EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Total enrollment in the Mountain View Los Altos High School District (MVLA) is projected to increase from the current 3,993 to 4,576 by 2021-22 before decreasing back to 4,242 by 2025-26. MVLA experiences generally stable grade-to-grade student migration, so enrollment projections are driven primarily by trends occurring with enrollment coming in from MVLA’s feeder elementary school districts.

Larger kindergarten cohorts and increasingly positive grade-to-grade student migration have caused enrollment within the elementary districts that feed into MVLA to increase consistently in recent years. Grade-to-grade migration from 8th grade to 9th grade also shifted positively in recent years after a period of being slightly negative for several years. These larger incoming cohorts then enter MVLA and replace smaller graduating cohorts, leading to overall enrollment gain for MVLA. One primary reason for the increase in kindergarten class sizes compared to a stable number of births is the in-migration of families into MVLA from other areas, largely due to the general economic growth of the region.

Beginning in 2009, however, the number of births recorded for mothers residing in MVLA dropped, and has remained lower ever since. The birth to kindergarten ratio has not increased significantly during that time, meaning that smaller kindergarten cohorts have entered MVLA’s feeder elementary districts. These smaller cohorts will reach 9th grade at MVLA in 2022, beginning a period of enrollment decline over a period of four years through the 2025-26 school year, as larger graduating cohorts are replaced by smaller incoming cohorts. MVLA enrollment should remain stable after that time, as the State forecasts births in Santa Clara County to remain stable for the next few years.

This comprehensive study provides a detailed review of all influencing demographic factors affecting future District enrollments. The District is strongly encouraged to monitor and update this study at least annually in order to remain abreast of new trends as they develop.

Recommendations

The Mountain View Los Altos High School District has undertaken this study in order to assist in proactive planning for current and future facility needs for its student population. Based on the comprehensive Demographic Analysis and Enrollment Projections prepared for this study, the following steps are recommended for the Mountain View Los Altos High School District to meet its future facility needs:
It is recommended the District add facility capacity in order to accommodate the projected significant enrollment growth, most of which will occur over the next six years.

It is recommended the District correspondingly expand core ancillary facilities as new classrooms are constructed. While adding classrooms will provide housing for additional students, it will also overburden existing ancillary facilities such as libraries, cafeterias, administrative space, gymnasiums, etc.

It is recommended the District increase staffing and programs correspondingly as facility capacity expands and student enrollments increase.

Until new facilities are constructed, it is recommended the District consider revising the current intra-district transfer policy to alleviate overcrowding.

It is recommended the District consider federal, state, and local sources of funding, including a local school bond to assist in constructing new facilities for housing current and future students.

It is recommended the District update this study annually to determine if projected development and enrollment trends are accurate. Should future trends deviate from those identified in the study, adjustments regarding future school facility needs and costs may be required.
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SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

The Mountain View Los Altos High School District is located in Santa Clara County, California. The District serves most portions of the Cities of Mountain View and Los Altos, as well as part the Town of Los Altos Hills and a small portion of unincorporated Santa Clara County land. MVLA serves grades 9-12 and has a total 2015-16 enrollment of 3,993 students as provided by the District. MVLA currently operates two traditional high school sites and one alternative/continuation program (Table 1, Figure 1).

Table 1. School Sites and 2015-16 Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>2015-16 Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>2,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Enrollment: 3,993

Source: MVLA
Figure 1. Mountain View Los Altos High School District
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Mountain View Los Altos High School District Demographic Analysis & Enrollment Projections 2015-16

This report is divided into nine major components:

A. Introduction
B. District Goals and Mission
C. District and Community Demographics
D. Student Generation Factors
E. Land Use & Planning
F. Economic Development
G. Spatial Analysis
H. Enrollment Projections
I. Recommendations

Enrollment data presented in this report was compiled from Mountain View Los Altos High School District core data and through historical figures maintained by the California Department of Education. Data utilized in this report was also sourced from the entities listed at the end of the document.
SECTION B: DISTRICT GOALS AND MISSION

Mission Statement
We are committed to creating a community of learners with the knowledge, skill, and values necessary to combine personal success with meaningful contributions to our multicultural and global society.

Goals
1. Align curriculum, grading systems and practices
2. Maintain fiscal stability
3. Improve academic achievement of all students
4. Enhance the opportunities as well as achievement of students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math.

Core Values
The Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District, as part of our effort to build a “community of learners,” has chosen these five values to guide us in our work. They represent the underpinnings of our organizational culture. We make every effort to have our actions and behaviors reflect these values.

Quality
The district believes that every teacher, every classified staff member, and every administrator should set excellence of instruction and program as their number one priority. The district is committed to attracting, recruiting, and retaining enthusiastic, talented, and caring faculty and staff to carry out our educational mission. We are committed to focusing the institution’s energy and resources on student learning and to their academic and personal development.

Empowerment
The district is committed to the professional and personal development of its staff members. This will be accomplished through workshop and conference attendance in an effort to bring about educational reform and to promote teacher-driven innovations grounded in research and practical experience.

Teamwork
The district makes the commitment of time and resources necessary to support staff development and training for curriculum planning and review. The district believes in fostering collegiality, respect, and cooperation among all students and staff.
**Personalized, Caring Environment**
We are committed to focusing on the development of each and every student, to providing honest feedback, support, and opportunities so that student can reach his or her potential.

**Continuous Improvement**
The Mountain View Los Altos High School District has a long history of high standards and high test scores. The district is committed to an ongoing assessment of student progress and evaluation of effectiveness of programs and services. They are further committed to designing and implementing programs and interventions which encourage students to maximize their academic development and achievement.
SECTION C: DISTRICT AND COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS

District Enrollment Trends

Historical Enrollments

The Mountain View Los Altos High School District experienced stable enrollment from 2005 through 2011, after which enrollments increased each year through 2015. Overall, enrollments increased from 3,672 students in October 2005 to 3,993 students in October 2015, representing a gain of 8.7%. The various demographic factors affecting the District’s historical enrollments will be discussed in greater detail in the following sections. Figure 2 illustrates the District's enrollment pattern since 2005-06. Figure 3 provides current year enrollments by school. Figure 4 illustrates annual growth/decline in student enrollment. Table 2 provides historical enrollments by school since 2006-07.

Figure 2. Historical Enrollments

Source: California Department of Education and MVLA.
Figure 3. 2015-16 Enrollments by School

Source: California Department of Education and MVLA.

