



Developer Fee Justification Study

Mt. Diablo Unified School District

August 28, 2024

Prepared for:

Mt. Diablo Unified School District

1936 Carlotta Drive

Concord, CA 94519

925.682.8000

Prepared by:

King Consulting

2901 35th St.

Sacramento, CA 95817

916.706.3538

www.kinginc.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
DEVELOPER FEES: BACKGROUND	3
LEGISLATIVE HISTORY	4
AB 2926	4
AB 1600	4
AB 181	5
DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT	6
Mt. Diablo Unified School District.....	6
Projected Residential Development	6
Student Generation Rates.....	7
Projected School Facilities Needs	7
New Construction Cost vs. Modernization/Reconstruction	8
DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROJECTS	10
Senior Housing	10
Commercial/Industrial Development Fee Calculations	10
SUMMARY AND FINDINGS.....	14
ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEES	15
Administrative Requirements	15
Reporting Requirements.....	15
Government Code Section 66001 (a) (1): Purpose of Fees.....	15
Government Code Section 66001 (a) (2): Use of Fees.....	15
Government Code Section 66001 (a) (3): Reasonable Relationship between the Fee’s Use and the Type of Development Project on which the Fee is Imposed	16
Government Code Section 66001 (a) (4): Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Project Upon Which the Fee is Imposed	16
Government Code Section 66001 (b): Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Public Facility.....	17
REVENUE SOURCES/FUNDING FACILITIES	17
State School Facility Program	17
General Obligation Bonds.....	17
Parcel Taxes	17
Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts	18

RECOMMENDATIONS 19

SOURCES 20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Student Generation Rates and Students Generated.....	7
Table 2. Housing Units and Calculation of Weighted Square Footage	8
Table 3. Calculation of Weighted Average Square Footage	8
Table 4. Cost per Student for New Construction	9
Table 5. District Total Modernization/Reconstruction Need.....	9
Table 6. District Modernization/Reconstruction Facilities Cost per Square Foot.....	9
Table 7. Commercial/Industrial Employee Generation Factors.....	11
Table 8. Commercial/Industrial Base Cost per Square Foot (Except Mini-Storage)	11
Table 9. Mini-Storage Base Cost per Square Foot	12
Table 10. Commercial/Industrial Residential Fee Offset (Except Mini-Storage)	12
Table 11. Mini-Storage Residential Fee Offset	12
Table 12. Commercial/Industrial Final Costs per Square Foot.....	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD, or “the District”) is located in Contra Costa County in California and serves the City of Concord, City of Clayton, and City of Pleasant Hill. The District also serves a portion of the City of Walnut Creek, the City of Martinez, the City of Pittsburg, and some surrounding areas of unincorporated Contra Costa County. The District serves a total of 30,010 TK-12th grade students.

In January 2024, the State Allocation Board’s biennial inflation adjustment changed the fee to \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction. The following Developer Fee Justification Study demonstrates the District is justified in collecting the statutory Level I residential and statutory commercial/industrial fees on future development based on the following analysis:

- The District’s total enrollment at its school sites in 2023-24 was 30,010 students;
- The City of Clayton, City of Concord, City of Martinez, City of Pittsburg, City of Pleasant Hill, City of Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County planning departments collectively estimate a total of 14,844 new residential units to be constructed over the next twenty years.
- It is estimated that the weighted average square footage of new homes will be 1,935 square feet;
- Based on an analysis of District enrollments and housing units, each new residence will generate students at a rate of 0.305 TK-12th grade students per unit;
- The 14,844 new units are projected to generate 4,527 TK-12th grade students for the District to house;
- Many District facilities are over 25 years old and in need of construction or reconstruction to continue housing existing students and students generated by new development at the existing level of service over the next 20 years;
- It is fiscally more prudent to extend the useful life of an existing facility than to construct new facilities when possible;
 - The cost to modernize facilities is approximately 38.4% of the cost to construct new facilities;
 - The total estimated cost to reconstruct and/or modernize facilities for the students generated from new development is \$183,927,483;
- Based on the cost of reconstructed school facilities, the impact equates to \$6.40 per square foot of residential development;
- All categories of commercial/industrial development except for mini-storage create a modernization/reconstruction cost to the District of \$1.58 per square foot;
- Mini-storage construction creates a cost of \$0.03 per square foot;
- The District is justified to adopt statutory Level I Developer Fees, currently \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction, except for mini-storage which should be charged at \$0.03 per square foot.

