inflation rate, as listed by the statewide index for Class B construction set by the State Allocation Board. In January of 1992, the State Allocation Board increased the maximum fee to $1.65 per square foot for residential construction and $0.27 per square foot for commercial and industrial construction.

Senate Bill 1187 (Chapter 1354/Statutes of 1992) effective January 1, 1993, affected the facility mitigation requirements a school district could impose on developers. Senate Bill 1187 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 $0.34 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 $0.36 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 $0.43 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 maintained the fees 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 fee will be adjusted in January 2022 and every two years thereafter in accordance with the statewide cost index for Class B construction as determined by the State Allocation Board.

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.

Senate Bill 50: Background

In August 1998, the Governor signed into legislation Senate Bill 50, also known as the Leroy Greene School Facilities Act of 1998. This bill made major changes in the State school facilities program, as well as developer fee mitigation for school districts in California. Education Code Section 17620 was amended to include the provisions of Government Code Section 65995.

Prior to the passage of SB 50, school districts had been able to rely on a series of appellate court decisions known as "Mira-Hart-Murrieta". These court decisions had allowed municipalities, when making a legislative decision (such as general plan amendments, development agreements, zoning changes, etc.) concerning land use, to consider the impacts of that decision on school facilities and condition its approval on mitigation measures. These cases allowed cities and counties to assist school districts by using their legislative power to fully mitigate the impacts of land development on school facilities. These measures could be in the form of higher developer fees, land

dedication or other measures which the municipal agencies agreed would mitigate the impacts of the proposed development. In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was interpreted by the "Mira" decisions to include mitigation for the environmental impact of a development, providing the school districts with another opportunity to benefit from mitigation agreements.

SB 50 imposes new limitations on the power of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities impacts as a condition of approving new development. This law amends Government Code Section 65995(a) to provide that only those funds authorized by Education Code Section 17620 or Government Code Section 65970 may be levied or imposed in connection with or made conditions of any legislative or adjudicative act by a local agency involving planning, use, or development of real property.

SB 50 provides authority for collection of three levels of developer fees:

Level I Fees:

Level I Fees are the current statutory fees allowed under Education Code Section 17620. This code section provides the basic authority for school districts to levy a fee against residential, commercial, and industrial construction for the purpose of funding school construction or reconstruction of facilities. These fees, which are currently $4.08 for residential construction and $0.66 for commercial and industrial construction, will be increased in the year 2022 and every two years thereafter in accordance with the statewide cost index for Class B Construction as determined by the State Allocation Board. The district can collect these fees as long as a current justification study justifies those amounts, according to the regulations in Government Code Section 66001.

Level II Fees:

Level II Fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5. This code section allows a school district to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. This level of developer fees is subject to a Facility Needs Analysis based on Government Code Section 65995.6.

Level III Fees:

Level III Fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.7. If State funding becomes unavailable, this code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees, to collect a higher fee on residential construction. This fee is equal to twice the amount of Level II fees. However, if a district eventually receives State funding, this excess fee must be reimbursed to the developers or be subtracted from the amount of State funding.

In accordance with the recent decision in the *Cresta Bella* LP v. *Poway Unified School District*, 218 Cal. App.4th 438(2013) court Case, school districts are now 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 construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities in the District based on the requirements for collection of Level I Fees (statutory fees).

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. Justification for the fee can be shown if anticipated residential, commercial, and industrial development within a district will impact it with additional students. In addition, the district either will not have the facility capacity to house these students and/or the students would have to be housed in existing facilities that are not educationally adequate (i.e., antiquated facilities). It must also be shown that the amount of developer fees to be collected will not exceed the district's cost for housing students generated by new development. This section of the study will show that justification does exist for levying developer fees in the District.

School Capacity

The District's capacity of 3,287 is based on State School Facility Program loading standards of 27 pupils per 9th-12th grade classrooms, 13 pupils per non-severe SDC classrooms, and 9 pupils per severe special day classrooms. A District capacity summary is included as Appendix A.