Figure 4. Annual Growth in Student Enrollment

Source: California Department of Education and MVLA.

Table 2. Historical Enrollments by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>3,618</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>3,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historical Enrollment by Socioeconomic Status**

In order to analyze the District's socioeconomic profile, the consultant utilized participation in the Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM) program as a socioeconomic indicator. Table 3 provides the number of MVLA students participating in the FRPM program from 2004-05 to 2014-15. Since 2004, participation in the program increased by 277 students, and participation as a percentage of total enrollments increased from 14% to 20.1%. Figure 5 graphically demonstrates the change by year.

**Table 3. Historical Students Enrolled in Free or Reduced Price Meals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Students Enrolled in Free or Reduced Price Meals</th>
<th>Percent FRPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Historical Students Enrolled in Free or Reduced Price Meals**

Source: California Department of Education.
**Historical Enrollment by Ethnicity**

To analyze the District's race/ethnicity profile, the 2004-2014 CalPADS enrollments by race/ethnicity were used.

Historically, MVLA enrollments have been fairly diverse, and have been getting more diverse in recent years. No single ethnicity or race composes a majority of students within the District. White students (45.3% in 2014-15) comprise the largest proportion, but students of other races and ethnicities represent a greater proportion of the District every year. The second largest ethnic group is Hispanic or Latino students (26%), with Asian students being the third largest ethnic group (21%). Figure 6 below demonstrates the race/ethnicity trends of the District from 2004-05 to the 2014-15 school year, the most recent for which State data is available.

**Figure 6. Historical Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Source: California Department of Education.
**Historical Enrollment of English Language Learners**

CalPADS enrollments of English Language Learners (ELL) were also compiled and analyzed. Table 4 contains the number of MVLA students enrolled as ELL students from 2004-05 to 2014-15, as well as a breakdown by primary language spoken. ELL enrollment increased almost every year since 2006. The percentage of ELL students out of total District students, however, peaked in 2011 but was still higher in 2014 than it was in 2013. The composition of the ELL student population has consisted of predominantly Spanish speaking students, with multiple other spoken languages represented by the remainder of the ELL student population. Both Spanish speaking students and students speaking any other language have increased at approximately the same rate since 2004. Figure 7 graphically depicts this trend over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>Percent ELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Historical Students Enrolled as English Language Learners**

Source: California Department of Education.
**Historical Enrollment of Special Education Students**

Data on students classified by the State as being enrolled in Special Education classes were also collected from CalPADS. Table 5 provides the number of MVLA students enrolled in Special Education classes from 2004-05 to 2014-15. Special Education enrollment generally increased throughout the last decade. As a percentage of total enrollment, special education enrollment has been more erratic, with both increases and decreases during that time. After a large gain from 2008 to 2009 and a smaller decline the next year, the percentage of Special Education students in MVLA has been stable.

Table 5. Historical Students Enrolled in Special Education Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Historical Students Enrolled in Special Education Classes

Source: California Department of Education.
Feeder Elementary School District Trends

Another demographic factor to be considered when analyzing past and future enrollments is the feeder elementary school district population, as a significant number of these students will become future 9th-12th grade MVLA students. Figure 9 provides a map of the MVLA feeder elementary school districts included in this analysis.

Figure 9. Santa Rosa High School District Feeder Elementary School Districts
TK-8th grade enrollments in feeder elementary school districts increased by 13.5% since 2007, (Figure 10). Mountain View Whisman grew more than Los Altos during that time (+15% compared to +12%), though both districts displayed healthy enrollment growth (Table 6). Since incoming cohort size is a major influencing factor on MVLA enrollment trends, this is a significant trend.

**Figure 10. Historical TK-8th Grade Enrollments of Feeder Elementary School Districts**

Source: California Department of Education.

**Table 6. Historical TK-8th Grade Enrollments of Feeder Elementary School Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>4,171</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>4,478</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Whisman</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,458</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>5,047</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>8,972</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>9,443</td>
<td>9,502</td>
<td>9,588</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Charter School Trends**

While there are numerous charter schools operating throughout Santa Clara County, there are no charter schools serving high school students located within the MVLA boundary. JSA will continue to monitor new charter schools if and when they are established for any potential impact on the District.
Private School Trends

While public-to-private and private-to-public student transfer data is not readily available and therefore difficult to measure, it is possible to compare historical enrollments in order to determine if there is a significant correlation between public school enrollments as compared to private school enrollments. For example, if a school district is experiencing declining enrollments, and private schools within that District (or in adjacent districts) are experiencing enrollment increases, assumptions can be made regarding an increase in public-to-private school student transfers.

Private school enrollments for private schools serving grades 9-12 located within the District (Figure 12) were collected from the California Department of Education for all years from 2005 to 2015. Since 2011, enrollments at private schools located within MVLA increased concurrently with MLVA enrollment increases, by 7.3% (+145 students), indicating a general increase in the District’s school-age population (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Private School Enrollments for Private Schools Located within MVLA

![Graph showing private school enrollments from 2005-06 to 2015-16.](image)

Source: California Department of Education.
Figure 12. Private School Locations in MVLA
Community Demographics

The Mountain View Los Altos High School District serves most portions of the Cities of Mountain View and Los Altos, as well as part the Town of Los Altos Hills and a small portion of unincorporated Santa Clara County land. This community demographic analysis will focus on the general population residing within the District boundary.

Population Trends

MVLA has a total population of approximately 111,502 according to ESRI Business Analyst estimates, which compile and project Census populations for specialized geographic boundaries such as school districts. This is an increase of 9.6% since 2000 (Figure 13). MVLA is expected to continue to grow.

As Figure 14 demonstrates, MVLA is an older community with a median age of 39.7 years (up from 38.7 in 2010). The relevant school-aged population of 14-17 year olds increased by over 1,000 from 2000 to 2010, and by an additional 231 from 2010 to 2015 (Figure 15). The MVLA community is approximately half White with sizeable Asian and Hispanic/Latino components (Figure 16).

Figure 13. Population Growth 2000-2014


Figure 14. Age Distribution by Percent of Population

Source: ESRI forecasts for 2015.
Figure 15. Population Growth by Age 2000-2020

![Population Growth by Age Graph](image)


Figure 16. Population by Race and Ethnicity

![Population by Race and Ethnicity Graph](image)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2014 1-Year Estimates
Household Characteristics

Median household income is high in MVLA compared to the State as a whole, and the gap between MVLA income and State income is increasing (Figure 17).