DEVELOPER FEES: BACKGROUND

School districts are continually evaluating the condition of their capital facilities and identifying whether construction of new facilities and/or improvements to existing facilities are necessary to sufficiently house their student body. Districts may use various sources of funds for these capital facility projects, including Developer Fees, State program funds, redevelopment funds, certificates of participation, sale of capital assets, and mitigation measures. In September 1986, the Governor signed into law Assembly Bill 2926 (Chapter 887/Statutes 1986), which granted school district governing boards the authority to impose developer fees. This authority is codified in Education Code Section 17620, et seq. which states in part "...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 for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities."

School districts were provided a mechanism to assist in funding with the adoption of the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.). This act governs the imposition of fees by a district as a condition of approval of a development project. In order to impose such a fee, a reasonable connection must exist between the new development and the construction and/or improvement of school facilities for which the fees are to be assessed.

Level I fees (also known as statutory fees) are adjusted every two years according to the inflation rate for Class B construction as determined by the State Allocation Board. With the passage of SB50 in 1998, a cap was placed on the amount that could be charged under the Level I fee calculation. The law allowed for adjustments of the cap as noted in Government Code Section 65995(b)(3), which specifies in part that "...fees shall be increased every two years, 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."

Level II developer fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5 and allow a school district to impose a higher fee on residential construction only if certain conditions can be met and a study conducted to provide justification for the higher residential fee per square foot.

As of January 2024, Government Code Section 65995 authorizes school districts to collect Developer Fees on future development of no more than \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 for commercial/industrial construction (Level I fees).

Recent legislation expounded the parameters of attached and detached living areas which are attached or detached from the primary single-family or multifamily dwelling unit (generally referred to as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and Junior Accessory Dwelling Units (JADUs)). Whether these types of dwelling units are called casitas, granny flats, in-law units, accessory units, or converted living space, these constructed areas are intended to provide an area for living and sleeping – whether the facilities and provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation are within that living space or within (or adjacent to) the attached single-family or multifamily dwelling unit. The District recognizes that students are generated from these types of living areas and will levy the appropriate fee rate for these types of construction projects.

The content of this Study will show that the Mt. Diablo Unified School District is justified in levying the statutory maximum Level I Developer Fee.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

State legislation, specifically AB 2926 and AB 1600, provides guidelines, procedures, and restrictions on the levy of School Fees for school facilities. Certain provisions of this legislation and history are summarized below:

AB 2926

AB 2926 was enacted by the State in 1986. Among other things, AB 2926 added various sections to the Government Code which authorize school districts to levy School Fees on new residential and commercial/industrial developments in order to pay for school facilities. In addition, AB 2926 provides for the following:

1. No city or county can issue a building permit for a development project unless such School Fees have been paid.
2. School Fees for commercial/industrial development must be supported by the finding that such School Fees "are reasonably related and limited to the needs for schools caused by the development."
3. School Fees for 1987 were limited to \$1.50 per square foot on new residential construction and \$0.25 per square foot for new commercial/industrial construction.
4. Every year, School Fees are subject to annual increases based on the Statewide cost index for Class B construction, as determined by the SAB at its January meeting (This provision was changed to every other year by AB181).

The provisions of AB 2926 have since been expanded and revised by AB 1600.

AB 1600

AB 1600, which created Sections 66000 et seq. of the Government Code, was enacted by the State in 1987. AB 1600 requires that all public agencies satisfy the following requirements when establishing, increasing or imposing a fee as a condition of approval for a development project.

1. Determine the purpose of the fee.
2. Identify the facilities to which the fee will be put.
3. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the need for public facilities and the type of development on which a fee is imposed.
4. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.
5. Provide an annual accounting of any portion of the fee remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted, in the School District's accounts five or more years after it was collected.

In other words, AB 1600 limits the ability of a school district to levy School Fees unless (i) there is a need for the School Fee revenues generated and (ii) there is a nexus or relationship between the need for School Fee revenues and the type of development project on which the School Fee is imposed. (The requirements of AB 1600 were clarified with the passage in 2006 of AB 2751, which codifies the findings of *Shapell Industries vs. Milpitas Unified School District*.) The Study will provide information necessary to establish such a nexus between School Fees and residential development.

