

## SECTION E: FUTURE FACILITY NEED AND FUNDING

It has been shown by the enrollment forecasts and the facility capacity analysis in the previous sections that the Folsom Cordova Unified School District will need to provide additional facilities and modernize school sites in the future.

### Cost Per Student

Any proposal to provide new facilities must include an analysis of costs associated with the various facility options. Student cost calculations based on State cost formulas and information from the Office of Public School Construction, State Department of Education and District specific costs are used to determine the cost of providing facilities for each additional student according to State standards. All costs provided in this report are based on 2008 dollars. Based on information from the District regarding recent purchases of land in the area, land costs were estimated to be \$600,000 per acre. The cost per student is shown in Table E-1.

<b>Table E-1: Estimated Facility Cost Per Student</b> (Based on 2008 Dollars)	
<u>Traditional 9-Month Calendar</u>	
<u>Facility Type</u>	<u>All Facilities With Land Costs</u>
K-5	\$50,641
6	69,126
7-12	97,251
SDC	67,606

*Source: OPSC, Folsom Cordova Unified School District.*

### **Portable Classroom Facilities**

Portable classrooms provide a district with the most effective way to provide classroom facilities on a short-term basis. The cost for a Division of the State Architect (DSA) approved portable, including site preparation work, utility installation costs, architect, engineering, inspection, agency fees and furniture and equipment, is approximately \$90,000 to \$120,000. If each portable is loaded at 25 students per class, a cost of \$3,600 to \$4,800 per student is identified. If each portable is loaded at 27 students per class, a cost of \$3,333 to \$4,444 per student is identified. However, if the portable is used for class size reduction purposes the portable would be loaded at 20 students per class and a cost of \$4,500 to \$6,000 per student is identified.

While portable classrooms offer the district an inexpensive temporary solution to housing students, portables should not be viewed as a long-term solution. Portables classrooms overburden ancillary facilities, i.e. playgrounds, libraries, restrooms, cafeteria and multi-purpose rooms.

### **New Construction Funding in the State Facility Program**

The New Construction program provides State funds on a 50/50 State and local sharing basis for public school capital facility projects. Education Code Section 17022.10 establishes the new construction grant per unhoused pupil for new construction projects. The State Allocation Board approves annual adjustments to the grant based on the change in the Class B Construction Cost Index in January of each year.

The new construction grant amount is intended to provide the State's share for all necessary project costs with the exception of site acquisition, utilities, off-site and service-site development. The necessary project costs include, but are not limited to, funding for design, the construction of the building, general-site development, education technology, unconventional energy, tests, inspections and

furniture/equipment. The costs not included in the base grant are site acquisition, utilities, off-site and service-site development and other possible augmentations. These costs can be reported on the funding application and are subject to SAB review and approval.

The District’s new construction eligibility for the State School Facility Program is calculated on a high school attendance area basis. The Folsom High School Attendance Area (FHSAA) and the Cordova High School Attendance Area (CHSAA) current new construction eligibility is shown in Table E-2. A map of the two high school attendance areas is shown in Appendix E-1.

<u>Eligibility</u>	Folsom HSAA	Cordova HSAA
K-6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Eligibility	1,291	766
7-8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Eligibility	0	0
9-12 <sup>th</sup> Grade Eligibility	153	333
Non Severe Special Day Class	33	113
Severe Special Day Class	3	45

*Source: Office of Public School Construction.*

The District received funding from the State Allocation Board in February of 2006 for Navigator Elementary School. The elementary eligibility used for Navigator Elementary was subtracted from the Rancho Cordova HSAA eligibility shown in Table E-2.

The District received funding from the State Allocation Board in July of 2007 for Vista del Lago High School and Russell Ranch Elementary. Both of these projects are within the FHSAA and have been subtracted from the eligibility shown in Table E-2.

A district's new construction eligibility is updated with a current enrollment projection every time the district files a funding request (SAB 50-04) for a new construction project. A district's new construction eligibility is dependent on the enrollment at the time the funding application is submitted. The number of proposed housing units that have tentative map approval and the student yield factor used at the time of submittal also affect the eligibility determination. The eligibility shown in Table E-2 is the current eligibility of the District and would be adjusted when the District applies for funding for another new construction project.

**Costs of Schools Built in the Last 10 Years**

Table E-3 contains a list of the costs for schools within the District boundaries in the last ten years. All of the elementary sites listed in Table E-3 were a re-use of plans, which illustrates the increase in costs over time for the same plans. The two high school sites are not as easy to compare, as the topography and asbestos issues, rising material and labor costs at the Vista del Lago High School site created additional costs well beyond the scope of Folsom High.