Figure 17. Median Household Income

![Median Household Income Graph](image)


The percent of households with children under 18 increased in MVLA from 2000-2014 while the number of persons per household increased in owner-occupied units and decreased slightly in renter-occupied units. (Figures 18-19).

Figure 18. Percent of Households with Individuals Under 18

![Percent of Households with Individuals Under 18 Graph](image)

Home Ownership and Median Home Values

Home-ownership in the District (the percent of non-vacant housing units occupied by the owner) decreased slightly since 2000 (Figure 20). The Census Bureau collects and records median home values of owner-occupied housing units up to $1,000,000, however median home values of owner-occupied housing units in MVLA currently exceed this cap, so Zillow estimates for Mountain View and Los Altos were utilized for 2015 ($1,700,000) (Figure 21).

Figure 20. Home Ownership Rate

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census and ACS 2014 1-Year Estimates.
Figure 21. Median Value of Owner-Occupied Units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census and Zillow estimates for 2015.

The percent of owner-occupied housing units in MVLA declined during the study period, while the percent of vacant housing units increased correspondingly (Figure 22). The percent of renter-occupied housing units declined slightly since 2000.

Figure 22. Housing Units by Occupancy

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census and ACS 2014 1-Year Estimates
SECTION D: STUDENT GENERATION FACTORS

Student Generation Factors: New Construction

Student generation factors are one of the critical components of facility planning. When analyzing the impacts of future residential development, student generation factors are used to project the number of students the District can expect from a planned development. The data is used to determine if and when new school facilities will be needed and to make critical facility decisions, such as potential boundary adjustments or the addition of new classrooms to existing sites. The housing mix of the planned development, including detached units, attached units, and apartments, is compared to similar housing in existing neighborhoods in the District to project how many students will reside in the new development. Next, the number of years a new development will take to be completed is calculated with the projected number of students from the various housing types. This determines how many students from each grade level will be generated over the build-out of the new community.

Jack Schreder & Associates accessed a real-estate database to collect the number of housing units constructed between 2005 and 2015. Multi-family units were analyzed from all years of construction since many have been renovated since initial construction. These units were cross-referenced with the 2015-16 MVLA student list to determine the number of students generated per housing unit by housing type.

A total of 1,187 single-family detached units, 940 single-family attached units, 8,255 multi-family units, and 164 affordable units were surveyed in the District. The 9th-12th grade District-wide student generation factors by typology are outlined in Table 7.

Table 7. Student Generation Factors: District-wide New Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Student Generation Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is critical the District remain aware of potential development and be proactive in working with the planning agencies serving the District. Further, these student generation factors should be monitored annually to ensure that any significant variations are accounted for in the District’s planning efforts.
Student Generation Factors: Existing Home Sales

New construction is only one part of student generation for MVLA; new students also enter the District from existing home sales as older neighborhoods “turn over” and empty-nesters are replaced by families with school-age children. For this reason, JSA assesses the impact of families moving into the District who buy homes for sale. As with the new construction, a real-estate database was accessed to collect the number of housing units sold from January 2014 to August 2015. This database was cross-referenced with the 2015-16 CUSD student list to determine the number of students generated per housing unit by grade level.

A total of 833 single-family detached housing units were surveyed within the District, which generated 60 9th-12th grade students for the District. An additional 529 single-family attached units were also surveyed, which generated 22 9th-12th grade students. Student generation factors by grade configuration are displayed in Table 8. Single-family detached homes that resell generate fewer students for the District to house than newly constructed single-family detached homes, while single-family attached units generated slightly more. Overall, the blended student generation rate (all units and students counted together) for housing resales is slightly lower than the rate for newly constructed residential units.

Table 8. Student Generation Factors: District-wide Existing Home Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Single-Family Detached SGR</th>
<th>Single-Family Attached SGR</th>
<th>Blended SGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 9-12</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: LAND USE & PLANNING

School districts are inextricably linked to their community(s). The land use and planning policies of the City and County agencies are developed to identify current land use patterns and determine how land might best be used in the future. While land use plans can provide an indication of the development attitudes of the local government, the documents are advisory only and are not good predictors of development, as market forces, government planning and regulations, and community attitudes and action all affect current and future planned development.

It is imperative to monitor land use and planning as development will affect where and how schools will be constructed as well as the fate of older schools within the District. In order to understand the connection between the schools in the Mountain View Los Altos High School District and the cities they serve, an overview of policies and planning is included in this section of the study. By understanding the fabric of the communities, the policies and goals of the cities, and the goals of the District, planning for the future will be made easier.

MVLA serves most portions of the Cities of Mountain View and Los Altos, as well as part the Town of Los Altos Hills and a small portion of unincorporated Santa Clara County land. These cities, towns, or counties were contacted to provide information and documents regarding land use and planning, development, and other pertinent information for the District. A brief summary of that information is provided in this section.

Santa Clara County

Santa Clara County, located at the southern end of the San Francisco Bay, is the sixth largest county in California and the largest of nine Bay Area counties. There are 15 cities in the county, each with its own distinct character. A significant portion of the county is unincorporated ranch and farmland. Ninety-five percent of the population lives in cities. The County is a major employment center for the region, providing more than a quarter of all jobs in the Bay Area, and was named the best-performing metro economy in the nation in 2013. It has one of the highest median family incomes in the nation, and a wide diversity of cultures, backgrounds and talents.

The primary goal of the County Planning Department is to plan and regulate land use and development within the unincorporated portions of Santa Clara County, of which MVLA contains only a small area.
Santa Clara County General Plan: 1995-2010

The General Plan outlines the policy that urban types and densities of development be located only within cities’ urban service areas, in location suitable for such development. An important cornerstone of the Plan is that of “compact development” as an overall approach to managing our future growth. This concept means that most of the growth would be in appropriate locations within existing urban areas, particularly along transit corridors and closer to employment centers to minimize sprawl. By doing so, the county believes it can preserve the existing communities. The County sought to preserve its objectives and goals, including:

- Directing public and private resources toward meeting the needs of our existing communities and neighborhoods;
- Reducing potential congestion on our roadways;
- Providing more affordable housing;
- Providing opportunities for lifestyles less dependent upon the automobile;
- Maintaining the scenic, rural character of our hillsides and other non-urban lands; and
- Improving air quality.1

Outside cities’ urban service areas, only non-urban uses and development densities are allowed, to preserve natural resources, rural character, and minimize population exposure to significant natural hazards, such as landslides, earthquake faults, and wildfire. The countywide growth management policies described herein have historically been referred to as the “joint urban development policies,” held in common by the cities, County, and County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) which controls city formation and expansion.