AB 181

AB 181, enacted by the State in 1989, made significant changes in several State Codes, including Sections 53080 et seq. of the Government Code which was re-codified as Sections 17620 et seq. of the Education Code on January 1, 1998. Changes in Section 53080 included additional requirements and procedures for imposing School Fees and other conditions on new development. Specifically, AB 181 imposes more stringent nexus requirements on school districts that wish to levy School Fees on Commercial Industrial Development ("CID"), as follows:

1. In order to levy a School Fee on CID, a formal study must be conducted to determine the impact of "the increased number of employees anticipated to result" from new CID on the "cost of providing school facilities within the School District".
2. Only that portion of the School Fee justified by the "nexus findings" contained in this study may be levied. Nexus findings must be made on an individual project basis or on the basis of categories of CID and must "utilize employee generation estimates that are based on commercial/industrial factors within the school district."
3. Categories to be evaluated may include, but are not limited to, office, retail, transportation, communications and utilities, light industrial, heavy industrial, research and development, and warehouse uses.
4. Starting in 1990, maximum School Fees for residential and CID will be subject to increases every two (2) years rather than annually.
5. An appeals procedure shall be established whereby the levy of School Fees on a commercial/industrial project may be appealed to the governing board of a school district. Grounds for an appeal must include, but are not limited to, improper project classification by commercial/industrial category, or the application of improper or inaccurate employee or student generation factors to the project.


In summary, AB 181 establishes additional requirements which must be satisfied by school districts prior to their levying School Fees on CID.

DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mt. Diablo Unified School District

MDUSD includes more than 50 school sites in Contra Costa County, in the cities of Clayton, Concord, and Pleasant Hill, as well as portions of Martinez, Pittsburg, and Walnut Creek, plus the unincorporated communities of Bay Point, Lafayette, and Pacheco in addition to other unincorporated areas of Contra Costa County. The District serves a total of 30,010 TK-12th grade. Figure 1 provides the location of the District’s boundaries.

Figure 1. Mt. Diablo Unified School District Boundaries



Projected Residential Development

Residential development generates students for the District to house in facilities, new and/or renovated. Therefore, it is imperative to research residential development to project growth and associated student generation within the District. According to the City of Clayton, 1,050 units may be constructed within the District over the next 20 years. According to the City of Concord 5,073 units may be constructed within the District over the next 20 years. The City of Martinez allocated a total of 3,651 units to be built in the next 20 years for the entire municipality. Given that about 40% of the City of Martinez is within the District boundaries, 40% of the total units were utilized, resulting in a final allocation of 1,460 units. The City of

Pittsburg estimated a total of 3,688 units may be constructed within the District over the next 20 years. According to the City of Pleasant Hill 2,040 units may be constructed within the District over the next 20 years. The City of Walnut Creek provided a list of certified housing units to be built. The Geographical Information System (GIS) map showed 11 of those units to be built within the District over the next 20 years. Contra Costa County released its 2023 Adopted Housing Element, detailing the Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) for the unincorporated areas, which identifies a need for 7,610 units over the next 20 years. Given that 20% of the population in these unincorporated areas resides within the boundaries of the MDUSD, 20% of the total RHNA units, equating to 1,522 units, have been allocated accordingly. In conclusion, the District expects that approximately 14,844 new homes will be constructed in the next 20 years.

Student Generation Rates

The average number of students generated by each housing unit provides a student generation rate or “yield factor”. The number of students generated from new housing units within the District’s boundaries was assessed for the District by comparing the total number of occupied housing units within the District provided by the 2022 American Community Survey (ACS) 1-Year Estimates to the 2023-24 MDUSD student list to calculate the number of students within the District, for a student generation rate of 0.305. This calculation is shown in Table 1. This student generation rate can then be applied to the projected housing units to assist in determining the new students entering the District, which is also shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Student Generation Rates and Students Generated

Total Occupied Housing Units ACS 2022	2023-24 Students	Student Generation Rate	Projected Units Within the District	Expected Students Generated
98,481	30,010	0.305	14,844	4,527

Projected School Facilities Needs

As new students are generated by development, the need to increase the useful life of school facilities becomes more apparent. Only with regular modernization/reconstruction can the District maintain facilities to their current quality to ensure they can still be effectively used to house students over the next 20 years. Without the ongoing modernization/reconstruction of its existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service, some MDUSD school facilities may not be available over the next 20 years to house students in the future. But for the students generated by new residential development, the District would not need to maintain as many facilities at the existing level of service.