Student Generation

To identify the number of students anticipated to be generated by new residential development, student generation rates were calculated by Jack Schreder & Associates and are included in Table 1.

Table 1:
Student Generation Rates

Residential Unit Type	Grade Level	Yield
Market Rate Multi-Family	9 - 12	.047
Below Market Rate Multi-Family	9 - 12	.312
Market Rate Condo/Rowhouse	9 - 12	.018
Below Market Rate Condo/Rowhouse	9 - 12	.312
Single-Family Detached	9 - 12	.1098

Source: Jack Schreder & Associates.

Enrollment Projection and Development

The enrollment projections used in this study utilize a cohort methodology based on four years of historic California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS) enrollments. The cohort survival method of projecting enrollments identifies the probability that a student will "survive" from one school year to the next in the successive grade level. By using four years of enrollment, the cohort rates are averaged over four years.

The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District is located within the Santa Clara County, City of Mountain View, City of Sunnyvale, City of Palo Alto, Town

of Los Altos Hills, and the City of Los Altos planning jurisdictions. All Planning Departments were contacted regarding projected development for a five year period. According to Santa Clara County, City of Sunnyvale, City of Palo Alto, and the Town of Los Altos Hills planning jurisdictions, development is not projected in the District's boundary located in those planning jurisdictions. According to the City of Mountain View and Los Altos Planning Departments, a total of 3,050 residential units are projected to be constructed within the District's boundary over the next five years. Appendix C and Table 2 contain a list of approved development. In addition to the approved development included in Table 2, there will be infill projects, along with the construction of accessory structures (additional unit on an existing parcel) which will also be subject to Level I fees.

Table 2:
Projected Residential Development

Market Rate Multi-Family Units	2,445
Below Market Rate Multi-Family Units	333
Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	264
Below Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	6
Single-Family Detached Units	2
Total	**3,050**

Sources: City of Mountain View, City of Los Altos Planning Departments.

Weighted Student Generation Factor

In order to determine a weighted student generation rate for the developer fee calculation, the number of units from each type of residential construction proposed to be built in the District were multiplied by the student yield factors for that type of construction. The total number of students generated was divided by the total proposed residential development to determine the weighted student generation factor for the District. The weighted student generation factor calculation of .0741 is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3:
Average Student Generation Factor

Type of Construction	# of Units	x	Yield	=	Students Generated
Market Rate Multi-Family	2,445		.047		115
Below Market Rate Multi-Family	333		.312		104
Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	264		.018		5
Below Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	6		.312		2
Single-Family Detached	2		.1098		0
Total	3,050				226
9-12 Weighted Avg. Student Generation Factor (226 / 3,050 DU) = .0741					

Sources: City of Mountain View, City of Los Altos, Jack Schreder and Associates.

District Capacity Compared to Enrollment Projection

The District's current enrollment is 4,521 with a capacity of 3,287. The District currently exceeds its capacity and will continue to do so through the 2024-2025 school year. The District's capacity is included as Appendix A and the enrollment projection is included as Appendix B. The enrollment projection includes projected development of 610 units per year over a five year period, for a total of 3,050 residential units.

Residential Fee Projection

To show a reasonable relationship exists between the construction of new housing units and the need for additional school facilities, it will be shown that each square foot of new assessable residential space will create a school facility cost impact on the District.

The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District plans to provide housing for future students generated from new development with the construction of new classrooms on existing sites, and, when a new site becomes available, the District plans to construct a new school. Future students will be housed in permanent school

facilities, constructed as stand-alone permanent school structures or permanent additions to existing structures.

