



FCUSD

*Department of
Facilities and Planning*

Folsom Cordova Unified School District

**Craig Rouse
Executive Director**

Developer Fee Justification Study April 2026



**Prepared by
Folsom Cordova Unified School District
Facilities and Planning Department**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
I. Introduction	2
Purpose of Study	3
II. Background of Developer Fee Legislation	4
III. Revenue Sources for Funding School Facilities	5
State Sources	5
Local Sources	6
IV. Developer Fee Justification	8
District Capacity	8
Student Generation	8
Enrollment Projections and Development.....	9
Residential Fee Projections	10
V. Commercial/Industrial Fee Justification	11
Overview	11
Commercial/Industrial Development and Fee Projections	12
Summary	13
VI. Establishing the Cost, Benefit and Burden Nexus	14
Establishment of a Cost Nexus	14
Establishment of a Benefit Nexus	14
Establishment of a Burden Nexus	14
Statement to Identify the Purpose of the Fee	14
Establishment of a Special Account	14
Conclusion	15
Sources	16
Appendix A: State Allocation Board 2024 Fee Adjustment.....	17
Appendix B: SAB 50-02 Capacity Forms.....	20
Appendix C: Development Build-Out Estimates.....	23
Appendix D: Enrollment Projection.....	27
Appendix E: Facilities Cost Calculations.....	29
Appendix F: Commercial and Industrial Fee Justification Calculations.....	32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Education Code Section 17620 authorizes school districts to levy a fee, charge, dedication or other form of requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities provided the district can show justification for levying of fees.
- In January 2026, the State Allocation Board increased the maximum statutory fee (“Level 1”) for residential construction to \$5.38 and commercial/industrial fee to \$0.87 per square foot due to adjustments to the Class B construction cost index.
- The Folsom Cordova Unified School District will exceed its TK-12th grade State Building Program facility capacity of 23,388 pupils during the next five years.
- Each new residential unit to be constructed in the District will average 2,425 square feet and will generate an average of 0.72 TK-12th grade students. The student yield increased .05 which is largely due to the increase in Transitional Kindergarten (TK) and growth in the Folsom Planning Area.
- Based on a weighted average facilities cost of \$193,756 per student, each new residential housing unit will represent a TK-12th grade school facilities mitigation need of approximately \$139,501.
- This study finds that justification exists for levying Level I residential construction fees in the District. However, the District is currently collecting Level II residential construction fees district-wide and this justification will serve only as a parallel justification document to the School Facilities Needs Analysis.
- This study also justifies the collection of the statutory commercial industrial fee of \$0.87 per square foot for commercial/industrial construction, with mini storage at the rate of \$.51 per square foot.

I. INTRODUCTION

Education Code Section 17620 (AB 2926, Chapter 887/Statutes 1986), stipulates that “the Governing Board of any school district is authorized to levy a fee, charge, dedication, or other forms of requirement against any development project for the construction or reconstruction of school facilities.” To levy and collect developer fees, a school district must show the correlation (or “nexus”) between new residential, commercial and industrial development and the need for new school facilities.

The original fees were established in 1987 and had a maximum of \$1.50 per square foot of new residential construction and \$0.25 per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction. This maximum amount is reviewed and adjusted every two years by the State Allocation Board (SAB) and corresponds to the statewide Class B construction index. The SAB increased the maximum fee at its January 28, 2026, meeting to \$5.38 per square foot for residential and \$0.87 per square foot for commercial/industrial development (Appendix A).

Developer fees may be used to finance new schools and equipment, and to reconstruct existing facilities in order to maintain adequate housing for all the district’s students. Other legitimate uses of fees include, but are not limited to: interim housing; site acquisition; replacement of aged, inadequate portable classrooms; and housing for class-size reduction. Up to three percent of the fees collected may be used to defray the administrative costs incurred by the district in collecting these fees. Uses of the fees which are specifically prohibited by law are regular or routine maintenance of facilities, asbestos abatement incidental to construction or reconstruction and deferred maintenance programs.

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

The State School Facilities Program, which replaced the State Lease-Purchase Program, requires a match based on the cost of the project. Except in the cases where a district can establish economic “hardship” status, all new state construction projects require a district contribution of 50% of the project cost. Modernization projects require a smaller local share of 20% of the project cost. The passage of Proposition 13 (Chaptered 4/29/02) increased the district’s share for modernization projects to 40%.

The passage of SB 50 also repealed all locally imposed fees authorized by local ordinances and instituted the collection of three levels of developer fees. Level I fees are the current statutory fees (also referred to as the “Stirling Fee”) allowed under Education Code 17620. Level II developer fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.5. This code section allows a school district to impose a higher fee on residential construction if certain conditions are met. This level of developer fees is subject to a Facility Needs Analysis based on Government Code Section 65995.6. Level III developer fees are outlined in Government Code Section 65995.7. If state funding becomes unavailable, this code section authorizes a school district that has been approved to collect Level II fees to collect a higher fee based on residential construction. However, if a district eventually receives state funding, this excess fee must be reimbursed to the developers or be subtracted from the amount of state funding.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this Developer Fee Justification Report (or “nexus study”) is to comply with the provisions of Education Code Section 17620 in relation to the levy and collection of developer fees. This study will substantiate that there is a “reasonable relationship” (a nexus) between residential, commercial and industrial development projects and the cost to provide adequate school facilities for the students generated from those developments. It will identify the expected revenue derived from fees from those developments; identify other potential sources of revenue for facilities (and their viability); and the additional students projected to enroll in district schools as a result of these development projects. It will also:

- Identify the purpose of the fee;
- Identify how the fee is to be used;
- Determine how a reasonable relationship exists between the fee’s use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed; and
- Determine a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

The Folsom Cordova Unified School District is currently collecting residential developer fees at the Level II rate district wide. This Developer Fee Justification document will not affect that assessment. This document will serve as a parallel justification document to the Level II report and will justify the Level I developer fee rate for commercial/industrial construction.

II. BACKGROUND OF DEVELOPER FEE LEGISLATION

Initially, the maximum allowable developer fee was limited by Government Code Section 65995 to \$1.50 per square foot of covered or enclosed space for residential development and \$0.25 per square foot of covered or enclosed space of commercial or industrial development. In January 2026, the State Allocation Board increased the maximum fee to \$5.38 per square foot for residential construction and increased the fee for commercial/industrial construction to \$0.87 per square foot.

Assembly Bill 1600 (Chapter 927/Statutes 1987) became effective January 1, 1989, and requires school districts that establish fees based on development must make the following findings:

- 1) a cost nexus must be established;
- 2) a benefit nexus must be established; and
- 3) a burden nexus must be established.