Based on the urban development policies, the Land Use Plan and policies further define allowable land uses and development potential for all unincorporated lands. Inside urban service areas, the policy of the County General Plan is to defer to the policies of the applicable city’s land-use plan in defining (a) allowable uses and (b) densities of development. Outside urban service areas, all lands are assigned a land use designation, or classification. Principal designations for privately-owned lands are Hillside, Ranchlands, Agriculture, and Rural Residential. Typical densities range from 20-160 acres per parcel.

---

1 Santa Clara County General Plan., pg. A-3
depending on the designation, for lots created by subdivision. One primary dwelling is allowed per legal lot.²

**Housing Element Update 2015-2022**

State Law requires each city and county to adopt a general plan containing at least seven elements, including a housing element. Unlike other mandatory general plan elements, the housing element is required to be updated every five years and is subject to detailed statutory requirements and mandatory review by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development.

The *Housing Element*, one component within the County’s General Plan, was adopted by resolution of the Board of Supervisors (June, 2014) and certified by the California State Department of Housing and Community Development in July 2014. This document provides an assessment of housing needs throughout Santa Clara County.

The Housing Needs Assessment provides background information and analysis used to help to inform updates to the County’s housing goals, policies, and programs. The regional numbers are supplied by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is responsible for allocating the regional target number to cities and counties in the Bay Area.

The County, in order to prepare the current Housing Element and meet its housing needs, conducted public outreach and collected input on potential changes in Housing Element goals, policies, and programs, to augment the technical analysis conducted in the preparation of the Housing Needs Assessment. Under State law, the County must conduct a Housing Needs Assessment which provides the following information and analysis:

- Identification and analysis of existing housing needs and projected housing needs;
- A statement of goals, objectives, strategies, and policies relating to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing;
- An analysis of the capacity of the existing General Plan and Zoning to meet projected needs; and
- A summary of housing programs and a five-year schedule of implementation measures.

² Santa Clara County General Plan.
Housing Affordability

Once the needs are identified, the County must develop a plan to achieve the goals of the Housing Element. These goals include the following categories: rehabilitation, affordability, housing development, removal of governmental constraints, energy and water conservation. The central focus of a housing element update is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The primary goal of this analysis for the Housing Element is to determine the affordability of housing to all economic segments of the community, and assist in providing housing while maintaining the character of the County. The County currently has an identified need for 277 housing units consisting of very low income, low income, moderate income, and above moderate income units. 200 of these units are moderate income units transferred to the County from the City of Palo Alto.

The regional allocation of 277 units is a significant decrease compared to the 1,090 units allocated for the previous housing element. This decrease reflects Plan Bay Area and its emphasis to concentrate housing opportunities within incorporated Priority Development Areas.3

Santa Clara Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

In 2000 the State of California adopted AB2838, a significant law which altered the guidelines for LAFCOs to establish Spheres Of Influence (SOI) in California. “Sphere of Influence” means a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local government agency. Establishing geographic areas around each city and special district to delineate where they may expand in the future is one of the primary activities of each LAFCO in the State. This law included uniform “analytical tools” for LAFCOs when evaluating potential SOIs, in addition to requiring the update of all SOIs by 2005.

The mission of the Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is to promote orderly growth and development in Santa Clara County by:

- Preserving agricultural lands and open space;
- Curbing urban sprawl;
- Encouraging efficient delivery of services;
- Exploring and facilitating regional opportunities for fiscal sustainability; and
- Promoting public accountability and transparency of local agencies to improve governance.

Spheres of influence act as a guide to LAFCO review of future boundary proposals. LAFCO is required to review adopted spheres of influence every five years. New legislation passed in 2001 requires LAFCO

to perform service reviews prior to updating the spheres of influence. LAFCOs must review all of the agencies that provide each local service within a designated geographic area.

**City of Mountain View**

Mountain View is located at the southern end of the San Francisco Peninsula, where the Peninsula joins the Santa Clara Valley. This location is where the technology industries that extend across Silicon Valley meet the financial and corporate headquarters offices concentrated on the Peninsula. Mountain View’s focal-point location is emphasized by the way key roadways and rail transit line serving Santa Clara County join before continuing to San Francisco.

Mountain View’s location makes it part of the Bay Area’s economy, its housing and jobs market, the regional transportation system, and shared environmental concerns like air quality and water supply.4

**General Plan Update: 2030**

As part of the process to update the General Plan for the City of Mountain View, in March 2008 the City embarked on a city-wide process to actively engage the community and key stakeholders in helping to envision the city's future through the year 2030. Through an extensive outreach effort, residents were given the opportunity to share their ideas and opinions of the city’s assets, challenges, values, and vision for the future. Two workshops were held with over 200 community members. From these workshops a Visioning Report was produced which is a synthesis and reflection of the community’s input and feedback. This document served as a starting point for the City’s General Plan Update.

The General Plan is the foundation for zoning regulations, subdivisions and public works plans. It also addresses other issues related to the City’s physical environment, such as noise and safety. The City has identified planning areas and policy direction for each one; the Land Use section of the plan regulates the design, location of housing, industry, offices, retail and other land uses. Included within land use is also the designation which covers the types of uses, densities and intensities allowed in each part of the City. These land use regulations are important for MVLA as they will determine what types of construction will occur in each area of the City. This development, residential and commercial, will affect the District’s decisions regarding planning for schools and students.

---

4 *General Plan, City of Mountain View, 1992.*
City of Mountain View General Plan 2030 and Precise Plans

The City of Mountain View has adopted Precise Plans which are a tool for coordinating future public and private improvements on specific properties where special conditions of size, shape, land ownership or existing or desired development require particular attention. The City has 32 Precise Plan areas which assist the City in reviewing and approving development projects within those areas.

The General Plan 2030 identified “change areas”. The change areas include: North Bayshore, East Whisman, El Camino Real, San Antonio, and Moffett Boulevard. Changes in these areas include greater commercial intensities and residential densities, with new more intensive mixed-use designations—focused on how they will develop and look. These change areas reinforce the General Plan policies and will guide precise plan updates. The following Precise Plan areas have current commercial and residential development projects under review and/or construction.

