

SDFA

SPECIAL DISTRICT
FINANCING & ADMINISTRATION

437 W. Grand Avenue, Escondido CA 92025
Tel: 760.233.2630 | Fax: 760.233.2631

Etiwanda School District Community Facilities Districts

FEE JUSTIFICATION REPORT

For Residential & Commercial/Industrial Development

MAY 2020



PREPARED FOR:
Etiwanda School District
6061 East Avenue
Etiwanda, CA 91739
Tel: 909 • 899 • 2451
Contact: Doug Claffin



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Introduction	1
The Etiwanda School District	1
Synopsis of District Growth & Student Capacity	1
Legislative History	3
Methodology.....	4
Data Sources.....	4
Residential Development	5
Existing Facilities Capacity and Current Enrollment.....	5
Future Residential Unit Projections	5
Student Generation Rates.....	7
Students Generated By New Development.....	8
School Facilities Required to Serve New Development	8
Estimated School Facilities Costs	9
Interim Housing and Administrative Support.....	10
Total Estimated Cost per Student	11
School Facilities Impact per Dwelling Unit	11
Commercial/Industrial Development	13
School Facilities Impacts from Commercial/Industrial.....	13
Estimated Number of Employees per Square Foot.....	13
Estimated Number of Employees Living & Working within the School District....	14
Estimated Household Rate per Resident Worker.....	16
School Facilities Cost from Commercial/Industrial Development.....	17
Commercial/Industrial Development Impact.....	18
Impacts from Senior Housing	20
Redevelopment	21
Conclusions & Statement of Findings	22
Appendices	23

- Appendix A: CBEDS Enrollment
- Appendix B: School Capacity
- Appendix C: Development Projections
- Appendix D: Student Generation Rate Summary
- Appendix E: School Facilities Cost Estimates
- Appendix F: Census Data; Employment & Housing Estimates

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
Table 1	<i>FY 2019/20 Student Enrollment</i>	2
Table 2	<i>Existing School Facilities Capacity</i>	5
Table 3	<i>Projected Future Residential Units</i>	6
Table 4	<i>Mitigated Developments</i>	6
Table 5	<i>Unmitigated Developments</i>	7
Table 6	<i>Student Generation Rate for Elementary & Middle School Pupils</i>	8
Table 7	<i>Student Generation for Elementary & Middle School Pupils</i>	8
Table 8	<i>School Facilities Required for New Development (Unmitigated)</i>	9
Table 9	<i>Estimated Facilities Costs Per School Site</i>	9
Table 10	<i>Estimated Facilities Costs (Excluding Interim Housing & Admin. Facilities)</i>	9
Table 11	<i>Costs for Interim Housing & Administrative Support Facilities</i>	10
Table 12	<i>Total Estimated Facilities Costs</i>	10
Table 13	<i>Total Facilities Costs Per Pupil</i>	11
Table 14	<i>Total Facilities Costs Per Residential Unit</i>	11
Table 15	<i>Jurisdictional Fee Allocation - Residential Development</i>	12
Table 16	<i>Comparison of Facilities Costs to Authorized Fees</i>	12
Table 17	<i>Region-wide Employment Per 1000 SqFt by Development Type</i>	14
Table 18	<i>Estimated Resident Employees within the FRC Census Area</i>	15
Table 19	<i>Resident Employee Generation Factors by Development Type</i>	16
Table 20	<i>Household Rate for FRC Area</i>	16
Table 21	<i>Household Generation for Commercial/industrial Land Uses</i>	17
Table 22	<i>Gross School Facilities Impact for Commercial/industrial Land Use</i>	18
Table 23	<i>Net Facilities Deficit after Collecting Maximum Residential Fees</i>	18
Table 24	<i>Non-Residential Facilities Deficit After Collection of Residential Impact Fee</i>	19
Table 25	<i>Jurisdictional Fee Allocation -- Commercial/Industrial Development</i>	20

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Fee Justification Report (“Report”) for Residential and Commercial/Industrial Development has been prepared by Special District Financing & Administration (“SDFA”) for the purpose of identifying the impact of projected future development on the school facilities of the Etiwanda School District (“ESD” or “District”), the ability of the District’s current facilities to accommodate the impact, and the extent to which projected demand exceeds the District’s current facilities capacity as well as quantify the costs associated with meeting the increased demand.

Specifically, this Report is intended to provide the Board of Trustees of the District with the required information to make the necessary findings set forth in Government Code Section 66001 et seq. and in accordance with Government Code Section 65995 et. seq, to support the District’s collection of its fair share of the statutory fees allowed by the State of California, which for unified districts (K-12) is currently \$4.08 per square foot of new residential development and \$0.66 per square foot of new commercial/industrial development. The ESD is a school district providing both elementary and middle school facilities to students living within portions of the Cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga as well as unincorporated portions of San Bernardino County. Pursuant to its fee sharing agreement between the ESD and the Chaffey Joint Union High School District and assuming this report is adopted the ESD is currently authorized to collect \$2.82 per square foot of new residential construction and \$0.46 per square foot of new commercial/industrial construction.

The findings contained in this Report include the following:

- *The District currently has school capacity to house approximately 12,530 students.*
- *As of October 2, 2020, current enrollment, including Special Day Class students, is approximately 14,033 students resulting in a current capacity deficit of 1,503 seats.*
- *According to the District’s current development estimate, approximately 4,000 new dwelling units are anticipated to be constructed within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Etiwanda School District within the next decade. Of these units, approximately twelve percent (12%) have mitigated the impact of their development through participation in a community facilities district, a negotiated fee payment or some other mitigation measure (“Mitigated Developments”).*
- *Historical data indicates that more than four elementary/middle school students are generated from every ten single-family detached homes constructed.*
- *At least one new (115%) elementary schools and almost one-half (47%) of a new middle school will need to be constructed in order to provide adequate facilities to house students to be generated solely from currently unmitigated developments*

expected during the next twenty years. The estimated cost of these school facilities, excluding interim housing requirements and central administrative support, is over \$60 million dollars.

- *Considering the cost of interim housing and administrative support, the total cost of school facilities results in a cost of approximately \$39,477 per elementary school student and approximately \$58,615 per middle school student. Thus, estimated school facilities cost per new dwelling unit equates to approximately \$18,444.*
- *Based largely on the weighted average home size of dwelling units constructed within the ESD during the past five years, the average size of dwelling units expected to be constructed in the future was determined to be 2,563 square feet. Based upon this average square footage, the District would need to collect approximately \$7.20 per square foot of new residential development to mitigate the school facilities impacts. This amount is well in excess of the amount that can currently be collected by the District (i.e., the District's current allowed fee of \$2.82 per square foot) and permitted by State Statute. Thus, the District is justified in collecting the statutory fees for residential development as permitted by state law.*
- *Utilizing estimates regarding employee generation and associated residential household generation provided by the San Diego Association of Governments ("SANDAG"), it was determined that the District would need to collect between \$0.85 and \$17.07 per square foot of commercial/industrial development to mitigate the gross school facilities impacts resulting from new non-residential development. This amount is well in excess of the amount currently authorized to be collected by the District assuming this report is adopted (i.e., the District's current allowed maximum fee amount is \$0.46 per square foot) and permitted by State Statute. Thus, the District is justified in collecting the statutory fees for commercial/industrial development as permitted by state law.*
- *Absent additional state or local funding, the District will not be able to provide adequate school facilities for new residential, commercial or industrial developments within the boundaries of the District, which are currently unmitigated.*

Section

One

INTRODUCTION

This Section of the Report sets forth the legislative requirements as well as the methodology and the data sources utilized in the analysis of the District’s school facilities impact. Also included in this Section is a brief description of the ESD, its current student enrollment and its current capacity.

The Etiwanda School District

The ESD is a political subdivision of the State of California and is represented by approximately 38 square miles and includes portions of the Cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga as well as unincorporated areas of the County of San Bernardino. Specifically, its western boundary is generally represented by Milliken Avenue extending to the foothills in the north and down to Foothill Boulevard to the south. The southernmost portion of the ESD is largely represented by commercial/industrial zoned property located between the Day Creek channel to the west and East Avenue to the east; Foothill Boulevard on the north and Fourth Street to the south. The eastern portion of the District includes properties located just east of Interstate 215 that are largely within the City of Fontana. Specifically, the eastern boundary of the ESD is generally represented by Lytle Creek Road (north of Baseline) and Cherry Avenue between Baseline and Foothill Boulevard.

The District was established in 1883 and is currently governed by five board members elected at large from within the boundaries of the District. The ESD, along with five other school districts provide education for grades K-8 and serves as a feeder district to the Chaffey Joint Union High School District (CJUHSD). The District currently operates thirteen elementary schools (grades K-5), and four middle schools (grades 6-8). District administrative offices are currently located at 6061 East Avenue, Etiwanda, CA 91739.

Synopsis of District Growth & Student Capacity

During the past ten years, the District has experienced significant student growth as well as accompanying demographic changes both in terms of ethnicity and economic diversity. With the development of several master-planned communities as well as other projects, the last decade has seen continuous growth. During the ten-year period from 2010 to 2019, District enrollment went up by over ten percent (10%).

Student enrollment for 2019-20 by grade level is as follows:

*Table 1
FY 2019/20 Student Enrollment ⁽¹⁾*

Grade Level	Current Enrollment ⁽²⁾
Kindergarten ⁽³⁾	1,724
First	1,417
Second	1,421
Third	1,483
Fourth	1,506
Fifth	1,501
Sixth	1,564
Seventh	1,675
Eighth	1,742
Total 2019/20 Enrollment	14,033

(1) Reflects enrollment as of October 2, 2019, the California Student Information System (CSIS) enrollment Information Day.

(2) Includes Special Day Class students and well Home Study/Home Hospital pupils.

(3) Includes Transitional Kindergarten pupils as well.

According to California Student Information Services (“CSIS”), enrollment figures show that the total student population is over 14,000 students. For purposes of calculating current enrollment and capacity the District utilized enrollment and capacity computations as identified on the CSIS Enrollment and Current School Capacity worksheets, attached as Appendix “A” and “B” respectively. The Current School Capacity worksheet indicates that the District’s current school facilities are sufficient to house 8,475 elementary and 4,055 middle school students. A comparison of current student enrollment to current capacity demonstrates that the District is severely impacted and lacks excess capacity to accommodate students from new developments.