Assembly Bill 181 (Chapter 1109/Statutes 1989) became effective October 2, 1989, and made the following clarifications to the developer fee law:

- 1) exempts residential remodels of less than 500 square feet from fees;
- 2) prohibits the use of developer fee revenue for routine maintenance and repair, most asbestos work, and deferred maintenance;
- 3) allows the fees to be used to pay for the cost of performing developer fee justification studies;
- 4) allows for the collection of fees at the time the building permit is issued if the district has established a developer fee account and funds have been appropriated for which the district has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan;
- 5) clarifies that the establishment or increase of fees is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act;
- 6) clarifies that the impact of commercial and industrial development may be analyzed in categories of development as well as on an individual project by project basis;
- 7) changes the frequency of the annual inflation adjustment on the maximum fee to every two years;
- 8) exempts from fees – development used exclusively for religious purposes, private schools, and government-owned development;
- 9) expands the definition of senior housing and requires the conversion from senior housing to be approved by the city/county after notification of the school district; and
- 10) extends the commercial/industrial fee cap to mobile home parks limited to older persons.

Assembly Bill 3228 (Chapter 1572/Statutes 1990) became effective January 1, 1991, and requires school districts adopting or increasing any fee to first hold a public hearing as part of a regularly scheduled meeting and publish notice of this meeting twice, with the first notice published at least ten days prior to the meeting.

III. REVENUE SOURCES FOR FUNDING SCHOOL FACILITIES

There are two general sources that exist for funding facility construction and reconstruction; state sources and local sources. The District has considered the following available sources:

State Sources

State School Facility Program

The Leroy Greene Lease-Purchase Act of 1976 was reformed by Senate Bill 50 in August of 1998. The new program, entitled the School Facilities Program (SFP), provides funding under a “grant” program. Funding required from the District is based on a 50-50 state/district share for new construction projects and on an 80-20 state/district share for modernization/reconstruction projects. AB 16 (chapters 15, statutes 2002) signed by the Governor as an urgency measure changes the modernization program to a 60-40 state/district share.

Since the implementation of SB 50, six statewide school bonds have been passed in the amount of \$42.48 billion. Of this amount, \$17.031 billion has been allocated to new construction projects and \$17.435 billion to modernization projects. As of January 28, 2026, there is approximately \$5,043,800 still available for new construction projects and \$7,572,000 for modernization projects.

Table 1
SB 50 State-wide School Bonds (in millions)

Proposition	Date	Bond Total (in millions)	Allocated to Construction (in millions)	Remaining Construction Funds (in millions)	Allocated to Modernization (in millions)	Remaining Modernization Funds (in millions)
1A	Nov 1998	\$ 6,700.0	\$ 2,900.0	\$ 0	\$ 2,100.0	\$ 0
47	Nov 2002	11,400.0	6,250.0	0	3,300.0	0
55	Mar 2004	10,022.5	4,965.8	1,800.0	2,250.0	0
1D	Nov 2006	7,357.5	1,900.0	0	3,300.0	0
51	Nov 2016	7,250.0	3,000.0	2,600.0	3,000.0	5,000.0
2	Nov 2024	8,500.0	2,970.0	2,443.8	3,485.0	2,572.0
Total		\$ 51,230.0	\$ 21,985.8	\$ 6,843.8	\$ 17,435.0	\$ 7,572.0

Local Sources

School District General Funds

The District’s general funds are needed by the District to provide for the operation of its instructional program. There are no unencumbered funds that could be used to construct new facilities or reconstruct existing facilities.

Developer Fee Revenue

Under the SB 50 law, districts may levy the current statutory developer fee as long as a district can justify collecting that fee. If a district desires to collect more than the statutory fee (Level II or Level III), the district must meet certain requirements outlined in the law, as well as conduct a needs assessment to enable a higher fee to be calculated. The District currently collects residential developer fees in both the Folsom and Cordova High School attendance areas at the Level II rate. Commercial and industrial fees

are being collected at the Level I statutory rate.

Local Bond Revenue

Local bond revenue of \$42.616 million was authorized by the passage of Measure J in November 1992 by the City of Folsom. The revenue was specifically earmarked for school construction and modernization projects within the boundaries of the City of Folsom. The revenue from that bond issue has been expended on the following projects: Natoma Station Elementary School, Folsom High School, facilities at Folsom Middle/Blue Ravine, and modernization at Sutter Middle School.

In November 1997, the voters within the School Facilities Improvement District (SFID 1) located in Rancho Cordova approved a \$10.4 million general obligation bond, Measure V, to be used to modernize existing schools (including installation of upgraded heating and air conditioning systems, and electrical upgrades necessary to operate computers and related technology). The District used the state modernization eligibility and filed applications for state modernization funds at 13 school sites in the Rancho Cordova area. The District has received matching share funds from the state SFP program for these projects.

An election was held in June 1999 in Folsom SFID 2 to finance additional new construction and modernization projects in Folsom schools. However, Measure C was unsuccessful, losing by a very thin margin. Another election was held in Folsom SFID 2 in May 2000 for \$38.4 million to address the facilities needs of the community and was once again unsuccessful, losing by a very thin margin.

Two general obligation bond elections were passed by voters on March 5, 2002, in the City of Folsom (SFID 2) and in Rancho Cordova (SFID 1). The Folsom bond (Measure C) provided \$53 million for Folsom schools for renovation of existing schools, construction of Sandra J. Gallardo Elementary School and Russell Ranch Elementary School, additions to Folsom High School, construction of the Folsom Middle School gymnasium, part of the cost of construction of Vista del Lago High School and installation of technology infrastructure at all school sites within Folsom. The Rancho Cordova bond (Measure B) provided \$49 million to Rancho Cordova schools for modernization of existing sites, part of the construction of Navigator Elementary School within the Villages of Zinfandel subdivision, replacement of aged portables, and installation of technology infrastructure at all school sites in Rancho Cordova.

The District ran two general obligation bonds in November of 2006; one for SFID 3 (growth south of Highway 50) and the other in SFID 4 (existing Rancho Cordova schools). Measure M was sent on to a special election in March 2007, where the voters passed a \$750 million bond for future growth in the area south of Highway 50 and east of Sunrise Boulevard. Measure N was passed by the voters in November 2006 for \$125 million for schools in Rancho Cordova.

Measure P was placed on the ballot in 2012 for SFID 4 (existing Rancho Cordova Schools). The downturn in the economy limited the District to issue only half of the bonds authorized under Measure N. The approval of Measure P allows the District to issue bonds in the amount unissued under Measure N to complete the projects outlined under Measure N. This bond measure is for SFID 4 modernization, technology upgrades and the construction of the Cordova High School performing arts theater and the auxiliary gym.

A \$195 million general obligation bond, Measure G, was passed by the voters of SFID 5 (Folsom north of Highway 50) in November 2014. Measure G provided much needed funding to modernize facilities in Folsom.

Measure R was passed by the voters of SFID 4 in November 2024 for \$144 million for existing Rancho Cordova elementary school repairs.

Measure S was passed by the voters of SFID 4 in November 2024 for \$144 million for existing Rancho Cordova secondary school repairs.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 allows school districts to establish a community facilities district in order to impose a special tax to raise funds to finance the construction of school facilities.

The developers of the Broadstone subdivision authorized a Mello-Roos district to encompass the perimeters of the Broadstone project, where homeowners pay roughly \$0.40 a square foot to the Mello-Roos district account to defray the cost of Gold Ridge Elementary, which opened in the fall of 1998. This school construction project also received additional revenue from developer fees collected within the district. The subdivision developer, Elliott Homes, receives a “credit” against the current Level II fee for prior Mello-Roos funding received.

