JANUARY 2018

2018 DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION STUDY SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

MIKE MCLAUGHLIN, ED.D. SUPERINTENDENT

> SCHOOLWORKS, INC. 8331 Sierra College Blvd., #221 Roseville, CA 95661

PHONE: 916-733-0402 WWW.SCHOOLWORKSGIS.COM



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exec	utive Summary	1
Back	ground	2
Purp	ose and Intent	3
	Burden Nexus	3
	Cost Nexus	3
	Benefit Nexus	3
Enrol	Iment Projections	4
	Student Generation Factor	5
	New Residential Development Projections	6
Exist	ing Facility Capacity	7
	Classroom Loading Standards	7
	Existing Facility Capacity	8
	Unhoused Students by State Housing Standards	9
Color	ulation of Davidanmentia Fiscal Import on Caboola	
Calci	liation of Development's Fiscal Impact on Schools	10
Calci	School Facility Construction Costs	10 10
Calci	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development	10 10 11
Calct	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development	10 10 11 12
Calci	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development	10
Calc	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development	10 10 11 12 12 12
Calc	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee	10 10 11 12 12 13 13
Calcu	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student	10 10 11 12 12 13 13 13
Calcu	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset	10 10 11 12 12 13 13 13 13
Calcu	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot	10 10 11 12 12 13 13 13 13 13
Calcu	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact	10 10 11 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 15
Distri	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact	10 10 11 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 14 15 15
Distri	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact Instruction	10 10 12 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 14 15 15 16 17
Distri	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact Iusion Burden Nexus	10 11 12 12 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 14 15 15 16 17
Distri	School Facility Construction Costs Impact of New Residential Development Impact of Other Residential Development Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development Students per Employee School Facilities Cost per Student Residential Offset Net Cost per Square Foot Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact Iusion Burden Nexus Cost Nexus	10 10 11 12 12 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 14 15 16 17 17



Appendices

- SAB 50-01 Enrollment Certification/Projection
- Census Data
- Use of Developer Fees
- Site Development Costs
- Index Adjustment on the Assessment for Development State Allocation Board Meeting of January 24, 2018
- Annual Adjustment to School Facility Program Grants



Executive Summary

This Developer Fee Justification Study demonstrates that the San Leandro Unified School District requires the full statutory impact fee to accommodate growth from development activity.

A fee of \$3.36 per square foot for residential construction and a fee of \$0.51 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction is currently assessed on applicable permits pulled in the District. The new fee amounts are **\$3.79** per square foot for residential construction and **\$0.61*** per square foot for commercial/industrial construction. This proposed increase represents \$0.43 per square foot and \$0.10 per square foot for residential and commercial/industrial construction, respectively.

The following table shows the impacts of the new fee amounts:

Table 1 SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED Developer Fee Collection Rates

Totals	Previous	New	<u>Change</u>
Residential	\$3.36	\$3.79	\$0.43
Commercial/Ind.	\$0.51	\$0.61	\$0.10

*except for Rental Self-Storage facilities in which a fee of \$0.20 per square foot is justified.



Background

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

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

The authority sited in Education Code Section 17620 states in part "... the governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication or other form of requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities." The legislation originally established the maximum fee rates at \$1.50 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.25 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction. Government Code Section 65995 provides for an inflationary increase in the fees every two years based on the changes in the Class B construction index. As a result of these adjustments, the fees authorized by Education Code 17620 are currently **\$3.79** per square foot of residential construction and **\$0.61** per square foot of commercial or industrial construction.



Purpose and Intent

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

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

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

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

The purpose of this report is to document if a reasonable relationship exists between residential, commercial and industrial development and the need for new and/or modernized facilities in the San Leandro Unified School District.

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



Enrollment Projections

In 2017/2018 the District's total enrollment (CBEDS) was 8,888 students. The enrollment by grade level is shown here in Table 2.

Table 2

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED CURRENT ENROLLMENT

Grade	2017/2018			
TK/K	772			
1	625			
2	667			
3	610			
4	646			
5	690			
6	693			
TK-6 Total	4,703			
7	663			
8	696			
7-8 Total	1,359			
9	651			
10	683			
11	711			
12	781			
9-12 Total	2,826			
TK-12 Total	8,888			

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



Student Generation Factor

In determining the impact of new development, the District is required to show how many students will be generated from the new developments. In order to ensure that new development is paying only for the impact of those students that are being generated by new homes and businesses, the student generation factor is applied to the number of new housing units to determine development-related impacts.

The student generation factor identifies the number of students per housing unit and provides a link between residential construction projects and projections of enrollment. The State-wide factor used by the Office of Public School Construction is 0.7 for grades TK-12. For the purposes of this Study we will use the local factors to determine the students generated from new housing developments. This was done by comparing the number of housing units in the School District to the number of students in the School District as of the 2010 Census. Table 3 shows the student generation factors for the various grade groupings.

Table 3

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED STUDENT GENERATION FACTORS

<u>Grades</u>	Students per Household
TK-6	0.1893
7-8	0.0551
9-12	0.1177
Total	0.3622

When using the Census data to determine the average district student yield rate, it is not possible to determine which students were living in multi-family units versus single-family units. Therefore, only the total average yield rate is shown. The Census data does indicate that **57%** of the total housing units within the district boundaries are single family units. It is reasonable to assume that the construction of new housing units would be similar to the current housing stock, which was confirmed by the various planning departments within the school district boundaries, and therefore the overall student generation rate will be used to determine student yields from the projected developments.



New Residential Development Projections

The San Leandro Unified School District has experienced an average new residential construction rate of approximately 100 units per year over the past two years. This was determined by reviewing the residential permits pulled and school development impact fees paid to the District. After contacting the City of San Leandro planning department within the school district boundaries, it was verified that using the same average residential construction rate over the past four years for the next five years is a reasonable assumption. Projecting the average rate forward, we would expect that 500 units of residential housing will be built within the District boundaries over the next five years.

To determine the impact of residential development, an enrollment projection is prepared. Applying the student generation factor of 0.3622 to the projected 500 units of residential housing, we expect that 182 students will be generated from the new residential construction over the next five years. This includes 95 elementary school students, 28 middle school students and 59 high school students.

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

Table 4

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED FIVE YEAR ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

	Current	Development	Projected
<u>Grades</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	Projection	<u>Enrollment</u>
TK to 6	4,703	95	4,798
7 to 8	1,359	28	1,387
9 to 12	2,826	59	2,885
Totals	8,888	182	9,070



Existing Facility Capacity

To determine the need for additional school facilities, the capacity of the existing facilities must be identified and compared to current and anticipated enrollments. The District's existing building capacity will be calculated using the State classroom loading standards shown in Table 6. The following types of "support-spaces" necessary for the conduct of the District's comprehensive educational program, are not included as "teaching stations," commonly known as "classrooms" to the public:

Table 5

List of Core and Support Facilities

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

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

Classroom Loading Standards

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

Table 6

State Classroom Loading Standards

TK/Kindergarten	25 Students/Classroom
1 st -3 rd Grades	25 Students/Classroom
4 th -6 th Grades	25 Students/Classroom
7 th -8 th Grades	27 Students/Classroom
9 th -12 th Grades	27 Students/Classroom
Non-Severe Special Ed	13 Students/Classroom



Existing Facility Capacity

The State determines the baseline capacity by either loading all permanent teaching stations, plus a maximum number of portables, equal to 25% of the number of permanent classrooms or by loading all permanent classrooms and only portables that are owned or have been leased for over 5 years. As allowed by law and required by the State, facility capacities are calculated by identifying the number of teaching stations at each campus. All qualified teaching stations were included in the calculation of the capacities at the time the initial inventory was calculated. To account for activity and changes since the baseline was established in 1998/99, the student grants (which represent the seats added either by new schools or additions to existing schools) for new construction projects funded by OPSC have been added. Using these guidelines, the District's current State calculated capacity is shown in Table 7.

Table 7

School Facility	Permanent <u>Classrooms</u>	Portable <u>Classrooms</u>	Chargeable Portables	Total Chargeable <u>Classrooms</u>	State Loading <u>Factor</u>	State Funded <u>Projects</u>	Total State <u>Capacity</u>
Grades TK-6	120	67	44	164	25	1,339	5,439
Grades 7-8	69	2	1	70	27	0	1,890
Grades 9-12	53	25	17	70	27	828	2,718
Special Ed	12	3	2	14	13	8	190
Totals	254	97	64	318		2,175	10,237

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED Summary of Existing Facility Capacity

OPSC Funded Projects

<u>Name</u>	Project #	TK-6 Grants	7-8 Grants	<u>9-12 Grants</u>	Special Ed	<u>CR</u>
San Leandro High	1	0	0	700	8	25
John Muir	2	300	0	0	0	8
Bancroft Junior High	3	205	0	0	0	8
Jefferson Elementary	4	200	0	0	0	8
San Leandro High	5	0	0	128	0	8
San Leandro High	6	405	0	0	0	15
San Leandro High	7	229	0	0	0	3
	Totals	1,339	0	828	8	75

This table shows a basic summary of the form and procedures used by OPSC (Office of Public School Construction) to determine the capacity of a school district. There was a total of 254 permanent classrooms in the District when the baseline was established. In addition, there were 97 portable classrooms. However, OPSC regulations state that if the number of



portables exceeds 25% of the permanent classrooms, then the maximum number of portables to be counted in the baseline capacity is 25% of the permanent classrooms. Therefore, the chart shows the chargeable portables as 64 which is 25% of the permanent classroom count. This results in a total classroom count of 318 and is referred to as the chargeable classrooms since it accounts for the fact that some of the portable were not included in the total. This is done to account for the fact that portables are typically considered to be temporary, especially when the total number exceeds 25% of the permanent classrooms.