Based on a review of housing estimates set forth in the most recent planning documents of the cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga, it is anticipated that the District will continue to experience additional growth in the future. Specifically, current growth estimates of the cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga indicate that some additional housing development within the area, and more particularly within the jurisdictional boundaries of the ESD, will continue during the next few years. Thus, as the District’s current facilities are inadequate to house additional students beyond its current enrollment and the future dwelling units to be constructed within Mitigated Developments, additional facilities must be added to provide capacity for students that will be generated from new non-mitigated development.

Since 1989, the District and the development community have entered into various mitigation agreements in order to ensure the timely construction of school facilities to house students from new development (Mitigated Development). The primary financing mechanism authorized in the mitigation agreements is the formation of a community facilities district (CFD). The District can then issue bonds to construct school facilities with repayment of the bonds being accomplished through the levy of a special tax on properties within the CFDs. These developments which are

subject to the special tax are considered Mitigated Developments as they have provided significant funding and support to the ESD facilities program since 1989. Nevertheless, increased student generation within existing developments as well as new residential construction for which a mitigation agreement does not exist continues to cause the District to operate with inadequate school facilities.

Legislative History

School districts have historically relied upon state funds and local bond measures to provide funding for the acquisition and construction of new school facilities. Prior to the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, a school district's share of local property taxes was typically sufficient to build necessary schools to accommodate new development. The rapid increase in real estate prices within California during the 1970's and 1980's ensured that revenues would expand as the "ad valorem" tax base grew. However, limitations on the growth of this funding source were significantly constrained by the passage of Proposition 13 which limited annual increases in assessed values of real estate, except in the case of ownership transfers, to two percent (2%). This action, combined with a compounding need for new construction monies, caused significant hardships in many school districts during the early 1980's.

In 1986 the state legislature attempted to address this funding shortfall through the enactment of Assembly Bill 2926 ("School Fee Legislation") which provided for the imposition of development fees on new residential and commercial/industrial construction. The School Fee Legislation provides that development fees are to be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit. Furthermore, no city or county is authorized to issue a building permit for new residential or commercial/industrial projects unless it first certifies with the appropriate school districts that the developer of the project has complied with the development fee requirement.

Shortly thereafter, AB 1600 ("Mitigation Fee Act") was enacted by the state legislature which took effect on January 1, 1989. Government Code Section 66001 Et. Seq. sets forth the requirements for establishing, imposing and increasing development fees initially authorized under AB 2926. Specifically, the Mitigation Fee Act requires that a reasonable relationship or "nexus" exist between the type and the amount of a development fee imposed and the cost of the benefit to be derived from the fee. Specifically, Section 66001 of the Government Code with respect to the imposition of development fees provides, in pertinent part, that any action establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee on new development shall do all the following:

- *Identify the purpose of the fee.*
- *Identify the use to which the fee is to be put.*
- *Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.*
- *Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.*

The development fees are currently authorized under Education Code Section 17620 and are \$4.08 per square foot of new residential construction and \$0.66 per square foot of new commercial/industrial development (for K-12 school districts). These development fees will next be increased by the SAB in 2020 and every two years thereafter.

Methodology

In order to determine the impact of new residential development on ESD facilities the relationship between the construction of a new residential dwelling unit and its impact on the demand for school facilities must be identified. For residential development this determination includes the following:

- *Projecting the number of future residential dwelling units to be constructed within ESD boundaries.*
- *Calculating a student generation rate (i.e., students expected to be generated from each new home) for each dwelling unit type (SFD, SFA and Multi-Family).*
- *Determining the number of students to be generated from new development.*
- *Identifying the “per student cost” for new elementary and middle school facilities.*
- *Multiplying the per student costs for elementary and middle school facilities by the student generation rate for each dwelling unit type.*

The methodology for determining the impact of new commercial/industrial development is similar. However, instead of determining the number of students to be generated per new dwelling unit, the focus is on the number of students generated per employee. This Report utilizes, in part, employee generation factors derived from the Traffic Generator’s Guide prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) last updated in April of 2002, as well as certain 2006-2011 worksite and household census data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau as part of its American Community Survey.

Data Sources

The primary information required to establish a nexus between new development and school facilities impacts include residential housing projections, employment impacts from new commercial/industrial development, historical student generation rates and facilities cost estimates. Primary information sources regarding future housing projections include housing and population estimates contained in various planning documents of the cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga, certain employment, housing and population data derived from 2010 Census data as well as recent estimates of future development prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) as well as the planning department of the City of Rancho Cucamonga and Fontana. As previously indicated, data for determining commercial/industrial impacts was prepared by SANDAG. Student generation rates for this Report were calculated by SDF. Facilities cost estimates were prepared using cost information obtained from the District’s Facilities Department.

Section

Two

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

This Section of the Report identifies the school facilities impact from new residential construction.

Existing Facilities Capacity and Current Enrollment

Prior to examining the school facilities impacts from new development, the District’s current capacity and enrollment were reviewed to identify existing facilities that may be available to house future students. As summarized in Appendix “B”, the District has determined that its existing school building capacity is approximately 8,475 elementary school and 4,055 middle school seats. As shown in Table 1, CBEDS enrollment figures for 2019/2020 reflect 9,052 elementary school and 4,981 middle school students. The resulting capacity deficit is shown in Table 2.

*Table 2
Existing School Facilities Capacity*

School & Pupil Type	2019/20 Capacity ⁽¹⁾	2019/20 Enrollment	Existing Seat Surplus/(Deficit)
Elementary	8,475	9,052	(577)
Middle	4,055	4,981	(926)
Total	12,530	14,033	(1,503)

(1) Includes Permanent Facilities & Interim Facilities.

In addition to the current facilities deficit indicated in Table 2, because the most recently constructed schools were financed, in part, by special taxes imposed upon Mitigated Developments located in close proximity, a portion of these school facilities are largely reserved for students located within these areas. As these master-planned communities continue to develop, seats currently occupied by existing students that live outside the Mitigated Developments will increasingly be needed to serve the needs of the Mitigated Developments. The displaced students will need to be relocated to other new or existing school facilities.

Future Residential Unit Projections

The ESD anticipates adopting its School Facilities Needs Analysis (SFNA) concurrently with this Report. For the SFNA, an estimate of “Future Dwelling Units” was prepared which identified expected near-term ESD development utilizing, in part, approved tentative tract map information obtained from the cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga. For this report, that five-year projection of future development has been supplemented with approximately 3,850 future mitigated dwelling units expected to be constructed within the District within the next twenty

years. A worksheet setting forth estimated future unmitigated dwelling units is included in Appendix “C”.

Specifically, for the land area of the ESD that lies within the City of Fontana, estimated future development consists primarily of the currently undeveloped portions of the Westgate Specific Plan as well as some additional in-fill in western Fontana. The District conservatively estimates that an additional 2,500 single-family dwelling units will be constructed within the next two decades. For remaining undeveloped property within the City of Rancho Cucamonga and its sphere of influence that lies to the northern portion of the City, the District assumed that approximately 1,500 additional dwelling units will be constructed in unmitigated developments and an additional 358 dwelling units will be constructed in CFD No. 2005-1 (Richland-Pinehurst). On a longer-term basis, the District believes that additional dwelling units located within the City of Rancho Cucamonga will largely be the result of redevelopment and small in-fill projects.

Table 3 shows the aggregate existing and future dwelling units expected to be developed for both Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga as determined pursuant to the estimates just discussed.

Table 3
Projected Future Residential Units

Jurisdictional Area	Future SFD Dwelling Units	Future SFA Dwelling Units	Future Apt Dwelling Units	Total Future Dwelling Units ⁽¹⁾
City of Fontana	2,500	0	0	2,500
City of Rancho Cucamonga	1,000	300	200	1,500
Aggregate Dwelling Units	3,500	300	200	4,000

(1) Represents the District’s estimate of future development based on a review of planning documents of the two relevant planning departments.

As previously indicated, a number of future dwelling units have been and will continue to be constructed within master-planned communities and other in-fill areas which are considered Mitigated Developments because they have already mitigated their school impacts through the formation of a community facilities district or some other ‘in-lieu-of’ consideration. These units are considered part of Mitigated Developments and therefore, both their impact on school facilities and their mitigation payments are excluded from the fee calculation in this Report. A summary of these projects is shown below:

Table 4
Mitigated Developments ⁽¹⁾

Jurisdiction	CFD / Mitigation	Future SFD Dwelling Units	Future SFA Dwelling Units	Future Apt Dwelling Units	Total Future Dwelling Units
Rancho Cucamonga	CFD 2005-1	358	0	0	358
Rancho Cucamonga	CFD 2018-1 ⁽²⁾	0	136	0	136

(1) Future Planned Residential Projects with Existing Mitigation.

(2) This CFD is represented by a single project being developed by DR Horton as Daycreek Square. Of the 380 dwelling units expected at buildout, 136 units were unpermitted as of 01/01/2020 and designated as a future mitigated dwelling unit for this report.

Thus, the estimated single-family detached, single-family attached and multi-family units for the remaining Unmitigated Developments (i.e., the total new dwelling units in Table 3 less the mitigated dwelling units in Table 4) is shown in Table 5. As the communities within the ESD mature, it is likely that additional infill projects and a natural progression towards increased density will cause these numbers to increase over time.

Table 5
Unmitigated Developments ⁽¹⁾

Jurisdiction	Project Description	Future SFD Dwelling Units	Future SFA Dwelling Units	Future Apt Dwelling Units	Total Future Dwelling Units
Fontana	Westgate Specific Plan & In-fill	2,500	0	0	2,500
Rancho Cucamonga	North Etiwanda SP and In-fill	642	164	200	1,006
Totals		3,142	164	200	3,506

(1) Future Planned Residential Projects currently without mitigation.

(2) Represents the difference between the total future dwelling units shown in Table 3, less identified future mitigated dwelling units as shown in Table 4.

Student Generation Rates

To establish a nexus between anticipated future residential development and a corresponding need for additional school facilities, the number of future students anticipated to be generated from the new residential development must be determined. This calculation often results in a student generation rate or factor, which represents the number of students, or portion thereof, expected to attend District schools from each new house. To accurately determine the cost of school facilities impacts a student generation rate for each dwelling unit type (i.e., SFD, SFA and Apartments) is required because different product types generate a different number of students per dwelling unit than others.

The calculation of student generation rates (SGRs) by SDFA was determined by matching student addresses to property addresses within the boundaries of the District. Specifically, enrollment data was matched to property characteristics data provided by the County of San Bernardino. The property characteristics data contained the unit count and developed square footage for all developed property located within the Tax Rate Areas (TRAs) that correspond to the boundaries of the ESD.