To determine the cost impact of residential construction on the District, the cost to house a student in new school facilities must be identified. Table 4 shows the cost impact for each student generated by new residential development is $160,705. The cost is based on the per pupil construction cost to add additional classrooms and ancillary facilities to existing sites. In addition to constructing classrooms on existing sites, the District also plans to construct a new school when a site becomes available. The estimated cost per pupil to construct a new school is $364,231. For purposes of calculating the cost per square foot for the Level I Study, the cost to construct additional classrooms and ancillary facilities on existing sites was utilized. Construction costs were provided by Quattrocchi Kwok Architects and Kramer Project Development. Appendix D includes a summary of costs.

Table 4:
Facility Cost Per Student

Grade	Cost
9-12	$160,705

Sources: Quattrocchi Kwok Architects, Kramer Project Development.

Square Footage of Residential Development

To determine the impact per square foot of residential construction, the student generation factors are compared to the average house size by unit type anticipated to be constructed in the District. Table 5 calculates the average square footage for residential construction, 1,236.07 square feet.

Table 5:
Average Square Footage of Residential Units

Type of Units	# of Units	Average SF	Total SF
Market Rate Multi-Family	2,445	1,200	2,934,000
Below Market Rate Multi-Family	333	1,200	399,600
Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	264	1,600	422,400
Below Market Rate Condos/Rowhouses	6	1,600	9,600
Single-Family Detached	2	2,200	4,400
Total	3,050		3,770,000
Weighted Average Square Footage (3,770,000 / 3,050) = 1,236.07 square feet			

Sources: City of Mountain View, City of Los Altos, Jack Schreder & Associates.

Residential Fee Generation

To determine the impact per square foot of residential construction, the average student generation factor was compared to the average square footage of residential units anticipated to be constructed in the District.

Since each residential unit generates an average of .0741 9th - 12th grade students for the District to house, each residential unit will generate .000059948 students per square foot (.0741 students per unit divided by the average residential unit size of 1,236.07 sq. ft.). The cost to house students is $9.63 per square foot of new residential construction ($160,705 per student multiplied by the square foot student generation factor of .000059948 students). This cost impact is based on each new student requiring new facilities.

This calculation satisfies the requirements of *Shapell Industries, Inc. v. Governing Board of Milpitas Unified School District* (1991) 1 Cal.App.4th 218 ("*Shapell*"), as follows. The *Shapell* case requires that a fee justification study must involve the interrelation

between three elements: (1) a projection of the total amount of new housing expected to be built within the District, (2) approximately how many students will be generated by the new housing, and (3) an estimate of what it will cost to provide the necessary school facilities for that approximate number of new students. As stated above, the projection of the total amount of unmitigated new housing units expected to be built within the District is 3,050 units, which will generate approximately 226 new students. The cost to house 226 students is $36,391,330, calculated by multiplying the per-student construction cost ($160,705) by the 226 students. Breaking that cost down among the total projected square footage of 3,770,000, yields a fee of $9.63 per square foot of residential construction ($36,319,330/3,770,000), as cited above.

Based on the residential fee generation calculations each square foot of residential construction will create a school facilities cost of $9.63 per square foot for the District. However, the Level I Statutory fee is $4.08 per square foot of residential construction and the District has a Level I Fee Sharing Agreement with its feeder elementary school districts. The High School District collects 33.33 percent of the Level I Fee and its elementary feeder school districts collect 66.67 percent of the Level I Fee. Therefore, the Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District is justified to collect $1.36 (33.33 percent of $4.08) per square foot of residential 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 6.

Table 6 indicates the number of employees generated for every 1,000 square feet of 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.

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 in the District live in existing housing units. The forty percent adjustment eliminates double counting the impact. This adjustment is shown in the worksheets in Appendix E and in Table 6.

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. The data in Table 7 is based on the per student costs shown in Table 4. These figures are multiplied by the 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 7, the students per square foot are multiplied by the cost of providing school facilities.