To determine the total capacity based on State standards, the capacity of the chargeable classrooms are multiplied by the State loading standards and then the capacity of the projects completed since 1998/99 (when the baseline was established) are added based on the State funded new construction projects. As Table 7 shows, the total State capacity of the District facilities is 10,237 students.

Unhoused Students by State Housing Standards

This next table compares the capacity with the space needed to determine if there is available space for new students from the projected developments. The space needed was determined by reviewing the historic enrollments over the past four years along with the projected enrollment in five years to determine the maximum seats needed to house the students within the existing homes. The seats needed were determined individually for each grade grouping. The projected enrollment in this analysis did not include the impact of any new housing units.

Table 8

Space Available State School Facility Capacity Needed Capacity Grades TK-6 5,439 5,077 362 1,890 Grades 7-8 1,359 531 Grades 9-12 2,718 3,074 (356)Special Ed 190 0 190 Totals 10,237 9,510 727

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED Summary of Available District Capacity

Since the enrollment space needed exceeds the District capacity at grade levels 9-12, there is no excess capacity available to house students at grade levels 9-12 from new development.



Calculation of Development's Fiscal Impact on Schools

This section of the Study will demonstrate that a reasonable relationship exists between residential, commercial/industrial development and the need for additional school facilities in the San Leandro Unified School District. To the extent this relationship exists, the District is justified in levying developer fees as authorized by Education Code Section 17620.

School Facility Construction Costs

For the purposes of estimating the cost of building schools, we have used the State School Building Program funding allowances. These amounts are shown in Table 9. In addition to the basic construction costs, there are site acquisition costs of \$1,000,000 per acre and service site, utilities, off-site and general site development costs which are also shown in Table 9.

Table 9

NEV	N CO	ONS	RU	стю	N C	OSTS
				U 1 1 U		0010

				Per Student	
<u>Grade</u>	Base Grant	Fire Alarms	Fire Sprinklers	Total	
TK-6	\$23,134	\$28	\$388	\$23,550	
7-8	\$24,468	\$38	\$460	\$24,966	
9-12	\$31,134	\$62	\$480	\$31,676	
Site Acreage Needs			Projected	Equivalent	Site
	Typical	Average	Unhoused	Sites	Acres
<u>Grade</u>	<u>Acres</u>	Students	Students	Needed	Needed
TK-6	10	600	0	0.00	0.00
7-8	20	800	0	0.00	0.00
9-12	40	1,500	59	0.04	1.57
			_	TOTAL	1.57

General Site Development Allowance

Totals	1.57					\$129.200
9-12	1.57	\$37,654	\$59,117	3.75%	\$70,083	\$129,200
7-8	0.00	\$37,654	\$0	6%	\$0	\$0
TK-6	0.00	\$37,654	\$0	6%	\$0	\$0
<u>Grade</u>	Acres	Acre	Base Cost	<u>% Allowance</u>	Added Cost	Total Cost
		Allowance/				

Site Acquisition & Development Summary

	Acres			Site			
	To Be	Land	Total	Development	Site	General Site	Total Site
<u>Grade</u>	Bought	Cost/Acre	Land Cost	Cost/Acre	Dev. Cost	Development	Development
TK-6	0.00	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$248,896	\$0	\$0	\$0
7-8	0.00	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$234,162	\$0	\$0	\$0
9-12	1.57	\$1,000,000	\$1,570,000	\$273,060	\$428,704	\$129,200	\$557,904
Totals	1.57		\$1,570,000		\$428,704	\$129,200	\$557,904

Note: The grant amounts used are twice those shown in the appendix to represent the full cost of the facility needs and not just the standard State funding share of 50%.



Impact of New Residential Development

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

In addition, the State provides that new construction projects can include the costs for site acquisition and development, including appraisals, surveys and title reports. The District needs to acquire 1.57 acres to meet the needs of the students projected from the new developments. Therefore, the costs for site acquisition and development of the land have been included in the total impacts due to new development.

Finally, the modernization needs are included for the students not housed in new facilities but who would be housed in existing facilities that are eligible for and need to be modernized to provide adequate housing and to maintain the existing level of service for the students generated by development.

Table 10

			Average cos	st per student:	\$67,742
			New Constru	uction Needs:	\$3,996,788
Site Developme	ent:				\$557,904
Site Purchase:	1.57 acres				\$1,570,000
High & Cont.	59	0	59	\$31,676	\$1,868,884
Middle	28	531	0	\$24,966	\$0
Elementary	95	362	0	\$23,550	\$0
School <u>Facility</u>	Development Projection	Available <u>Space</u>	Net <u>Unhoused</u>	Construction Cost Per Student	Total Facility <u>Costs</u>

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED Summary of Residential Impact

The total need for school facilities based solely on the impact of the 500 new housing units projected over the next five years totals \$3,996,788. To determine the impact per square foot of residential development, this amount is divided by the total square feet of the



projected developments. As calculated from the historic Developer Fee Permits, the average size home built has averaged 1,302 square feet. The total area for 500 new homes would therefore be 651,000 square feet. The total residential fee needed to be able to collect \$3,996,768 would be **\$6.14** per square foot.

Impact of Other Residential Development

In addition to new residential development projects that typically include new single family homes and new multi-family units, the District can also be impacted by additional types of new development projects. These include but are not limited to redevelopment projects, additions to existing housing units, and replacement of existing housing units with new housing units.

These development projects are still residential projects and therefore it is reasonable to assume they would have the same monetary impacts per square foot as the new residential development projects. However, the net impact is reduced due to the fact that there was a previous residential building in its place. Therefore, the development impact fees should only be charged for other residential developments if the new building(s) exceed the square footage area of the previous building(s). If the new building is larger than the existing building, then it is reasonable to assume that additional students could be generated by the project. The project would only pay for the development impact fees for the net increase in assessable space generated by the development project. Education Code 17620(a) allows for an exemption from development impact fees for any additions to existing residential structures that are 500 square feet or less.

Impact of Commercial/Industrial Development

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

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



Employees per Square Foot of Commercial Development

Results from a survey published by the San Diego Association of Governments "1990 San DAG Traffic Generators" are used to establish numbers of employees per square foot of building area to be anticipated in new commercial or industrial development projects. The average number of workers per 1,000 square feet of area ranges from 0.06 for Rental Self-Storage to 4.79 for Standard Commercial Offices. The generation factors from that report are shown in the following table.

Commercial/Industrial	Average Square Foot	Employees Per Average
Category	Per Employee	Square Foot
Banks	354	0.00283
Community Shopping Centers	652	0.00153
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	369	0.00271
Industrial Business Parks	284	0.00352
Industrial Parks	742	0.00135
Rental Self Storage	15541	0.00006
Scientific Research & Development	329	0.00304
Lodging	882	0.00113
Standard Commercial Office	209	0.00479
Large High Rise Commercial Office	232	0.00431
Corporate Offices	372	0.00269
Medical Offices	234	0.00427

Table 11

Source: 1990 SanDAG Traffic Generators report

Students per Employee

The number of students per employee is determined by using the 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates for the District. There were 31,511 employees and 24,360 homes in the District. This represents a ratio of 1.2936 employees per home.

There were 8,822 school age children attending the District in 2010. This is a ratio of 0.28 students per employee. This ratio, however, must be reduced by including only the percentage of employees that worked in their community of residence (20.6%), because only those employees living in the District will impact the District's school facilities with their children. The actual ratio of students per employee in the District is 0.0557.

School Facilities Cost per Student

State costs for housing commercially generated students are the same as those used for residential construction. The cost factors used to assess the impact from commercial development projects are contained in Table 10.



Residential Offset

When additional employees are generated in the District as a result of new commercial/industrial development, fees will also be charged on the residential units necessary to provide housing for the employees living in the District. To prevent a commercial or industrial development from paying for the portion of the impact that will be covered by the residential fee, this amount has been calculated and deducted from each category. The residential offset amount is calculated by multiplying the following factors together and dividing by 1,000 (to convert from cost per 1,000 square feet to cost per square foot).

- Employees per 1,000 square feet (varies from a low of 0.06 for rental Self-Storage to a high of 4.79 for office building).
- Percentage of employees that worked in their community of residence (20.6 percent).
- Housing units per employee (0.7731). This was derived from the 2008-2012 ACS 5 Year Estimates data for the District, which indicates there were 24,360 housing units and 31,511 employees.
- Percentage of employees that will occupy new housing units (75 percent).
- Average square feet per dwelling unit (1,302).
- Residential fee charged by the District (\$3.79 per square foot).
- Average cost per student was determined in Table 10.

The following table shows the calculation of the school facility costs generated by a square foot of new commercial/industrial development for each category of development.

Table 12

SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED

Summary of Commercial and Industrial Uses

	Employees per 1,000	Students per	Students per	Average Cost per	Cost per	Residential offset per	Net Cost per
Туре	<u>Sq. Ft.</u>	Employee	1.000 Sq. Ft.	Student	<u>Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Sq. Ft.</u>	<u>Sq. Ft.</u>
Banks	2.83	0.0577	0.163	\$67,742	\$11.06	\$1.67	\$9.39
Community Shopping Centers	1.53	0.0577	0.088	\$67,742	\$5.98	\$0.90	\$5.08
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	2.71	0.0577	0.156	\$67,742	\$10.59	\$1.60	\$8.99
Industrial Business Parks	3.52	0.0577	0.203	\$67,742	\$13.75	\$2.07	\$11.68
Industrial Parks	1.35	0.0577	0.078	\$67,742	\$5.27	\$0.80	\$4.48
Rental Self Storage	0.06	0.0577	0.003	\$67,742	\$0.23	\$0.04	\$0.20
Scientific Research & Development	3.04	0.0577	0.175	\$67,742	\$11.88	\$1.79	\$10.09
Lodging	1.13	0.0577	0.065	\$67,742	\$4.41	\$0.67	\$3.75
Standard Commercial Office	4.79	0.0577	0.276	\$67,742	\$18.71	\$2.82	\$15.89
Large High Rise Commercial Office	4.31	0.0577	0.249	\$67,742	\$16.84	\$2.54	\$14.30
Corporate Offices	2.69	0.0577	0.155	\$67,742	\$10.51	\$1.59	\$8.92
Medical Offices	4.27	0.0577	0.246	\$67,742	\$16.68	\$2.52	\$14.17

*Based on 1990 SanDAG Traffic Generator Report



Net Cost per Square Foot

Since the State Maximum Fee is now \$0.61 for commercial/industrial construction, the District is justified in collecting the maximum fee for all categories with the exception of Rental Self-Storage. The District can only justify collection of \$0.20 per square foot of Rental Self-Storage construction.