- North Bayshore Precise Plan: (Released for public review July, 2014). This plan is focused on Office, R&D, retail, services, hotel and entertainment. The intent is for this area to evolve from an auto-oriented, suburban office into an innovative and forward thinking employment district. Shoreline Boulevard will become a more walkable place with a mix of new and expanded uses.

- San Antonio Precise Plan encompasses 123 acres. Three precise plan development alternatives are being reviewed, all of which include a focus on green space, pedestrian friendly streets, residential use near mass transit, increased bicycle lanes, and mixed use development.

- El Camino Real Precise Plan: This plan encompasses 222 acres and runs 3.9 miles of the El Camino Real corridor. El Camino Real is envisioned as a place where a new mix of land uses fosters a more walkable and transit-friendly corridor.

- Downtown and Evelyn Corridor Precise Plans promote a new residential area that emulates the qualities of the Old Mountain View Neighborhood, a commercial area that supports Downtown and adjacent residential areas, a multi-modal Downtown Transit Center, and a clear hierarchy of streets and roadways, with Evelyn Avenue improved as an attractive Downtown entrance.
City of Los Altos

Los Altos is located to the west and south of Mountain View, and is an outlier in Santa Clara County for having grown only slightly during the emergence of the tech economy beginning in the 1990s. Being an established residential community with little vacant land to develop, Los Altos did not see the substantial population increases many of its neighbors experienced. The City’s total population increased from about 27,000 in 1987 to approximately 30,288 in 2014.

General Plan 2002-2020

The General Plan for Los Altos was adopted in November 2002, and is the primary source for long-range planning of the community. It addresses the physical, social, economic, and environmental character of Los Altos. The General Plan meets all State requirements for Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Safety, Conservation, Open Space, and Noise elements. All other public and private development proposal must be consistent with the City’s General Plan.

City of Los Altos Specific Plans

The City of Los Altos has adopted Specific Plans for Sherwood Gateway and Loyola Corners, as well as a specialized document for downtown land use plans.

- Sherwood Gateway Specific Plan (Adopted March 1999, Amended February 2008). This plan is focused on economic revitalization of Sherwood Gateway and the preservation of the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. The intent is to promote this area as a principal shopping and business center in Los Altos. This will be achieved through improvements to appearance and pedestrian amenities, as well as encouraging high quality development.

- Loyola Corners Specific Plan (Adopted December 1990). This commercially oriented area of approximately 9.1 acres aims to create commercial use facilities while maintaining the small, pedestrian scale of the area.

- Downtown Land Use summarizes the history of recent Downtown study efforts and policy documents. The focus for the downtown area has been in maintaining the feel Los Altos has cultivated while still bringing in a diverse commercial presence in the area.
The **2015-2023 Housing Element** indicates in its housing needs assessment that the City will need a total of 477 new dwelling units from the Extremely Low to Above Moderate income ranges to accommodate the estimated population growth through 2022. The housing element presents the City’s goals and plans for housing policy, which focus on maintaining the existing character of the City’s housing profile, including the preservation of rental units and smaller homes that are more accessible to lower income and special needs population segments.

**Town of Los Altos Hills**

Los Altos Hills is a smaller community characterized by extensive open spaces and a semi-rural lifestyle. Its General Plan (adopted in 2007) provides a policy framework within which the Town can develop in a safe, orderly manner while preserving these valued characteristics. The Town’s topography and seismic profile naturally constrain much development, and growth in Los Altos Hills has been slow compared to much of the surrounding area.

**Residential Development**

In order to provide projections for future development (and therefore future enrollments), the Cities of Mountain View and Los Altos, as well as the Town of Los Altos Hills, were contacted to provide an overview of current residential development projects. The current projects are outlined in Table 9. This table provides the total units within each project by type. In order to factor future students generated by these projects into the 10-year projections where appropriate, JSA mapped the location of all development (Figure 23).
Table 9. Current and Planned Residential Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>School Boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>858 Sierra Vista Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>827 N. Rengstorff Ave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1951 Colony</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>2392 Rock St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1958 Rock St.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>647 Sierra Vista Ave</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1946 San Luis Ave</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>2025 San Luis Ave</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>2024 Montecito Ave.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1968 Hackett Ave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>400 San Antonio Rd</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>2645 Fayette Dr</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>897 N. San Antonio Rd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Multi-Family/Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>4750 El Camino Real</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>4880 El Camino Real</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>2296 Mora Dr</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>394 Ortega Ave</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>2268 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Awaiting Revisions</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1984 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1958 Latham St</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1720 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1616 El Camino Real</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>1701 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>86 Third St</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Los Altos HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>660 Tyrella Ave</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>111 Fairchild Dr.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>133-149 Fairchild</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>277 Fairchild</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>450 N. Whisman Dr.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>186 E Middlefield Rd</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>100 Moffett</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>167 N. Whisman Rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>Pacific Dr</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>420 Ferguson Dr</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>500 Ferguson Dr</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>325 Franklin St</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Awaiting Revisions</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>231 Hope St</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>605 Castro St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>1101 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>881 Castro St</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>801 W. El Camino Real</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Approved/Under Construction</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>525 E. Evelyn</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>779 E. Evelyn Ave</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>1991 Sun Mor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>334 Bryant Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Awaiting Revisions</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1540 Miramonte Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>999 Fremont Ave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>Mountain View HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23. Current and Planned Residential Development
SECTION F: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic factors within the South Bay Area will have a direct impact on the communities served by MVLA. A vibrant, growing economy will generate more regional population, which, in turn, will increase the need for schools, services and other businesses (restaurants, retail stores, recreational facilities, etc.). The increase or decline in the economy affects the population and, in turn, the number of students for the District to house. Enrollments tend to fall in worsening economic conditions and increase during stabilization or a period of economic growth. Therefore, it is prudent to review economic trends as part of this demographic analysis.

State of California Employment Development Department

The Employment Development Division (EDD) of the State of California compiles detailed industry employment data by county and by metropolitan statistical area (MSA). Industry employment data for the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara MSA were used to gauge the current state of the local economy, as well as investigate how the employment economy has grown and changed in recent years.

Employment by Sector

As with most parts of the country, this region was impacted by the nationwide recession and endured the loss of many jobs. The economy, however, has since recovered as evidenced by the addition of almost 174,000 jobs between 2010 (the low point for total employment within the MSA) and 2015. Total non-farm employment in March 2016 was 1,063,800 jobs, the highest total since December 2000. Figure 24 below demonstrates the decline and subsequent recovery of the economy for non-farm employment. Values shown are averages for each year of the monthly employment reports for all non-farm jobs.
Figure 24. Non-Farm Employees. San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara MSA. 2006-2015

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department.