The prescribed methodology established for conducting a SFNA requires that SGRs be derived from dwelling units constructed within the previous five-year period. On behalf of the ESD, SDFA computed both district-wide and five-year SGRS and the District determined that for the purpose of projecting future students likely to be generated from the District's near-term development projection, the SGRs derived from the last five years of development were most appropriate. While the "five-year" constraint is not imposed on the requirements related to the preparation of a Developer Fee Justification Study (DFJS), the District elected to apply the "five-year SGRs to this study as well. A summary of the SGRs is contained in Appendix "D".

The student generation rates for both elementary and middle school students are reflected in Table 6.

*Table 6
Student Generation Rates for Elementary & Middle School Pupils*

Dwelling Type	Dwelling Units ⁽¹⁾	Elementary Pupils (Grades K-5)		Middle School Pupils (Grades 6-8)	
		Students	Generation Rates	Students	Generation Rates ⁽²⁾
Single-Family Detached	714	216	0.3025	89	0.1246
Single-Family Attached	84	7	0.0833	4	0.0476
Apartments	306	73	0.2386	32	0.1046
Total/Weighted Average	1,104	296	0.2681	125	0.1132

(1) With the exception of Apartments, figures shown reflects permitted dwelling units for the period beginning January 1, 2014 and ending December 31, 2018 only; D/Us permitted on or after January 1, 2019 as shown in Table 3 were excluded from the SGR calculations as many of these D/Us are unlikely to be sold, occupied, and producing students that are enrolled in the ESD as of October 2, 2019 (i.e., the CSIS information day).

(2) Rounded to the nearest ten-thousandth.

Students Generated by New Development

The number of students estimated to be generated from future Unmitigated Development is determined by multiplying the projected number of future unmitigated SFD, SFA and Apt units (Table 5) by the corresponding generation rates (Table 6). This computation is reflected in Table 7:

*Table 7
Student Generation for Elementary & Middle School Pupils*

Housing Product Type	Unmitigated Dwelling Units	Elem. School Student Generation Rate	Middle School Student Generation Rate	Aggregate Student Generation Rate	Elementary School Students	Middle School Students	Total Students
SFD	3142	0.3025	0.1246	0.4271	951	392	1,343
SFA	164	0.0833	0.0476	0.1309	14	8	22
Apt	200	0.2386	0.1046	0.3432	48	21	69
Totals/Avg.	3,506				1,013	421	1,434

School Facilities Required to Serve New Development

In order to determine the number of schools, or portions thereof, required to serve students to be generated from new development; the aggregate student generation rate shown in Table 9 is divided by the school capacity (i.e., design population). Table 8 shows the number of new elementary schools required to serve new development:

Table 8
School Facilities Required for New Development (Unmitigated)

School Type	School Capacity	New Students	Required Facilities ⁽¹⁾
Elementary	884	1,013	1.15
Middle	903	421	0.47

(1) Required sites shown have been truncated to the nearest hundredth.

Estimated School Facilities Costs

To calculate the cost for elementary school facilities, SDFA relied on actual historical costs and current estimates of costs associated with the construction of recent school facilities. These numbers reflect the District’s estimate of land acquisition and construction costs, furniture & equipment costs and technology. The design populations of the District’s most recently constructed schools were incorporated into these estimates.

The estimated costs for elementary and middle school facilities are contained in Appendix “E”. The resulting facilities costs per school site, including acquisition and site development are shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Estimated Facilities Costs Per School Site

School Type	Site Acquisition/ Development	Construction ⁽¹⁾	Total Cost
Elementary	\$4,368,000	\$27,740,606	\$32,108,606
Middle	\$7,971,600	\$41,678,947	\$49,650,547

(1) Includes plans, tests and inspections, furniture and equipment, technology and other items.

The aggregate facilities cost impact from new, Unmitigated Development is determined by multiplying the per site costs shown in Table 9 by the required number of sites reflected in Table 8. This resulting impact is shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Estimated Facilities Costs (Excluding Interim Housing & Admin. Facilities)

School Type	Required Schools ⁽¹⁾	Site Acquisition/ Development	Construction ⁽²⁾	Total Cost
Elementary	1.15	\$5,023,200	\$31,901,697	\$36,924,897
Middle	0.47	3,746,652	19,589,105	23,335,757
Totals		\$8,769,852	\$51,490,802	\$60,260,654

(1) Rounded to the nearest hundredth. Aggregate facilities costs shown do not reflect this truncation.

(2) Includes plans, tests and inspections, furniture and equipment, technology and other items.

Interim Housing and Administrative Support

In addition to elementary school facilities, new development imposes additional facilities impacts on school districts. Because development fees are collected at the time a building permit is issued, funds to provide facilities accumulate over a period of time and revenues, particularly when other local or state funds are not available, are not sufficient to build a school when development so warrants. The solution to this problem is most often addressed through “interim housing” in which the District purchases or leases relocatable classrooms that are used to temporarily alleviate overcrowding at existing school sites. The ESD has determined that it costs the District approximately \$2,226 per elementary school and \$2,386 per middle school student to provide interim housing until new facilities are available.

Additional central administrative facilities and support is also required as new students place incremental demands on school administration. The District has determined that \$800 for each new student is necessary to provide for corresponding central administrative facilities. The estimated total cost of interim housing and central administrative facilities is shown in Table 11.

*Table 11
Costs for Interim Housing & Administrative Support Facilities*

Pupil Type	Future Students	Per Pupil Costs		Total
		Interim Housing ⁽¹⁾	Administrative Support ⁽¹⁾	
Elementary	1,013	\$2,226	\$800	\$3,065,338
Middle	421	\$2,386	\$800	1,341,306
Total	1,434			\$4,406,644

(1) Rounded to the nearest dollar.

Thus, the estimated total cost of school facilities (Table 10) and ancillary facilities (Table 11) necessary to accommodate students generated from new residential development is shown in Table 12:

*Table 12
Total Estimated Facilities Costs*

School Type	School Facilities	Interim Housing	Administrative Support	Total Cost
Elementary	\$36,924,897	\$2,254,938	\$810,400	\$39,990,235
Middle	23,335,757	1,004,506	336,800	24,677,063
Total	\$60,260,654	\$3,259,444	\$1,147,200	\$64,667,298

Total Estimated Cost per Student

The estimated facilities cost for each elementary and middle school student is derived by dividing the corresponding school facilities costs for by the respective number of students expected to be generated from new residential development. The per-pupil costs for interim housing and administrative support (Table 11) are added to the per pupil school facilities cost to determine the total per student facilities costs for middle and elementary school facilities. The total estimated per pupil facilities costs are shown below:

Table 13
Total Facilities Costs per Pupil

School Type	School Facilities Cost	Future Students	Per Pupil Costs ⁽¹⁾			
			School Facilities	Interim Housing	Administrative Support	Total Cost
Elementary	\$36,924,897	1,013	\$36,451	\$2,226	\$800	\$39,477
Middle	23,335,757	421	\$55,429	\$2,386	\$800	\$58,615
Composite ⁽²⁾	\$60,260,654	1,434	\$42,023	\$2,273	\$800	\$45,096

(1) Rounded to the nearest dollar.

(2) Reflects a weighted average based upon the anticipated number of students to be generated from future development.

School Facilities Impact per Dwelling Unit

The total estimated facilities cost for each new residential SFD and MF unit is determined by multiplying the facilities costs per student (Table 13) by the applicable student generation rates (Table 6) and is shown below:

Table 14
Total Facilities Costs per Residential Dwelling Unit

Per Pupil Cost	Future Unmitigated Dwelling Units	Future Unmitigated Pupils	Student Generation Rate ⁽¹⁾	Facilities Cost Per Dwelling Unit ⁽²⁾
\$45,096	3,506	1,434	0.4090	\$18,444

(1) Determined by dividing total future pupils by future unmitigated dwelling units, Rounded to the nearest ten-thousandth.

(2) Reflects a weighted average based upon anticipated number of SFD, SFA and Apartment units to be constructed (composite facilities cost per dwelling unit is equal to total facilities cost for school type divided by total dwelling units to be constructed).

The average size of all unmitigated dwelling units currently expected to be constructed within the ESD (SFD, SFA and Apartment) is 2,563 square feet as shown in Appendix “C”. Dividing the total facilities cost per dwelling unit of \$18,444 by the average size of a dwelling unit yields a school facility cost of \$7.20 per square foot.

This Report demonstrates that the school facilities impact amount per square foot equals \$7.20 for all new residential development within the boundaries of the District. Thus, there is full

justification for collecting the District’s share of the maximum statutory developer fee allowed of \$4.08 per square foot of new residential development.

As previously indicated, the current statutory development fee authorized by Government Code Section 65995 (b)(1) for new residential construction is \$4.08 per square foot for unified school districts. Based on the District’s student generation rates, actual costs to provide school facilities and the average square footage for new dwelling units, the District, as outlined above, would need to levy approximately \$7.20 per square foot to actually provide the school facilities necessitated by new residential development. Since the District’s school facilities impact per square foot is greater than the maximum statutory fee allowed under Government Code Section 65995 (b)(1), the District actually suffers unmitigated impacts from new residential development, which not only supports the collection of the statutory development fee for residential developments, but also those fees for new commercial/industrial development as provided for in Section Three of this Report.

In addition, Education Code Section 17623 provides that non-unified school districts having a common jurisdiction, such as a high school district and feeder elementary schools, must determine how to distribute the development fee among the school districts if the combined fees to be collected exceed the maximum amount authorized under Government Code Section 65995 (b)(1). Therefore, ESD has entered into an agreement with the Chaffey Joint Union High School District specifying the amount of the development fee it will collect from new residential developments as follows:

*Table 15
Jurisdictional Fee Allocation -- Residential Development*

Fees to be Collected by ESD	Fees to be Collected by CJUHSD	Total Statutory Fee Collected Per Govt Code Section 65995
\$2.82 per square foot	\$1.26 per square foot	\$4.08 per square foot

Table 16 identifies the facilities costs per dwelling unit and on a square foot basis -- the facilities cost per square foot, the amount allowed to be collected by ESD and the net fee deficit for new development. As can be seen, the amount required is more than 250% of the maximum amount that can be collected (\$2.82) by the ESD:

*Table 16
Comparison of Facilities Cost to Currently Authorized Fee*

Facilities Cost Per Dwelling Unit	Average Sqft of Dwelling Unit	Facilities Cost Per Sqft	Current Fee Per Sqft	Fee Deficit Per Sqft
\$18,444	2,563	\$7.20	\$2.82	(\$4.38)

Section

Three

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

This Section of the Report identifies the school facilities impact from new commercial and industrial development.