MDUSD’s 2018 Facilities Master Plan (FMP) identifies numerous reconstruction projects across the District’s school sites along with their costs. Among the work identified are modernize, repair, and site utilities, reconfigure existing classrooms, safety and security, parking, drop-off and entry plaza, exterior play spaces, playfields, hardcourts and classroom technology and infrastructure. All project costs were estimated at about \$1.3 billion.

Based on costs detailed in its 2018 Facilities Master Plan, the District estimates a total need of \$1.3 billion based on all identified projects. Even after applying \$150 million in Measure J bond funding, the \$348 million in measure C bond funding and \$90 million in Measure A Mello-Roos parcel tax funding, this creates a shortfall of more than \$712 million.

To calculate the reconstruction needs generated by students from new development, the District must analyze the number of new units to be constructed, the square footage of those units, and, utilizing the student generation rate, the number of students to be generated by those developments. Once this analysis is completed, the per pupil cost to house those students can be calculated based on the cost to modernize facilities. Except for the City of Clayton, none of the jurisdictions were able to provide an estimate of the average square footage for the projected new housing units. Consequently, to obtain a more representative sample, a combination of 1,031 recently constructed single-family and multi-family units were surveyed. Although this calculated average is more conservative than the estimate from the City of Clayton, it still fundamentally aligns with their provided average. Therefore, average square footage for this study is based on the square footage of 1,031 units built within the past 20 years within the areas served by the District. For each type of residential development, the number of units surveyed within the District is multiplied by the average square footage to determine the total average square footage. The total average square footage is then divided by the total surveyed housing units for a weighted average square footage. Once the weighted square footage is determined, it is multiplied by the total projected housing units (Table 1) resulting in the total projected square footage. These calculations are shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2. Housing Units and Calculation of Weighted Square Footage

Residential Type	Surveyed Housing Units	Average Square Footage	Total Average Square Footage	Weighted Average Square Footage
Single-Family	586	2,745	1,608,570	
Multi-Family	445	869	386,705	
Total	1,031		1,995,275	1,935

Table 3. Calculation of Weighted Average Square Footage

Average Square Footage	Total Projected Housing Units	Total Projected Square Footage
1,935	14,844	28,723,140

New Construction Cost vs. Modernization/Reconstruction

The cost per student to construct new school facilities within the Mt. Diablo Unified School District is \$105,805 as shown in Table 4. Construction costs were provided by Van Pelt Construction Services based on records of past and present projects in recent new construction school projects in the Bay Area California region (Appendix A). The cost to modernize facilities is 38.4% of new construction costs. This percentage is based on the comparison of the per pupil grant for the State School Facility Program modernization program and the State per pupil new construction grant. When analyzing the cost to construct new facilities, the State provides \$15,770 per elementary school pupil and \$6,005 to modernize facilities. For middle school pupils, the State provides \$16,679 for new construction and \$6,350 for modernization/reconstruction. Finally, for high school pupils, the State provides \$21,223 per 9-12 pupil and \$8,315 to modernize facilities. The average of the modernization/reconstruction grants is 38.4% of the new construction grants. Appendix B details the School Facility Program per pupil grant amounts.

Table 4. Cost per Student for New Construction

Grade Level	New Construction Cost per Student
Elementary	\$92,646
Middle	\$112,559
High	\$123,766
Weighted Average $((\\$92,646*7)+(\\$112,559*3)+(\\$123,766*4))/14$	\$105,805

Since the new construction cost per student is \$105,805, the modernization/reconstruction cost per student for the Mt. Diablo Unified School District is 38.4% of this value, or \$40,629.

This modernization/reconstruction cost per student is multiplied by the total students generated from Table 1 to determine the District’s total modernization/reconstruction need (Table 5). Dividing the total modernization/reconstruction need by the total projected square footage in Table 3 provides the modernization/reconstruction facilities cost per square foot (Table 6).