Verifying the Sufficiency of the Development Impact

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

The total need for school facilities resulting from development totals \$3,996,788. The amount the District would collect over the five year period at the maximum rate of \$3.79 for residential and \$0.61 for commercial/industrial development would be as follows:

\$3.79 x 500 homes x 1,302 sq ft per home = \$2,467,290 for Residential
\$0.61 x 13,440 sq ft per year x 5 years = \$40,992 for Commercial/Industrial
Total projected 5 year income: \$2,508,282

The estimated income is less than the projected facility needs due to the impact of new development projects.



District Map

The following map shows the extent of the areas for which development fees are applicable to the San Leandro Unified School District.





Conclusion

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

<u>Burden Nexus:</u> New residential development will generate an average of 0.3622 TK-12 grade students per unit. Because the District does not have adequate facilities for all the students generated by new developments, the District will need to build additional facilities and/or modernize/reconstruct the existing facilities in order to maintain existing level of services in which the new students will be housed.

<u>Cost Nexus:</u> The cost to provide new and reconstructed facilities is an average of \$6.14 per square foot of residential development. Each square foot of residential development will generate \$3.79 in developer fees resulting in a shortfall of \$2.35 per square foot.

<u>Benefit Nexus:</u> The developer fees to be collected by the San Leandro Unified School District will be used for the provision of additional and reconstructed or modernized school facilities. This will benefit the students to be generated by new development by providing them with adequate educational facilities.

The District's planned use of the fees received from development impacts will include the following types of projects each of which will benefit students from new developments.

- New Schools: When there is enough development activity occurring in a single area, the District will build a new school to house the students from new developments.
- 2) Additions to Existing Schools: When infill development occurs, the District will accommodate students at existing schools by building needed classrooms and/or support facilities such as cafeterias, restrooms, gyms and libraries as needed to increase the school capacity. Schools may also need upgrades of the technology and telecommunication systems to be able to increase their capacity.



- 3) Portable Replacement Projects: Some of the District's capacity is in temporary portables and therefore may not be included in the State's capacity calculations. These portables can be replaced with new permanent or modular classrooms to provide adequate space for students from new developments. These projects result in an increase to the facility capacity according to State standards. In addition, old portables that have reached the end of their life expectancy, will need to be replaced to maintain the existing level of service. These types of projects are considered modernization projects in the State Building Program. If development impacts did not exist, the old portables could be removed.
- 4) Modernization/Upgrade Projects: In many cases, students from new developments are not located in areas where new schools are planned to be built. The District plans to modernize or upgrade older schools to be equivalent to new schools so students will be housed in equitable facilities to those students housed in new schools. These projects may include updates to the building structures to meet current building standards, along with upgrades to the current fire and safety standards and any access compliance standards.

The reasonable relationship identified by these findings provides the required justification for the San Leandro Unified School District to levy the maximum fees of **\$3.79** per square foot for residential construction and **\$0.61** per square foot for commercial/industrial construction, except for Rental Self-Storage facilities in which a fee of **\$0.20** per square foot is justified as authorized by Education Code Section 17620.

Appendices 2018 Developer Fee Justification Study

San Leandro Unified School District

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ENROLLMENT CERTIFICATION/PROJECTION