Lottery Funds

Government Code Section 880.5 states: “It is the intent of this chapter that all funds allocated from the California State Lottery Education Fund shall be used exclusively for education of pupils and students and no funds shall be spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing research, or any other non-instructional purpose.”

IV. DEVELOPER FEE JUSTIFICATION

District Capacity

Determining capacity in accordance with the provisions of SB 50 allows districts to discount some teaching stations if they are housed in portable classrooms. The capacity of a district is equal to the baseline capacity totals used to determine eligibility for state construction funding. Adjustments have been made to the capacity for the special day class regulation change and the addition of new classrooms built since 1998 when the baseline classroom count was established per SB 50. The SAB 50-02 Capacity Analyses were approved by the State Allocation Board for both high school attendance areas, and are attached as Appendix B.

Table 2
Existing Capacity

Grade Level	1998 Baseline Capacity	Adjustment for SDC Regulation Change	Pupils Apportioned by SAB to Date*	Adjusted Capacity
<i>SFID 1 : Pupils apportioned are for the following project: Navigator Elementary.</i>				
TK-5	4,575	(200)	600	4,975
6-8	2,214	(162)	0	2,052
9-12	2,862	(216)	0	2,646
SDC	0	286	13	299
RC Total	9,651	(292)	613	9,972
<i>SFID 2 : Pupils apportioned are for the following projects: Empire Oaks Elementary School, Mangini Ranch Elementary School, Sandra Gallardo Elementary School, Folsom High School Phase 2, Folsom High School Building, Folsom High School Theater, Folsom High School Career Technical Education Building, Russell Ranch Elementary, and Vista del Lago High School.</i>				
TK-5	3,175	(125)	3,636	6,686
6-8	1,161	(54)	405	1,512
9-12	1,998	27	2,914	4,939
SDC	0	91	188	279
Folsom Total	6,334	(61)	6,530	13,416
District Total	15,985	(353)	7,143	23,388

** State Classroom Loading Summary is based on SAB 50-02 Classroom Analysis.*

The District has submitted a new construction application for Alder Creek Elementary School. The above capacity will be adjusted once the State has approved and funded the application.

Student Generation Rate

The District's student yield study was updated in January 2026 to identify the number of students anticipated to be generated by new residential development within the Folsom Cordova Unified School District. The yield factors are shown in Table 3 and the yield calculations and methodology are shown in Appendix C. The Office of Public School Construction uses a student yield factor of 0.70 per household in their eligibility calculations for the State Building Program, Folsom Cordova Unified School District yield is .72.

Table 3
District Student Yield Factors

Basis	TK-5 Student + SDC Yield Factor	6-8 Student Yield Factor	9-12 Student Yield Factor	Total Yield Factor
District-wide	0.40	0.16	0.16	0.72

Enrollment Projections and Development

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

Demand for housing in both segments of the District is supported by business expansion occurring along the Highway 50 corridor. Even though there has been a slowdown in the construction industry, residential construction has increased in the last few years, meetings with developers and the increased collection rate of developer fees shows a significant rise in the rate of construction. Appendix C includes phase-in plans for all approved subdivisions within the District.

Based on the SAB 50-01 Enrollment Certification/Projection, the District will exceed the District capacity in the next five years. The District will need to make plans to house these new students in the near future. Appendix D contains the SAB 50-01 Enrollment Projection.

Residential Fee Projections

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

To determine the cost impact of residential construction on the District, the cost to house a student in new school facilities must be identified. Table 4 shows the cost impact for new school facilities for each student generated by new residential development. Table 4 is based on state cost formulas and information obtained from the Office of Public School Construction and State Department of Education. The facilities cost calculations are included as Appendix F.

Table 4
Facility Cost per Student

Grade Level	Cost per Student
TK-5	\$ 143,704
6-8	\$ 253,862
9-12	\$ 223,753
Weighted Average	\$ 193,756

Sources: Office of Public School Construction, CDE and FCUSD.

Based on developer fees collected in the District, the average size of a new residence is approximately 2,425 square feet. Since each home generates an average of 0.72 TK-12th grade students per unit for the District to house, each home will generate 0.000296 students per square foot (0.72 students per unit divided by the average home size of 2,425 square feet). The cost to house students is \$57.34 per square foot of new residential construction (\$193,756) per student multiplied by the square foot generation factor of 0.000296). This cost impact is based on each new student requiring new facilities. In order to adjust for excess capacity in the new facilities, the residential fee has been adjusted to 20% of the calculated cost per square foot. The new per square foot residential construction fee with the 20% adjustment is \$11.46 ($\$57.34 \times .20 = \$11.46$) per square foot.

The Folsom Cordova Unified School District is justified in the levying of residential developer fees. The District is currently collecting residential developer fees at the Level II rate in both the Folsom and Rancho Cordova High school attendance areas. The Level I Developer Fee Justification document will not affect the Level II assessment for residential construction.

This document will serve as a parallel justification document to that report, and will justify the Level I developer fee rate for residential construction and the district-wide developer fee rate for commercial/industrial construction.

V. COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL FEE JUSTIFICATION

Overview

In order to levy fees on commercial and industrial development, existing law stipulates that the district "... must determine the impact of the increased number of employees anticipated to result from commercial and industrial development upon the cost of providing school facilities within the district. To make 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 or categorical basis." The passage of Assembly Bill AB 530 (Chapter 633/Statutes of 1990) modified the requirements of AB 181 by allowing the use of employee generation factors. Assembly Bill 530 allows the use of the employee generation factors identified in the San Diego Association of Governments report titled, San Diego Traffic Generators. This study which was completed in January of 1990 identifies the number of employees generated for every 1,000 square feet of floor area for several demographic categories. These generation factors are shown in Table 5.

Commercial/Industrial Development and Fee Projections

According to the 2020 United States Census of Population and Housing there are 66,906 workers over the age of 16 within the District. Of these workers, 27,756 or 42% of the workers had a commute time of 20 minutes or less. It is assumed that a commute time of less than 20 minutes indicates the person is employed and lives within the District. Based on this assumption, 42% of all new jobs in the District will be filled by employees living within the District.

However, since each employee that works and lives within the district boundaries does not represent a household, an additional adjustment is necessary. The 2020 United States Census of Population and Housing shows there were 53,344 households and 66,096 workers over the age of 16 within the District. Based on these two numbers, there is a ratio of one employee for every 1.24 households.

By multiplying the percentages of employees that will live and work in the District (42%) by the percentage of employees that represent households (1.24), a job-to-district household factor of 52.08% is identified. These calculations show that for every employee generated by new commercial and industrial development within the District, 52.08% will represent district households. Although the job-to-district household factor is 52.08%, the District has chosen to use a more conservative ratio for each category, 26.04% (50% of the 52.08% ratio), except mini-storage, is shown in Column 2 of Table 5. In the mini-storage category a higher ratio was used to more reasonably reflect the number of employee's that live and work in mini-storage facilities.