Table 5. District Total Modernization/Reconstruction Need

Modernization/Reconstruction Cost per Student	Total Students Generated	Total Modernization/Reconstruction Need
\$40,629	4,527	\$183,927,483

Table 6. District Modernization/Reconstruction Facilities Cost per Square Foot

Total Modernization/Reconstruction Need	Total Projected Square Footage	Facilities Cost per Square Foot
\$183,927,483	28,723,140	\$6.40

The Mt. Diablo Unified School District is justified in collecting residential developer fees at a rate of \$6.40 that exceeds the current statutory Level I fee of \$5.17. Therefore, the District is justified to collect the full amount of the statutory fee per square foot of new residential construction.

DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION: COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROJECTS

California Assembly Bill 181 provides that a district “must determine the impact of the increased number of employees anticipated to result from commercial/industrial development upon the cost of providing school facilities within the district. For the purposes of making this determination, the study shall utilize employee generation estimates that are based on commercial and industrial factors within the district, as calculated on either an individual project or categorical basis”. However, Assembly Bill 530 modified the requirements of AB 181 by allowing the use of a set of statewide employee generation factors. These factors are identified in the San Diego Association of Governments report, “San Diego Traffic Generators”. This study has become the standard in the industry for the calculation of the commercial/industrial fees.

Senior Housing

Certain types of housing dedicated for occupancy by senior citizens may not be subject to the full residential fee because it would not house student age residents. Pursuant to state law, it would generally be subject to the maximum fee for commercial development projects, based on its indirect contribution to student generation. Individual projects applying for such special treatment should be evaluated by the District on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the units will be permanently dedicated for use by seniors.

Commercial/Industrial Development Fee Calculations

The construction of commercial/industrial buildings within a community generates new employees and, therefore, new residents for a school district. The link between creating new jobs and student enrollment has been acknowledged by the State Allocation Board and in statute. The Legislature has also determined that if there is more impact than can be mitigated by residential fees, and some of this impact is caused by commercial/industrial development, then commercial/industrial development can also be charged fees. As shown above, the District is justified to collect a higher residential fee than the current statutory level.

To determine the impact of commercial/industrial development, several factors must be analyzed to calculate the modernization/reconstruction cost per square foot of this development. Assembly Bill 530 allows for the use of state-wide employee generation factors, specifically those derived from a report entitled San Diego Traffic Generators published by the San Diego Association of Governments in 1990. This report demonstrates the number of employees generated per square foot of commercial/industrial development, by category. Table 7 displays these categories and the number of employees generated for each square foot of space. An average employees/square foot value is then determined for MDUSD based on these categories.

Table 7. Commercial/Industrial Employee Generation Factors

Development Category	Employees/Square Foot
Agriculture	0.00031
Banks	0.00282
Commercial Offices	0.00478
Community Shopping Centers	0.00109
Corporate Offices	0.00268
Industrial Parks	0.00168
Industrial/Business Parks	0.00221
Lodging	0.00155
Medical Offices	0.00427
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	0.00362
Scientific R&D	0.00304
Average	0.00255

Additional data is used to determine the base school facility impact incurred to the District by commercial/industrial development. As shown in Table 8, the calculations also consider the percent of employees in the District who also live in the District, the number of households per employee, the students generated per household, and the modernization/reconstruction cost for each student. Data for percent of employees living in the District and households per employee are sourced from The United States Census Bureau’s 2022 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates. The number of students generated per household was previously shown in Table 1, while the modernization/reconstruction cost per student was shown in Table 5.

Table 8. Commercial/Industrial Base Cost per Square Foot (Except Mini-Storage)

Employees/ Square Foot	% Employees Living in District	Households per Employee	TK-12 Students per Household	Modernization Reconstruction Cost per Student	Commercial/Industrial Cost per Square Foot
0.00255	34%	0.76	0.305	\$40,629	\$8.17

It is important to note the mini-storage category of commercial development as an exception to the rates in Table 7. This type of development has a much lower impact than all other categories of commercial/industrial development, with only 0.00006 employees generated per square foot. Table 9 demonstrates the base cost per square foot for mini-storage development only.

Table 9. Mini-Storage Base Cost per Square Foot

Employees/ Square Foot	% Employees Living in District	Households per Employee	K-12 Students per Household	Modernization Reconstruction Cost per Student	Commercial/Industrial Cost per Square Foot
0.00006	34%	0.76	0.305	\$40,629	\$0.19

Having calculated the base costs per square foot for commercial/industrial development, a residential fee offset must be applied to account for the residential fee revenues the District will collect from homes associated with the employees generated by new commercial/industrial development. It is important to note that while this offset assumes all homes associated with new employees are new homes, in reality some of the new employees will live in existing homes. For the purpose of calculating the residential fee offset, it is estimated the District will collect the full statutory residential fee of \$5.17 per square foot. The weighted average square footage for a new home in the District was previously shown in Table 2. Table 10 shows the calculations for the residential fee offset for all commercial/industrial development except mini-storage, while Table 11 shows the calculation for mini-storage development.