Table 6:
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	.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 7:
Commercial and Industrial Facilities Cost Impact

Type of Development	Cost Impact Per Sq. Ft.
Medical Offices	$4.07
Corporate Offices	$2.55
Commercial Offices	$4.55
Lodging	$2.21
Scientific R&D	$2.90
Industrial/Business Parks	$1.60
Industrial/Com Park	$2.11
Commercial Shopping Centers	$5.17
Community Shopping Centers	$1.56
Banks	$4.03
Mini-Storage	$0.06
Agriculture	$0.74

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

Table 7 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 $9.63 per square foot. Each square foot of commercial and industrial development creates a school facility cost ranging from $0.06 to $5.17 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 school districts. The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District collects 33.33 percent of the Level I fee and its feeder elementary school districts collect 66.67 percent of the Level I Fee. Therefore, the Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District is justified to collect $1.36 (33.33 percent of $4.08) per square foot of residential construction and $0.22 (33.33 percent of $0.66) per square foot for commercial/industrial construction, with the exception of mini storage. The mini storage category of construction should be collected at the rate of $0.06 per square foot.

SECTION II: BACKGROUND OF DEVELOPER FEE LEGISLATION

Initially, the maximum 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 $.25 per square foot of covered or enclosed space of commercial or industrial development. The maximum 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 increased the maximum fee to $4.08 per square foot for residential construction and $0.66 per square foot for commercial and industrial construction. In January of 2022, the State Allocation Board will increase the maximum fees for residential, 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.

Assembly Bill 3228 (Chapter 1572/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 530.880.4 to the Government Code. Government Code Section 530.880.4 has been changed to Education Code Section 17625. 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 may be imposed only as to the initial installation of the manufactured or mobile home in the school district.

2. A manufactured or mobile home must not have been located previously on the pad where the manufactured or mobile home is to be installed.

3. The construction of the pad where the manufactured or mobile home is to be located must have commenced after September 1, 1986.

Senate Bill 1151 (Chapter 1037/Statutes of 1987) concerns agricultural buildings and added Section 530.880.15 to the Government Code. Government Code Section 530.880.15 has been changed to Education Code Section 17622. 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 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 an analysis were to be done by categories.

7. Changes the frequency of the annual inflation adjustment on the maximum 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 cap 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 cap to mobile-home parks limited to older persons.

SECTION III: 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 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 (State/District) 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.

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 bond in March of 2018 in the amount of $295 million to modernize and construct school facilities. The District's March 2018 Facility Master Plan includes a list of facility projects; facility projects included in the Plan exceed available bond funds.

Developer Fees

District developer fees are dedicated to the modernization and new construction needs of school facilities due to the impact of students generated from new development.

School District General Funds

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

SECTION IV: 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.

Assembly Bill 1600 as Related to 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 V: ESTABLISHING THE COST, BENEFIT AND BURDEN NEXUS

Establishment of a Cost Nexus

The District chooses to construct and/or reconstruct facilities for the additional students created by development in the District and the cost for providing new and/or reconstructed 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 new 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 new and/or reconstructed 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 reconstructed school facilities. The District must carry the burden of constructing new facilities required by the students generated by future developments and the need for 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 housing costs. We suggest that the District continue to pursue State School Facility Program 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 construction and/or modernization of school facilities. The District will provide for the construction and/or modernization of school facilities, in part, with developer fees. The District completed a Facility Master Plan in March 2018 which includes a list of facility needs.

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 Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District levy residential development fees and commercial/industrial fees up to the statutory fee for which justification has been determined.

SOURCES

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.

Economic Development Department, City of Mountain View.

Einfalt, Cody. Planner, Town of Los Altos Hills.

Horan, Erin. Planner, City of Mountain View.

Local Control Accountability Plan. Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District. 2019-2020.

Mathiesen, Mike. Associate Superintendent Business Services, Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District.

McCay, Scott. Planner, City of Palo Alto.

Meyer, Nellie. Superintendent, Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District.

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

Persicone, Guido. Planning Manager, City of Los Altos.