In addition, an adjustment in the formula is necessary so that students moving into new residential units that have paid residential fees are not counted in the commercial/industrial fee calculation. For this adjustment it is assumed that forty-percent (40%) of all employees in the District live in existing housing units. The forty-percent (40%) adjustment eliminates double counting the impact. This adjustment is shown in the worksheets in Appendix G and in Table 5.

Table 5 indicates the number of employees generated for every 1,000 square feet of development and the number of district households generated for every employee in eleven categories of commercial and industrial development. The number of district households is calculated by adjusting the number of employees for the percentage of employees that live in the district and are heads of households.

Table 5
Commercial and Industrial Generation Factors

Type of Development	Employees per 1000/sf Comm/Ind Dev.*	District Employees per Household	Percent of Employees in Existing Housing	Adjusted Households per Employee
Medical Offices	0.00427	0.2604	0.400	0.0004448
Corporate Offices	0.00268	0.2604	0.400	0.0002791
Commercial Offices	0.00478	0.2604	0.400	0.0004979
Lodging	0.00155	0.2604	0.400	0.0001614
Research & Development	0.00304	0.2604	0.400	0.0003166
Industrial Park	0.00168	0.2604	0.400	0.0001750
Industrial/Business Park	0.00221	0.2604	0.400	0.0002302
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	0.00362	0.2604	0.400	0.0003771
Community Shopping Centers	0.00109	0.2604	0.400	0.0001135
Banks	0.00282	0.2604	0.400	0.0002937
Mini-Storage	0.00006	0.800	0.400	0.0000192

* Per San Diego Traffic Generators Study.

The data shown in Table 6 is based on the per student costs shown in Table 4. These figures are multiplied by the student yield factor to determine the number of students generated per square foot of commercial development. To determine the school facilities square foot impact of commercial and industrial development shown in Table 6, the students per square foot are multiplied by the cost of providing school facilities.

Table 6
Commercial and Industrial Facilities Cost Impact

Type of Development	Cost Impact per Square Foot
Medical Offices	\$59.55
Corporate Offices	\$37.38
Commercial Offices	\$66.67
Lodging	\$21.62
Research & Development	\$42.40
Industrial Park	\$23.43
Industrial/Business Park	\$30.82
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	\$50.49
Community Shopping Centers	\$15.20
Banks	\$39.33
Mini-Storage	\$2.57

Source: San Diego Traffic Generators.

Table 7 includes a 20% adjustment to the costs per square foot impact illustrated in Table 6. The adjustment was made to account for existing capacity in new sites.

Table 7
Adjusted Commercial and Industrial Facilities Cost Impact

Type of Development	Cost Impact per Square Foot Adjusted by 20%
Medical Offices	\$11.91
Corporate Offices	\$ 7.48
Commercial Offices	\$13.33
Lodging	\$ 4.32
Research & Development	\$ 8.48
Industrial Park	\$ 4.69
Industrial/Business Park	\$ 6.16
Neighborhood Shopping Centers	\$10.10
Community Shopping Centers	\$ 3.04
Banks	\$ 7.87
Mini-Storage	\$ 0.51

Source: San Diego Traffic Generators.

Table 7 shows that all types of commercial and industrial development will create a square foot cost justifying a commercial/industrial fee. Thus, a reasonable relationship between commercial and industrial development and the impact on the Folsom Cordova Unified School District is shown. Based on this relationship, the levying of commercial and industrial developer fees is justified in the District. Appendix G contains the commercial/industrial calculations.

Summary

A reasonable relationship exists between commercial and industrial development in the Folsom Cordova Unified School District and the need for new school facilities. This relationship is based on the finding that the District will exceed its facility capacity in the next five years. New students to be generated by new commercial and industrial development will have to be housed in new school facilities. The cost to provide additional school facilities exceeds the amount of fees generated from residential, commercial and industrial construction. Each square foot of commercial and industrial development creates a TK-12 school facility impact ranging from \$0.51 to \$13.33 per square foot. The District is justified to collect the statutory commercial/industrial fee of \$0.87 per square foot. Mini storage fees will be collected at the rate of \$0.51 per square foot.

The Folsom Cordova Unified School District is currently collecting residential developer fees at the Level II rate in both the Folsom and Rancho Cordova High school attendance areas. This Developer Fee Justification document will not affect that assessment. This document will serve as a parallel justification document to that report, and will justify the Level I developer fee rate for residential construction and the district-wide developer fee rate for commercial/industrial construction.

VI. ESTABLISHING THE COST, BENEFIT AND BURDEN NEXUS

Establishment of a Cost Nexus

The Folsom Cordova Unified School District chooses to construct and/or reconstruct facilities for the additional students created by development in the District and the cost for providing new and/or reconstructed facilities exceeds the amount of developer fees to be collected. It is clear that when educational facilities are provided for students generated by new residential, commercial and industrial development that the cost of new facilities exceeds developer fee generation, thereby establishing a cost nexus.

Establishment of a Benefit Nexus

Students generated by new residential, commercial and industrial development will be attending district schools. Housing district students in new and/or reconstructed facilities will directly benefit those students from the new development, projects upon which the fee is imposed; therefore, a benefit nexus is established.

Establishment of a Burden Nexus

The generation of new students by development will create a need for additional and/or reconstructed school facilities. The District must carry the burden of constructing new facilities required by the students generated by future developments and the need for facilities will be, in part, satisfied by the levying of developer fees, therefore, a burden nexus is established.

Statement to Identify the Purpose of the Fee

It is a requirement of AB 1600 that the District identify the purpose of the fee. The purpose of the fees being levied shall be used for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities. The District will provide for the construction and/or reconstruction of school facilities, in part, with developer fees.

Establishment of a Special Account

Pursuant to Government Code Section 66006, the District has established a special account in which fees for capital facilities are deposited. The fees collected in this account will be expended only for the purpose for which they were collected. Any interest income earned on the fees that are deposited in such an account must remain with the principal. The school district must make specific information available to the public within 180 days of the end of each fiscal year pertaining to each developer fee fund. The information required to be made available to the public by Section 66006(b)(1) was amended by SB 1693 and includes specific information on fees expended and refunds made during the year.

CONCLUSION

The Folsom Cordova Unified School District is currently collecting residential developer fees at the Level II rate in both the Folsom and Rancho Cordova High school attendance areas. The Level I Developer Fee Justification document will not affect the residential assessment. This document will serve as a parallel justification document to that report, and will justify the Level I developer fee rate for residential construction and the district-wide developer fee rate for commercial/industrial construction.

Based on the information contained in this fee justification study, and after noting that the District has proved there is a clear “nexus” between new development in the District and the need to continue to assess fees, it is recommended that the District’s Board of Education increase the developer fee rate to the state maximum of \$0.87 per square foot for commercial/industrial development and \$0.51 per square foot for mini-storage construction.

SOURCES

California Basic Education Data System. California State Department of Education October Enrollments, 2005-2024.

California State Department of Education. California Public School Directory, 2018

California State Department of Finance. Population Research Division.

City of Folsom. Department of Planning, Inspections and Permitting. Housing Element.