Table 10. Commercial/Industrial Residential Fee Offset (Except Mini-Storage)

Employees/Square Foot	% Employees Living in District	Households per Employee	Weighted Average Square Feet/ Household	Revenue per sq. ft. from Residential Fee	Residential Offset
0.00255	34%	0.76	1,935	\$5.17	\$6.59

Table 11. Mini-Storage Residential Fee Offset

Employees/Square Foot	% Employees Living in District	Households per Employee	Weighted Average Square Feet/ Household	Revenue per sq. ft. from Residential Fee	Residential Offset
0.00006	34%	0.76	1,935	\$5.17	\$0.16

By subtracting the residential fee offset from the base commercial/industrial costs per square foot, the final school facility cost, which takes into account linked residential revenue, is determined. Table 12 shows the final commercial/industrial costs per square foot.

Table 12. Commercial/Industrial Final Costs per Square Foot

Development Type	Base Cost per Square Foot	Residential Offset	Final Cost per Square Foot
Mini-Storage	\$0.19	\$0.16	\$0.03
All Other Commercial/Industrial	\$8.17	\$6.59	\$1.58

The Mt. Diablo Unified School District is therefore justified in collecting commercial/industrial developer fees at a rate \$1.58 that exceeds the current statutory Level I fee \$0.84, with the exception of mini-storage development, which is justified at a lower amount. Therefore, the District is justified to collect the full amount of the statutory \$0.84 fee per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction, except for mini-storage, which should be collected at \$0.03 per square foot.

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

This study finds that the Mt. Diablo Unified School District is justified in the collection of the statutory developer fees per square foot of both residential and commercial/industrial construction. The District should move forward with adopting the new fees. This requires the District to follow the appropriate notices for a public hearing and meeting all noticing requirements.

This justification is based on the following conclusions of the study:

- There remains a need to modernize the District's school facilities to continue housing new students who are generated from new development at the existing level of service;
 - Modernization/reconstruction costs are 38.4% of new construction costs;
- Residential development will generate 0.305 TK-12th grade students per unit for the District to house;
 - The District's modernization/reconstruction cost for students generated from residential development is \$6.40 per square foot;
- Commercial/Industrial calculations also indicate a cost to house pupils that would be generated from local housing as a result of residents moving into the District;
 - This modernization/reconstruction cost for students generated from commercial/residential development is \$1.58 per square foot, except for mini-storage development which is \$0.03 per square foot;
- The District meets the criteria to impose the statutory developer fee.

Due to these factors, the District should proceed with adopting the statutory Level I Developer Fees, currently \$5.17 per square foot for residential construction and \$0.84 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction, except for mini-storage which is charged at \$0.03 per square foot.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEES

Administrative Requirements

The District must maintain a special account for the developer fees collected and any interest which accrues from the fees collected.

Reporting Requirements

Government Code sections 66006 and 66001 require, annually within 180 days of the end of each fiscal year, that the District make available to the public certain information and adopt prescribed findings relative to Developer Fees adopted pursuant to Education Code section 17620 and Government Code section 65995.

For the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit into the fund, and every five years thereafter, the District is required to make additional findings with respect to that portion of the fund remaining unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted.

This accounting will identify a description of the fee and its amount as well as a beginning and ending fund balance. Also, in the report will be the portion of the collected funds that have been expended, those remaining funds, and the purpose to which those have been and will be put to use. The report must also identify the approximate date upon which a school district anticipates receiving adequate revenue to complete any improvements required as a result of students generated from residential or commercial construction projects.

Government Code Section 66001 (a) (1): Purpose of Fees

The purpose of the fee is school facility construction and reconstruction to help the District continue to provide school facilities to all pupils, current and new, over the next 20 years by continuing to reconstruct or modernize the existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service for all students.