SAB 50-01 (REV 05/09)

	````													- 9
CHOOL DIST	RICT							FIVE DIGIT DIST	RICT CODE NUME	BER ( <i>see Califo</i>	rnia Public Sch	ool Directory)		
DUNTY								HIGH SCHOOL A	ATTENDANCE ARE	EA (HSAA) OR S	SUPER HSAA (	(if applicable)		
Check o	one: 🗆 F	ifth-Year E	Inrollment	Projectio	n 🗆 Tent	h-Year Enr	rollment P	rojection	Part G.	Number o	f New Dw	elling Units		
HSAA D	Districts O	nly - Chec	k one:	Atten	dance	Resid	ency	,		(Fifth-Year	Projection	n Only)		
		Res	idency - C	OS Distric	ts Only -	(Fifth Year	Projection	Only)						
□ Mod	lified Weig	<b>hting</b> (Fil	fth-Year Pr	ojection Or	nly)	3rd Prev. to	2nd Prev.	Previous to	Part H.	District St	udent Yie	ld Factor		
□ Alte	rnate Wei	<b>ghting -</b> (F	ill in boxes	to the righ	t):	2nd Prev.	to Prev.	Current		(Fifth-Year	Projection	n Only)		
									Part I. P	rojected E	nrollment	t		
Part A.	K-12 Pupil	Data	Eth David	Ath Dress	2nd David	Or d Dress	Draviana	Current	1. FITT	n-year Pro	ojection	waant Cnaak		
Crado	/in Prev.	6th Prev.	5th Prev.	4in Prev.	3rd Prev.	2nd Prev.	Previous	Current	Enfoil		0 12		ai Day Cia	iss pupils)
K	1	1	/	1	/	/	1	1	K-0	7-0	7-12	TOTAL		
1														
2									Specia	al Day Cla	ss pupils	only - Enroll	ment/Re:	sidency
3										Eleme	entary	Secon	dary	TOTAL
4									Non-Severe					
5									Severe					
6									TOTAL					
7									а <b>т</b>					
8									2. Ter	ith-Year P	rojection	waant Cnaak		
9									EIIIOII				a Day Cia	iss pupils)
10									K-0	7-0	7-12	TOTAL		
12					}	1			L		I	1		
TOTAL									Specia	al Day Cla	ss pupils	only - Enroll	ment/Re:	sidency
					<u>.</u>					Eleme	entary	Secon	dary	TOTAL
Part B. I	Pupils Att	ending Scl	hools Cha	rtered By	Another D	istrict			Non-Severe					
	7th Prev.	6th Prev.	5th Prev.	4th Prev.	3rd Prev.	2nd Prev.	Previous	Current	Severe					
		i	1	1		1	1		TOTAL			1		1

I certify, as the District Representative, that the information reported on this form and, when applicable, the High School Attendance Area Residency Reporting Worksheet attached, is true and correct and that:

• I am designated as an authorized district representative by the governing board of the district.

• If the district is requesting an augmentation in the enrollment projection pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.42.1 (a), the local planning commission or approval authority has approved the tentative subdivision map used for augmentation of the enrollment and the district has identified dwelling units in that map to be contracted. All subdivision maps used for augmentation of enrollment are available at the district for review by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC).

• This form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction. In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail.

TELEPHONE NUMBER

NAME OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE (PRINT OR TYPE)

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE

#### Part F. Birth Data - (Fifth-Year Projection Only)

6th Prev.

7th Prev.

Grade

9

10

11

12

TOTAL

Non-Severe

Severe

TOTAL

6th Prev.

Elementary

7th Prev.

5th Prev.

4th Prev.

Part D. Special Day Class Pupils - (Districts or County Superintendent of Schools)

Secondary

Part E. Special Day Class Pupils - (County Superintendent of Schools Only)

5th Prev.

3rd Prev. 2nd Prev.

TOTAL

3rd Prev. 2nd Prev.

Previous

Previous

Current

Current

DATE

🗌 Cou	inty Birth D	ata 🗆 Bi	rth Data by	District ZI	P Codes	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
8th Prev.	7th Prev.	6th Prev.	5th Prev.	4th Prev.	3rd Prev.	2nd Prev.	Previous	Current

4th Prev.

E-MAIL ADDRESS

# U.S. Census Bureau

# FactFinder (

# DP04

# SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

#### 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

HOUSING OCCUPANCY Estim	ate 25,505	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error
HOUSING OCCUPANCY	25,505			
	25,505			
Total housing units		+/-630	25,505	(X)
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	95.5%	+/-1.0
Vacant housing units	1,145	+/-256	4.5%	+/-1.0
Homeowner vacancy rate	2.3	+/-1.1	(X)	(X)
Rental vacancy rate	1.7	+/-0.8	(X)	(X)
UNITS IN STRUCTURE				
Total housing units	25,505	+/-630	25,505	(X)
1-unit, detached	14,531	+/-496	57.0%	+/-1.6
1-unit, attached	1,776	+/-282	7.0%	+/-1.1
2 units	721	+/-160	2.8%	+/-0.6
3 or 4 units	953	+/-225	3.7%	+/-0.9
5 to 9 units	1,240	+/-239	4.9%	+/-0.9
10 to 19 units	1,235	+/-265	4.8%	+/-1.1
20 or more units	4,683	+/-446	18.4%	+/-1.6
Mobile home	337	+/-127	1.3%	+/-0.5
Boat, RV, van, etc.	29	+/-38	0.1%	+/-0.1
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT				
Total housing units	25,505	+/-630	25,505	(X)
Built 2010 or later	19	+/-30	0.1%	+/-0.1
Built 2000 to 2009	1,254	+/-199	4.9%	+/-0.8
Built 1990 to 1999	1,149	+/-225	4.5%	+/-0.9
Built 1980 to 1989	2,305	+/-345	9.0%	+/-1.4
Built 1970 to 1979	3,633	+/-384	14.2%	+/-1.4
Built 1960 to 1969	3,827	+/-420	15.0%	+/-1.6
Built 1950 to 1959	4,803	+/-348	18.8%	+/-1.4
Built 1940 to 1949	5,354	+/-409	21.0%	+/-1.5
Built 1939 or earlier	3,161	+/-334	12.4%	+/-1.3
ROOMS				
Total housing units	25,505	+/-630	25,505	(X)
1 room	1,200	+/-248	4.7%	+/-1.0
2 rooms	637	+/-158	2.5%	+/-0.6

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California							
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Frror				
3 rooms	3,580	+/-416	14.0%	+/-1.5				
4 rooms	5,280	+/-505	20.7%	+/-2.0				
5 rooms	5,575	+/-438	21.9%	+/-1.6				
6 rooms	4,175	+/-456	16.4%	+/-1.7				
7 rooms	2,786	+/-337	10.9%	+/-1.3				
8 rooms	1,480	+/-246	5.8%	+/-1.0				
9 rooms or more	792	+/-140	3.1%	+/-0.6				
Median rooms	4.9	+/-0.1	(X)	(X)				
BEDROOMS								
Total housing units	25,505	+/-630	25,505	(X)				
No bedroom	1,311	+/-243	5.1%	+/-0.9				
1 bedroom	3,902	+/-368	15.3%	+/-1.3				
2 bedrooms	8,921	+/-595	35.0%	+/-2.2				
3 bedrooms	8,496	+/-504	33.3%	+/-1.8				
4 bedrooms	2,343	+/-304	9.2%	+/-1.3				
5 or more bedrooms	532	+/-126	2.1%	+/-0.5				
HOUSING TENURE								
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24,360	(X)				
Owner-occupied	12,914	+/-550	53.0%	+/-1.9				
Renter-occupied	11,446	+/-516	47.0%	+/-1.9				
Average household size of owner-occupied unit	2.80	+/-0.09	(X)	(X)				
Average household size of renter-occupied unit	2.65	+/-0.12	(X)	(X)				
YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT								
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24,360	(X)				
Moved in 2010 or later	2,690	+/-372	11.0%	+/-1.5				
Moved in 2000 to 2009	12,897	+/-640	52.9%	+/-2.1				
Moved in 1990 to 1999	4,355	+/-383	17.9%	+/-1.5				
Moved in 1980 to 1989	2,070	+/-244	8.5%	+/-1.0				
Moved in 1970 to 1979	1,079	+/-167	4.4%	+/-0.7				
Moved in 1969 or earlier	1,269	+/-196	5.2%	+/-0.8				
VEHICLES AVAILABLE								
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24,360	(X)				
No vehicles available	1,945	+/-309	8.0%	+/-1.2				
1 vehicle available	9,118	+/-591	37.4%	+/-2.0				
2 vehicles available	8,582	+/-559	35.2%	+/-2.2				
3 or more vehicles available	4,715	+/-363	19.4%	+/-1.6				
HOUSE HEATING FUEL								
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24,360	(X)				
Utility gas	17,361	+/-626	71.3%	+/-1.8				
Bottled, tank, or LP gas	380	+/-117	1.6%	+/-0.5				
Electricity	6,417	+/-434	26.3%	+/-1.7				
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc.	6	+/-10	0.0%	+/-0.1				
Coal or coke	0	+/-30	0.0%	+/-0.2				
Wood	65	+/-51	0.3%	+/-0.2				
Solar energy	8	+/-13	0.0%	+/-0.1				
Other fuel	0	+/-30	0.0%	+/-0.2				
No fuel used	123	+/-76	0.5%	+/-0.3				
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS								
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24.360	(X)				
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	162	+/-102	0.7%	+/-0_4				
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	309	+/-133	1.3%	+/-0.5				
No telephone service available	256	+/-101	1.1%	+/-0.4				

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California							
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of				
				Error				
	04.000		04.000					
Occupied housing units	24,360	+/-563	24,360	(X)				
	22,414	+/-638	92.0%	+/-1.3				
1.01 to 1.50	1,223	+/-237	5.0%	+/-1.0				
1.51 or more	723	+/-173	3.0%	+/-0.7				
VALUE								
Owner-occupied units	12,914	+/-550	12,914	(X)				
Less than \$50,000	529	+/-146	4.1%	+/-1.1				
\$50,000 to \$99,999	123	+/-80	1.0%	+/-0.6				
\$100,000 to \$149,999	125	+/-63	1.0%	+/-0.5				
\$150,000 to \$199,999	261	+/-108	2.0%	+/-0.8				
\$200,000 to \$299,999	1,777	+/-245	13.8%	+/-1.8				
\$300,000 to \$499,999	6,695	+/-485	51.8%	+/-3.2				
\$500,000 to \$999,999	3,268	+/-374	25.3%	+/-2.7				
\$1,000,000 or more	136	+/-71	1.1%	+/-0.5				
Median (dollars)	395.000	+/-10.447	(X)	(X)				
		,	(**)	(**)				
MORTGAGE STATUS								
Owner-occupied units	12 01/	+/ 550	12 01/	(X)				
Housing units with a mortgage	0.227	+/ 508	71 59/	(/)				
Housing units without a mortgage	9,237	+/-308	71.57	+/-2.5				
	3,077	+/-354	28.3%	+/-2.5				
SELECTED MONTHET OWNER COSTS (SMOC)		/ ====						
Housing units with a mortgage	9,237	+/-508	9,237	(X)				
Less than \$300	19	+/-24	0.2%	+/-0.3				
\$300 to \$499	91	+/-49	1.0%	+/-0.5				
\$500 to \$699	99	+/-60	1.1%	+/-0.6				
\$700 to \$999	383	+/-132	4.1%	+/-1.4				
\$1,000 to \$1,499	955	+/-224	10.3%	+/-2.3				
\$1,500 to \$1,999	1,817	+/-257	19.7%	+/-2.7				
\$2,000 or more	5,873	+/-433	63.6%	+/-3.2				
Median (dollars)	2,355	+/-85	(X)	(X)				
Housing units without a mortgage	3,677	+/-354	3,677	(X)				
Less than \$100	15	+/-23	0.4%	+/-0.6				
\$100 to \$199	209	+/-92	5.7%	+/-2.5				
\$200 to \$299	643	+/-146	17.5%	+/-3.6				
\$300 to \$399	835	+/-187	22.7%	+/-4 2				
\$400 or more	1 975	+/-261	53.7%	+/-5.0				
Median (dollars)	1,373	+/ 20	(X)	(X)				
	423	+/-30	(^)	(^)				
PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (SMOCAPI)								