Figure 25 demonstrates the proportions of employment by sector as of March 2016.

Figure 25. Employment by Sector – March 2016

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department.
Every major economic sector with the exception of Government grew between March 2011 and March 2016. Employment in the sectors of Information (+56.8%), Mining, Logging, and Construction (+46.4%), Professional and Business Services (+34.8%), and Leisure and Hospitality (+32.3%) increased the most (Figure 26). This economic growth is anticipated to continue, which will lead to more demand for housing throughout the region.

Figure 26. Employment Growth or Decline by Sector, March 2011 – March 2016

Source: State of California, Employment Development Department.
SECTION G: SPATIAL ANALYSIS

The consultant utilized a computer mapping software, a Geographic Information System (GIS), to map and analyze the Mountain View Los Altos High School District. A GIS is a collection of computer hardware, software, and geographic data that allows us to capture, store, update, analyze, and display all forms of geographic information. Unlike a one-dimensional paper map, a GIS is dynamic in that it links location to information in various layers in order to spatially analyze complex relationships. For example, within a GIS you can analyze where students live vs. where students attend school. Figure 27 provides a visualization of the layers developed for the MVLA specific GIS.

Figure 27. MVLA GIS Layers
MVLA Specific GIS Data

One of the most crucial pieces of GIS data that aids in the educational and facility planning process is District-specific GIS data. Facility Master Planning is a multi-criteria process, which may result in a District making decisions regarding the consolidation of schools, renovation of existing schools, reconfiguration of current schools, and/or site location analysis and construction of new schools. Combining District-specific GIS data (students, attendance areas, land use data, etc.) with basemap data (roads, rivers, school sites, etc.) significantly enhances the decision making process. The current District boundary map is provided in Figure 28.
Figure 28. 2015-16 School Boundaries
**Student Data**

The consultant mapped the 2015-16 student information database by a process called geocoding. The address of each individual MVLA student was matched in the MVLA GIS. This resulted in a point on the map for each student (Figure 29). This map demonstrates the distribution of 2015-16 students (or lack thereof) in the various areas of the District.

*Figure 29. 2015-16 Student Resident Distribution*
**Student Densities**

Once the 2015-16 students were mapped, they were analyzed and displayed by boundary of residence. These layers of information provide tools for analyzing enrollments, determining future enrollments, and promoting diversity District-wide. In MVLA, more students reside in the Los Altos High School boundary then the Mountain View High School boundary (Figure 30).

*Figure 30. 2015-16 Student Resident Totals*
Attendance Matrix

An important factor in analyzing the MVLA student population is determining how well each school is serving its neighborhood population. An attendance matrix has been included to provide a better understanding of where students reside versus where they attend school. The table compares the 2015-16 MVLA students by their school of residence versus their school of attendance. Table 10 is meant to be read from top to bottom, then right to left.

In-migration refers to students attending a school but not residing in its zone. Out-migration refers to students leaving their resident school zone to attend some other school. This analysis demonstrates the MVLA is experiencing some in-migration and out-migration, but that most students attend their assigned school based on residence.

Table 10 demonstrates the rates of in-migration; 8.5% at Los Altos High and 12.6% at Mountain View High (in other words, 12.6% of Mountain View High enrollment is comprised of students not residing within the Mountain View High boundary).

Likewise, the matrix also demonstrates the rates of out-migration; 9.5% at Mountain View High and 12.9% at Los Altos High (in other words, 12.9% of the students residing in the Los Altos High boundary attend a school other than Los Altos High).

Figures 31 and 32 demonstrate the rates of in and out-migration for MVLA schools. Figure 33 demonstrates student net migration. Net migration is the difference between the number of students migrating into the school and the number of students migrating out of the school boundary, not counting out of District students and students attending alternative schools. Net migration demonstrates which traditional schools are enrolling more or fewer students than live in their boundary.

---

5 These student totals were derived from the geocoded 2015-16 student list and therefore may not perfectly match the 2015-16 MVLA enrollment data totals.
Table 10. Attendance Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/District of Residence</th>
<th>Los Altos High</th>
<th>Mountain View High</th>
<th>Other Districts</th>
<th>Total Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos High</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista High</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residing</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,102</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,785</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outflow to other Attendance Area</th>
<th>Inflow from other Attendance Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outflow to Other Program</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflow from Other Districts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % In-Migration | 8.5% | 12.6% |
| % Out-Migration| 12.9%| 9.5%  |

| Net Migration | -65 | 65    |
Figure 31. Student In-Migration

Student In-Migration Percentage
Mountain View Los Altos High School District

Los Altos 8.5%

Mountain View 12.6%

Prepared by Jack Schredor and Assc., 2015-16.
Data Sources: Santa Clara County GIS, ESRI, MVLA, TIGER, JS&A Original Research.
Figure 32. Student Out-Migration
Figure 33. Student Net Migration

**Student Net Migration**
Mountain View Los Altos High School District

Note: Net Migration is the difference between the number of students residing in a school's attendance boundary and the number of students who attend the school.

Note: Inter-district transfer students and students attending alternative schools are not counted in these numbers.
Detailed Planning Area Analysis

Since MVLA contains only two school boundaries, JSA created planning areas to analyze spatial data with a higher degree of detail. Figure 34 depicts the planning areas, Figure 35 provides the number of student residents in each planning area, and Table 11 provides an attendance matrix for each of the ten areas.

Figure 34. MVLA Planning Areas
Figure 35. Student Resident Totals by Planning Area

The number contained in each label represents how many students live in the area and attend a District school.
### Table 11. Attendance Matrix of Planning Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/District of Residence</th>
<th>Los Altos A</th>
<th>Los Altos B</th>
<th>Los Altos C</th>
<th>Los Altos D</th>
<th>Los Altos E</th>
<th>Mountain View A</th>
<th>Mountain View B</th>
<th>Mountain View C</th>
<th>Mountain View D</th>
<th>Mountain View E</th>
<th>Other Districts</th>
<th>Total Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos High</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residing</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
<td><strong>651</strong></td>
<td><strong>593</strong></td>
<td><strong>259</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>431</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>539</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,964</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outflow to other Attendance Area</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outflow to Other Program</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Out-Migration</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 demonstrates the number of student residents and the rates of out-migration in different areas of the District. The lowest rates of out-migration occur in Los Altos Area C and Mountain View Area D, where each respective high school campus is located. The highest rates of out-migration occur in Los Altos Areas A and B, and Mountain View Area A (Figure 36). Out-migration in these planning areas is influenced by significantly more students who reside there attending Alta Vista High compared to the rest of MVLA.