County of Sacramento. Department of Planning and Community Development. Cordova Community Plan.

Martin, Sean. Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services. Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Developer Fee Justification Document, April 2024

Folsom Cordova Unified School District. Facilities Master Plan, December 2025.

Folsom Cordova Unified School District. School Facilities Needs Analysis. April 2025.

Office of Public School Construction. Leroy Green School Facilities Act, 1998.

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

United States Census 2020.

Rouse, Craig. Executive Director, Facilities Development. Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Wickham, Geri. Director of Facilities Finances and Planning. Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Appendix A

SAB 2026 Developer Fee Adjustment

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, January 28, 2026

INDEX ADJUSTMENT ON THE ASSESSMENT FOR
DEVELOPMENT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

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

DESCRIPTION

The law requires the maximum assessment for development be adjusted every two years by the change in the Class B construction cost index, as determined by the State Allocation Board (Board) in each calendar year. This item requests that the Board make the adjustment based on the change reflected using the RS Means (The Gordian Group, Inc.¹) index.

AUTHORITY

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

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

BACKGROUND

There are three levels that may be levied for developer fees. The fees are levied on a per-square foot basis. The lowest fee, Level I, is assessed if the district conducts a Justification Study that establishes the connection between the development coming into the district and the assessment of fees to pay for the cost of the facilities needed to house future students. The Level II fee is assessed if a district makes a timely application to the Board for new construction funding, conducts a School Facility Needs Analysis pursuant to Government Code Section 65995.6, and satisfies at least two of the requirements listed in Government Code Section 65995.5(b)(3). The Level III fee can be assessed if a school district meets requirements to adopt Level I fees and the Board is no longer approving apportionments for new construction due to a lack of state funds available for this

¹ Effective September 27, 2025, RS Means was transitioned under the company's unified entity, The Gordian Group, Inc.

purpose. Level III fees are intended to provide up to 100 percent of the School Facility Program new construction project cost.

STAFF ANALYSIS/STATEMENTS

A historical comparison of the assessment rates for development fees for 2022 and 2024 are shown below for information. According to the RS Means (The Gordian Group, Inc.), the cost index for Class B construction increased by 4.06 percent during the two-year period from January 2024 to January 2026, requiring the assessment for development fees to be adjusted as follows beginning January 2026:

	<u>RS Means (The Gordian Group, Inc.) Index</u> <u>Maximum Level I Assessment Per Square Foot</u>		
	<u>2022</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2026</u>
Residential	\$4.79	\$5.17	\$5.38
Commercial/Industrial	\$0.78	\$0.84	\$0.87

RECOMMENDATION

Increase the 2026 maximum Level I assessment for development in the amount of 4.06 percent using the RS Means (The Gordian Group, Inc.) Index to be effective immediately.

Appendix B

SAB 50-02, Existing Building Capacity

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EXISTING SCHOOL BUILDING CAPACITY
SAB 60-02 (Rev. 09/01) Excd (Rev. 10/28/00)

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
PAGE 1 OF 1

DISTRICT
FOLSOM-CORDOVA UNIFIED

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

67330

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA (if applicable)

Cordova HSAA

CITY
SACRAMENTO

PART I.- Classroom Inventory ☐ New ☒ Amended

Line	1	2	3	4
Line 1. Leased State Relocatable Classrooms	12			12
Line 2. Portable Classrooms Leased Less Than 5 Years				
Line 3. Interim Housing Portables Leased Less Than 5 Years				
Line 4. Interim Housing Portables Leased At Least 5 Years				
Line 5. Portable Classrooms Leased At Least 5 Years	22	1	18	41
Line 6. Portable Classrooms Owned By The District	181	81	88	330
Line 7. Permanent Classrooms	195	82	106	383
Line 8. Total				

PART II.- Available Classrooms

Line	1	2	3	4
a. Part 1, Line 4				
b. Part 1, Line 5				
c. Part 1, Line 6	22	1	18	41
d. Part 1, Line 7	181	81	88	330
e. Total a b c & d	183	82	106	371
a. Part 1, Line 8	195	82	106	383
b. Part 1 Lines 1, 2, 5 & 6 (Total only)				53
c. 25% of Part 1, Line 7				83
d. Subtract c from b (enter 0 if negative)				
e. Total, a minus d	195	82	106	383

PART III.- Determination of Existing School Building Capacity

Line	1	2	3
Line 1. Classroom capacity	4,575	2,214	2,862
Line 2. SER adjustment	275		
Line 3. Operational Grants	275		
Line 4. Greater of line 2 or 3	4,850	2,214	2,862
Line 5. Total, lines 1 & 4			

I certify, as the District Representative, that the information provided on this Form is true and correct and that:
I am designated as an authorized district representative by the governing board of the district.
I certify that this form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC).
In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC Form will prevail.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE

Matt Washburn

DATE

01/19/00

1-18-00
Post-it brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages = 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
EXISTING BUILDING CAPACITY
SAB 50-02 (NEW 12/3/98)

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION
PAGE 1 OF 1

SCHOOL DISTRICT Folsom Cordova USD

FIVE DIGIT DISTRICT CODE NUMBER (see California Public School Directory)
67330

CITY Sacramento

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA (if applicable)
Folsom High

PART I.- Classroom Inventory

1. Leased State Relocatable Classrooms (Chapter 14)

2. Portable Classrooms Leased Less Than 5 Years

3. Interim Housing Portables Leased Less Than 5 Years

4. Interim Housing Portables Leased At Least 5 Years

5. Portable Classrooms Leased At Least 5 Years

6. Portable Classrooms Owned By the District

7. Permanent Classrooms

8. Total

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
6		6	12
82	5	12	99
87	40	68	195
175	45	86	306

PART II.- Available Classrooms

Option A.

a. Part 1, Line 4

b.) Part 1, Line 5

c. Part 1, Line 6

d. Part 1, Line 7

e. Total a b c & d

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
82	5	12	99
87	40	68	195
169	45	80	294

Option B.

a. Part 1, Line 8

b. Part 1 Lines 1, 2, 5 & 6
Total

c. 25% of Part 1, Line 7

d. Subtract c from b
(enter 0 if negative)

e. total, a minus d

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
175	45	86	306
			111
			49
48	2	12	62
127	43	74	244

PART III.- Determination of Existing School Building Capacity

Line 1. Classroom Capacity

Line 2. SER adjustment

Line 3. Operational Grants

Line 4. Greater of line 2 or 3

Line 5. Total lines 1 & 4

K-6 @ 25	7-8 @ 27	9-12 @ 27	
3175	1161	1998	
191			
191			
3366	1161	1998	Total
			6525

ICF REPRESENTATIVE CERTIFICATION

certify that this form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC). In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC Form will prevail. It is understood that Government Code Section 12650 et seq. Provides for penalties including the imposition of treble damages, for making false claims against the State.

NATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE

Matt Washburn

DATE

3/26/99

Appendix C

Residential Development Build-Out Estimates

Subdivision	Type of Dev.	Total Units	Built	Unbuilt Units	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
American River Canyon 4A	SF	19	14	5	1	1	1	1	
American River Canyon 6B	SF	102	96	6	1	1	1	1	1
American River Canyon 8A	SF	20	20	-					
American River Canyon 8B	SF	25	22	3	1	1	1		
Bidwell Homes	SF	4	4	-					
Bidwell Homes	SF	1	1	-					
Bidwell Place Apartments (St. Anton)	MF	75	75	-					
Broadstone 3 - Village 1	SF	123	112	11	2	2	2	2	2
Broadstone 3 - Village 2A	SF	38	33	5	2	1			
Broadstone 3 - Village 2B	SF	124	99	25	5	3	3	3	2
Broadstone 3 - Village 3B	SF	91	91	-					
Broadstone Villas	MF	257	257	-					
Capital Village Residences	SF	225	-	225		125	100		
Easton Place	MF	1,644	-	1,644		100	100	200	200
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 32	SF	140	117	23	2	2	2	2	2
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 36A	SF	41	40	1	1				
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 36B	SF	55	54	1	1				
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 40C	SF	22	21	1	1				
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 46	SF	7	5	2	1	1			
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 48	SF	72	62	10	2	2	2	2	2
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 49B	SF	40	40	-					
Empire Ranch 2 - Village 50	SF	49	49	-					
Empire Ranch - Emblem Empire Ranch Apartments	MF	180	-	180			180		
Iron Point Apartments (Folsom Corporate)	MF	253	253	-					
Folsom Village	SF	4	-	4	4				
FPA - Bucket	MF	2,494	-	2,494		125	125	125	125
FPA - Bucket	SF	1,510	-	1,510		100	100	100	100
FPA - Broadstone Estates (Woodside)	SF	81	46	35	35				
FPA - Carr Trust	SF	28	28	-					
FPA - Creekside Apartments	MF	187	187	-					
FPA - Folsom Heights	SF	405	-	405		50	50	50	55
FPA - Folsom Heights-Veranda	SF	125	-	125		50	50	25	
FPA - Hillsborough Lot 5	MF	320	-	320		320			
FPA - Hillsborough Lot 6	SF	240	-	240		60	60	60	60
FPA - Mangini Ranch - Folsom Ranch Rental Community (near	MF	238	119	119					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph 1 - 1C North V1	SF	100	88	12	12				
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph 1 - 1C North V2	SF	41	41	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph 1 - 1C North V3	SF	35	35	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 - 1C North V4	SF	115	115	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph 1 - Bungalows (Southpointe-Sendero)	SF	136	36	100	25	25	25	25	
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph 1 - Mangini Ranch Apts (Southpointe)	MF	278	278	-					

Subdivision	Type of Dev.	Total Units	Built	Unbuilt Units	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1	MF	109	25	84	25	25	34		
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 - St Anton Apts.	MF	152	152	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V1 - Azure	SF	108	108	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V10 - Creekstone	SF	71	71	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V2 - Dakota	SF	98	98	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V3 - Brookstone	SF	49	49	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V4 - Waterstone	SF	86	86	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V5 - Brookstone	SF	87	87	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V6 -	SF	116	116	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V7 -	SF	108	108	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V8 - Oakleaf	SF	78	78	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph1 V9 - Copperwood	SF	103	103	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 - Alder Creek Apts	MF	265	-	265	100	165			
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V1	SF	88	88	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V10 - Rockcress	SF	118	118	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V2	SF	74	74	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V3	SF	53	53	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V4	SF	73	73	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V5	SF	83	25	58	20	9			
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V6	SF	70	52	18	18				
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V7	SF	68	68	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph2 V8	SF	36	36	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V1	SF	102	92	10	10				
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V2	SF	80	70	10	10				
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V3	SF	36	31	5	5				
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V4	SF	42	42	-					
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V5	SF	111	-	111	20	20	20	20	11
FPA - Mangini Ranch Ph3 V6	SF	70	-	70	20	20	10		
FPA - Mangini Ranch Phase 1 (Arcadian Heights)	SF	112	-	112	20	20	20	20	12
FPA - Parcel 68	SF	184	-	184			50	50	50
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V1 - Golden Hills	SF	52	52	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V2 - Gold Hill	SF	25	25	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V3 - Silver Crest	SF	26	26	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V4 - Steel Canyon	SF	114	114	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V5 - Silver Crest	SF	41	41	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V6 - Iron Ridge	SF	43	43	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V7 - Silver Crest	SF	41	41	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph1 V8 - Iron Ridge	SF	52	52	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph2 V1	SF	33	33	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph2 V2	SF	79	79	-					

Subdivision	Type of Dev.	Total Units	Built	Unbuilt Units	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph2 V3	SF	63	63	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph2 V4	SF	96	96	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph2 V5	SF	118	50	68	50	18			
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph3A	SF	132	132	-					
FPA - Russell Ranch Ph3B	SF	110	96	29	4				
FPA - The Enclave	SF	111	107	4	4				
FPA - Toll Brothers	AA	1,011	575	436	150	136			
FPA - Toll Brothers (Preserve at FR Phase 3B)	SF	76	44	32	32				
FPA - Toll Brothers (Preserve at FR Phase 3A)	SF	135	97	38	26				
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V1A)	SF	106	-	106		56	50		
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V1B)	SF	101	-	101		50	51		
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V1C)	SF	124	-	124		50	50	24	
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V2A)	SF	93	-	93			50	43	
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V2B)	SF	71	-	71			50	21	
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V3A)	SF	135	-	135				50	50
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V3B)	SF	25	-	25					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V4A)	SF	31	-	31					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V4B)	SF	63	-	63					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V5)	SF	47	-	47					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V6)	SF	99	-	99					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V7A)	SF	58	-	58					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V7B)	SF	81	-	81					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V8A)	SF	105	-	105					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V8B)	SF	27	-	27					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V8C)	SF	96	-	96					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V9A)	SF	62	-	62					
FPA - Toll Brothers (at Alder Creek V9B)	SF	103	-	103					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V1	SF	93	93	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V2	SF	29	29	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V3	SF	52	52	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V4	SF	50	50	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V5	SF	21	21	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V6	SF	24	24	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V7	SF	40	40	-					
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V8	SF	42	31	11	6	5			
FPA - White Rock Springs Ranch V9	SF	44	44	-					
Glenborough at Easton	MF	1,266	-	1,266			200		
Glenborough at Easton	SF	1,973	-	1,973		100	100	200	200
Harrington Gardens- Low Income (Folsom)	MF	52	-	52	52				
Kassis Property - Trumark Homes RC/Folsom Blvd.	MF	252	-	252		252			