School Facilities Impacts from Commercial/Industrial

Just as the District is required to establish the impact of new residential development on student enrollment and a corresponding need for additional school facilities, a similar nexus must be established between new commercial/industrial development and the corresponding need for additional school facilities. The four-step methodology used to quantify the impact of commercial/industrial development on student enrollment is discussed in this section of the report and is summarized as follows:

1. *Determine the number of employees required per square foot for specific types of commercial and industrial development (i.e. new jobs created within the school district).*
2. *Determine the number of new employees that would both live and work within the school district.*
3. *Determine the number of occupied housing units that would be associated with new employees.*
4. *Determine the number of new students generated from these employees utilizing the estimated student generation rates.*

Estimated Number of Employees per Square Foot

Because the utilization of commercial and industrial buildings varies significantly, in order to estimate the number of employees and hence, the number of school age children generated by employees, it is important that the relationship between the size of any commercial/industrial development and its associated employee base, be established for various development or land use types. To do this, the ESD relied on survey results published in SANDAGs report entitled Traffic Generators Guide. This Traffic Generators Guide reflects data gleaned from a site-specific employment inventory of diverse developments throughout San Diego County. Multiple sites for eighteen different development types are included in the survey data and the square

footage and number of employees has been averaged for each development type yielding the average number of employees per 1,000 square feet as shown in the following table:

Table 17
Region-wide Employment Per 1000 Square Feet by Development Type ⁽¹⁾

Development Type	Square Feet of Dev. Type	Total Employees	Employees per 1,000 Square Feet ⁽²⁾
Specialized Recreation	19,850	9	0.453
Lodging (Hotel/Motel)	162,343	184	1.133
Discount Retail Club	128,629	215	1.671
Commercial Strip Center	27,667	50	1.807
Regional Shopping Center	1,496,927	2,778	1.855
Car Dealers	28,433	57	2.005
Industrial Parks (No Commercial)	351,266	733	2.087
Community Shopping Center	200,442	432	2.155
Industrial Plants (Mult. Shift)	443,000	1,121	2.530
Neighborhood Shopping Center	69,509	178	2.561
Corporate Office (Single User)	127,331	342	2.686
Banks	9,203	26	2.825
Scientific Research & Development	221,184	673	3.043
Industrial/Business Parks	276,218	972	3.519
Medical Offices	22,507	96	4.265
Commercial Offices (>100,000 sqft)	144,800	625	4.316
Commercial Offices (<100,000 sqft)	27,100	130	4.797
Restaurants	5,267	48	9.113

(1) Source: SANDAG Publication, *Traffic Generators Guide*.

(2) $Employees/1000\ Square\ Feet = Total\ Employment/Square\ Feet\ of\ Each\ Type$

Estimated Number of Employees Living & Working within the School District

In order to determine the minimum number of students that will be generated as a result of new commercial/industrial development, an estimate of the number of employees (i.e., parents of the children expected to attend schools within the District) that will both work and live within the District must be determined. To make this determination, SDFA relied on 2000 Census data and worksite information provided by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Specifically, SDFA obtained employment and population estimates for both the City of Fontana and the City of Rancho Cucamonga. Tabulations of the worksite and population estimates are contained in Appendix “F”.

The US Census Bureau estimated that based on the 2006-2010 American Consumer Survey, there were a total of 124,105 employees working within the cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga (the “FRC Census Area”). The census data also contains “place of residence” information for these employees. The following table identifies the residential employee generation rate (REGR) for the two cities, which is determined by dividing the total number of employees within the FRC Census Area by the total number of employees that *both live and work* within the boundaries of FRC Census Area.

Table 18
Estimated Resident Employees within the FRC Census Area ⁽¹⁾

Jurisdiction	Total Employees	Place of Residence			Pct of Employees Residing in Fontana or Rancho Cucamonga
		Fontana	Rancho Cucamonga	Other	
Fontana	59,610	17,825	3,175	38,610	35.23%
Rancho Cucamonga	64,495	2,419	12,342	49,734	22.89%
Total	124,105	20,244	15,517	88,344	28.82%

(1) Source: 2006-2010 American Community Survey EEOC Worksite Data as tabulated by the US Census Bureau.

Because the census data does not identify a place of residence which corresponds solely to the jurisdictional boundaries of the ESD, it was assumed that the REGR for the FRC Census Area would produce a close approximation of the actual REGR for the ESD. This assumption is reasonable because the commercial and industrial development characteristics of areas outside of the ESD but within the jurisdictional boundaries of the FRC Census Area are similar to those of commercial and industrial developments within the boundaries of the ESD.

It should be noted that by considering only those employees that both live and work within the ESD (as expressed by the REGR), the District is being conservative in its estimate of the impact of commercial/industrial development on student enrollment because the methodology identified herein does not take into account any students who may attend schools within the District as a result of Education Code Section 48204 (i.e., inter-district transfers). Section 48204 of the Education Code permits employees working within the school district who do not reside within the boundaries of the school district to request that their children be permitted to attend a school within the boundaries of the District in which they work. The census data suggests that approximately seventy-one percent (71%) of FRC Census Area workers commute from outside of the FRC Census Area to their jobs. Many of these workers living outside of but working within the FRC Census Area could request that their children be transferred into the ESD on the basis of employment.

Nevertheless, by multiplying the number of employees per thousand square feet as shown in Table 17 by the REGR computed for the FRC Census Area, one can derive a REGR for the various commercial/industrial development types. The following table indicates that for every thousand square feet of new commercial or industrial development, expected residential employee generation ranges from a low of 0.131 employees for Specialized Recreation to a high of 2.626 employees for *Restaurants*.

Table 19
Resident Employee Generation Factors by Development Type

Development Type	Employees per 1,000 Square Feet	Residential Employment Generation Rate	Resident Employee Per 1,000 Square Feet
Specialized Recreation	0.453	.2882	0.131
Lodging	1.133	.2882	0.327
Discount Retail Club	1.671	.2882	0.482
Commercial Strip Center	1.807	.2882	0.521
Regional Shopping Center	1.856	.2882	0.535
Car Dealers	2.005	.2882	0.578
Industrial Parks (No Commercial)	2.087	.2882	0.601
Community Shopping Center	2.155	.2882	0.621
Industrial Plants (Mult. Shift)	2.530	.2882	0.729
Neighborhood Shopping Center	2.561	.2882	0.738
Corporate Office (Single User)	2.686	.2882	0.774
Banks	2.825	.2882	0.814
Scientific Research & Development	3.043	.2882	0.877
Industrial/Business Parks	3.519	.2882	1.014
Medical Offices	4.265	.2882	1.229
Commercial Offices (>100,000 sqft)	4.316	.2882	1.244
Commercial Offices (<100,000 sqft)	4.797	.2882	1.382
Restaurants	9.113	.2882	2.626

Estimated Household Rate per Resident Worker

In order to quantify the impact of these residential workers on the District, two additional relationships must be established. The first of these is the number of households per resident worker. Utilizing census data of occupied housing within the FRC Census Area, SDFA identified the household rate (i.e., the number of occupied housing units per residential worker) to be 0.3525

Table 20
Household Rate for FRC Census Area

FRC Census Area Component	Resident Workers (Either City)	Occupied Housing Units	Household Rate ⁽¹⁾
City of Fontana	20,244	47,253	42.84%
City of Rancho Cucamonga	15,517	54,194	28.63%
Aggregate FRC Census Area	35,761	101,447	35.25%

Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey of Housing Information as Published by the California Dept. of Finance.
(1) Household Rate = Occupied Housing Units/ Resident Workers

By applying the household generation rate for the FRC Census Area of .3525 to the Resident Employee Generation Factors shown in Table 19, housing units required per employee for each commercial/industrial land use category can then be determined. Expected household generation per thousand square feet of commercial/industrial development appears in the following table:

*Table 21
Household Generation for Commercial/Industrial Land Uses*

Development Type	Residential Employees Per 1,000 Square Feet	Household Generation Rate	District Households Per 1,000 Square Feet
Specialized Recreation	0.131	.3525	0.046
Lodging	0.327	.3525	0.115
Community Shopping Center	0.442	.3525	0.156
Discount Retail Club	0.482	.3525	0.170
Commercial Strip Center	0.521	.3525	0.184
Regional Shopping Center	0.535	.3525	0.188
Car Dealers	0.578	.3525	0.204
Industrial Parks (No Commercial)	0.601	.3525	0.212
Industrial Plants (Mult. Shift)	0.729	.3525	0.257
Neighborhood Shopping Center	0.738	.3525	0.260
Corporate Office (Single User)	0.774	.3525	0.273
Banks	0.814	.3525	0.287
Scientific Research & Development	0.877	.3525	0.309
Industrial/Business Parks	1.076	.3525	0.379
Medical Offices	1.229	.3525	0.433
Commercial Offices (>100,000 sqft)	1.330	.3525	0.469
Commercial Offices (<100,000 sqft)	1.382	.3525	0.487
Restaurants	2.626	.3525	0.926

School Facilities Cost from Commercial/Industrial Development

Since the school facilities cost per new dwelling unit was already identified in Table 14, by applying the total cost per dwelling unit to the district household generation shown in Table 21, the gross school facilities impact of commercial/industrial development can be determined. Since it is not possible to know how many employees of any given development type will choose to live in single-family detached, single-family attached, or multi-family housing, the composite cost per dwelling unit for all unit types of \$18,444 is used. The resulting facilities cost per square foot is shown in Table 22 and ranges from \$0.85 to \$17.07 per square foot of development.