<b>Table E-3: Actual/Estimated Costs for Recently Built District Schools</b>						
Re-use of Plans	Capacity	Year Built	Total Project Costs	Cost Per Acre	Cost Per Pupil	
<i>Elementary Schools</i>						
Gold Ridge	625	1998	\$10,890,000	\$156,650	\$17,424	
Empire Oaks	625	2000	12,791,765	226,354	20,467	
Gallardo	625	2002	12,539,385	167,864	20,063	
Navigator	625	2006	16,865,931	250,000	26,985	
Russell Ranch	625	2007	26,000,000	349,000	41,600	
<i>High Schools</i>						
Folsom High	2,000	1998	\$67,732,407	\$88,427	\$33,782	
Vista del Lago	1,500	2007	130,000,000	303,147	86,667	

Source: OPSC, Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

### **Modernization Funding in the State Facility Program**

The State Modernization Program provides funds on a 60/40 (state/district) basis for improvements to enhance school facilities educationally. Projects eligible under this program include such improvements as air conditioning, plumbing, lighting, and electrical systems. Site acquisition may not be included in modernization applications. The necessary projects costs include, but are not limited to, funding for design, the modernization of the building, education technology, unconventional energy, tests, inspections and furniture/equipment.

The State School Facility Program (SFP) considers permanent buildings that are more than 25 years old inadequate housing and portables more than 20 years old inadequate housing. Buildings that meet these age requirements are eligible for modernization through the SFP Program.

Many of the Folsom Cordova Unified School District's sites have been modernized using State Facility Program eligibility. However, there are still many modernization needs throughout the District that have not been met with the amount of modernization funding provided by the State.

Carl Sundahl Elementary (19 classrooms) received modernization eligibility approval from the SAB in July of 2007. Oak Chan Elementary (24 classrooms) will be eligible to apply for modernization in 2009. The modernization eligibility is based on the lesser of either the enrollment at the school site or the eligible number of classrooms times the loading factor. In both school sites, the enrollment is less than the loading factor times the eligible classroom count. Table E-4 illustrates the modernization eligibility and 2008 base grant funding for both school sites.

**Table E-4: State Modernization Funding  
2008 Base Grant\*\***

<u>Site</u>	<u>Student Eligibility</u>	<u>60% OPSC Contribution</u>	<u>40% District Contribution</u>	<u>Total</u>
Carl Sundahl Elem.	414*	\$1,431,612	\$954,408	\$2,386,020
Oak Chan Elem.	580	2,005,640	1,337,093	3,342,733
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$3,437,252</b>	<b>\$2,291,501</b>	<b>\$5,728,753</b>

\*Eligibility Approved by the SAB

\*\* No Augmentations Included

Source: 2008 OPSC grants, Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

It should be noted that the base grant changes every January when the State Allocation Board changes the construction cost index. The actual modernization funding that the District will receive for a project will depend on the year the District decides to request funding from OPSC. The funding cited in Table E-4 is based on the 2008 Construction Cost Index and should be considered an estimate.

As sites in Folsom become eligible for SFP modernization funding, the District will need to secure funding for their 40% matching share.

### **School Facilities Improvement Districts**

For the purposes of this Master Plan, the new construction needs of the District will be assessed based on the geographical boundaries of the School Facilities Improvement Districts (SFID). SFID 1 secured funding source includes Measure V and B in Rancho Cordova and SFID 2 includes Measure C in Folsom which were formed on October 7, 1999. These measures have been expended and are currently inactive. SFID 3 (Measure M-South of Highway 50, east of Sunrise Boulevard) and SFID 4 (Measure N-Existing

City of Rancho Cordova west of Sunrise Boulevard) were formed on June 22, 2006. A map illustrating the location of each SFID is shown in Appendix E-2.

*School Facilities Improvement District 1 - Rancho Cordova*

SFID 1 includes most of the city of Rancho Cordova and some unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. It is bordered by the American River to the north; Prairie City Road to the east; Douglas Road and Kiefer Boulevard to the south; and Mather Airport to the west. It is situated in roughly the geographic center of Sacramento County, about 9 miles east of the central business district of the city of Sacramento.

*School Facilities Improvement District 2 - Folsom*

SFID 2 includes most of the city of Folsom and some unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. It is bordered by the Placer County line to the north; El Dorado County line to the east; Douglas Road to the south; and Prairie City Road and the Folsom city limits to the west. There is a small portion of the city of Folsom that is not included as part of the District and it is bordered by Oak Avenue to the north, Madison Avenue to the south, American River Drive to the east and the Folsom city limits to the west. Although this area is not included as part of the District, pupils in this area are free to enroll as pupils of our District.

*School Facilities Improvement District 3 - South of Highway 50/East of Sunrise Blvd.*

SFID 3 encompasses the area south of Highway 50, east of Sunrise Boulevard, north of Douglas Boulevard, and east to the El Dorado County line. The majority of this area is sparsely inhabited by residential development; however, planning has begun for large-scale residential development in Rio del Oro, Westborough, Easton, Glenborough, North Douglas and the area south of the City of Folsom over the next thirty years.

It is estimated by developers that the area will eventually contain over 32,327 new residential units; 20,603 single-family homes, 6,073 multi-family medium density units and 6,154 high density multi-family homes. Developers have started to push their start up schedules out because of the downturn in the housing market and in turn, the District is adjusting the start dates for building school facilities in this area.

*School Facilities Improvement District 4 - Existing City of Rancho Cordova and Mather*

SFID 4 encompasses part of the City of Rancho Cordova and Mather **without** the proposed residential development east of Sunrise Boulevard. This area includes the residential developments occurring in Stone Creek, Capital Village and infill projects throughout the area.