Government Code Section 66001 (a) (2): Use of Fees

The District's use of the fee will involve construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities and/or additional permanent facilities on existing school campuses, including but not limited to the types of projects included in this Study and the District's Facility Master Plan. In addition, the District may need to purchase or lease portable classrooms to use for interim housing while permanent facilities are being constructed. Revenue from fees collected on residential and commercial/industrial development may be used to pay for any of the following:

1. Design of School Facilities;
2. Purchase of land for School Facilities;
3. Construction or reconstruction of school facilities including both classroom and instructional spaces, and ancillary supporting facilities;
4. Testing and inspection of school sites and school buildings and permit and plan check fees;
5. Interim school facilities to house students generated by new development while permanent facilities are being constructed;
6. Legal and administrative costs associated with providing facilities to students generated by new development;
7. Administration of the collection of developer fees;

8. Miscellaneous purposes resulting from student enrollment growth caused by new residential development; and
9. Any other use permitted by law.

Government Code Section 66001 (a) (3): Reasonable Relationship between the Fee's Use and the Type of Development Project on which the Fee is Imposed

Future residential development will cause new families to move into the District and, consequently, generate additional students in the District. In order to continue providing facilities at the existing level of service for future students, the District will need to modernize and/or reconstruct facilities. The fee's use is therefore reasonably related to the type of project upon which it is imposed.

In addition, new commercial/industrial development will cause new workers to move into the District. Because these workers will have school-age children, the District will need to provide facilities for these students. The fee's use is reasonably related to the type of project upon which it is imposed.

Fees on Residential Reconstruction

Residential Reconstruction consists of voluntarily demolishing existing residential units and replacing them with new residential development. To the extent reconstruction increases the residential square footage beyond what was demolished, the increase in square footage is subject to the applicable developer fees as such construction is considered new residential development. As for the amount of square footage constructed that replaces only the previously constructed square footage the determination of the applicable fee, if any, is subject to a showing that the replacement square footage results in an increase in student enrollment and, therefore, an additional impact being placed on the School District to provide facilities for new student enrollment. Prior to the imposition of fees on Replacement Square Footage, the School District shall undertake an analysis on any future proposed projects(s) to examine the extent to which an increase in enrollment can be expected from Replacement Square Footage due to any differential in SGRs as identified in the Study for the applicable unit types between existing square footage and Replacement Square Footage. Any such fee that is calculated for the Replacement Square Footage shall not exceed the School Fee that is in effect at such time.

Reconstruction of Commercial/Industrial Square Footage

The voluntary demolition of existing commercial/industrial buildings and replacement with new residential development is a different category of Reconstruction. The School District will evaluate the impacts of Commercial/Industrial Reconstruction projects on a case-by-case basis and will make a determination of whether a fee credit is justified based on the nature of the project.

Government Code Section 66001 (a) (4): Reasonable Relationship Between the Need for the Public Facility and the Type of Project Upon Which the Fee is Imposed

As demonstrated in this Study, current District school facilities require renovation/reconstruction to continue providing the existing level of service for the next 20 years. Existing residents and residents from new development, both residential and commercial/industrial, should share in these costs. Therefore, the need for adequate school facilities is directly related to the new residential and commercial/industrial development projects upon which the fee is imposed.

Government Code Section 66001 (b): Reasonable Relationship Between the Amount of the Fee and the Cost of the Public Facility

The State School Facility Program provides a reference for the relative cost of modernization/reconstruction projects to new construction. This report demonstrates the cost per student for new construction projects, and by using the School Facility Program grant amounts for reference, the cost per student for modernization/reconstruction projects that will need to be undertaken to ensure the District can continue to provide school facilities at the existing level of service for all future students. This report also demonstrates that the cost impact to the District per square foot of development, whether residential or commercial/industrial, is greater than the statutory developer fees to be collected.

REVENUE SOURCES/FUNDING FACILITIES

The District may also utilize other sources of funding for modernizing and/or reconstructing school facilities. These funding sources include:

State School Facility Program

Senate Bill 50 reformed the State School Building Lease-Purchase Program in August, 1998. The new program, entitled the School Facility Program, provides funding under a “grant” program once a school district establishes eligibility. Funding required from districts is a 50/50 match for new construction projects and a 60/40 match for modernization/reconstruction projects. While there is generally a shortfall between State funding and the District’s actual facility needs, the State monies aid in assisting the District in its facility needs.