Table 22

Gross School Facilities Impact for Commercial/Industrial Land Uses

Development Type	District Households Per Sqft. Of Non-Res. Dev.	School Facilities Cost Per Dwelling Unit	Gross Facilities Cost Per Sqft of Commercial/Industrial Development
Specialized Recreation	0.000046	\$18,444	\$0.85
Lodging	0.000115	\$18,444	\$2.12
Discount Retail Club	0.000170	\$18,444	\$3.13
Commercial Strip Center	0.000184	\$18,444	\$3.39
Regional Shopping Center	0.000189	\$18,444	\$3.48
Car Dealers	0.000204	\$18,444	\$3.76
Industrial Parks (No Commercial)	0.000212	\$18,444	\$3.91
Community Shopping Center	0.000219	\$18,444	\$4.04
Industrial Plants (Mult. Shift)	0.000257	\$18,444	\$4.74
Neighborhood Shopping Center	0.000260	\$18,444	\$4.80
Corporate Office (Single User)	0.000273	\$18,444	\$5.03
Banks	0.000287	\$18,444	\$5.29
Scientific Research & Development	0.000309	\$18,444	\$5.70
Industrial/Business Parks	0.000357	\$18,444	\$6.59
Medical Offices	0.000433	\$18,444	\$7.99
Commercial Offices (>100,000 sqft)	0.000438	\$18,444	\$8.09
Commercial Offices (<100,000 sqft)	0.000487	\$18,444	\$8.99
Restaurants	0.000926	\$18,444	\$17.07

Commercial/Industrial Development Impact

As noted, the school facilities impact shown above represents the total cost to provide school facilities required to serve new students resulting from the construction of new commercial/industrial development. This amount reflects the gross impact of such development and does not take into account the impact fees already collected from new residential construction. Nor does it consider that as new commercial/industrial development occurs, some portion of the new employees will be housed in existing housing (from which no additional residential impact fee may be collected). The following table shows the *net facilities* impact remaining assuming that the currently authorized maximum statutory fee (Level II Fee) was collected from all new residential development:

Table 23

Net Facilities Deficit after Collecting Maximum Residential Fees

Net Facilities Fee Component	Statutory Level I Fee	Alternative Level II Fee
Residential School Fee Amount	\$2.82	\$3.09
Weighted Average Sqft of Dwelling Unit	2,563	2,563
True Facilities Costs Per Dwelling Unit	\$18,444	\$18,444
Fee from New Residential Development ⁽¹⁾	\$7,228	\$7,920
Fee Deficit Per D/U after collecting Residential Fee	\$11,216	\$10,524

(1) Fee Amounts shown reflect amount set forth in this report, if adopted, as well as the Level II fee set forth in the SFNA dated, May 2020, if adopted.

By multiplying the “fee deficit per D/U” for the two fee scenarios shown in Table 23 by the District Households Per Sqft of Non-Residential Development for each of the development types as shown in Table 24, we see the net facilities cost remaining after collection of the various statutory residential fee alternatives. For example, assuming that Level II Fees are imposed at \$3.09 a square foot the “net facilities deficit” for the non-residential development type classified as “Car Dealers” would be \$2.14 per square foot (i.e., Deficit per D/U after Payment of Level II Fees of \$10,524 multiplied by 0.000204).

Please note that the “net facilities deficit” assumes that all employees lived in new residential housing within the ESD for which the current Level II Fee had been paid and thus, the remaining facilities mitigation obligation for such employees would have been reduced to its theoretical minimum. In reality, many of the employees would be living in housing constructed prior to 1998 when Level II Fees were first introduced or even prior to 1986, when Level I Fees were authorized by statute. For employees living in ESD housing constructed prior to 1986, the “gross” facilities impact from new non-residential construction as shown in Table 22 is what would be required to fully mitigation the impact of the new non-residential development.

*Table 24
Non-Residential Facilities Deficit After Collection of Residential Impact Fee*

Development Type	District Households Per Sqft of Non-Res. Dev.	Unfunded Impact Per Sqft After Collection of Impact Fee	
		Statutory Level I Fee	Alternative Level II Fee
Specialized Recreation	0.000046	\$0.52	\$0.48
Lodging	0.000115	\$1.29	\$1.21
Discount Retail Club	0.000170	\$1.90	\$1.79
Commercial Strip Center	0.000184	\$2.06	\$1.93
Regional Shopping Center	0.000189	\$2.11	\$1.98
Car Dealers	0.000204	\$2.28	\$2.14
Industrial Parks (No Commercial)	0.000212	\$2.38	\$2.23
Community Shopping Center	0.000219	\$2.46	\$2.30
Industrial Plants (Mult. Shift)	0.000257	\$2.88	\$2.71
Neighborhood Shopping Center	0.000260	\$2.92	\$2.74
Corporate Office (Single User)	0.000273	\$3.06	\$2.87
Banks	0.000287	\$3.22	\$3.02
Scientific Research & Development	0.000309	\$3.47	\$3.25
Industrial/Business Parks	0.000357	\$4.01	\$3.76
Medical Offices	0.000433	\$4.86	\$4.56
Commercial Offices (>100,000 sqft)	0.000438	\$4.92	\$4.61
Commercial Offices (<100,000 sqft)	0.000487	\$5.47	\$5.13
Restaurants	0.000926	\$10.38	\$9.74

Thus, assuming that *all* employees working in new non-residential developments within the District also reside in new housing within the District and the District was collecting the current maximum Alternative Fee (Level II) of \$3.09 per square foot from each home, a fee deficit *after collecting the maximum statutory fee for residential development* would still range between \$0.48 (Specialized Recreation) and \$9.74 (Restaurants) per square foot of new non-residential development.

Thus, based on ESD’s currently authorized share of the non-residential fee (i.e., \$0.46 per square foot of non-residential development), assuming that every employee within the ESD also resided within the ESD and was housed in a dwelling unit for which the maximum Alternative Fee for residential and the statutory non-residential fee was collected, a net facilities funding deficit would still remain for all commercial/industrial development types, except for Specialized Recreation.

And as previously mentioned, this analysis does not consider inter-district transfers attributable to parental employment pursuant to Education Code Section 48204. Section 48204 of the Education Code permits employees working within the school district who do not reside within the boundaries of the school district to request that their children be permitted to attend a school within the boundaries of the District in which they work. For any of these pupils, the District will have collected no corresponding residential development impact fees.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995(b)(2), a unified school district is authorized to collect \$0.66 per square foot of for new commercial/industrial development. As previously indicated, Education Code Section 17623 provides that non-unified school districts having a common jurisdiction, such as a high school district and feeder elementary schools, must determine how to distribute the development fee among the school districts if the combined fees to be collected exceeds the maximum amount authorized under Government Code Section 65995 (b)(1), currently \$0.66 per square foot for new commercial/industrial development. For all the commercial/industrial development types shown in Table 22, ESD is justified in levying the maximum fee for unified school districts of \$0.66 per square foot. However, ESD has entered into an agreement with the CJUHSD specifying the amount of the development fee it will collect from new commercial/industrial developments as follows:

*Table 25
Jurisdictional Fee Allocation -- Commercial/Industrial Development*

Fees Collected by ESD	Fees Collected by CJUHSD	Total Statutory Fee Collected Per Government Code § 65995
\$0.46 per square foot	\$0.20 per square foot	\$0.66 per square foot

Impacts from Senior Housing

As it relates to the imposition of developer fees upon senior citizen housing projects, Section 65995.1(a) of the Government Code reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, as to any development project for the construction of senior citizen housing, as described in Section 51.3 of the Civil Code, a residential care facility for the elderly as described in subdivision (j) of Section 1569.2 of the Health and Safety Code, or a multilevel facility for the elderly as described in paragraph (9) of subdivision (d) of Section 15432, any fee charge, dedication or other requirement that is levied under Education Code Section 17620 may be applied only to new construction and is subject to the limits and conditions applicable to under subdivision (b) of Section 65995 in the case of commercial or industrial development.

The District acknowledges that students will not reside in senior citizen housing units. However, the development of such housing generally generates jobs for facilities maintenance and administration, and in the case of assisted care living situations, health professionals. These jobs may be filled by persons living either within the boundaries of the District or outside the boundaries of the District. In either case, the employees may enroll their students in the District. As, a result some students may be generated as a result of the development of new senior citizen housing.

The District conducted a survey of senior citizen housing projects within the District- both assisted-care and independent-living facilities and as a result of applying the methodology used to quantify the impacts of commercial and industrial development as set forth in this report, determined that the expected facilities cost per exceeded senior housing was \$0.89. Thus, the District acknowledges Section 65995.1 and will levy its share of developer fees on any senior citizen housing projects at the current commercial/industrial rate of \$0.46 per square foot.

Redevelopment

Redevelopment means the voluntary demolition of existing residential dwelling units or commercial or industrial construction and the subsequent construction of new residential dwelling units ("Redevelopment").

The District anticipates Redevelopment projects, more specifically, the demolishing of existing residential dwelling units replaced with new residential dwelling units, within the next five-year period. In such a situation, the District shall levy Statutory School Fees authorized pursuant to Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code Sections 65995 et seq. ("Statutory School Fees") if there is a nexus established between the impact of the new residential dwelling units in terms of a net increase in students generated and the fee to be imposed. In other words, the Statutory School Fees must bear a nexus to the burden caused by the Redevelopment project.

The purpose of this section is to set forth a general policy for the levy of Statutory School Fees on future Redevelopment projects within the District. The District may levy the applicable Statutory School Fees on all of the square footage of the proposed new residential dwelling units once an analysis has been done on the impact on school facilities from such new residential dwelling units and consideration has been given as to the applicability of giving credit for existing square footage to be demolished.

The analysis will include a review as to whether the Redevelopment project results in an additional impact to the District. This will be analyzed by comparing the impact from all potential future dwelling units after having considered the loss of any dwelling units as a result of Redevelopment.

Statutory School Fees will be assessed only to the extent of the net actual impact of the school facilities as determined above, but in no event will the Statutory School Fees assessed be greater than the applicable authorized Statutory School Fees. The District will complete a detailed analysis utilizing the above-mentioned criteria to determine the applicability of Statutory School Fees to each Redevelopment project presented to the District.