A map illustrating the four areas is included in Appendix D-1. Land acquisition, site development and construction costs will vary due to site location, mitigation for naturally occurring asbestos, other site contamination issues, topography, engineering, soil conditions, and the economic climate. All costs stated in the scenarios are only estimates based on historic cost increases and are subject to change based on the economic climate at the time of construction.

**Projected Pupils in Folsom SFID 2**

*High School Attendance Areas (HSAA) Within the City of Folsom*

There are currently two high school attendance areas in the City of Folsom. The Folsom High School attendance area includes the area in Folsom that is **west** of E. Bidwell Street. Pupils that attend Sutter Middle School, Blanche Sprentz Elementary, Carl Sundahl Elementary, Gold Ridge Elementary, Natoma Station Elementary, Sandra Gallardo Elementary and Theodore Judah Elementary will attend Folsom High School.

The Vista del Lago High School attendance area includes the area in Folsom that is east of E. Bidwell Street. Pupils that attend Folsom Middle School (except Blanche Sprentz Elementary), Empire Oaks Elementary, Folsom Hills Elementary, Oak Chan Elementary and Russell Ranch Elementary will attend Vista del Lago High School.

*Proposed Residential Development in Folsom SFID 2*

Based on information from the planning department and local developers, proposed residential development in the Folsom SFID 2 area will produce approximately 1,391 single-family units, 242 single-family attached units, and 866 multi-family units at build out. This area **does not include** proposed residential development south of Highway 50. Table E-5 illustrates the proposed multi-family residential development in the Folsom SFID 2 area.

<u>Development</u>	<u>Multi-family Units</u>
Bidwell Home/Folsom Oaks	19
Hidden Lake Apartments	37
Montecito Commons	26
Oaks at Willow Springs	194
TLCS/Mercy Housing	19
Willow Creek Village	86
<b>Folsom HSAA</b>	<b>381</b>
Multi-family - S. Empire Ranch	344
<u>Trilogy Condos (Formally Mirabella Condos)</u>	<u>141</u>
<b>VDL HSAA</b>	<b>485</b>
<b>Total Multi-family</b>	<b>866</b>

*Sources: FCUSD, City of Folsom Planning Dept. and Local Developers.*

The majority of the proposed multi-family development will occur in the Vista del Lago HSAA (56%), with the Folsom HSAA producing 44% of the multi family development. Table E-6 illustrates the proposed single-family and single-family attached residential development in the Folsom SFID 2 area.

<u>Development</u>	<u>SF Attached</u>	<u>Single-Family</u>
<b>Folsom High School Attendance Area</b>		
530 Levy Road (Remaining to be built)	0	4
Addison Place	0	35
American River Canyon 4A	0	10
American River Canyon 6B	0	16
American River Canyon 8A	0	5
American River Canyon 8B	0	10
ARC/Residences II	0	10
Bidwell St. Rezone	5	0
Folsom Village	0	11
Montara Grove	0	21
<u>Oaks at Willow Springs (Remaining)</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>88</u>
<b>Folsom HSAA Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>210</b>
<b>Vista del Lago High School Attendance Area</b>		
Broadstone 3	0	212
Empire Ranch 2 (North)	0	390
Empire Ranch 2 (South)	0	231
La Colina dal Lago	0	31
Natoma Valley	0	79
Parkway 2-Rivage	72	0
Parkway 2 - Lot I and J	152	57
Viscaya	0	17
<b>VDL HSAA Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>1,017</b>
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>1,227</b>

Table E-7 illustrates the type and amount of residential development by HSAA in the Folsom SFID 2. The majority of the proposed residential development will occur in the Vista del Lago HSAA.

**Table E-7: SF, SFA and MF Residential Development  
Folsom HSAA and VDL HSAA**

<u>HSAA</u>	<u>SF Units</u>	<u>SF Att. Units</u>	<u>MF Units</u>	<u>Totals Units</u>
Folsom HSAA	210	29	381	620
VDL HSAA	1,017	224	485	1,726
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>1,227</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>2,346</b>

The table above illustrates that VDL HSAA will experience the largest amount of residential development in the next few years and in turn the largest amount of enrollment growth. In order to estimate enrollment growth as accurately as possible for the remaining build out in this area, specific yields for each of the different types of proposed units were used to generate the K-12 students in Table E-8.

**Table E-8: Estimated Pupils from Residential Development  
Folsom HSAA and Vista del Lago HSAA**

<u>HSAA</u>	<u>Pupils From SF Units</u>	<u>Pupils From SF Att. Units</u>	<u>Pupils From MF Units</u>	<u>Total Pupils</u>
<b>Folsom HSAA</b>				
K-5	63	2	30	96
6-8	42	1	15	58
9-12	42	1	19	62
SDC	2	0	4	6
<b>Total Pupils</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>Vista del Lago HSAA</b>				
K-5	207	16	39	262
6-8	130	4	19	153
9-12	113	7	24	144
SDC	10	2	5	17
<b>Total Pupils</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>576</b>

*Proposed Residential Development Impact on Folsom HSAA*

The impact of the proposed residential development on the K-5 elementary schools in the Folsom HSAA will be felt at Gold Ridge Elementary, Theodore Judah Elementary and Carl Sundahl Elementary. Gold Ridge Elementary will feel the impact first from the Oaks at Willow Springs development that is currently under construction. The site will need to house an additional 44 K-5 students at build out.