Rader, Dave. Planner, County of Santa Clara.

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

Santa Clara County Economic Forecast, 2019 County-Level Economic Forecast. California Economic Forecast. Caltrans. 2019.

Schroeder, George. Planner, City of Sunnyvale.

Schreder, Jack and Associates. Original research.

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT CAPACITY

Mountain View -Los Altos Union High School District	
Capacity	
	Capacity
School Facility Program Capacity (SAB 50-02 attached, Part III line 1)	3,287

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EXISTING SCHOOL BUILDING CAPACITY

SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM

SAB 50-02 (REV 12/10)

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

SCHOOL DISTRICT: Mt. View-Los Altos Union High

FIVE DIGIT DISTRICT CODE NUMBER (see California Public School Directory): 69609

COUNTY: Santa Clara

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA (HSAA) OR SUPER HSAA (if applicable):

PART I - Classroom Inventory ■ NEW ☐ ADJUSTED

	K-6	7-8	9-12	Non-Severe	Severe	Total
Line 1. Leased State Relocatable Classrooms						
Line 2. Portable Classrooms leased less than 5 years						
Line 3. Interim Housing Portables leased less than 5 years						
Line 4. Interim Housing Portables leased at least 5 years						
Line 5. Portable Classrooms leased at least 5 years						
Line 6. Portable Classrooms owned by district			23	2	1	26
Line 7. Permanent Classrooms			97	3		100
Line 8. Total (Lines 1 through 7)			120	5	1	126

PART II - Available Classrooms

Option A.

	K-6	7-8	9-12	Non-Severe	Severe	Total
a. Part I, line 4						
b. Part I, line 5						
c. Part I, line 6			23	2	1	26
d. Part I, line 7			97	3		100
e. Total (a, b, c, & d)			120	5	1	126

Option B.

	K-6	7-8	9-12	Non-Severe	Severe	Total
a. Part I, line 8			120	5	1	126
b. Part I, lines 1, 2, 5 and 6 (total only)						26
c. 25 percent of Part I, line 7 (total only)						25
d. Subtract c from b (enter Ø if negative)			1			1
e. Total (a minus d)			119	5	1	125

PART III - Determination of Existing School Building Capacity

	K-6	7-8	9-12	Non-Severe	Severe
Line 1. Classroom capacity			3,213	65	9
Line 2. SER adjustment					
Line 3. Total of lines 1 and 2			3,213	65	9

I certify, as the District Representative, that the information reported on this form is true and correct and that:

- I am designated as an authorized district representative by the governing board of the district; and,
- This form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC). In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE: [signature]

DATE: 8/15/17

NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE (PRINT OR TYPE): Jeff Harding Ed.D.