Housing units with a mortgage (excluding units where	9,223	+/-511	9,223	(X)				
SMOCAPI cannot be computed)								
Less than 20.0 percent	1,932	+/-268	20.9%	+/-2.7				
20.0 to 24.9 percent	1,170	+/-180	12.7%	+/-1.9				
25.0 to 29.9 percent	1,253	+/-224	13.6%	+/-2.2				
30.0 to 34.9 percent	1,107	+/-234	12.0%	+/-2.5				
35.0 percent or more	3,761	+/-394	40.8%	+/-3.4				
Not computed	14	+/-22	(X)	(X)				
			. ,					
Housing unit without a mortgage (excluding units	3.641	+/-347	3.641	(X)				
where SMOCAPI cannot be computed)	- ,		-,	~ 7				
Less than 10.0 percent	1,853	+/-273	50.9%	+/-5.6				
10.0 to 14.9 percent	595	+/-133	16.3%	+/-3.7				
15.0 to 19.9 percent	357	+/-104	9.8%	+/-2.7				

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California							
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Percent	Percent Margin of Error				
20.0 to 24.9 percent	206	+/-116	5.7%	+/-3.0				
25.0 to 29.9 percent	205	+/-74	5.6%	+/-1.9				
30.0 to 34.9 percent	33	+/-26	0.9%	+/-0.7				
35.0 percent or more	392	+/-121	10.8%	+/-3.1				
Not computed	36	+/-31	(X)	(X)				
GROSS RENT								
Occupied units paying rent	10,945	+/-538	10,945	(X)				
Less than \$200	46	+/-39	0.4%	+/-0.4				
\$200 to \$299	70	+/-56	0.6%	+/-0.5				
\$300 to \$499	339	+/-124	3.1%	+/-1.1				
\$500 to \$749	609	+/-195	5.6%	+/-1.8				
\$750 to \$999	2,313	+/-296	21.1%	+/-2.5				
\$1,000 to \$1,499	5,178	+/-485	47.3%	+/-3.7				
\$1,500 or more	2,390	+/-278	21.8%	+/-2.4				
Median (dollars)	1,186	+/-28	(X)	(X)				
No rent paid	501	+/-139	(X)	(X)				
GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (GRAPI)								
Occupied units paying rent (excluding units where GRAPI cannot be computed)	10,882	+/-533	10,882	(X)				
Less than 15.0 percent	982	+/-256	9.0%	+/-2.3				
15.0 to 19.9 percent	1,296	+/-265	11.9%	+/-2.3				
20.0 to 24.9 percent	1,478	+/-277	13.6%	+/-2.6				
25.0 to 29.9 percent	1,599	+/-280	14.7%	+/-2.4				
30.0 to 34.9 percent	1,047	+/-204	9.6%	+/-1.9				
35.0 percent or more	4,480	+/-439	41.2%	+/-3.4				
Not computed	564	+/-142	(X)	(X)				

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

The median gross rent excludes no cash renters.

In prior years, the universe included all owner-occupied units with a mortgage. It is now restricted to include only those units where SMOCAPI is computed, that is, SMOC and household income are valid values.

In prior years, the universe included all owner-occupied units without a mortgage. It is now restricted to include only those units where SMOCAPI is computed, that is, SMOC and household income are valid values.

In prior years, the universe included all renter-occupied units. It is now restricted to include only those units where GRAPI is computed, that is, gross rent and household Income are valid values.

The 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 plumbing data for Puerto Rico will not be shown. Research indicates that the questions on plumbing facilities that were introduced in 2008 in the stateside American Community Survey and the 2008 Puerto Rico Community Survey may not have been appropriate for Puerto Rico.

Median calculations for base table sourcing VAL, MHC, SMOC, and TAX should exclude zero values.

Telephone service data are not available for certain geographic areas due to problems with data collection. See Errata Note #93 for details.

While the 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the December 2009 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural population, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2000 data. Boundaries for urban areas have not been updated since Census 2000. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey

#### Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.

2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.

4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

5. An '***' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.

6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate. 7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

# FactFinder

# S0802

### MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO WORK BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

#### 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Supporting documentation on code lists, subject definitions, data accuracy, and statistical testing can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Data and Documentation section.

Sample size and data quality measures (including coverage rates, allocation rates, and response rates) can be found on the American Community Survey website in the Methodology section.

Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Total         Car, truck, or value alone         More that for the state alone         More that for the state alone         Car, truck, or value alone         Car, truc	ck, or van pooled	
Estimate         Margin of Error         Estimate         Margin of Error         Estimate           Workers 16 years and over         31,511         +/-832         22,145         +/-781         Image: Stand Stan	•	
Workers 16 years and over       31,511       +/-832       22,145       +/-781         AGE              16 to 19 years       1.6%       +/-0.6       1.4%       +/-0.5          20 to 24 years       8.1%       +/-1.4       7.9%       +/-1.8          25 to 44 years       46.7%       +/-2.1       47.0%       +/-2.8          45 to 54 years       23.6%       +/-1.5       23.8%       +/-2.0          55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3          60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5          Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX              Male       51.2%       +/-1.5       53.4%       +/-2.0	Estimate	
AGE       Image: Margin and the system of the	3,138	
16 to 19 years       1.6%       +/-0.6       1.4%       +/-0.5         20 to 24 years       8.1%       +/-1.4       7.9%       +/-1.8         25 to 44 years       46.7%       +/-2.1       47.0%       +/-2.8         45 to 54 years       23.6%       +/-1.5       23.8%       +/-2.0         55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3         60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX              Male       51.2%       +/-1.5       53.4%       +/-2.0		
20 to 24 years       8.1%       +/-1.4       7.9%       +/-1.8         25 to 44 years       46.7%       +/-2.1       47.0%       +/-2.8         45 to 54 years       23.6%       +/-1.5       23.8%       +/-2.0         55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3         60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX       Image       Image       Image       Image       Image         Male       51.2%       +/-1.5       53.4%       +/-2.0	2.8%	
25 to 44 years       46.7%       +/-2.1       47.0%       +/-2.8         45 to 54 years       23.6%       +/-1.5       23.8%       +/-2.0         55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3         60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX       Image       Image       Image       Image       Image         Male       51.2%       +/-1.5       53.4%       +/-2.0	4.9%	
45 to 54 years       23.6%       +/-1.5       23.8%       +/-2.0         55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3         60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX       SEX       10.0%       +/-1.5       53.4%       +/-2.0         Female       48.8%       +/-1.5       46.6%       +/-2.0	50.9%	
55 to 59 years       10.0%       +/-1.0       10.2%       +/-1.3         60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX       Image: Sex series       Imag	28.2%	
60 years and over       9.9%       +/-1.1       9.7%       +/-1.5         Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX	5.5%	
Median age (years)       42.3       +/-0.6       42.6       +/-0.6         SEX       Image: Sex in the second	7.6%	
SEX         SEX <td>41.3</td>	41.3	
Male         51.2%         +/-1.5         53.4%         +/-2.0           Female         48.8%         +/-1.5         46.6%         +/-2.0		
Female 48.8% +/-1.5 46.6% +/-2.0	53.6%	
	46.4%	
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN		
One race         95.3%         +/-1.1         96.4%         +/-1.0	95.1%	
White         43.5%         +/-2.6         44.8%         +/-2.9	32.6%	
Black or African American         15.4%         +/-1.6         15.4%         +/-1.9	9.9%	
American Indian and Alaska Native     0.4%     +/-0.3     0.4%     +/-0.3	0.8%	
Asian 28.8% +/-2.0 28.0% +/-2.3	46.0%	
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander     1.0%     +/-0.6     0.8%     +/-0.5	0.9%	
Some other race         6.2%         +/-1.3         7.1%         +/-1.7	4.8%	
Two or more races         4.7%         +/-1.1         3.6%         +/-1.0	4.9%	
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)         25.4%         +/-2.1         25.9%         +/-2.1	19.3%	
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino         25.6%         +/-1.7         27.1%         +/-1.9	19.6%	
NATIVITY AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS		
Native 58.1% ±/-2.5 58.5% ±/-2.8	53.1%	
Foreign born         41.9%         +/-2.5         41.5%         +/-2.8	46.9%	
Naturalized U.S. citizen         24 7%         +/-2 1         25 7%         +/-2 5	29.6%	
Not a U.S. citizen         17.2%         +/-2.3         15.7%         +/-2.2	17.4%	

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California									
	Тс	otal	Car, truck, or va	an drove alone	Car, truck, or van carpooled					
-	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate					
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND ABILITY TO										
SPEAK ENGLISH Speak language other than English	40 70/	1/26	40.29/	1/20	EQ 00/					
Speak English "yony well"	48.7%	+/-2.0	49.2%	+/-2.8	00.7%					