Theodore Judah Elementary and Carl Sundahl Elementary currently have room to house the additional students from the residential development proposed to be built in their areas. The remaining grade level impacts, middle and high school, will not be enough to warrant the need of additional facilities. Sutter Middle School and Folsom High School should have enough room to house the additional students.

*Proposed Residential Development Impact on Vista del Lago HSAA*

The impact of the proposed residential development on the K-5 elementary schools in the Vista del Lago HSAA will be felt at Russell Ranch Elementary, Empire Oaks Elementary and Folsom Hills Elementary. Russell Ranch and Folsom Hills Elementary will feel the most impact from the proposed residential development.

Russell Ranch Elementary will need to house an additional 118 K-5 students from the proposed residential development within its boundaries by the time of build out. There are currently five classrooms available at the site for additional students. Depending on the grade level configuration of the additional students, there may be enough room to house the new students in the original school site. If there is enough room to house all of the students there is an area reserved on the site for the placement of another classroom wing or relocatables.

Empire Oaks Elementary will need to house an additional 16 K-5 students from the proposed residential development by the time of build out. The majority of the new

students cited would be coming from a multi family residential development near the school that is currently going through the planning process. The community has protested the construction of a multi family development on this property in the past and has changed the scope of the project a couple of times. There is a good chance that the multi family development may not occur. There has also been some talk about a strip mall going on the site in place of the multi family development. Empire Oaks Elementary is currently at capacity and may need to add additional classroom space to handle the impact if all of the residential development occurs.

Folsom Hills Elementary will need to house an additional 158 K-5 students from the proposed residential development within it's boundaries by the time of build out. There is currently room for an additional 125 students at the site. Depending on the grade level configuration of the additional students, there may be enough room to house the new students in the original school site. If there is enough room to house all of the students the District may need to add relocatables or move existing programs from the site.

The remaining grade level impacts, middle and high school, will not be enough to warrant the need of additional facilities. Folsom Middle School and Vista del Lago High School should have enough room to house the additional students.

### **Projected Pupils in RC SFID 3 Area (Without the Folsom SOI)**

Based on information from the planning department and local developers, proposed residential development in the RC SFID 3 area is estimated to produce approximately 12,182 K-12 pupils in the next 23 years. This area **includes** proposed residential development south of Highway 50 and east of Sunrise Boulevard **excluding** the Folsom SOI area. Table E-9 illustrates the proposed residential development and the estimated amount of pupils from the development over a 20+-year period. Appendix E-3 illustrates the calculations.

Table E-9 shows the projected students from the proposed residential development in SFID 3 without the development slated for the Folsom SOI.

<u>Development</u>	<u># Units</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>SF Att.</u>	<u>Multi- Family</u>	<u>Students Generated</u>
N. Douglas I/II	841	841	0	0	606
Rio del Oro	11,660	8,044	1,896	1,720	6,749
Easton Place	1,494	578	0	916	563
Glenborough	3,309	3,100	0	209	2,265
Westborough	3,949	2,134	862	953	1,999
<b>Totals SFID 3 (w/o Folsom)</b>	<b>21,253</b>	<b>14,697</b>	<b>2,758</b>	<b>3,798</b>	<b>12,182</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Dept., County of Sacramento Planning Dept., and Local Developers.

Table E-10 illustrates the number of proposed pupils from residential development that are planned to occur in this area in five-year increments beginning in 2008. Timelines will be adjusted to more accurately reflect housing conditions and the start of development as information becomes available.

<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period - 2008-2012</u>				
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2017</u>
K-5	1,678	0	1,678	2.72
6-8	548	0	548	0.62
9-12	647	0	647	0.33
SDC	51	0	51	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,924</b>		<b>2,924</b>	<b>3.67</b>
<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period 2013-2017</u>				
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2023</u>
K-5	1,678	0	1,678	2.72
6-8	548	0	548	0.62
9-12	647	0	647	0.33
SDC	51	0	51	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,924</b>		<b>2,924</b>	<b>3.67</b>

**Table E-10: Schools Needed in RC SFID 3 Area, Continued**

<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period 2018-2022</u>				
Grade Level	Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Unhoused Pupils	Schools Needed by 2028
K-5	1,678	0	1,678	2.72
6-8	548	0	548	0.62
9-12	647	0	647	0.33
SDC	51	0	51	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,924</b>		<b>2,924</b>	<b>3.67</b>

<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period 2023-2027</u>				
Grade Level	Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Unhoused Pupils	Schools Needed by 2034
K-5	1,678	0	1,678	2.72
6-8	548	0	548	0.62
9-12	647	0	647	0.33
SDC	51	0	51	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,924</b>		<b>2,924</b>	<b>3.67</b>

<u>2,260 Units Built over 5 Year Period 2028-2032</u>				
Grade Level	Projected Enrollment	Capacity	Unhoused Pupils	Schools Needed by 2034
K-5	278	0	278	0.45
6-8	92	0	92	0.10
9-12	109	0	109	0.06
SDC	9	0	9	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>592</b>		<b>592</b>	<b>0.61</b>

Table E-11 shows that the District will need to build school facilities in the Rancho Cordova SFID 3 area, (11.34 K-5 schools, 2.59 middle schools and 1.38 high schools) over the next 24 years in this area if the proposed residential development occurs at the estimated rate.