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Jeff.Harding@mvla.net

TELEPHONE: 650.940.4650

APPENDIX B

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION

Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District													
Enrollment Projection													
Grade	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	Change			Ave.	20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25
K	1153	1161	1085	1100				1125	1135	1145	1155	1165	1175
1	1051	1021	1032	962	-132	-129	-123	-128	982	1017	1027	1037	1047
2	1013	1049	1036	1018	-2	15	-14	0	972	992	1027	1037	1047
3	1050	993	1047	1005	-20	-2	-31	-18	1010	964	984	1019	1029
4	1076	1059	975	1005	9	-18	-42	-17	998	1003	957	977	1012
5	1094	1055	1049	963	-21	-10	-12	-14	1001	994	999	953	973
6	1054	1030	1004	964	-64	-51	-85	-67	906	944	937	942	896
7	1079	1083	1038	1006	29	8	2	13	987	929	967	960	965
8	1070	1073	1079	1058	-6	-4	20	3	1019	1000	943	980	973
9	1059	1117	1154	1170	47	81	91	73	1142	1104	1085	1027	1065
10	1038	1067	1097	1166	8	-20	12	0	1181	1154	1115	1096	1038
11	1045	1043	1066	1096	5	-1	-1	1	1178	1194	1166	1127	1108
12	922	1034	1051	1089	-11	8	23	7	1114	1196	1212	1184	1145
K-6	7,491	7,368	7,228	7,017					7,004	7,059	7,086	7,130	7,178
7-8	2149	2156	2117	2064					2006	1930	1910	1941	1939
9-12	4064	4261	4368	4521					4616	4647	4577	4434	4356
Total	13,704	13,785	13,713	13,602					13,626	13,635	13,572	13,504	13,474
						Residential Units			610	610	610	610	610
	Student Generation Rates					School Year			20-21	21-22	22-23	23-24	24-25
		SGR											
	K-8	0.148						Kd	10	10	10	10	10
	9-12	0.074						1st	10	10	10	10	10
								2nd	10	10	10	10	10
								3rd	10	10	10	10	10
								4th	10	10	10	10	10
								5th	10	10	10	10	10
								6th	10	10	10	10	10
								7th	10	10	10	10	10
								8th	10	10	10	10	10
								9th	11	11	11	11	11
								10th	11	11	11	11	11
								11th	11	11	11	11	11
								12th	11	11	11	11	11

APPENDIX C

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Development Summary
City of Mountain View/City of Los Altos

Project Address	Unit Type	Approved Units (not under construction)	Planning Jurisdiction
Multi-Family Market Rate			
2580 & 2590 California Street/201 San Antonio Circle (total of 632, 32 BMR included below)	MF (MR)	600	Mountain View
777 West Middlefield Road (total of 508, 144 BMR)	MF (MR)	364	Mountain View
759 West Middlefield Road	MF (MR)	75	Mountain View
555 East Evelyn Avenue	MF (MR)	471	Mountain View
1313-1347 West El Camino Real (total of 24, 2 BMR)	MF (MR)	22	Mountain View
1255 Pear Avenue	MF (MR)	635	Mountain View
1720 Villa Street (total of 207, 34 BMR)	MF (MR)	173	Mountain View
950 West El Camino Real (total of 71, 70 BMR)	MF (MR)	1	Mountain View
4856 El Camino Real	MF (MR)	42	Los Altos
425 First Street	MF (MR)	17	Los Altos
4898 El Camino Real	MF (MR)	22	Los Altos
444-450 First Street	MF (MR)	23	Los Altos
	Sub-Total	**2445**	
Multi-Family Below Market Rate			
2580 & 2590 California Street/201 San Antonio Circle (total of 632, 32 BMR)	MF (BMR)	32	Mountain View
950 West El Camino Real (total of 71, 70 BMR)	MF (BMR)	70	Mountain View
777 West Middlefield Road (total of 508, 144 BMR)	MF (BMR)	144	Mountain View
1313-1347 West El Camino Real (total of 24, 2 BMR)	MF (BMR)	2	Mountain View
1720 Villa Street (total of 207, 34 BMR)	MF (BMR)	34	Mountain View
4856 El Camino Real	MF (BMR)	10	Los Altos
425 First Street	MF (BMR)	3	Los Altos
5150 El Camino Real	MF (BMR)	28	Los Altos
4898 El Camino Real	MF (BMR)	6	Los Altos
444-450 First Street	MF (BMR)	4	Los Altos
	Sub-Total	**333**	
Condo/Rowhouse Market Rate			
231-235 Hope Street	Condominiums	6	Mountain View
982 Bonita Avenue	Condominiums	4	Mountain View
864 Hope Street	Condominiums	2	Mountain View
1411-1495 West El Camino Real (total of 53, 5 BMR)	Condominiums	48	Mountain View
410-414 Sierra Vista Avenue	Rowhouse	3	Mountain View
828 & 836 Sierra Vista Avenue (total of 15, 1 BMR)	Rowhouse	14	Mountain View
535 & 555 Walker Drive	Rowhouse	2	Mountain View
1958 Latham Street	Rowhouse	5	Mountain View
962 Acacia Avenue	Condominiums	2	Los Altos
385-389 First Street	Condominiums	10	Los Altos
5150 El Camino Real	Condominiums	168	Los Altos
	Sub-Total	**264**	
Condo/Rowhouse Below Market Rate			
1411-1495 West El Camino Real (total of 53, 5 BMR)	Condominiums	5	Mountain View
828 & 836 Sierra Vista Avenue (total of 15, 1 BMR)	Rowhouse	1	Mountain View
	Sub-Total	**6**	
Single Family Detached			
268 Ada Avenue	Single Family Detached	2	Mountain View
	Sub-Total	**2**	
	TOTAL	**3050**	