General Obligation Bonds

School districts can, with the approval of 2/3 or 55% of voters, issue General Obligation Bonds which are paid out of property taxes.

The Mt. Diablo Unified School District was most recently successful in passing Measure J in November 2018, which authorized \$150 million in bonds “To improve and upgrade science, engineering, technology and vocational education classrooms; replace outdated plumbing/electrical wiring, upgrade alarm/emergency communication systems; improve student safety/campus security.” In June 2010 the District was successful in passing Measure C, which authorized \$348 million in bonds “To support quality education and safety for local students, and reduce impacts of State budget cuts by improving science, career and technical education facilities; upgrading classroom instructional technology; repairing leaky roofs; improving safety; maximizing energy efficiency including adding solar panels and modern air conditioning; and repairing, replacing, equipping or modernizing other school facilities.” As of 2024 all bond funds have been exhausted or encumbered for existing projects.

Parcel Taxes

Approval by 2/3 of the voters is required to impose taxes that are not based on the assessed value of individual parcels. The revenues from these taxes are usually minor. Parcel taxes are typically not used for capital outlay. Instead, revenue from such programs is generally used to fund curriculum, instructional enhancements, and other non-facility related expenditures.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Districts

This alternative uses a tax on property owners within a defined area to pay long-term bonds issued for specific public improvements. Mello-Roos taxes require approval from 2/3 of the voters in an election.

In 1989, the District also receives funds from Measure A, a Mello-Roos parcel tax approved in 1989 and which authorized the District to sell up to \$90 million in bonds to serve as an operating fund for school site furniture and equipment. As of 2024 all funds have been exhausted or encumbered for existing projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This report recommends that the Mt. Diablo Unified School District levy the maximum statutory fee authorized by Government Code Section 65995 on new residential development, currently \$5.17 per square foot. This report also recommends that the Mt. Diablo Unified School District levy the maximum statutory fee authorized by Government Code Section 65995 currently \$0.84 per square foot on all categories of commercial/industrial development (except mini-storage).

These recommendations are based on the findings that residential and commercial/industrial development create a school facility cost for the Mt. Diablo Unified School District.

SOURCES

Ayers, Dana. City of Clayton. Community Development Director.

Brenyah-Addow, Maurice. City of Pittsburg. Senior Planner.

California Basic Educational Data System. California State Department of Education. October Enrollments, 2023-24.

California State Department of Education. California Public School Directory.

California State Department of Finance. Population Research Division.

Cass, Michael P. City of Martinez. Planning Manager.

Clark Ed.D., Adam. Superintendent. Mt. Diablo Unified School District.

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

RealQuest Online Database.

Sage, Aaron. City of Walnut Creek. Principal Planner.

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

Tully Sean. Contra Costa County. Permit Center Planning Manager.

United States Census Bureau, 2022 American Community Survey.

Vargas, Adrian. Chief Business Official. Mt. Diablo Unified School District.

Watkins, Scott. City of Concord. Associate Planner.

APPENDIX A
CONSTRUCTION COSTS



May 1, 2024

RE: Estimated Construction Costs
Subject: Per-Student Costs at Mt. Diablo Unified School District

To Whom It May Concern,

We have reviewed our records of past and present projects that involve recent new school Construction, within the region. Using a formula based on escalation from projects in previous years, our estimate for the Mt. Diablo Unified School District is as follows:

Elementary School - capacity of 600 students:	\$55,587,581
Construction cost per student	\$92,646
Middle School - capacity of 1000 students:	\$112,559,302
Construction cost per student	\$112,559
High School - capacity of 2000 students:	\$247,531,038
Construction cost per student	\$123,766

These costs assume a reasonably flat site with access to utilities consistent with an urban/residential area. These costs exclude site acquisition. The above estimated costs are for the purposes of discussing State eligibility and developer fees, and are not intended for use in developing budgets for specific projects with unique conditions. Projections beyond the next 12 months will require a minimum of 6.5% escalation compounded annually.

Thank you,

— DocuSigned by:

Kelli Jurgenson

Kelli Jurgenson, Vice President
VPC

APPENDIX B
PER PUPIL GRANT AMOUNTS

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2024

Grant Amount Adjustments

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

ATTACHMENT B

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT TO SCHOOL FACILITY PROGRAM GRANTS

State Allocation Board Meeting, January 24, 2024

Grant Amount Adjustments

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