**Table E-11: Total Schools Needed in RC SFID 3 Area  
(Without Folsom SOI)**

Grade Level	Projected Enrollment	Schools Needed by 2032/33
K-5	6,990	11.34
6-8	2,284	2.59
9-12	2,697	1.38
SDC	213	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,184</b>	<b>15.31</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, County of Sacramento Planning Dept. and Local Developers.

The funding impact from the Rancho Cordova SFID 3 area over the next 24 years is estimated to be \$987,826,963. Table E-12 illustrates the total funding calculation and Appendix E-3 lists the calculations in five-year increments and the total funding needed for RC SFID 3 area.

**Table E-12: Total School Facility Funding Impact in RC SFID 3 Area  
(Without Folsom SOI)**

Grade Level	Students	Schools Needed	School Construction (all costs)
K-5	6,990	11.34	\$418,372,991
6-8	2,284	2.59	242,503,454
9-12	2,697	1.38	309,967,486
SDC	213	0.00	16,983,031
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,184</b>	<b>15.31</b>	<b>\$987,826,963</b>

Sources: FCUSD, County of Sacramento Planning Dept., City of Rancho Cordova Planning Dept. and Local Developers.

**Projected Pupils in Folsom SOI SFID 3 Area (Without the RC SFID Area)**

Based on information from the planning department and local developers, proposed residential development in the Folsom SFID 3 area is estimated to produce approximately 5,823 K-12 pupils in the **next 17 years**. This area **includes** proposed residential development south of Highway 50 in the Folsom SOI area only. Table E-13

illustrates the proposed residential development and the estimated amount of pupils from the development over a 15+-year period. Appendix E-4 contains the calculations.

<u>Development</u>	<u># Units</u>	<u>Single Family</u>	<u>MF Med. Density</u>	<u>MF High Density</u>	<u>Students Generated</u>
<b>Folsom SFID 3</b>	<b>11,577</b>	<b>5,906</b>	<b>3,315</b>	<b>2,356</b>	<b>5,823</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Folsom Planning Dept., County of Sacramento Planning Dept., and Local Developers.

Table E-14 illustrates the number of proposed pupils from residential development that is planned to occur in this area in five-year increments beginning in 2010. Table E-13 also lists an estimate of the total number of schools needed by the 2025 school year when the area is expected to be near build out.

<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period - 2010 to 2015</u>				
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2015</u>
K-5	1,125	0	1,125	1.83
6-8	383	0	383	0.44
9-12	432	0	432	0.22
SDC	39	0	39	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,979</b>		<b>1,979</b>	<b>2.49</b>
<u>5,000 Units Built over 5 Year Period - 2016 to 2020</u>				
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2020</u>
K-5	1,125	0	1,125	1.83
6-8	383	0	383	0.44
9-12	432	0	432	0.22
SDC	39	0	39	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,979</b>		<b>1,979</b>	<b>2.49</b>

**Table E-14: Schools Needed in Folsom SOI, Continued**

4,620 Units Built over 5 Year Period – 2021-2025

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2025</u>
K-5	1,058	0	1,058	1.72
6-8	361	0	361	0.41
9-12	407	0	407	0.21
SDC	38	0	38	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,865</b>		<b>1,865</b>	<b>2.34</b>

Table E-15 lists the total number of schools by grade level that will be needed in the Folsom SOI SFID 3 area over the next 20+ years.

**Table E-15: Total Schools Needed in Folsom SOI (SFID 3 Area Only)**

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Projected Enrollment</u>	<u>Schools Needed by 2025</u>
K-5	3,308	5.38
6-8	1,127	1.28
9-12	1,271	0.65
SDC	116	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,823</b>	<b>7.31</b>

Table E-15 shows that the District will need to build seven school facilities in the Folsom SOI-SFID 3 area, (5.38 K-5 schools, 1.28 middle schools and 0.65 high schools) over the next 20+ years, if the proposed residential development occurs at the estimated rate.

Table E-16 illustrates the total funding calculation and Appendix E-4 lists the calculations in five-year increments and the total funding needed for this area.

**Table E-16: Total School Facility Funding Impact in Folsom SOI  
(SFID 3 Area Only)**

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Schools Needed</u>	<u>Construction (all costs)</u>
K-5	3,308	5.38	\$185,394,986
6-8	1,127	1.28	111,236,625
9-12	1,271	0.65	136,811,948
SDC	116	0	8,669,034
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,822</b>	<b>7.31</b>	<b>\$442,112,592</b>

Sources: FCUSD, County of Sacramento Planning Dept. and Local Developers.

The funding impact from the Folsom SOI SFID 3B area over the next 15+ years is estimated to be \$442,112,592.

**Total Funding Impact for SFID 3 (RC and Folsom SOI)**

The total estimated funding needed for the Rancho Cordova SFID 3 and Folsom SOI SFID 3 areas is \$1,429,939,555. The total funding needed for each of the areas of SFID 3 is also shown in Table E-17.