** According to the City of Los Altos Hills, Palo Alto, Sunnyvale & the County of Santa Clara Planning Departments, there are currently no approved projects for which permits have not been issued.*

APPENDIX D

CONSTRUCTION COST

MOUNTAIN VIEW LOS ALTOS HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
NEW COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL
COST ANALYSIS

QUATTROCCHI KWOK ARCHITECTS

KRAMER PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, INC.

NEW COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL FOR 1,000 STUDENTS

School Site Required	11.8	Acres	514,000	sf	
Building Site area			372,000	sf	
Turf field and parking area			142,000	sf	

									Construction cost escalation factor (10 year average of 3.37%)				
						0.00%	103.37%	106.85%	110.45%	114.18%	118.02%	122.00%
A. School Site Development	Quantity	Unit	Cost per unit	Cost source	Multiplier to 2018 cost	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Aquatic facility	1	each	$ 5,320,000	MVHS Aquatic facility 2012 escalated to 2018	1.21	$ 5,320,000						
Synthetic turf field	80,000	sf	$ 49.00	LGHS Lower field turf 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 3,920,000						
Site clearing	514,000	sf	$ 5.80	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 2,981,200						
Site Utilities & Power per sf of building site	372,000	sf	$ 12.33	Steindorf K8 School 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 4,586,760						
Building Pads	120,000	sf	$ 9.30	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 1,116,000						
Landscaping	40,000	sf	$ 8.90	Steindorf K8 School 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 356,000						
Hardscape	180,000	sf	$ 27.93	Steindorf K8 School 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 5,027,400						
Total Site Development				Parking cost is in section D		$ 23,307,360	$ 24,092,818	$ 24,904,746	$ 25,744,036	$ 26,611,610	$ 27,508,421	$ 28,435,455

B. School Teaching Spaces	Area Each Teaching Space	Number	Qty	Unit	Cost per unit	Cost source	Multiplier to 2018 cost	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Classrooms	960	39	37,440	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 23,400,000						
Labs	1600	8	12,800	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 8,000,000						
Music	4300	2	8,600	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 5,375,000						
Dance Studio	2000	1	2,000	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 1,250,000						
Drama Classroom	2000	1	2,000	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 1,250,000						
Art	1600	2	3,200	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 2,000,000						
Staff Teacher Collaboration		1	1,000	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 625,000						
Toilet custodial storage		1	5,500	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 3,437,500						
Subtotal			72,540											
Circulation Space	30%		21,762	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 13,601,250						
Total Teaching Spaces			94,302					$ 58,938,750	$ 60,924,986	$ 62,978,158	$ 65,100,522	$ 67,294,409	$ 69,562,231	$ 71,906,478