In-migration and net migration analysis are not applicable for planning areas, since each one does not contain a school for students living elsewhere to attend.
Figure 36. Student Out-Migration by Planning Area
Inter-district Transfer Student Trends

Inter-district transfers into MVLA were isolated and measured for purposes of evaluating the impact to District enrollments and District facilities. For these numbers, all students residing outside of the Mountain View Los Altos boundary are considered, though some of them may not have required an official inter-district transfer to attend an MVLA school. Reasons for this could include a parent working for the District, which only requires a transfer application in the first year.

Currently, there are 77 inter-district students enrolled in MVLA representing 1.9% of the District’s 2015-16 enrollment. Figure 37 depicts the current year inter-district students by their city of residence, as provided by the District.

Figure 37. 2015-16 Inter-district Transfer Students into MVLA by City of Residence

```
City of Residence | Number of Students
-----------------|-------------------
Sunnyvale        | 22
San Jose         | 20
Palo Alto        | 12
Santa Clara      | 5
Campbell         | 4
East Palo Alto   | 3
Fremont          | 3
San Francisco    | 2
Gilroy           | 1
Hayward          | 1
Menlo Park       | 1
Portola Valley   | 1
Redwood City     | 1
San Carlos       | 1
```
SECTION H: ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

To effectively plan for facilities, boundary changes, or policy changes for student enrollments, school district administrators need a 10-year enrollment projection. This projection is dual-purpose: 1) for 1 to 2-year short-term budgeting and staffing, and 2) for 5 to 7-year facility planning.

The consultant utilized the industry standard cohort “survival” methodology to prepare the 10-year enrollment projection for the Mountain View Los Altos High School District. While based on historical enrollments, the consultant adjusts the calculation for:

- Historical and Projected Birth Data of Feeder Elementary School Districts (used to project future kindergarten students)
- Residential Development
- Student Migration Rates

**Historical and Projected Birth Data**

Close tracking of local births is crucial for projecting future kindergarten students coming into MVLA’s feeder elementary districts. Births are the single best predictor of the number of future kindergarten students. Birth data is collected for the MVLA by the California Department of Health Services using ZIP Codes and is used to project future kindergarten class sizes of the feeder elementary school districts.

Since 2007, births in California have declined significantly (Figure 38). The decline in births in 2009 and 2010 were the second and third largest since 1990. In 2011, the State realized fewer births than at any time since 1990. Californians gave birth to 494,390 children in 2013, equivalent to 12.9 births per 1,000 residents. That’s the lowest birth rate in California since 1933, during the heart of the Great Depression. Women in California continue to put off having children until later in life. Birth rates in California in 2013 fell for mothers under 30 but rose for mothers 30 and older. 2014 state-wide data are not available at the time of this report’s writing.

In Santa Clara County, births were more stable through the 1990s, but have declined since 2007 (Figure 39).

---

6 The consultant utilized ZIP Codes 94022, 94024, 94035, 94040, 94041, and 94043.
Figure 38. California Births: 1991-2013

Figure 39. Santa Clara County Births: 1991-2013

Source: California Department of Public Health
Births in MVLA have generally mirrored State and County trends, though the decline since 2007 has been more gradual. Figure 40 demonstrates the total number of live births between 1991 and 2013 in the Mountain View Los Altos High School District.

**Figure 40. MVLA Births: 1991-2013**

The number of children born to parents who live in MVLA is significantly correlated with the size of the sum of all feeder elementary school district’s kindergarten classes five years later. Therefore, we use recent birth data as the most important factor when projecting future kindergarten students within MVLA. Figure 41 demonstrates this relationship.

Source: California Department of Public Health
There is rarely a one-to-one correspondence between births and subsequent kindergarten enrollments. Table 12 and Figure 42 demonstrate the kindergarten-birth ratio. The ratio provides the percentage of births that result in kindergarten or transitional kindergarten enrollments in the District five years later. It is a net rate, because children move both into and out of the District. The ratio of MVLA births to MVLA feeder district kindergarten enrollments has generally increased over the last two decades. Currently, the kindergarten to birth ratio is 0.71, meaning that for every 100 births in 2010, about 71 children enrolled in kindergarten classes five years later (in 2015). Since 2012, there has also been a Transitional Kindergarten (TK) program. The ratio of TK enrollment to births increased during program implementation, and is currently 0.11. It is anticipated that the ratio will remain at this level. The kindergarten to birth ratios are analyzed and statistical calculations are applied to estimate future kindergarten to birth ratios.
Table 12. Kindergarten/Transitional Kindergarten Enrollment to Birth Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Year</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Annual Change</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Kindergarten Enrollment</th>
<th>Ratio of Births to Kindergarten Enrollment</th>
<th>TK Enrollment</th>
<th>Ratio of Births to TK Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 42. Kindergarten/Transitional Kindergarten Enrollment to Birth Ratios
The projected kindergarten to birth ratios are multiplied by the number of births each year to project kindergarten enrollments. We anticipate the birth to kindergarten ratio and the birth to transitional kindergarten ratio will remain fairly stable in the coming years. In order to project kindergarten classes beyond 2018, county birth projections from the California Department of Finance (DOF) are utilized along with the ratios.

Student Migration Rates

The methods of projecting student enrollment in grades 9th-12th involve the use of student migration rates. A migration rate is simply how a given cohort changes in size as it progresses to the next grade level.

- Positive migration occurs when a District gains students from one grade into the next grade the following year. For example, a cohort of 100 9th grade students becomes a cohort of 125 10th grade students the following year. In this case, 25 new students enrolled in the District who were not enrolled the prior year.
  - Positive migration could be indicative of numerous influences, including the in-migration of families with school age children to the District, private to public school transfers, new residential construction, District policy changes, school closures in adjacent Districts, etc.

- Negative migration occurs when a District loses students from one grade into the next grade the following year. For example, a cohort of 100 9th grade students becomes a cohort of 75 10th grade students the following year. In this case, 25 students who were present the prior year are not enrolled in the current year.
  - These losses could be indicative of numerous influences including the closure of schools, District policy changes toward inter-district transfer students, losses to private and charter schools or other Districts, out-migration of families due to economic decline, etc.