**Table E-17: Total School Facility Funding Impact in SFID 3  
(Rancho Cordova and Folsom SOI)**

<b>Rancho Cordova SFID 3</b>			
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Schools Needed</u>	<u>Construction (all costs)</u>
K-5	6,990	11.34	\$418,372,991
6-8	2,284	2.59	242,503,454
9-12	2,697	1.38	309,967,486
SDC	213	0.00	16,983,031
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,184</b>	<b>15.31</b>	<b>\$987,826,963</b>

  

<b>Folsom SOI SFID 3</b>			
<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Students</u>	<u>Schools Needed</u>	<u>Construction (all costs)</u>
K-5	3,308	5.38	\$185,394,986
6-8	1,124	1.28	111,236,625
9-12	1,271	0.65	136,811,948
SDC	116	0.00	8,669,034
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,822</b>	<b>7.31</b>	<b>\$442,112,592</b>

**Total Funding Needed for SFID 3**

**\$1,429,939,555**

**Projected Pupils in Rancho Cordova SFID 4**

Based on information from the planning department and local developers, proposed residential development in the Rancho Cordova SFID 4 area is estimated to produce approximately 1,534 residential units in the next 10 years. This area **does not include** residential development east of Sunrise Boulevard and south of Highway 50. Table E-18 illustrates the proposed residential development in the SFID 4 area.

<u>Development</u>	<u># Units</u>	<u>Single-Family</u>	<u>SF Att. Family</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>
Stone Creek Development	574	272	0	302
Cordova City Center	207	0	0	207
Terra Loma Condos	11	0	0	11
Trinity Garden Estates	21	0	0	21
Summerset Apartments	34	0	0	34
<u>Capital Village</u>	<u>687</u>	<u>476</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Totals RC SFID4</b>	<b>1,534</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>575</b>

*Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and Local Developers.*

Table E-19 illustrates the number of proposed pupils from **multi-family** residential development that is planned to occur in RC SFID 4.

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>MF Units</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Pupils Generated</u>
K-5	575	.07	40
6-8	575	.04	23
9-12	575	.04	23
<u>SDC</u>	<u>575</u>	<u>.01</u>	<u>6</u>
<b>K-12 Yield</b>		<b>.16</b>	<b>92</b>

Table E-20 illustrates the number of proposed pupils from **single-family attached** residential development that is planned to occur in the RC SFID 4 area.

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>SF Units</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Pupils Generated</u>
K-5	211	.07	15
6-8	211	.02	4
9-12	211	.03	6
SDC	211	.01	<u>2</u>
<b>K-12 Yield</b>		<b>.13</b>	<b>27</b>

Table E-21 illustrates the number of proposed pupils from **single-family** residential development that is planned to occur in this area.

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>SF Units</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Pupils Generated</u>
K-5	748	.30	224
6-8	748	.20	150
9-12	748	.20	150
SDC	748	.01	<u>8</u>
<b>K-12 Yield</b>		<b>.71</b>	<b>532</b>

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Pupils From SF Units</u>	<u>Pupils From SFA</u>	<u>Pupils From MF Units</u>	<u>Total Pupils</u>
K-5	224	15	40	279
6-8	150	4	23	177
9-12	150	6	23	179
SDC	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>16</u>
<b>K-12 Pupils</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>651</b>

Table E-22 illustrates that 651 K-12 pupils are expected to be generated by new residential construction in the Rancho Cordova SFID 4 in the next ten years. As can be seen in Table E-16 the majority of the residential development will occur in the Navigator Elementary attendance area. This school opened in 2006 and has ample space to house the estimated K-5 students that will be generated from the build out in the area. The existing middle schools in RC SFID 4 should be able to handle the additional secondary students generated by the residential development. The high school serving this area, Cordova High School, is scheduled to go through a major renovation in the next couple of years. The final capacity of the renovated site has not been determined at the time of writing this report but the District will be able to house the additional students from the proposed development.

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Proposed Pupils in RC SFID 4</u>	<u>Remaining Capacity</u>	<u>Unhoused Pupils</u>	<u>CRS Needed</u>
K-5	279	375	0	0
6-8	177	189	0	0
9-12	179	0*	179	6
SDC	16	30	0	0
<b>K-12 Pupils</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>6</b>

There is also the possibility that high school students from RC SFID 4 may choose to attend the proposed new high school complex that is planned to be built in RC SFID 3. By the time of build out of RC SFID 4 (2018), the new high school in RC SFID 3 should have been built and opened taking some of the capacity load off Cordova High School.

**Summary of Residential Development in SFID 2, 3 and 4**

The proposed residential development in the SFID areas within the District is estimated to produce approximately 36,710 residential units in the next 20+ years. Table E-24

illustrates the total amount of residential development proposed to be built within the District boundaries.

**Table E-24: Proposed Residential Development 2008-2027  
District-wide Summary**

SFID #	Single-family	SF Att. Family	Multi-Family	Total Units
SFID 2 Folsom (Existing)	1,227	253	866	2,346
SFID 3 RC (S. Hwy 50)	14,697	2,758	3,798	21,253
SFID 3 Folsom (SOI)	5,906	3,315	2,356	11,577
SFID 4 RC (Existing)	748	211	575	1,534
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,578</b>	<b>6,537</b>	<b>7,595</b>	<b>36,710</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department and Local Developers.