C. School Support Spaces	Number	Qty	Unit	Cost per unit	Cost source	Multiplier to 2018 cost	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Student Services	1	28,600	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 17,875,000						
Library	1	13,000	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 8,125,000						
Cafeteria Food Kitchen	1	8,000	sf	$ 756.00	Steindorf K8 School kitchen 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 6,048,000						
Gymnasium	1	12,000	sf	$ 694.00	Fisher Gymnasium 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 8,328,000						
Auxiliary gym with multi-use space	1	14,750	sf	$ 694.00	Fisher Gymnasium 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 10,236,500						
Theater of 370 seats	1	10,950	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 6,843,750						
Locker Room Bldg	1	12,000	sf	$ 735.00	Fisher Gymnasium 2016 escalated to 2018	0.00	$ 8,820,000						
Weight and wrestling room	1	3,000	sf	$ 625.00	LGHS Classroom and music building 2018	0.00	$ 1,875,000						
Total Support Spaces		102,300					$ 68,151,250	$ 70,447,947	$ 72,822,043	$ 75,276,146	$ 77,812,952	$ 80,435,248	$ 83,145,916

D. Parking	Quantity	Unit	Cost per unit	Cost source	Multiplier to 2018 cost	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Parking Spaces Required	350	spaces										
Surface Parking w/curbs and lighting	22	spaces	$ 11,172	Steindorf K8 School 2016 escalated to 2018	1.09	$ 245,784						
Parking Structure	328	spaces	$ 45,000	Approximate cost per space (various parking structure case studies)		$ 14,760,000						
Total Parking						$ 15,005,784	$ 15,511,479	$ 16,034,216	$ 16,574,569	$ 17,133,132	$ 17,710,518	$ 18,307,363

E. Site Acquisition	Quantity	Unit	Cost per unit	Cost source	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Recommended Building Site	11.8	Acres	$ 14,870,000		$ 175,466,000	$ 181,379,204	$ 187,491,683	$ 193,810,153	$ 200,341,555	$ 207,093,066	$ 214,072,102

Summary	2018 Cost	2019 Cost	2020 Cost	2021 Cost	2022 Cost	2023 Cost	2024 Cost
Total Cost of School Construction (A+B+C)	$ 150,397,360	$ 155,465,751	$ 160,704,947	$ 166,120,704	$ 171,718,971	$ 177,505,901	$ 183,487,849
Total Cost of School Construction with Parking Facility (A+B+C+D)	$ 165,403,144	$ 170,977,230	$ 176,739,163	$ 182,695,272	$ 188,852,103	$ 195,216,419	$ 201,795,212
Total Cost of School Construction with Parking Facility plus Site Acquisition (A+B+C+D+E)	$ 340,869,144	$ 352,356,434	$ 364,230,846	$ 376,505,425	$ 389,193,658	$ 402,309,485	$ 415,867,314

APPENDIX E

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL CALCULATIONS

Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District						
Commercial/Industrial Calculations						
	EMP/	DIST.HH/	HH/SF	% EMP IN	ADJUSTED	ADJ %
	1000 SQ.FT	EMP		EXIST HH	HH/SF	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 YIELDS			COST PER STUDENT			
9-12	0.0741		9-12	$160,705		
STUDENTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(YIELD FACTORS X ADJ HH/SQ. FT IN COLUMN F)						
	9-12					
MEDICAL	0.000025					
CORP. OFFICE	0.000016					
COM. OFFICE	0.000028					
LODGING	0.000014					
R&D	0.000018					
IN. PARK	0.000010					
IN/COM PARK	0.000013					
COM. SC.	0.000032					
COMMUNITY SC	0.000010					
BANKS	0.000025					
MINI STORAGE	0.000000					
AGRICULTURE	0.000005					
COSTS PER SQUARE FOOT						
(STUDENTS/ SQ. FOOT X STUDENT COST/SQ. FOOT IN EACH CATEGORY)						
	9-12					
MEDICAL	$4.07					
CORP. OFFICE	$2.55					
COM. OFFICE	$4.55					
LODGING	$2.21					
R&D	$2.90					
IN. PARK	$1.60					
IN/COM PARK	$2.11					
COM. SC.	$5.17					
COMMUNITY SC	$1.56					
BANKS	$4.03					
MINI STORAGE	$0.06					
AGRICULTURE	$0.74					