These are net measurements.
As an example, in 2010-11 the District’s class of 10th graders was 870. A year later, this class became an 11th grade class of 881. Using this example, the rate of migration is calculated in the following way:

\[
\frac{881-870}{870} = +1.26\%
\]

The +1.26% increase is a measure of the likelihood that a 10th grade class will become larger or smaller as it passes into 11th grade the following year. Migration rates are calculated for all grade levels over several years, and then weighted and analyzed by the current grade level configuration. Exceptionally high or low migration numbers for any given year that are not in line with more established trends are given lower weight, while in general more recent trends are given higher weight.

Since 2007, MVLA has experienced generally stable migration (+/- 1% in all but one year) of the 9th through 11th grade population of one year into 10th through 12th grade students the next year (Figure 43). From 2014 to 2015, migration was a net loss of 0.27%.

**Figure 43. Migration Grades 9-11 > Grades 10-12**
Looking at each year’s migration from grade to grade provides additional insight (Table 13). In MVLA, the slight negative migration of the last three years was driven by increasingly negative migration from 11th to 12th grade. 9th to 10th grade migration was particularly negative from 2013 to 2014, which also contributed to that year’s overall higher negative migration total. The migration from the feeder districts’ combined 8th grade is also included to demonstrate a recent trend of higher positive migration compared to previous years of negative migration.

To minimize the effects of an exceptional migration, rates are calculated by averaging and weighting historical migration.

Table 13. Historical Migration by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade From &gt; To</th>
<th>Year From &gt; To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8&gt;9</td>
<td>-1.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&gt;10</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&gt;11</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&gt;12</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment Projections**

The benefit of tracking District demographic trends is the ability to utilize the trend data to project future enrollment. Predicting future enrollment is an important factor affecting many school processes: long-range planning, budgeting, staffing, and predicting future building and capital needs. The consultant has utilized several tools to predict future enrollment – cohort growth, birth rates, and residential construction patterns.

The cohort survival method is the standard demographic technique for projecting enrollments. This method was utilized to project enrollments for MVLA. Using this method, the current student body is advanced one grade for each year of the projection. For example, year 2015 9th graders become year 2016 10th graders, and the following year’s 11th graders, and so on. As a cohort moves through the grades, its total population will, most likely, change. JSA utilized feeder elementary enrollments and birth to kindergarten ratios to project incoming cohort sizes for the MVLA projection.

JSA prepared a Low, Most Likely, and High District-wide projection. Individual school projections are based on the Most Likely District-wide projection.
Overall, based on the Most Likely projection, 9th-12th grade enrollments are projected to increase to 4,576 by 2021-22 before declining back to 4,242 by 2025-26. The initial enrollment gains will be driven by larger incoming cohorts from the feeder elementary school districts, as more births and a higher birth to kindergarten ratio produced more students in these grades. In 2013, however, the kindergarten cohort was smaller compared to the number of births, and beginning in 2014, smaller kindergarten cohorts became the norm due to lower birth numbers beginning in 2009. The first of these smaller cohorts will reach MVLA as 9th graders in 2022. After 2025, MVLA enrollment will stabilize, as all four grade levels will be filled with the smaller cohorts. Once births increase again, MVLA will eventually see larger incoming cohorts again, but births are projected by the State to remain stable through at least 2020.

Table 14 shows the total enrollment of MVLA’s two feeder elementary school districts. Cells shaded in green demonstrate recent larger cohorts of 8th graders that have translated into larger incoming 9th grade cohorts, while cells shaded in red indicate the smaller kindergarten cohorts that will eventually lead to smaller incoming cohorts several years in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is critical the District continue to monitor all variables included in this analysis, and update the projections each Fall and Spring as new data becomes available.

The enrollment projections through 2025-26 are provided in Tables 15 through 17. An analysis of enrollment projections by school follows under its own heading.
### Table 15. District-wide 10-Year MOST LIKELY Enrollment Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,993</td>
<td>4,073</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>4,557</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4,485</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16. District-wide 10-Year LOW Enrollment Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,993</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>4,392</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17. District-wide 10-Year HIGH Enrollment Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,993</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>4,604</td>
<td>4,648</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>4,491</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>4,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment Projections by School**

Table 18 provides enrollment projections by school. JSA prepared these individual school enrollment projections utilizing the standard cohort survival methodology and historical migration rates. The individual school enrollment projections are based on the assumption that the rate of progression from one grade to the next will be consistent with the rates of progression in previous years, barring obvious outliers that were appropriately weighted or removed.

However, these forecasts do not take into consideration local district factors such as changing school programs, the requirements of teacher to student ratios by grade level, the availability of classrooms, and the movement of students required to maintain the teacher/student ratio at all grade levels. Overloading, overflow designations, and intra-district transfer policy can also have a significant effect on
an individual school’s enrollment projection accuracy, even while total District-wide projections remain accurate.

Thus, these projections are not meant for staffing or budgeting purposes, but for long-term facility planning District-wide.

Table 18. Enrollment Projections by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos High</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,239</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2,055</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,439</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,458</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,260</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,206</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta Vista High</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,073</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,470</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,375</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,319</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION I: RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

The Mountain View Los Altos High School District has undertaken this study in order to assist in proactive planning for current and future facility needs for its student population. Based on the comprehensive Demographic Analysis and Enrollment Projections prepared for this study, the following steps are recommended for the Mountain View Los Altos High School District to meet its future facility needs:

- It is recommended the District add facility capacity in order to accommodate the projected significant enrollment growth, most of which will occur over the next six years.
- It is recommended the District correspondingly expand core ancillary facilities as new classrooms are constructed. While adding classrooms will provide housing for additional students, it will also overburden existing ancillary facilities such as libraries, cafeterias, administrative space, gymnasiums, etc.
- It is recommended the District increase staffing and programs correspondingly as facility capacity expands and student enrollments increase.
- Until new facilities are constructed, it is recommended the District consider revising the current intra-district transfer policy to alleviate overcrowding.
- It is recommended the District consider federal, state, and local sources of funding, including a local school bond to assist in constructing new facilities for housing current and future students.
- It is recommended the District update this study annually to determine if projected development and enrollment trends are accurate. Should future trends deviate from those identified in the study, adjustments regarding future school facility needs and costs may be required.
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