Table E-25 illustrates the number of new pupils that will be generated by residential development in the District between 2008 and 2027 by SFID.

**Table E-25: New Pupils from Proposed Residential Development 2008-2027  
District-wide Summary**

SFID	K-5	6-8	9-12	SDC	K-12
SFID 2 Folsom (Existing)	358	211	206	23	798
SFID 3 RC (S. Hwy 50)	6,990	2,284	2,697	213	12,184
SFID 3 Folsom (SOI)	3,308	1,127	1,271	116	5,823
SFID 4 (Existing)	279	177	179	16	651
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10,935</b>	<b>3,799</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>368</b>	<b>19,456</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, City of Folsom Planning Department, Sacramento County Planning and Local Developers.

Table E-26 shows the number of new schools needed in the District by 2027 in SFID 3.

**Table E-26: Total School Sites Needed  
District-wide Summary**

SFID #	K-5	6-8	9-12	SDC	K-12
SFID 3 RC (S. Hwy 50)	11 sites	2.5 sites	1.38 sites	0	15.3 sites
SFID 3 Folsom (SOI)	5.38 sites	1.28 sites	.65 sites	0	7.31 sites
<b>Total Sites</b>	<b>16 sites</b>	<b>4 sites</b>	<b>2 sites</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22 sites</b>

Sources: FCUSD, City of Rancho Cordova Planning Department, City of Folsom Planning Department, Sacramento County Planning and Local Developers.

## **Local Financing Options for School Construction**

A brief description of each of the major local financing types used by school districts is presented below and on the following pages.

### **General Obligation Bonds**

General Obligation Bonds are voter-approved long-term debt instruments that are secured by the legal obligation to levy and collect ad valorem property taxes sufficient to pay annual debt service on the bonds. Because general obligation bonds are secured by the taxing power of the school district, they are considered to pose the lowest risk to the investor and, therefore, provide the lowest borrowing cost to the school district of any of the financing techniques available. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using General Obligations are as follows:

#### **Advantages**

- New source of revenue.
- Least costly method of tax-exempt financing.
- Simple method of taxation results in shorter planning period.
- 55% vote with Proposition 39 permits financing of furnishings and equipment.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Requires approval of registered voters.
- Two-thirds or 55% vote required.
- Cannot finance furnishings and equipment with 2/3 vote.
- Tax reflects inequities of Proposition 13.
- 55% vote with Proposition 39 limits maximum tax, reducing amount of bonds.

### **School Facilities Improvement Districts**

Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using School Facilities Improvement Districts (SFID) are as follows:

#### **Advantages**

- New source of revenue.
- Can establish boundaries smaller than school district.
- Taxable property excludes any Mello-Roos district used to finance school facilities.

- Voters are residents within specified boundary of school facilities improvement district.
- Funding accomplished with general obligation bonds.
- 55% vote with Proposition 39 permits financing of furnishings and equipment.

### **Disadvantages**

- Requires approval of registered voters.
- Two-thirds or 55% vote required.
- Cannot finance furnishings and equipment with 2/3 vote.
- Requires board of supervisors to authorize use for all school districts in county.
- Long lead time for establishment of first tax levy.

### **Developer Fees**

Government Code Section 65995 and Education Code 17620 gave school district the ability to assess fees against new development projects. The maximum Level I fee that can be levied is currently \$2.97 per square foot for residential development and \$.47 per square foot for commercial development. Level II and III developer fees are regulated by Government Code 65995.6 and a district must conduct a Facility Needs Assessment to be able to collect these fees. Level II fees in the District are currently \$6.73 per square foot. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using developer fees are as follows:

#### **Advantages**

- New source of revenue.
- No election required.
- Can be used to fund a wide range of facilities associated with growth.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Fee is inadequate to finance full cost of school facilities.
- Revenues can only be used for facilities necessitated by new development.
- Fees collected will vary from year to year.
- Amount of revenues to be collected cannot be known with certainty.

### **Certificates of Participation (COP)**

Certificates of Participation represent a method whereby school district can raise tax-exempt funds for capital facilities without the need to obtain a vote and without the need to levy taxes on real property. Certificates of Participation represent the shares of

the investors in lease or installment purchase payments to be made by the school district and are secured by the school district's general funds and the revenues which flow into it, including unrestricted federal, state and local sources.

Unlike a GO bond or Mello-Roos bond issue, a COP is not secured by a lien on real property. They are secured by the general credit quality of the school district. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using COPs are as follows:

**Advantages**

- No election required.
- Can be used to fund a wide range of facilities and equipment.
- Funds can be obtained quickly.

**Disadvantages**

- No new revenue source created.
- Funds for payment of COPs usually come from district's general fund.

**Mello-Roos Special Tax Bonds**

Mello-Roos bonds are bonds payable from and secured by voter-approved special taxes levied within a specified geographic area (community facilities district). The special tax is secured by a lien on the land upon which the special tax is levied. The special tax is not a personal debt of the property owner. The special taxes are generally collected with and at the same time as general property taxes, although they can be collected at different times and in a different manner if circumstances require.

Mello-Roos bonds may be issued to finance the purchase, construction, expansion, improvement or rehabilitation of real or other tangible property with an estimated useful life of five or more years. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using Mello-Roos bonds are as follows:

**Advantages**

- New source of revenue.