Speak English less than "yory wall"	22.2%	+/-1.9	22.4%	+/-2.3	26.7%					
Speak English less than very well	26.5%	+/-2.3	26.7%	+/-2.5	32.1%					
EARNINGS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2012 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS) FOR WORKERS										
Workers 16 years and over with earnings	31,511	+/-832	22,145	+/-781	3,138					
\$1 to \$9,999 or loss	9.4%	+/-1.2	8.4%	+/-1.3	8.5%					
\$10,000 to \$14,999	7.7%	+/-1.4	6.5%	+/-1.3	10.5%					
\$15,000 to \$24,999	13.7%	+/-1.7	14.1%	+/-2.0	11.4%					
\$25,000 to \$34,999	13.2%	+/-1.6	12.1%	+/-1.8	16.2%					
\$35.000 to \$49.999	18.1%	+/-1 4	19.6%	+/-2 0	16.7%					
\$50,000 to \$64,999	14.7%	+/-1.5	15.8%	+/-1.9	14.5%					
\$65,000 to \$74,999	6.20/	1/-1.0	7.0%	1/-1.3	F 60/					
\$75,000 or more	10.3 /0	±/1.1	1.270	+/-1.4	16.6%					
	10.8%	+1.5	10.3%	+/-1.0	10.0%					
Median earnings (dollars)	39,469	+/-2,112	41,572	+/-1,478	37,177					
POVERTY STATUS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS										
Workers 16 years and over for whom poverty status is determined	31,511	+/-832	22,145	+/-781	3,138					
Below 100 percent of the poverty level	3.8%	+/-0.8	3.3%	+/-1.0	2.5%					
100 to 149 percent of the poverty level	6.3%	+/-1.5	5.5%	+/-1.6	5.7%					
At or above 150 percent of the poverty level	89.9%	+/-1.6	91.2%	+/-1.6	91.8%					
Workers 16 years and over	31 511	+/-832	22 1/5	+/_781	3 138					
OCCUPATION	51,511	17-032	22,143	1/-/01	5,150					
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	33.9%	+/-2.3	31.9%	+/-2.5	36.7%					
Service occupations	19.1%	+/-1.8	19.1%	+/-2.1	12.8%					
Sales and office occupations	25.5%	+/-1.7	25.6%	+/-2.1	20.2%					
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	8.1%	+/-1 0	8.9%	+/-1.3	12.5%					
occupations Production, transportation, and material moving	13.4%	+/-1.7	14.4%	+/-2.2	17.8%					
occupations										
	0.1%	+/-0.1	0.1%	+/-0.1	0.0%					
INDUSTRY										
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	0.1%	+/-0.1	0.1%	+/-0.1	0.0%					
Construction	4.5%	+/-0.8	4.7%	+/-1.1	8.7%					
Manufacturing	11.0%	+/-1.5	12.7%	+/-2 1	16.5%					
Wholesale trade	3.8%	+/-0.8	4.4%	+/-1.0	4 3%					
Retail trade	11 1%	+/ 1.4	10.8%	+/ 1.8	10.5%					
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	7 70/	1/-1.4	0.0%	1/-1.0	F 20/					
Information and finance and insurance, and real estate	7.7%	+/-1.2	9.0%	+/-1.5	0.0%					
and rental and leasing Professional, scientific, management, and	9.0%	+/-1.1	11.5%	+/-1.2	4.1%					
administrative and waste management services	12.470	• /- 1.4	11.076	17-1.0	10.178					
Educational services, and health care and social assistance	21.0%	+/-1.7	20.7%	+/-2.1	20.9%					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	8.5%	+/-1.6	8.0%	+/-1.8	9.5%					
Other services (except public administration)	5.8%	+/-0.9	5.5%	+/-1.1	8.8%					
Public administration	5.0%	+/-1.0	4.7%	+/-1.2	1.3%					
Armed forces	0.3%	+/-0.3	0.4%	+/-0.4	0.0%					
CLASS OF WORKER										
Private wage and salary workers	78 2%	+/_1 6	78 3%	+/_2.2	8/ 2%					
Government workers	14.8%	+/_1 /	15.6%	+/_2 0	8.5%					
	14.0 /0	1.4	10.0 /0	1-2.0	0.070					

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California								
	Тс	otal	Car, truck, or va	an drove alone	Car, truck, or van carpooled				
	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	Estimate				
Self-employed workers in own not incorporated business	6.9%	+/-1.0	6.1%	+/-1.1	7.3%				
Unpaid family workers	0.0%	+/-0.1	0.0%	+/-0.2	0.0%				
PLACE OF WORK									
Worked in state of residence	99.7%	+/-0.2	99.8%	+/-0.3	100.0%				
Worked in county of residence	73.6%	+/-1.9	76.5%	+/-2.0	74.2%				
Worked outside county of residence	26.2%	+/-1.9	23.3%	+/-2.0	25.8%				
Worked outside state of residence	0.3%	+/-0.2	0.2%	+/-0.3	0.0%				
Workers 16 years and over who did not work at home	30,553	+/-828	22,145	+/-781	3,138				
TIME LEAVING HOME TO GO TO WORK									
12:00 a.m. to 4:59 a.m.	4.9%	+/-1.1	5.3%	+/-1.2	4.9%				
5:00 a.m. to 5:29 a.m.	3.5%	+/-0.8	3.5%	+/-1.0	1.1%				
5:30 a.m. to 5:59 a.m.	3.5%	+/-0.7	3.7%	+/-0.8	2.9%				
6:00 a.m. to 6:29 a.m.	7.8%	+/-1.3	7.4%	+/-1.5	8.9%				
6:30 a.m. to 6:59 a.m.	7.8%	+/-1.3	7.4%	+/-1.2	9.6%				
7:00 a.m. to 7:29 a.m.	12.8%	+/-1.7	12.2%	+/-1.8	12.5%				
7:30 a.m. to 7:59 a.m.	14.8%	+/-1.7	14.6%	+/-2.0	20.6%				
8:00 a.m. to 8:29 a.m.	13.3%	+/-1.7	13.4%	+/-2.1	10.5%				
8:30 a.m. to 8:59 a.m.	5.6%	+/-1.2	5.7%	+/-1.4	5.6%				
9:00 a.m. to 11:59 p.m.	26.0%	+/-2.4	26.8%	+/-2.8	23.6%				
Less than 10 minutes	9.09/	1/1/1	0.0%	1/17	2.20/				
10 to 14 minutes	0.0%	+/-1.4	9.0%	T/-1./	10.90/				
15 to 19 minutes	12.0%	+/-2.0	14.0%	+/-2.3	14.49/				
20 to 24 minutes	15.0%	+/-1.5	13.3%	+/-1.0	14.4%				
25 to 29 minutes	15.5%	+/-1.7	0.0%	+/-2.2	11.0%				
30 to 34 minutes	0.0%	T/-1.2	0.3%	+/-1.5	9.0%				
35 to 44 minutes	15.5%	+/-1.5	15.2%	+/-1.0	20.9%				
45 to 59 minutes	10.4%	T/-1.1	0.1%	T/-1.2	9.0%				
60 or more minutes	0.1%	+/-1.0	5.1% 5.0%	+/-1.0	6.99/				
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	27.6	+/-0.8	24.5	+/-0.8	29.0				
Workers 16 years and over in households	31,475	+/-837	22,144	+/-781	3,138				
HOUSING TENURE									
Owner-occupied housing units	55.3%	+/-2.5	54.9%	+/-2.7	64.6%				
Renter-occupied housing units	44.7%	+/-2.5	45.1%	+/-2.7	35.4%				
VEHICLES AVAILABLE									
No vehicle available	4.0%	+/-1.1	2.2%	+/-0.9	4.5%				
1 vehicle available	23.9%	+/-2.0	23.5%	+/-2.4	17.3%				
2 vehicles available	39.2%	+/-2.8	40.1%	+/-3.0	37.7%				
3 or more vehicles available	32.9%	+/-2.6	34.1%	+/-3.1	40.5%				
Means of transportation to work	C 00/								
Time leaving home to go to work	0.0%	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)				
Travel time to work	9.4%	(X)	(X)	(X)	(X)				
Vehicles available	7.3%		(X)						
	0.0%	(^)	(^)	(A)	(^)				

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California				
	Car, truck, or van carpooled taxicab)				
	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error		
Workers 16 years and over	+/-548	4,001	+/-451		
AGE					
16 to 19 years	+/-2.1	1.3%	+/-1.3		
20 to 24 years	+/-2.0	11.6%	+/-4.7		
25 to 44 years	+/-6.3	48.3%	+/-6.7		
45 to 54 years	+/-5.3	14.9%	+/-3.5		
55 to 59 years	+/-2.2	12.9%	+/-3.9		
60 years and over	+/-2.9	10.9%	+/-3.5		
Median age (years)	+/-1.8	37.9	+/-4.0		
SEX					
Male	+/-4.9	42.5%	+/-6.5		
Female	+/-4.9	57.5%	+/-6.5		
RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN					
One race	+/-2.9	94.3%	+/-2.8		
White	+/-7.1	45.3%	+/-7.4		
Black or African American	+/-3.7	22.2%	+/-6.6		
American Indian and Alaska Native	+/-0.9	0.4%	+/-0.8		
Asian	+/-8.5	21.5%	+/-4.8		
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	+/-0.9	2.1%	+/-2.2		
Some other race	+/-2.5	2.8%	+/-1.5		
Two or more races	+/-2.9	5.7%	+/-2.8		
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	+/-5.6	26.2%	+/-6.7		
White alone, not Hispanic or Latino	+/-5.2	23.4%	+/-5.0		
NATIVITY AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS					
Native	+/-7.3	64.3%	+/-7.7		
Foreign born	+/-7.3	35.7%	+/-7.7		
Naturalized U.S. citizen	+/-6.5	14.6%	+/-4.1		
Not a U.S. citizen	+/-5.6	21.0%	+/-7.7		
LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH					
Speak language other than English	+/-6.5	37.9%	+/-7.6		
Speak English "very well"	+/-4.9	18.2%	+/-4.7		
Speak English less than "very well"	+/-7.0	19.6%	+/-7.3		
EARNINGS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS (IN 2012 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS) FOR WORKERS	+/ 549	4.001	+/ 451		
\$1 to \$9.999 or loss	r/-040 ±/ 2 /	4,001	r/-401		
\$10,000 to \$14.999	±/ 2 /	10 10/	±/ 5 1		
\$15,000 to \$24,999	+/ 2.4	11.20/	+/ 2.0		
\$25,000 to \$34,999	±//0	16.00/	±/ / F		
\$35,000 to \$49,999	+/ 4 1	13.8%	+/ 4.3		
\$50,000 to \$64,999	+/ 4.0	12.6%	+/ 4.0		
\$65,000 to \$74,999	+/27	12.0%	+/ 2 1		
\$75,000 or more	+/-2.7	22.4%	+/-2.1		
Modian carnings (dollare)	. 10.405	00.000			
	+/-3,185	38,299	+/-8,124		
POVERTY STATUS IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS					
Workers 16 years and over for whom poverty status is determined	+/-548	4,001	+/-451		
Below 100 percent of the result level	+/-1.3	5.2%	+/-3.0		
100 to 149 percent of the poverty level	+/-2.9	5.5%	+/-3.7		

Subject	San Leandro Unified School District, California			
	Car, truck, or van Public transportation (exclu carpooled taxicab)			
	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error	
At or above 150 percent of the poverty level	+/-3.1	89.3%	+/-4.1	
Workers 16 years and over	+/-548	4,001	+/-451	
OCCUPATION				
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	+/-5.9	40.7%	+/-6.9	
Service occupations	+/-3.7	21.5%	+/-6.7	
Sales and office occupations	+/-4.1	26.9%	+/-5.5	
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	+/-4.3	2.2%	+/-1.2	
Production, transportation, and material moving	+/-5.3	8.5%	+/-4.0	
Military specific occupations	+/-1.2	0.0%	+/-0.9	
INDUSTRY				
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	+/-1.2	0.0%	+/-0.9	
Construction	+/-4.0	1.4%	+/-0.8	
Manufacturing	+/-5.4	1.0%	+/-1.0	
Wholesale trade	+/-2.5	1.1%	+/-1.1	
Retail trade	+/-4.2	11.2%	+/-4.3	
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	+/-2.9	6.2%	+/-3.0	
Information and finance and insurance, and real estate	+/-2.6	16.2%	+/-4.2	
Professional, scientific, management, and administrative and waste management services	+/-3.5	15.2%	+/-4.7	
Educational services, and health care and social	+/-4.9	21.2%	+/-6.5	
Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and accommodation and food services	+/-4.0	12.5%	+/-5.3	
Other services (except public administration)	+/-4.1	2.5%	+/-2.0	
Public administration	+/-1.3	11.5%	+/-3.9	
Armed forces	+/-1.2	0.0%	+/-0.9	
CLASS OF WORKER				
Private wage and salary workers	+/-5.2	80.4%	+/-5.3	
Government workers	+/-3.3	18.1%	+/-4.8	