Subdivision	Type of Dev.	Total Units	Built	Unbuilt Units	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Kassiss Property - Trumark Homes RC/Folsom Blvd.	SF	189	-	189		50	50	50	39
Kilgore Apartments	MF	240	240	-		120	120		
Kilgore Townhomes	SFA	177	88	89	88	89			
La Collina dal Lago	SF	38	32	6	2	2	2		
North Douglas - Village 2	SF	80	79	1	1				
North Douglas - Village 7B	SF	66	65	1	1				
Peterson Place - Oak & Blue Ravine	MF	72	72	-					
Persifer St. - Habitat for Humanity	SF	10	10	-					
Rio Del Oro - Easton	MF	1,092	-	1,092				200	
Rio Del Oro - Easton	SF	5,912	-	5,912	50	50	50	50	50
Rio Del Oro - Easton	SFA	1,000	-	1,000			50	50	50
Rio del Oro - Elliott (Bucket)	MF	1,456	-	1,456			100		200
Rio del Oro - Elliott (Bucket)	SF	1,373	-	1,373	75	75	75	75	75
Rio del Oro - Elliott (Bucket)	SFA	-	-	-					
Rio Del Oro - Elliott Parcels (67 & 68)	SF	253	168	85	45	40			
Rio Del Oro - Elliott White Rock (Parcel 66)	SF	132	36	96	48	48			
Rio Del Oro - Elliott (Parcel 78)	SF	843	-	843	75	75	75	75	75
Sibley Street Rezone (1014)	SF	10	10	-					
Stone Creek - Veranda	SF	163	163	-					
Stone Creek Village	SF	128	107	21	30	21			
Stone Creek Village Apartments	MF	151	-	151		75	76		
Sunrise Crossing Affordable - St. Anton RC	MF	84	84	-					
Terra Loma Condos	MF	11	-	11		11			
The Preserve (north Douglas)	SF	440	248	192	64	64	64		
The Residences at Capital Center	MF	240	60	180	60	60	60	60	
The Residences at Capital Center	SFA	177	44	133	44	44	44	45	
Trinity Woods Estates	MF	21	-	21		21			
Veteran's Village Phase 4	MF	70	-	70					
Vivi Living Rancho Cordova (Double Tree Hotel conversion to MF)	MF	158	158	-					
Westborough at Easton	MF	3,044	-	3,044					
Westborough at Easton	SF	4,086	-	4,086					50
Totals		42,213	8,155	34,073	1,251	2,740	2,253	1,629	1,411

Appendix D

SAB 50-01 Enrollment Projection

ENROLLMENT CERTIFICATION/PROJECTION

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

SAB 50-01 (Rev. 09/04) Excel (Rev. 2/27/2003)

Page 3 of 3

SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

FOLSOM-CORDOVA UNIFIED

67330

COUNTY

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

SACRAMENTO

21

Part A. Enrollment Data - (districts or county superintendent of schools)

	3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current
Grade	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
K	1,374	1,608	1,774	1,964
1	1,427	1,314	1,386	1,368
2	1,461	1,474	1,425	1,444
3	1,494	1,502	1,551	1,510
4	1,460	1,496	1,621	1,623
5	1,501	1,490	1,588	1,678
6	1,521	1,483	1,588	1,656
7	1,503	1,569	1,592	1,629
8	1,408	1,534	1,622	1,619
9	1,671	1,661	1,763	1,891
10	1,656	1,688	1,705	1,781
11	1,659	1,645	1,700	1,716
12	1,487	1,606	1,608	1,658
TOTAL	19,622	20,070	20,923	21,537

Part B. Pupils Attending Schools Chartered By Another District

	3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current

Part C. Continuation High School - (districts only)

Grade	3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current
9		1	1	1
10	8	5	8	6
11	70	51	39	42
12	77	115	93	85

Part D. Special Day Class Pupils - (districts or county superintendent of schools)

Elementary	Non-Severe	Severe	Secondary	Non-Severe	Severe
MR			MR		
HH			HH		
DEAF			DEAF		
HI			HI		
SLI	241	181	SLI	117	128
VI			VI		
SED			SED		
OI			OI		
OHI			OHI		
SLD			SLD		
DB			DB		
MH			MH		
AUT			AUT		
TBI			TBI		
TOTAL	241	181	TOTAL	117	128

Part E. Special Day Class Enrollment - (county superintendent of schools only)

3rd Previous	2nd Previous	Previous	Current

Part F. Number of New Dwelling Units

16325

Part G. District Student Yield Factor

0.720

Part H. Five Year Projected Enrollment - School Facility Program

Projections - (except special day class pupils only)

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
19,132	4,862	10,851	34,845

Projections - special day class pupils only

Elementary	Non-Severe	Severe	Secondary	Non-Severe	Severe
MR			MR		
HH			HH		
DEAF			DEAF		
HI			HI		
SLI	335	252	SLI	134	146
VI			VI		
SED			SED		
OI			OI		
OHI			OHI		
SLD			SLD		
DB			DB		
MH			MH		
AUT			AUT		
TBI			TBI		
TOTAL	335	252	TOTAL	134	146

Part I.**One Year Projected Enrollment - State Relocatable Program**

Projections - (except special day class pupils only)

K-6	7-8	9-12	TOTAL
11,806	3,386	7,387	22,579

Projections - (special day class pupils only)

(includes Severe & Non-Severe)

	Elementary	Secondary		Elementary	Secondary
MR			OI		
HH			OHI		
DEAF			SLD		
HI			DB		
SLI	443	253	MH		
VI			AUT		
SED			TBI		
			TOTAL	443	253

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

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

If the district is requesting an augmentation in the enrollment projection pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.42 (b), the local

planning commission or approval authority has approved the tentative subdivision map used for augmentation of the

enrollment and the district has identified dwelling units in that map to be contracted. All subdivision maps used for

augmentation of enrollment are available at the district for review by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC).

This form is an exact duplicate (verbatim) of the form provided by the Office of Public School Construction.

In the event a conflict should exist, then the language in the OPSC form will prevail.

SIGNATURE OF DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE

DATE

Appendix E

Cost Per Student Calculations

Weighted Cost Per Student

"Based on the following school facility construction charts"

COST PER STUDENT		WEIGHTED AVERAGE	\$193,756
Elementary School (TK-5) Facility Construction Costs			
I. Allowable Building Area	Student Capacity/Bldg. Area	744 students @ 95sf/student	70,680
	Building Area	Speech/Resource Specialist	600
	Total Allowable Building Area:		<u>71,280</u>
II. Site Requirements	Purchase Price of Property	10 acres @ \$870,000/acre	\$8,700,000
	Appraisals, Costs Incurred in Escrow		35,000
	Surveys, Geo and Soils Reports, Other Costs		75,000
	Total-Acquisition of Site:		<u>\$8,810,000</u>
III. Plans	Architect's Fee for Plans		\$2,000,000
	DSA, CDE Plan Check Fees		250,000
	Preliminary Testing, Energy Cons, Advertising, Other Costs		45,000
	Total Plan Cost:		<u>\$2,295,000</u>
IV. Construction Requirements	Off-site Development, Utility Services, Service Site, General Construction		\$5,000,000
			66,100,000
	Total Construction Requirements:		<u>\$71,100,000</u>
	Total Items II, III and IV		<u>\$82,205,000</u>
	Contingency 10%		6,610,000
	Inspection, Special Inspections and Testing		1,000,000
	TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS		<u>\$89,815,000</u>
	ESTIMATED COST PER STUDENT		<u>\$143,704</u>
Middle School (6-8) Facility Construction Costs			
I. Allowable Building Area	Student Capacity/Bldg. Area	1200 students @ 83sf/student	99,600
	Building Area	Speech/Resource Specialist	1,360
	Total Allowable Building Area:		<u>100,960</u>
II. Site Requirements	Purchase Price of Property	22.2 acres @ 870,000/acre	\$19,314,000
	Appraisals, Costs Incurred in Escrow		95,000
	Surveys, Geo and Soils Reports, Other Costs		50,000
	Total-Acquisition of Site:		<u>\$19,459,000</u>
III. Plans	Architect's Fee for Plans		\$3,500,000
	DSA, CDE Plan Check Fees		456,000
	Preliminary Testing, Energy Cons, Advertising, Other Costs		50,000
	Total Plan Cost:		<u>\$4,006,000</u>
IV. Construction Requirements	Off-site Development, Utility Services, Service Site, General Construction		\$10,323,000
			175,000,000
	Total Construction Requirements:		<u>\$185,323,000</u>
	Total Items II, III and IV		<u>\$208,788,000</u>
	Contingency 10%		17,500,000
	Inspection, Special Inspections and Testing		2,187,500
	TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS		<u>\$228,475,500</u>
	ESTIMATED COST PER STUDENT		<u>\$253,862</u>