- Can establish boundaries smaller than school district.
- Option for landowner or registered voter election.
- Can be used to fund a wide range of facilities, including furnishing, equipment, and buses.
- Flexibility in creating method of levying tax.

### **Disadvantages**

- Two-thirds vote requires.
- Requires extensive advance planning.
- Complex tax formula can be confusing for registered voter election.
- Annual administrative burden.

### **Parcel Tax**

By a vote of 2/3 of the electorate, a school district may levy a parcel tax (a specific dollar amount per parcel) on property within the District. The parcel tax has the greatest flexibility of all voter approved taxes. The funds are not restricted to a capital facility project but may be used to pay for ongoing expenses. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using parcel taxes are as follows:

#### **Advantages**

- New source of revenue.
- Can be used to fund a wide range of facilities, as well as operating expenses of a district.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Requires approval of registered voters.
- Two-thirds vote required.
- Tax must be uniform, prohibiting a tax only on new development, or taxing new development at a different rate than existing development.
- To enhance political appeal, some school districts impose expiration date on tax levy, requiring new election for continuation of tax.

### **Redevelopment Tax Increment**

According to the draft City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, the Rancho Cordova Redevelopment Plan, which was adopted in June 2006, will allow the Agency to collect tax increment revenue for the purpose of improving and redeveloping commercial and

residential areas, and supporting the production of mixed-income housing in the City. The Redevelopment Plan Area is approximately 2,500 acres in size. The proposed project area includes Folsom Boulevard, the Trade Center Drive area, the Coloma Boulevard corridor, the Zinfandel Drive corridor, the Lincoln Village area, and the area located between Old Placerville Road, International Drive, White Rock Road and Highway 50, including the Downtown area. The redevelopment Plan will be used as a tool to implement the goal and supporting policies and actions of the Economic Development Element related to redevelopment. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of using redevelopment tax increments are as follows:

#### **Advantages**

- New source of revenue.
- Can be used to fund a wide range of facilities.
- No election required.
- No additional taxes levied.
- Increasing stream of revenues.

#### **Disadvantages**

- Available only if redevelopment agency exists within school district.
- Requires “pass-through” agreement with redevelopment agency subject to limitations under State law.
- May be small amount of revenue in early years.
- Revenue potential limited by size and characteristics of redevelopment project.

#### **Developer-Built Schools**

Many districts are turning to a new approach to the lengthy process and high cost of building and funding new schools in California. Districts are having developers finance and construct new schools.

A developer-built school is a public school project where the residential developer assumes the majority of the responsibility for causing a new school to be constructed. This primarily relates to construction, but does affect most steps and processes involved

with programming, planning, designing and building a new school. The basic reasons for considering a developer built school are as follows:

For the district:

- The cost risk for the project is shifted from the school district to the developer.
- The time and effort to complete the many processes and steps to build a new school are shifted from the district to the developer.
- The risks associated with construction are shifted from the district to the developer.

For the developer:

- The costs can be actively managed by the developer; savings are assumed to be possible.
- The schedule is controlled by the developer, allowing the school to be built to promote home sales.
- Agreeing to a developer-built school can be an important step in negotiating a school mitigation agreement with the district.

According to the district architect, developer-built schools are being promoted as an innovative methodology with many of the processes remaining unchanged and the final result is not markedly different. However, when risk and responsibility are shifted from one party to another, a certain amount of control is also shifted. The district must be prepared to give up some of the decision-making responsibilities and control to the developer if this methodology is considered.

### **Summary**

Several factors must be considered prior to providing options for housing students in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District through the next 25+ school years:

- The District should apply for modernization eligibility approval from the State School Facility Program for Oak Chan Elementary School in 2009. The District will need to identify the scope and funding share for the project after the eligibility is approved.

- The District received modernization eligibility approval by the State Allocation Board on July 27, 2007, for Carl Sundahl Elementary School. The District will need to identify the scope and funding share for the project before proceeding.
- Many of the school sites in the Folsom HSAA have additional modernization needs that will have to be funded by the District, as State modernization eligibility has been used at all of the sites except for Carl Sundahl Elementary and Oak Chan Elementary.
- Measure N is providing modernization funding for all of the school sites in RC SFID 4 area. Appendix C-1 contains the scope of the work planned at the existing school sites in Rancho Cordova.
- The majority of the proposed single-family residential development in the City of Folsom is remaining within the Vista del Lago High School Attendance Area. The existing school sites contain enough capacity to house the additional students generated from residential development by the time of build-out.
- The District may need to build 22+ new school sites in the area south of Highway 50 (SFID 3) over the next 23 years depending on state, city and county agency approvals and residential development types and build-out schedules.
- Continued and ongoing coordination efforts with the developers, city, and county agencies and government officials will be necessary to evaluate and define the timing and schedule of when schools will be needed.
- The estimated total amount of funding needed to house proposed students in the SFID 3 area in the next 23 years is \$1,429,939,555.
- Land acquisition, site development and construction costs will vary due to site location, mitigation for naturally occurring asbestos, other site contamination issues, topography, engineering, soil conditions, and the economic climate.

- All costs stated in the scenarios are only estimates based on historic cost increases and are subject to change based on the economic climate at the time of construction.