Section

Four

CONCLUSIONS & STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

Based upon the data gathered by SDFRA regarding future development within the boundaries of the ESD, student generation, school facilities costs and the methodology employed to determine the school facilities impact from new residential and commercial development, ESD makes the following findings pursuant to Section 66001 of the California Government Code:

- *The purpose of the fee is to pay for the construction and/or acquisition of new school facilities necessary to serve students expected to be generated from new residential and commercial/industrial development.*
- *The fees will be collected and may be used to repay debt service on bonds issued for the purpose of providing new school facilities or to pay directly for the acquisition and/or construction of such facilities. The fees may also be used to pay for the leasing or acquisition of portable classrooms to meet the temporary needs of students generated from new development.*
- *There is a reasonable relationship between the expected use of the fee (i.e., new school facilities) and the development on which the fee is imposed (i.e., new residential, commercial and industrial development) because additional students will be generated by new residential and commercial/industrial development.*
- *There is a reasonable relationship between the number of new residential units constructed and the number of elementary and middle school students expected to be generated from the construction of such units. There is also a reasonable relationship between the construction of new commercial and industrial development and the number of students expected to be generated from the construction of such commercial/industrial development, as the parents of students will be employed by new businesses occupying the new commercial or industrial development and a portion of the students' parents will also choose to live within the boundaries of the District.*
- *There is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee identified in this Report and the cost of the school facilities to be constructed and deemed required to serve new residential, commercial and industrial developments.*

Section

Five

APPENDICES

Appendix A: CBEDS Enrollment

Appendix B: School Capacity

Appendix C: Development Projections

Appendix D: Student Generation Rate Summary

Appendix E: School Facilities Cost Estimates

Appendix F: Census Data; Employment & Housing Estimates

Appendix A:

CBEDS Enrollment Worksheet

Etiwanda School District
 CSIS Enrollment for FY 2019/20 (Extracted from CSIS Data File)
 Total Student Records: 14,033

School	Grade Kinder ⁽¹⁾	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	All Grades
Elementary:										
Code Name										
005 Windrows	96	102	78	88	96	101				561
006 Caryn	119	80	90	93	90	104				576
007 Heritage West	112	104	114	112	128	120				690
008 C.P. Lightfoot	158	90	98	99	86	93				624
009 Heritage East	93	102	109	94	93	101				592
010 Terra Vista	195	167	163	139	146	147				957
011 D.W. Long	171	128	121	151	144	135				850
012 C.L. Solario	134	122	137	141	132	142				808
013 J.L. Golden	148	149	160	170	148	150				925
015 Grapeland	92	86	73	87	110	95				543
017 Etiwanda Colony	123	88	86	99	88	90				574
018 Perdew	157	111	97	126	137	144				772
020 Falcon Ridge	124	86	90	78	99	71				548
Subtotal	1,722	1,415	1,416	1,477	1,497	1,493				9,020
Intermediate:										
302 Etiwanda							428	427	489	1,344
303 Summit ⁽²⁾	2	2	5	6	9	8	379	416	370	1,197
314 Heritage							373	408	445	1,226
316 Day Creek							384	424	438	1,246
Subtotal	2	2	5	6	9	8	1,564	1,675	1,742	5,013
Total	1,724	1,417	1,421	1,483	1,506	1,501	1,564	1,675	1,742	14,033
						Elem: 9,052		Middle: 4,981		14,033

(1)] Figures shown for kindergarten incorporates transitional pupils as well but excludes 266 Pre-School Pupils.

(2)] Summit Intermediate enrollment also includes Community Day and Home School pupils.

Appendix B: School Capacity Worksheet

Etiwanda School District
Determination of Existing Capacity as of January 1, 2020

Existing School Building Capacity	As Loaded for Determining SFP Eligibility				Total
	Grades K-6	Grades 7-8	Special Day Class Non-Severe	Severe	
<i>Capacity Computation from SAB Forms 50-02 (11/18/02):</i>					
I. Classroom Inventory					
2. Portable Classrooms Leased Less Than 5 Years	35	19			54
6. Portable Classrooms Owned By the District	76	40	4	6	126
7. Permanent Classrooms	80	20	2		102
8. Total Classrooms	191	79	6	6	282
II. Available Classrooms - Option B					
a. Line 8 From Part I	191	79	6	6	282
b. Lines 1,2,5 & 6 from Part I (Total Only)					180
c. 25% of Line 7 From Part I (Total Only)					26
d. Subtract c from b (0 if negative)	96	50	3	5	154
e. Total (a minus d)	95	29	3	1	128
III. Existing School Building Capacity:					
1. Classroom Capacity	2,375	783	39	9	3,206
2. SER Adjustment	143				
3. Operational Grants					
4. Greater of Line 2 or 3	143				
5. Total of Lines 1 and 4	2,518	783	39	9	3,349
IV. Additional Classrooms from SB-50 Projects					
Terra Vista Elementary 50-67702-00-001	4				
Etiwanda Intermediate 50-67702-00-002		4			
Summit Intermediate 50-67702-00-003		5	2		
C.L. Solorio Elementary 50-67702-00-004	27				
C.L. Solorio Elem. Addition 50-67702-00-005	4				
John L. Golden Elementary 50-67702-00-006	31				
Heritage Intermediate 50-67702-00-007		50			
Grapeland Elementary 50-67702-00-008	36				
Day Creek Intermediate (Edison) 50-67702-00-009		53			
Etiwanda Colony (West Banyan) 50-67702-00-010	36				
Etiwanda Colony (West Banyan) 50-67702-00-011	4				
John L. Golden Elementary 50-67702-00-012	4				
Perdew Elementary 50-67702-00-013	36				
Falcon Ridge Elementary (#13) 50-67702-00-015	38				
V. Additional Classrooms Locally Funded					
DW Long Relos - Summer of 2014	6				
Terra Vista Elementary - 2018	2				
John L. Golden Elementary - 2019	4				
Caryn Elementary - 2019	4				
DW Long - 2019	4				
Total Additional Classrooms:	240	112	2	0	0
<i>Baseline Capacity from SAB Forms 50-02:</i>					
Gross Baseline Capacity	2,518	783	39	9	3,349
<small>(SAB Forms Certified on November 18, 2002)</small>					
Plus Capacity from New Construction:					
<small>(As Identified on Worksheet, dated 10/23/03 & supplemented as required)</small>					
<i>Existing Schools:</i>					
Terra Vista Elementary 50-67702-00-001	56				
Etiwanda Intermediate 50-67702-00-002		36			
Summit Intermediate 50-67702-00-003		65	25		
C.L. Solorio Elementary 50-67702-00-004	650		25		
C.L. Solorio Elem. Addition 50-67702-00-005	100				
John L. Golden Elementary 50-67702-00-006	762		13		
Grapeland Elementary 50-67702-00-008	900				
Heritage Intermediate 50-67702-00-007	0	1,750			
Etiwanda Colony (West Banyan) 50-67702-00-010	875		9		
Etiwanda Colony (West Banyan) 50-67702-00-011	100				
John L. Golden Elementary 50-67702-00-012	100		9		
Perdew Elementary 50-67702-00-013	875				
Falcon Ridge Elementary (#13) 50-67702-00-015	950				
Day Creek Intermediate (Edison) 50-67702-00-009	0	1,363	0	18	
<i>Locally Funded Additions:</i>					
Elementary Classrooms - 2014 thru 2019	500	0	0	0	
Gross Classroom Facilities	5,868	3,214	81	18	
Current School Facilities Capacity	8,386	3,997	120	27	12,530
Allocation of SDC Capacity to School Type ⁽¹⁾	89	58	(147)		0
Total Allocated/Reallocated School Capacity	8,475	4,055			12,530

⁽¹⁾ Baseline Capacity of SDC Pupils was reallocated using the elementary/middle school SDC pupil ratio derived from 2018-19 enrollment data.
(i.e., 147 SDC capacity x 239 elementary pupils / 395 aggregate SDC pupils = 89 elementary SDC seats)

Appendix C: Development Projections

Etiwanda School District - Future Unmitigated Development Projection - Supplemented with Westgate Specific Plan Dwelling Units

Jurisdiction /Development Area	Computation of Average Dwelling Unit Size From Last Five Years of Development within the Etiwanda School District			Projected Development For Next Twenty - Year Period		
	Dwelling Units	Aggregate Residential Sqft	Average Sqft of Dwelling	Projection of Future Dwelling Units	Estimated Average Sqft of Dwelling	Projection of New Residential Square Footage
City of Fontana (Portion Only)						
Apartments	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single-Family Attached (SFA)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Single-Family Detached (SFD)	<u>131</u>	<u>314,783</u>	<u>2,403</u> (1)	<u>2,500</u>	<u>2,600</u>	<u>6,500,000</u>
Subtotal - Portion of Fontana within ESD	131	314,783	2,403	2,500		6,500,000
City of Rancho Cucamonga (Portion Only)						
Apartments	306	403,301	1,318 (2)	200	1,200	240,000
Single-Family Attached (SFA)	84	137,567	1,638 (1)	300	1,700	510,000
Single-Family Detached (SFD)	<u>583</u>	<u>1,744,298</u>	<u>2,992</u> (1)	<u>1,000</u> (3)	<u>3,000</u>	<u>3,000,000</u>
Subtotal - Rancho Cucamonga	973	2,285,166	2,349 (4)	1,500		3,750,000
	Actuals from the Past Five Years of Development:			Projection of Future Development:		
	D/Us	Total Sqft	Avg Sqft	D/Us	Avg Sqft (4)	Total Sqft
Apartments	306	403,301		200		240,000
Single-Family Attached (SFA)	84	137,567	1,638	300		510,000
Single-Family Detached (SFD)	714	2,059,081	2,884	3,500	2,714	9,500,000
Total - All D/U Types	<u>1,104</u>	<u>2,599,949</u>	<u>2,355</u>	<u>4,000</u>	<u>2,563</u>	<u>10,250,000</u>

(1) Data shown for average dwelling unit size was computed from building permits issued from 01/01/14 through 12/31/18 and for which it was assumed a dwelling unit completed and was available for occupancy as of October, 1, 2019.

(2) Reflects the most recent apartment project (Enclave @ Homecoming) constructed within the District back in 2013. The District believes that the average unit size for this project is likely to be larger than the average of future multi-family projects to be constructed within the District in the future.

(3) Figure excludes 358 dwelling mitigated dwelling units expected to be developed in CFD No. 2005-1.

(4) Reflects a weighted-average computation of dwelling unit sizes based on unit mix of SFDs, SFAs and Apartments.