High School (9-12) Facility Construction Costs			
I. Allowable Building Area	Student Capacity/Bldg. Area	1800 students @ 104sf/student	218,400
	Building Area	Speech/Resource Specialist	4,000
	Total Allowable Building Area:		<u>222,400</u>
II. Site Requirements	Purchase Price of Property	55.4 acres @ 870,000/acre	\$48,198,000
	Appraisals, Costs Incurred in Escrow		35,000
	Surveys, Geo and Soils Reports, Other Costs		<u>50,000</u>
	Total-Acquisition of Site:		<u>\$48,283,000</u>
III. Plans	Architect's Fee for Plans		\$11,000,000
	DSA, CDE Plan Check Fees		800,000
	Preliminary Testing, Energy Cons, Advertising, Other Costs		<u>100,000</u>
	Total Plan Cost:		<u>\$11,900,000</u>
IV. Construction Requirements	Off-site Development, Utility Services, Service Site, General Construction		\$25,761,000
			<u>325,000,000</u>
	Total Construction Requirements:		<u>\$350,761,000</u>
	Total Items II, III and IV		\$410,944,000
	Contingency 10%		32,500,000
	Inspection, Special Inspections and Testing		4,062,500
	TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS		<u>\$447,506,500</u>
	ESTIMATED COST PER STUDENT		<u>\$223,753</u>

Appendix F

Commercial and Industrial Justification

**Folsom Cordova Unified School District
Commercial/Industrial Fee Justification 2026**

HH/EMPLOYEES	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Type of Development	Employees Per 1000/sf Comm/Ind.*	District Employees/ Household (HH)	Percent Employees in Existing Housing	District HH per Employee (B * C)	Adj. HH per Employee (A * D)
MEDICAL	0.00427	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0004448
CORPORATE OFFICE	0.00268	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0002791
COMMERCIAL OFFICE	0.00478	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0004979
LODGING	0.00155	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0001614
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	0.00304	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0003166
INDUSTRIAL PARK	0.00168	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0001750
INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK	0.00221	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0002302
NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING	0.00362	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0003771
COMMUNITY SHOPPING CNTR	0.00109	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0001135
BANKS	0.00282	0.2604	0.400	0.104	0.0002937
MINI-STORAGE	0.00006	0.800	0.400	0.320	0.0000192

* Per San Diego Traffic Generator Report

STUDENTS PER SQUARE FOOT (Yield Factors multiplied by Adjusted HH/Employee)					
Type of Development	Adj. HH per Employee	TK-5 Students/sf	6-8 Students/sf	9-12 Students/sf	Total Students/sf
MEDICAL	0.0004448	0.000178	0.000071	0.000071	0.000320
CORPORATE OFFICE	0.0002791	0.000112	0.000045	0.000045	0.000201
COMMERCIAL OFFICE	0.0004979	0.000199	0.000080	0.000080	0.000358
LODGING	0.0001614	0.000065	0.000026	0.000026	0.000116
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	0.0003166	0.000127	0.000051	0.000051	0.000228
INDUSTRIAL PARK	0.0001750	0.000070	0.000028	0.000028	0.000126
INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK	0.0002302	0.000092	0.000037	0.000037	0.000166
NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING	0.0003771	0.000151	0.000060	0.000060	0.000271
COMMUNITY SHOPPING CNTR	0.0001135	0.000045	0.000018	0.000018	0.000082
BANKS	0.0002937	0.000117	0.000047	0.000047	0.000211
MINI-STORAGE	0.0000192	0.000008	0.000003	0.000003	0.000014

COSTS PER SQUARE FOOT (Students/sf multiplied by Student Cost in Each Category)					
Type of Development	Total Students/sf	TK-5 Cost/sf	6-8 Cost/sf	9-12 Cost/sf	Total Cost/sf
MEDICAL	0.000320	\$25.57	\$18.07	\$15.92	\$59.55
CORPORATE OFFICE	0.000201	\$16.05	\$11.34	\$9.99	\$37.38
COMMERCIAL OFFICE	0.000358	\$28.62	\$20.22	\$17.82	\$66.67
LODGING	0.000116	\$9.28	\$6.56	\$5.78	\$21.62
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	0.000228	\$18.20	\$12.86	\$11.34	\$42.40
INDUSTRIAL PARK	0.000126	\$10.06	\$7.11	\$6.26	\$23.43
INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK	0.000166	\$13.23	\$9.35	\$8.24	\$30.82
NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING	0.000271	\$21.67	\$15.32	\$13.50	\$50.49
COMMUNITY SHOPPING CNTR	0.000082	\$6.53	\$4.61	\$4.06	\$15.20
BANKS	0.000211	\$16.88	\$11.93	\$10.52	\$39.33
MINI-STORAGE	0.000014	\$1.10	\$0.78	\$0.69	\$2.57

STUDENT YIELD	
TK-5 + SDC	0.40
6-8	0.16
9-12	0.16
	0.72

COST PER STUDENT	
TK-5	\$143,704
6-8	\$253,862
9-12	\$223,753

COSTS PER SQUARE FOOT ADJUSTMENT					
Type of Development	Total Cost/sf	Adjustment	Adj. Fee		
MEDICAL	\$59.55	20%	\$11.91		
CORPORATE OFFICE	\$37.38	20%	\$7.48		
COMMERCIAL OFFICE	\$66.67	20%	\$13.33		
LODGING	\$21.62	20%	\$4.32		
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	\$42.40	20%	\$8.48		
INDUSTRIAL PARK	\$23.43	20%	\$4.69		
INDUSTRIAL/BUSINESS PARK	\$30.82	20%	\$6.16		
NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING	\$50.49	20%	\$10.10		
COMMUNITY SHOPPING CNTR	\$15.20	20%	\$3.04		
BANKS	\$39.33	20%	\$7.87		
MINI-STORAGE	\$2.57	20%	\$0.51		