Self-employed workers in own not incorporated	+/-3.8	1.5%	+/-1.4	
Unpaid family workers	+/-1.2	0.0%	+/-0.9	
PLACE OF WORK				
Worked in state of residence	+/-1.2	99.7%	+/-0.5	
Worked in county of residence	+/-4.9	48.5%	+/-6.9	
Worked outside county of residence	+/-4.9	51.2%	+/-6.8	
Worked outside state of residence	+/-1.2	0.3%	+/-0.5	
Workers 16 years and over who did not work at home	+/-548	4,001	+/-451	
TIME LEAVING HOME TO GO TO WORK				
12:00 a.m. to 4:59 a.m.	+/-2.6	3.4%	+/-2.5	
5:00 a.m. to 5:29 a.m.	+/-1.1	6.1%	+/-3.1	
5:30 a.m. to 5:59 a.m.	+/-2.1	3.0%	+/-1.8	
6:00 a.m. to 6:29 a.m.	+/-3.5	9.5%	+/-3.5	
6:30 a.m. to 6:59 a.m.	+/-3.3	8.9%	+/-3.7	
7:00 a.m. to 7:29 a.m.	+/-4.8	16.7%	+/-4.8	
7:30 a.m. to 7:59 a.m.	+/-5.5	11.6%	+/-3.5	
8:00 a.m. to 8:29 a.m.	+/-4.0	14.9%	+/-4.5	
8:30 a.m. to 8:59 a.m.	+/-2.8	5.2%	+/-2.9	
9:00 a.m. to 11:59 p.m.	+/-5.4	20.7%	+/-5.0	
IRAVEL HIVE TO WORK				

Subject San Leandro Unified School District, Ca			trict, California
	Car, truck, or van carpooled	Public transportation (excludin taxicab)	
	Margin of Error	Estimate	Margin of Error
Less than 10 minutes	+/-1.8	0.2%	+/-0.3
10 to 14 minutes	+/-4.0	2.0%	+/-1.8
15 to 19 minutes	+/-4.1	1.5%	+/-1.3
20 to 24 minutes	+/-4.7	9.3%	+/-3.7
25 to 29 minutes	+/-4.7	7.6%	+/-3.4
30 to 34 minutes	+/-5.3	14.8%	+/-4.7
35 to 44 minutes	+/-3.5	14.4%	+/-3.0
45 to 59 minutes	+/-3.8	20.1%	+/-4.5
60 or more minutes	+/-2.8	30.0%	+/-5.3
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	+/-1.8	45.2	+/-3.1
Workers 16 years and over in households	+/-548	3,968	+/-449
HOUSING TENURE			
Owner-occupied housing units	+/-6.4	52.1%	+/-7.0
Renter-occupied housing units	+/-6.4	47.9%	+/-7.0
VEHICLES AVAILABLE			
No vehicle available	+/-2.4	10.0%	+/-4.5
1 vehicle available	+/-5.7	31.3%	+/-6.9
2 vehicles available	+/-5.9	34.7%	+/-7.1
3 or more vehicles available	+/-7.3	24.1%	+/-5.4
PERCENT IMPUTED			
Means of transportation to work	(X)	(X)	(X)
Time leaving home to go to work	(X)	(X)	(X)
Travel time to work	(X)	(X)	(X)
Vehicles available	(X)	(X)	(X)

Data are based on a sample and are subject to sampling variability. The degree of uncertainty for an estimate arising from sampling variability is represented through the use of a margin of error. The value shown here is the 90 percent margin of error. The margin of error can be interpreted roughly as providing a 90 percent probability that the interval defined by the estimate minus the margin of error and the estimate plus the margin of error (the lower and upper confidence bounds) contains the true value. In addition to sampling variability, the ACS estimates are subject to nonsampling error (for a discussion of nonsampling variability, see Accuracy of the Data). The effect of nonsampling error is not represented in these tables.

Foreign born excludes people born outside the United States to a parent who is a U.S. citizen.

Workers include members of the Armed Forces and civilians who were at work last week.

Industry codes are 4-digit codes and are based on the North American Industry Classification System 2007. The Industry categories adhere to the guidelines issued in Clarification Memorandum No. 2, "NAICS Alternate Aggregation Structure for Use By U.S. Statistical Agencies," issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

While the 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) data generally reflect the December 2009 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) definitions of metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas; in certain instances the names, codes, and boundaries of the principal cities shown in ACS tables may differ from the OMB definitions due to differences in the effective dates of the geographic entities.

Estimates of urban and rural population, housing units, and characteristics reflect boundaries of urban areas defined based on Census 2000 data. Boundaries for urban areas have not been updated since Census 2000. As a result, data for urban and rural areas from the ACS do not necessarily reflect the results of ongoing urbanization.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2012 American Community Survey

#### Explanation of Symbols:

1. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.

2. An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.

3. An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.

4. An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
5. An '**' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.

6. An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate. 7. An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

8. An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.



# **Use of Developer Fees:**

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

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

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

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

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

# REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2018

#### INDEX ADJUSTMENT ON THE ASSESSMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

#### DESCRIPTION

The law requires the maximum assessment for development be adjusted every two years by the change in the Class B construction cost index, as determined by the State Allocation Board (Board) at its January meeting. This item requests that the Board make the adjustment based on the change reflected using the RS Means index.

#### <u>AUTHORITY</u>

Education Code Section 17620(a)(1) states the following: "The governing board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other requirement against any construction within the boundaries of the district, for the purpose of funding the construction or reconstruction of school facilities, subject to any limitations set forth in Chapter 4.9 (commencing with Section 65995) of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code."

Government Code Section 65995(b)(3) states the following: "The amount of the limits set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be increased in 2000, and every two years thereafter, according to the adjustment for inflation set forth in the statewide cost index for class B construction, as determined by the State Allocation Board at its January meeting, which increase shall be effective as of the date of that meeting."

#### BACKGROUND

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

A historical comparison of the assessment rates for development fees for 2014 and 2016 are shown below for information. According to the RS Means, the cost index for Class B construction increased by 8.78, during the two year period from January 2016 to January 2018, requiring the assessment for development fees to be adjusted as follows beginning January 2018:

RS Means Index Maximum Level I Assessment Per Squ	are Foot
---------------------------------------------------	----------

	<u>2014</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2018</u>
Residential	\$3.36	\$3.48	\$3.79
Commercial/Industrial	\$0.54	\$0.56	\$0.61

# **RECOMMENDATION**

Increase the 2018 maximum Level I assessment for development in the amount of 8.78 percent using the RS Means Index to be effective immediately.

# REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2018

#### ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

#### PURPOSE OF REPORT

To adopt the annual adjustment in the School Facility Program (SFP) grants based on the change in construction costs pursuant to the Education Code (EC) and SFP Regulations.

#### DESCRIPTION

This item presents the State Allocation Board (Board) with the annual adjustment to the SFP grants based on the statewide cost index for Class B construction. Each year the Board adjusts the SFP grants to reflect construction cost changes. In January 2016, the Board adopted the RS Means index for 2016 and future years. This item presents the 2018 annual adjustment to SFP grants based on the RS Means index.

#### <u>AUTHORITY</u>

See Attachment A.

#### STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

At the January 2016 meeting, the Board adopted an increase to the SFP grants using the RS Means Construction Cost Index (CCI) as the statewide cost index for Class B construction.

The current rate of change between 2017 and 2018 for the RS Means Class B CCI is 4.17 percent. The chart below reflects the amounts previously adopted for 2017 compared to the potential amount for the new construction base grants.

			RS Means 4.17%
Grade Level	Regulation Section	Current Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-17	Potential Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-18
Elementary	1859.71	\$11,104	\$11,567
Middle	1859.71	\$11,744	\$12,234
High	1859.71	\$14,944	\$15,567
Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.1	\$31,202	\$32,503
Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.1	\$20,867	\$21,737

# STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS (cont.)

The following chart shows the amounts previously adopted compared to the potential amount for the modernization base grants.

			RS Means 4.17%
Grade Level	Regulation Section	Current Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-17	Potential Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-18
Elementary	1859.78	\$4,228	\$4,404
Middle	1859.78	\$4,472	\$4,658
High	1859.78	\$5,855	\$6,099
Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.3	\$13,475	\$14,037
Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.3	\$9,015	\$9,391

In addition, the CCI adjustment would increase the threshold amount for Government Code Section 66452.6(a)(2) for the period of one year commencing March 1, 2018. The following chart shows the amount previously adopted for 2017 compared to the resulting threshold amount, upon approval of the proposed 2018 CCI adjustment:

	RS Means Effective 3-1-2017	RS Means Potential 3-1-2018
Resulting Amount	\$279,571	\$291,229

### RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the increase of 4.17 percent for the 2018 SFP grants based on the RS Means Construction Cost Index as shown in Attachment B.

# ATTACHMENT B

# ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2018

# Grant Amount Adjustments

		Regulation Section	Current Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-17	Current Adjusted Grant Per Pupil Effective 1-1-18
	Elementary	1859.71	\$11,104	\$11,567
	Middle	1859.71	\$11,744	\$12,234
	High	1859.71	\$14,944	\$15,567
	Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.1	\$31,202	\$32,503
U U	Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.1	\$20,867	\$21,737
Ği	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$13	\$14
ž	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$18	\$19
lst	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.71.2	\$30	\$31
Cor	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$56	\$58
ew	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non- Severe	1859.71.2	\$39	\$41
Z	Automatic Sprinkler System – Elementary	1859.71.2	\$186	\$194
	Automatic Sprinkler System – Middle	1859.71.2	\$221	\$230
	Automatic Sprinkler System – High	1859.71.2	\$230	\$240
	Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.71.2	\$588	\$613
	Automatic Sprinkler System – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.71.2	\$395	\$411
	Elementary	1859.78	\$4,228	\$4,404
	Middle	1859.78	\$4,472	\$4,658
	High	1859.78	\$5,855	\$6,099
	Special Day Class - Severe	1859.78.3	\$13,475	\$14,037
	Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.3	\$9,015	\$9,391
	State Special School – Severe	1859.78	\$22,460	\$23,397
l o	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Elementary	1859.78.4	\$137	\$143
ati	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Middle	1859.78.4	\$137	\$143
jŻ	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – High	1859.78.4	\$137	\$143
derr	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.4	\$378	\$394
Moo	Automatic Fire Detection/Alarm System – Special Day Class – Non-	1859.78.4	\$253	\$264
	Severe			
	Severe Over 50 Years Old – Elementary	1859.78.6	\$5,874	\$6,119
	Severe Over 50 Years Old – Elementary Over 50 Years Old – Middle	1859.78.6 1859.78.6	\$5,874 \$6,212	\$6,119 \$6,471
	Severe Over 50 Years Old – Elementary Over 50 Years Old – Middle Over 50 Years Old – High	1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6	\$5,874 \$6,212 \$8,132	\$6,119 \$6,471 \$8,471
	Severe Over 50 Years Old – Elementary Over 50 Years Old – Middle Over 50 Years Old – High Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Severe	1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6	\$5,874 \$6,212 \$8,132 \$18,721	\$6,119 \$6,471 \$8,471 \$19,502
	Severe         Over 50 Years Old – Elementary         Over 50 Years Old – Middle         Over 50 Years Old – High         Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Severe         Over 50 Years Old – Special Day Class – Non-Severe	1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6 1859.78.6	\$5,874 \$6,212 \$8,132 \$18,721 \$12,519	\$6,119 \$6,471 \$8,471 \$19,502 \$13,041

### ATTACHMENT B

# ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS January 2018

# Grant Amount Adjustments

New Construction / Modernization / Joint-Use	Regulation	Current Adjusted	Current Adjusted
	Section	Grant Per Pupil	Grant Per Pupil
		Effective 1-1-17	Effective 1-1-18
Therapy/Multipurpose Room/Other (per square foot)	1859.72		
	1859.73.2		
	1859.77.3	\$182	\$190
	1859.82	\$10 <u>2</u>	¢100
	1859.125		
	1859.125.1		
Tollet Facilities (per square toot)	1859.72		
	1009.70.2	\$226	\$240
	1850 125	<b>\$</b> 320	φ <b>3</b> 40
	1859 125 1		
New Construction Only	1000112011		
Parking Spaces	1859.76	\$14,120	\$14,709
General Site Grant (per acre for additional acreage being acquired)	1859.76	\$18,073	\$18,827
Project Assistance (for school district with less than 2,500 pupils)	1859.73.1	\$6,791	\$7,074
Modernization Only			
Two-stop Elevator	1859.83	\$112,957	\$117,667
Additional Stop	1859.83	\$20,333	\$21,181
Project Assistance (for school district with less than 2,500 pupils)	1859.78.2	\$3,621	\$3,772
Facility Hardship / Rehabilitation			
Current Replacement Cost - Other (per square foot)	1859.2	\$362	\$377
Current Replacement Cost - Toilets (per square foot)	1859.2	\$653	\$680
Interim Housing – Financial Hardship (per classroom)	1859.81	\$37,231	\$38,784
Charter School Facilities Program - Preliminary Apportionment Amounts			. ,
Charter School Elementary	1859.163.1	\$11,161	\$11,626
Charter School Middle	1859.163.1	\$11,816	\$12,309
Charter School High	1859.163.1	\$14,997	\$15,622
Charter School Special Day Class - Severe	1859.163.1	\$31,351	\$32,658
Charter School Special Day Class - Non-Severe	1859.163.1	\$20,966	\$21,840
Charter School Two-stop Elevator	1859.163.5	\$94,131	\$98,056
Charter School Additional Stop	1859.163.5	\$16,943	\$17,650



Determination of Average State allowed amounts for Site Development Costs

Elementary Schools			Original		2009 Adjusted			
			OPSC Site	Inflation	Site	Project	2009	
District	Project #	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Development</u>	Factor	<u>Development</u>	<u>Year</u>	Cost/Acre	
Davis Jt Unified	3	9.05	\$532,282	38.4%	\$1,473,469	2004	\$162,814	
Dry Creek Jt Elem	2	8.5	\$516,347	46.2%	\$1,509,322	2002	\$177,567	
Dry Creek Jt Elem	5	11.06	\$993,868 \$556,011	20.1%	\$2,387,568 \$1,649,216	2006	\$215,874 \$125,444	
Elk Grove Unified	5 10	12.17	\$556,011 \$600,120	40.2%	\$1,040,310 \$2,045,999	2001	\$135,441 \$195,000	
Elk Grove Unified	10	10	\$090,120 \$702,127	40.2 /0	\$2,045,000 \$2,081,483	2001	\$100,990	
Elk Grove Unified	14	10	\$732,127	46.2%	\$2,001,403 \$2,142,130	2001	\$214 214	
Elk Grove Unified	16	9.86	\$570,198	46.2%	\$1 666 733	2002	\$169.040	
Elk Grove Unified	17	10	\$542,662	46.2%	\$1,586,243	2002	\$158,624	
Elk Grove Unified	20	10	\$710.730	43.2%	\$2.034.830	2003	\$203.483	
Elk Grove Unified	25	10	\$645,923	38.4%	\$1,788,052	2004	\$178,805	
Elk Grove Unified	28	10.03	\$856,468	24.4%	\$2,130,974	2005	\$212,460	
Elk Grove Unified	39	9.91	\$1,007,695	20.1%	\$2,420,785	2006	\$244,277	
Folsom-Cordova Unified	1	9.79	\$816,196	20.1%	\$1,960,747	2006	\$200,281	
Folsom-Cordova Unified	4	7.5	\$455,908	46.2%	\$1,332,654	2002	\$177,687	
Folsom-Cordova Unified	5	8	\$544,213	46.2%	\$1,590,776	2002	\$198,847	
Folsom-Cordova Unified	8	8.97	\$928,197	11.2%	\$2,063,757	2007	\$230,073	
Galt Jt Union Elem	2	10.1	\$1,033,044	38.4%	\$2,859,685	2004	\$283,137	
Lincoln Unified	1	9.39	\$433,498	46.2%	\$1,267,148	2002	\$134,947	
Lodi Unified	3	11.2	\$555,999	46.2%	\$1,625,228	2002	\$145,110	
Lodi Unified	10	11.42	\$1,245,492	46.2%	\$3,640,669	2002	\$318,798	
Lodi Unified	19	9.93	\$999,164	11.2%	\$2,221,545	2007	\$223,721	
Lodi Unified	22	10	\$1,416,212	7.7%	\$3,051,426	2008	\$305,143	
Natomas Unified	6	8.53	\$685,284	46.2%	\$2,003,138	2002	\$234,834	
Natomas Unified	10	9.83	\$618,251	43.2%	\$1,770,061	2003	\$180,067	
Natomas Unified	12	9.61	\$735,211	24.4%	\$1,829,275	2005	\$190,351	
Rocklin Unified	8	10.91	\$593,056 \$1,462,222	46.2%	\$1,733,548 \$2,450,592	2002	\$158,895	
Stockton Unified	1 2	12.00	\$1,402,232 \$791,675	1.1%	\$3,100,082 \$2,227,046	2008	\$248,801 \$212,129	
Stockton Unified	2	10.5	\$701,075 \$1 126 704	43.2%	\$2,237,940 \$2,720,702	2003	9213,130 \$219 906	
Tracy It Unified	0	12.40	\$1,130,704 \$618,254	20.1%	\$2,730,703 \$1,807,204	2000	\$210,000 \$180,720	
Tracy It Unified	4	10	\$573.006	40.2 %	\$1,607,204 \$1,586,202	2002	\$158,620	
Washington Unified	10	8	\$446 161	46.2%	\$1,304,163	2004	\$163,020	
Washington Unified	4	10.76	\$979,085	7.7%	\$2,109,575	2008	\$196.057	2018
in doning to in ordine d			<i><b>40</b>.0,000</i>	,0	<i>q</i> _,::::;::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	2000	<i><i>ϕ</i>,</i>	Adjustment
Totals		341.16			\$68,791,833	Average	\$201,641	\$248,896
Middle and High Scho	ols		Original		2009 Adjusted			
initiality and high conto	010		OPSC Site	Inflation	Site	Project	2009	
District	Project #	Acres	<b>Development</b>	Factor	<b>Development</b>	Year	Cost/Acre	
Western Placer Unified	4	19.3	\$5,973,312	24.4%	\$7,431,085	2005	\$385,030	
Roseville City Elem	2	21.6	\$1,780,588	48.2%	\$2,639,311	2000	\$122,190	
Elk Grove Unified	4	66.2	\$8,659,494	48.2%	\$12,835,704	2000	\$193,893	
Elk Grove Unified	13	76.4	\$9,791,732	48.2%	\$14,513,986	2001	\$189,974	
Elk Grove Unified	18	84.3	\$13,274,562	43.2%	\$19,002,626	2003	\$225,417	
Grant Jt Union High	2	24	\$2,183,840	48.2%	\$3,237,039	2000	\$134,877	
Center Unified	1	21.2	\$1,944,310	46.2%	\$2,841,684	2002	\$134,042	
Lodi Unified	2	13.4	\$1,076,844	46.2%	\$1,573,849	2002	\$117,451	
Lodi Unified	6	13.4	\$2,002,164	46.2%	\$2,926,240	2002	\$218,376	
Galt Jt Union Elem	1	24.9	\$2,711,360	46.2%	\$3,962,757	2002	\$159,147	
Tahoe Truckee Unified	2	24	\$2,752,632	43.2%	\$3,940,412	2003	\$164,184	
Davis Unified	5	23.3	\$3,814,302	43.2%	\$5,460,199	2003	\$234,343	
vvoodland Unified	3	50.2	\$8,664,700	46.2%	\$12,663,792	2002	\$252,267	
Sacramento City Unified	1	35.2	\$4,813,386	46.2%	\$7,034,949	2002	\$199,856 \$227,050	
Luai Unified	4	4/	\$1,052,176	40.2%	\$11,183,950 \$12,824,000	2002	\$237,956 \$261,000	
Natomas Unified	3 11	49.1 38.7	90,909,000 \$3,017,002	43.∠% 38./0/	\$12,024,990 \$1 175 950	2003	φ201,202 \$107.002	
Rocklin Unified	11	30.7 ∆7 1	φ3,017,00∠ \$11 1∩1 ∩₽₽	20.4%	94, 170,000 \$13,810,020	2004	\$202 212	2018
Totals	11	679.3	ψτι, ΙΟΙ,000	27.7/0	\$142 058 711		\$209.212	 Adjustment
Middle Schools		260 7			\$49,447,897	Middle	\$189 704	\$234 162
High Schools:		418.6			\$92,610.814	High	\$221,217	\$273,060
-						~		