Appendix D: Student Generation Rate Summary

Etiwanda School District

Student Generation Rate Computations - Dwelling Units Permitted from January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2018⁽¹⁾

Project Number	CFD	Project Name	Jurisdiction	Tract	Permitted Square Footage	Permitted Dwelling Units	Average Sqft Per D/U	Student Generation Rates				
								K-8 Rate	K-5 Rate	6-8 Rate		
1036	3	Eclave @ Homecoming ⁽²⁾	Rancho Cucamonga	18856	403,301	306	1,318	0.3431	0.2386	0.1046	73	32
Apartment Totals:												
					403,301	306	1,318	0.3431	0.2386	0.1046	73	32
Single-Family Attached (SFAs):												
1114	10	Elevage - DR Horton	Rancho Cucamonga	18212	106,162	67	1,585	0.1493	0.0896	0.0597	6	4
1206	18-1	Daycreek - SFAs	Rancho Cucamonga	20032	31,405	17	1,847	0.0588	0.0588	0.0000	1	0
SFA Totals:												
					137,567	84	1,638	0.1310	0.0833	0.0476	7	4
Single-Family Detached (SFDs):												
1218	10	Stonehaven	Fontana	18881	232,501	96	2,422	0.6875	0.4688	0.2188	45	21
1202		Lennar	Fontana	18987	82,282	35	2,351	0.0857	0.0571	0.0286	2	1
395		Ridgeview Estates	Rancho Cucamonga	14139	18,209	5	3,642	0.8000	0.6000	0.2000	3	1
664		Trimark Pacific	Rancho Cucamonga	16113	4,442	1	4,442	3.0000	2.0000	1.0000	2	1
947	HC	Whispering Ranch/Henderson Creek	Rancho Cucamonga	16324	3,225	1	3,225	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	1	0
979	9	Desert Candle LTD	Rancho Cucamonga	16114	30,911	8	3,864	0.2500	0.2500	0.0000	2	0
1113		KB Homes	Rancho Cucamonga	18122	272,858	74	3,687	0.4324	0.2838	0.1486	21	11
1116		Coral Sky - Pulte	Rancho Cucamonga	18741	15,033	4	3,758	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0	0
1118		Etiwanda Classics	Rancho Cucamonga	18819	47,635	11	4,330	0.8182	0.6364	0.1818	7	2
1119		Landmark/Vintage/Heritage	Rancho Cucamonga	18870	339,680	125	2,717	0.4480	0.3120	0.1360	39	17
1120		Landmark/Vintage/Heritage II	Rancho Cucamonga	18870-1	400,158	157	2,549	0.3503	0.2611	0.0892	41	14
1201		Wilson Estates LLC	Rancho Cucamonga	18960	42,710	12	3,559	0.0833	0.0833	0.0000	1	0
1203		Owens Estates	Rancho Cucamonga	16578	21,072	6	3,512	0.1667	0.1667	0.0000	1	0
1204		Manning Homes (Carnesi, LLC)	Rancho Cucamonga	18936	24,621	6	4,104	0.1667	0.1667	0.0000	1	0
1205	18-1	Daycreek - SFDs	Rancho Cucamonga	20032	56,285	32	1,759	0.1563	0.1250	0.0313	4	1
1216		JEC Enterprises	Rancho Cucamonga	18034	25,949	7	3,707	0.2857	0.1429	0.1429	1	1
1217		Meadow Lane Estates - DR Horton	Rancho Cucamonga	18508	84,875	31	2,738	0.4194	0.3871	0.0323	12	1
1219		GFR Homes - East /Fisher	Rancho Cucamonga	19968	34,926	10	3,493	0.3000	0.1000	0.2000	1	2
997C		KHovnanian / Tract 16226-2	Rancho Cucamonga	16226-2	321,709	93	3,459	0.5161	0.3441	0.1720	32	16
SFD Totals:												
					2,059,081	714	2,884	0.4272	0.3025	0.1246	216	89
All Dwelling Types Totals/Weighted Average:												
					2,599,949	1,104	2,355	0.3813	0.2681	0.1132	296	125

(1) The date range shown above was used as the cutoff date for certificate of compliance issuance assuming that it would take approximately nine months between the certificate issuance date and dwelling unit occupancy to generate students that would be enrolled and reflected in the student enrollment file of the District.

(2) For some buildings for this apartment project, the issuance date of the building permit was prior to January 1, 2014.

Appendix E: School Facilities Cost Estimates

**ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS
(FUTURE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL - K-5 PROTOTYPE)**

School Facilities Cost Component	Cost Estimate
A. SITE ACQUISITION	\$4,368,000
Purchase Price of Property ⁽¹⁾	\$4,200,000
Acres *:	12.00
Cost/Acre**:	\$350,000
Plus Appraisal/escrow/survey	\$168,000
4% of Site Costs per Section 1859.74(a)(2)	
	Adjusted
B. SITE DEVELOPMENT ⁽²⁾	\$3,081,516
	Per Acre
Off-Site Development	\$66,402
Service Site Development	\$178,808
Utilities	\$11,583
	\$796,824
	\$2,145,696
	\$138,996
C. CONSTRUCTION ⁽³⁾	\$23,177,015
Architect	\$1,100,230
Construction Management 8%	\$1,986,911
Construction	\$20,089,875
D. INSPECTIONS/ENGINEERING ⁽³⁾	\$453,036
E. FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT ⁽³⁾	\$1,029,039
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	\$32,108,606
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	884
NET COST PER STUDENT	\$36,322
PLUS INTERIM HOUSING & CENTRAL ADMIN. SUPPORT	\$3,026
GROSS SCHOOL FACILITIES COSTS PER STUDENT	\$39,348
GROSS FACILITIES COSTS PER SFD	\$11,903

(1) Estimated land price (excluding appraisal/escrow/survey) assumes superpad and site purchase based on sales price of property recently sold by the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

(2) Site development costs shown above were derived from average per acre costs of service site, off-site and utility costs realized by the District for Perdew Elementary School increased by the percentage change in the Marshall & Swift Class "B" index from January of 2007 thru January of 2019 (i.e., 29.4%).

**ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COSTS
(FUTURE MIDDLE SCHOOL - 6-8 PROTOTYPE)**

School Facilities Cost Component	Cost Estimate
A. SITE ACQUISITION	\$7,971,600
Purchase Price of Property ⁽¹⁾	\$7,665,000
Acres *:	21.90
Cost/Acre:	\$350,000
Plus Appraisal/escrow/survey	\$306,600
4% of Site Costs per Section 1859.74(a)(2)	
B. SITE DEVELOPMENT ⁽²⁾	\$5,623,767
Off-Site Development	\$1,454,204
Service Site Development	\$3,915,895
Utilities	\$253,668
	\$256,793
C. CONSTRUCTION ⁽³⁾	\$34,107,126
Architect (4% of Construction Costs)	\$1,100,230
Construction Management (8% of Construction)	\$2,200,460
Construction	\$30,806,436
D. INSPECTIONS/ENGINEERING ⁽³⁾	\$671,787
E. FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT ⁽³⁾	\$1,276,267
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	\$49,650,547
TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS	903
NET COST PER STUDENT	\$54,984
PLUS INTERIM HOUSING & CENTRAL ADMIN. SUPPORT	\$3,186
GROSS SCHOOL FACILITIES COSTS PER STUDENT	\$58,170
GROSS FACILITIES COSTS PER SFD	\$7,248

(1) Estimated land price (excluding appraisal/escrow/survey) assumes superpad and site purchase based on sales price of property recently sold by the City of Rancho Cucamonga.

(2) Site development costs shown above were derived from average per acre costs of service site, off-site and utility costs realized by the District for Perdew Elementary School increased by the percentage change in

**Etiwanda School District
Interim Housing and Administrative Facilities Cost Estimates**

Per Student Cost of Interim Facilities:

One-time Site/Setup Costs (four portables):

Setup & Delivery	\$200,000
Seismic	1,000
Electric	5,000
Ramps/Steps	2,500
Asphalt	1,000
Cost For Four Portables	\$209,500
Cost Per Classroom	\$52,375

Per Student Cost for Elementary School Interim Housing:

Estimated three year period for unhoused students.
Monthly charges assumed for 1.5 years as an average requirement.

Monthly charges:	\$800
Number of Periods:	18
Cost Per Classroom Unit	\$14,400
Plus Incidentals	<u>\$52,375</u>
Total Cost of Classroom	\$66,775

Students to be Housed	30
Cost Per Student	\$2,226

Per Student Cost for Middle School Interim Housing:

Estimated three year period for unhoused students.
Monthly charges assumed for 2 years as an average requirement.

Monthly charges:	\$800
Number of Periods:	24
Cost of Classroom Unit	\$19,200
Plus Incidentals	<u>\$52,375</u>
Total Cost of Classroom	\$71,575

Students to be Housed	30
Cost Per Student	\$2,386

Per Student Cost of Central Administrative Facilities:

Required Central Admin Facilities Sqft Per Student	4.0
Estimated Construction Cost Per Sqft	\$200
Administrative Facilities Cost per Student	\$800

Appendix F: Census Data: Employment & Housing Estimates



EEO-ALL01W

EEO 1w. Detailed Census Occupation by Sex and Race/Ethnicity for Worksite Geography

Universe: Civilians employed at work 16 years and over
EEO Tabulation 2006-2010 (5-year ACS data)

Note: This is a modified view of the original table.

The EEO Tabulation is sponsored by four Federal agencies consisting of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Employment Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) at the Department of Labor, and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

Geography: Fontana city, California
Estimate: Estimate

Occupation Code	Residence to Work Place Flows	Subject	Total, race and ethnicity
Total, all occupations	Worksite Total	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Worksite Total	Number	59,610
Total, all occupations	Fontana city, California to Fontana city, California	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Fontana city, California to Fontana city, California	Number	17,825
Total, all occupations	Rancho Cucamonga city, California to Fontana city, California	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Rancho Cucamonga city, California to Fontana city, California	Number	3,175

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey

Explanation of Symbols:

- An '*' entry in the margin of error column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute a standard error and thus the margin of error. A statistical test is not appropriate.
- An '-' entry in the estimate column indicates that either no sample observations or too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate, or a ratio of medians cannot be calculated because one or both of the median estimates falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
- An '-' following a median estimate means the median falls in the lowest interval of an open-ended distribution.
- An '+' following a median estimate means the median falls in the upper interval of an open-ended distribution.
- An '*' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the median falls in the lowest interval or upper interval of an open-ended distribution. A statistical test is not appropriate.
- An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not appropriate.
- An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.
- An '(X)' means that the estimate is not applicable or not available.

The U.S. Census Bureau collects race data in accordance with guidelines provided by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Except for the total, all race and ethnicity categories are mutually exclusive. "Black" refers to Black or African American; "AIAN" refers to American Indian and Alaska Native; and "NHPI" refers to Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander. The reference to "Hawaii only" indicates that these columns are only tabulated for areas in the state of Hawaii. "Balance of Not Hispanic or Latino" includes the balance of non-Hispanic individuals who reported multiple races or reported Some Other Race alone. For more information on race and Hispanic origin, see the Subject Definitions at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data_documentation/documentation_main/.

Race and Hispanic origin are separate concepts on the American Community Survey. "White alone Hispanic or Latino" includes respondents who reported Hispanic or Latino origin and reported race as "White" and no other race. "All other Hispanic or Latino" includes respondents who reported Hispanic or Latino origin and reported a race other than "White," either alone or in combination. To get a total for "Hispanic or Latino," add the two columns for "White alone Hispanic or Latino" and "All other Hispanic or Latino."

Occupation codes are 4-digit codes and are based on Standard Occupational Classification 2010.



EEO-ALL01W

EEO 1w. Detailed Census Occupation by Sex and Race/Ethnicity for Worksite Geography

Universe: Civilians employed at work 16 years and over
EEO Tabulation 2006-2010 (5-year ACS data)

Note: This is a modified view of the original table.

The EEO Tabulation is sponsored by four Federal agencies consisting of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the Employment Litigation Section of the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) at the Department of Labor, and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

Geography: Rancho Cucamonga city, California
Estimate: Estimate

Occupation Code	Residence to Work Place Flows	Subject	Total, race and ethnicity
Total, all occupations	Worksite Total	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Worksite Total	Number	64,495
Total, all occupations	Ontario city, California to Rancho Cucamonga city, California	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Ontario city, California to Rancho Cucamonga city, California	Number	4,835
Total, all occupations	Rancho Cucamonga city, California to Rancho Cucamonga city, California	Total, both sexes	
Total, all occupations	Rancho Cucamonga city, California to Rancho Cucamonga city, California	Number	20,540

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey

Explanation of Symbols:

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

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

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

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

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

An '*****' entry in the margin of error column indicates that the estimate is controlled. A statistical test for sampling variability is not

appropriate.

An 'N' entry in the estimate and margin of error columns indicates that data for this geographic area cannot be displayed because the number of sample cases is too small.

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

The U.S. Census Bureau collects race data in accordance with guidelines provided by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Except for the total, all race and ethnicity categories are mutually exclusive. "Black" refers to Black or African American; "AIAN" refers to American Indian and Alaska Native; and "NHPI" refers to Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander. The reference to "Hawaii only" indicates that these columns are only tabulated for areas in the state of Hawaii. "Balance of Not Hispanic or Latino" includes the balance of non-Hispanic individuals who reported multiple races or reported Some Other Race alone. For more information on race and Hispanic origin, see the Subject Definitions at http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data_documentation/documentation_main/.

Race and Hispanic origin are separate concepts on the American Community Survey. "White alone Hispanic or Latino" includes respondents who reported Hispanic or Latino origin and reported race as "White" and no other race. "All other Hispanic or Latino" includes respondents who reported Hispanic or Latino origin and reported a race other than "White," either alone or in combination. To get a total for "Hispanic or Latino," add the two columns for "White alone Hispanic or Latino" and "All other Hispanic or Latino."

Occupation codes are 4-digit codes and are based on Standard Occupational Classification 2010.

2007-2011 American Community Survey
HOUSING OCCUPANCY

California, Counties, Incorporated Cities, and Census Designated Places

Geography	Total housing units			Occupied housing units			Vacant housing units			Rate			Rental vacancy rate		
	Estimate	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Percent Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	Estimate Margin of Error	
California	13,631,129	859	12,433,172	22,372	91.2	0.2	1,197,957	22,077	8.8	0.2	2.3	0.1	5.1	0.1	
San Bernardino County, California	696,776	698	598,822	2,448	85.9	0.3	97,954	2,320	14.1	0.3	3.5	0.3	7	0.4	
Adelanto city, California	8,417	484	7,060	386	83.9	3.4	1,357	328	16.1	3.4	11	3.9	8.4	4.9	
Apple Valley town, California	25,622	676	22,851	560	89.2	1.6	2,771	444	10.8	1.6	5.1	1.6	9.3	2.9	
Baker CDP, California	203	65	176	65	86.7	11.6	27	23	13.3	11.6	0	33.2	10.2	15.5	
Barstow city, California	10,025	469	8,264	391	82.4	2.6	1,761	292	17.6	2.6	3.4	2.3	10.4	3.9	
Big Bear City CDP, California	12,248	258	4,538	386	37.1	3	7,710	386	62.9	3	7.3	4.3	10.3	6.3	
Big Bear Lake city, California	9,617	367	2,169	253	22.6	2.1	7,448	254	77.4	2.1	11.7	6.1	15.4	6.9	
Big River CDP, California	1,080	90	639	99	59.2	7.9	441	94	40.8	7.9	3.2	3.6	0	26	
Bloomington CDP, California	5,934	302	5,576	329	94	2.7	358	162	6	2.7	2.3	1.9	11.6	7	
Bluewater CDP, California	647	82	78	44	12.1	6.4	569	77	87.9	6.4	11.4	13.2	-	**	
Chino city, California	21,679	698	20,240	594	93.4	1.7	1,439	397	6.6	1.7	2.1	1.6	6.2	2.9	
Chino Hills city, California	23,323	439	22,280	420	95.5	1	1,043	241	4.5	1	1.2	0.7	6.7	3.5	
Colton city, California	16,680	571	15,076	505	90.4	1.8	1,604	321	9.6	1.8	3.4	1.5	11.1	3.4	
Crestline CDP, California	7,798	162	3,469	328	44.5	4	4,329	313	55.5	4	5.1	3.1	15	9.4	
Fontana city, California	50,406	831	47,253	804	93.7	0.8	3,153	396	6.3	0.8	3.4	0.8	5.6	1.4	
Fort Irwin CDP, California	2,797	106	2,303	172	82.3	6.6	494	194	17.7	6.6	0	71.2	2.1	2.4	
Grand Terrace city, California	4,651	220	4,449	218	95.7	2.6	202	122	4.3	2.6	2.9	2.2	2.2	3.6	
Hesperia city, California	27,574	606	25,088	563	91	1.6	2,486	450	9	1.6	3.7	1.3	6.3	2.2	
Highland city, California	15,908	518	14,757	430	92.8	1.6	1,151	280	7.2	1.6	0.5	0.6	10.4	3.5	
Homestead Valley CDP, California	2,394	188	1,579	195	66	7.2	815	195	34	7.2	6.3	5.9	9.7	16.9	
Joshua Tree CDP, California	3,902	219	3,289	259	84.3	5.5	613	224	15.7	5.5	7.3	5.8	14.3	9	
Lake Arrowhead CDP, California	12,332	161	3,673	360	29.8	2.9	8,659	363	70.2	2.9	2	2	3.8	4.5	
Lenwood CDP, California	1,375	175	1,268	107	92.2	6.9	107	95	7.8	6.9	0	6.5	4.6	7.1	
Loma Linda city, California	9,179	502	8,468	421	92.3	2	711	205	7.7	2	3.6	2.5	3.9	2.5	
Lucerne Valley CDP, California	2,641	221	2,128	284	80.6	7	513	180	19.4	7	0	2.1	0	9.9	
Lytile Creek CDP, California	367	111	237	73	64.6	22.6	130	108	35.4	22.6	0	19.4	26.8	37.7	
Mentone CDP, California	3,414	170	3,097	222	90.7	5.2	317	178	9.3	5.2	3.2	4	0	3	
Montclair city, California	9,997	418	9,322	345	93.2	2	675	212	6.8	2	1.9	1.2	5.3	2.6	
Morongo Valley CDP, California	2,068	118	1,648	186	79.7	8.7	420	185	20.3	8.7	2.6	4.2	0	7.7	
Mountain View Acres CDP, California	1,001	258	912	223	91.1	8.5	89	94	8.9	8.5	0	5.8	13.3	19.8	
Muscovy CDP, California	2,658	190	2,438	207	91.7	4.9	220	133	8.3	4.9	3	3.5	8.1	9.9	
Needles city, California	3,022	186	1,956	174	64.7	4.8	1,066	168	35.3	4.8	9.1	9.5	15.5	8.8	
Oak Glen CDP, California	230	112	177	76	77	30.6	53	85	23	30.6	0	27.6	0	39.8	
Oak Hills CDP, California	2,989	289	2,671	322	89.4	5.4	318	160	10.6	5.4	4.9	3.6	0	13.7	
Ontario city, California	48,206	843	45,283	840	93.9	0.9	2,923	425	6.1	0.9	2.9	0.8	5.7	1.3	
Phelan CDP, California	4,966	276	4,315	276	86.9	3.5	651	185	13.1	3.5	3.8	3.3	1.3	2.3	
Piñon Hills CDP, California	2,687	134	2,322	202	86.4	5.5	365	147	13.6	5.5	7.3	5.3	8	9	
Rancho Cucamonga city, California	56,711	986	54,194	928	95.6	0.8	2,517	484	4.4	0.8	1.8	0.7	3.8	1.1	
Redlands city, California	26,285	656	24,257	583	92.3	1.4	2,028	394	7.7	1.4	2.6	1.2	8.8	2.2	
Rialto city, California	26,176	702	24,214	593	92.5	1.2	1,962	349	7.5	1.2	3.7	1.2	7.9	2.3	
Running Springs CDP, California	4,088	189	1,920	282	47	6.5	2,168	277	53	6.5	2.2	2.2	16.6	12.8	
San Antonio Heights CDP, California	1,383	51	1,349	66	97.5	3	34	42	2.5	3	0	3.2	10.8	20.1	
San Bernardino city, California	66,575	1,190	60,614	987	91	0.8	5,961	611	9	0.8	3.8	0.9	7.3	1.4	
Searles Valley CDP, California	1,125	99	792	97	70.4	7.4	333	94	29.6	7.4	0	6.7	2.7	4.2	
Silver Lakes CDP, California	2,453	195	1,872	228	76.3	6.9	581	172	23.7	6.9	6.1	5	6.4	10.8	
Spring Valley Lake CDP, California	3,348	129	2,947	186	88	4.3	401	142	12	4.3	4.3	3.3	4.3	6.4	
Twentynine Palms city, California	9,429	545	7,612	429	80.7	2.8	1,817	313	19.3	2.8	8.1	4.3	8.6	3.4	
Upland city, California	26,795	591	25,347	603	94.6	1.4	1,448	380	5.4	1.4	1.2	0.8	4.8	2	
Victorville city, California	34,881	873	30,806	732	88.3	1.5	4,075	563	11.7	1.5	5.6	1.6	6.9	1.8	
Wrightwood CDP, California	2,767	61	1,900	254	88.7	8.7	867	240	31.3	8.7	2	3.3	0	11.2	
Yucaipa city, California	19,307	555	17,227	444	89.2	1.9	2,080	391	10.8	1.9	4.6	1.6	10.5	3.9	
Yucca Valley town, California	9,416	493	7,957	391	84.5	3.5	1,459	370	15.5	3.5	6.1	2.6	7.8	4.6	