

Section 5.14:

**School Facilities** 



### SECTION 5.14 SCHOOL FACILITIES

#### **5.14.1 PURPOSE**

This section identifies school facilities serving the City of Fullerton and evaluates the potential impacts to school services and facilities that could result from implementation of The Fullerton Plan.

#### 5.14.2 EXISTING REGULATORY SETTING

#### **AB 2926**

The State of California has traditionally been responsible for the funding of local public schools. To assist in providing facilities to serve students generated by new development projects, the State passed Assembly Bill 2926 (AB 2926) in 1986. This bill allowed school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space. Development impact fees were also referenced in the 1987 Leroy Greene Lease-Purchase Act, which required school districts to contribute a matching share of project costs for construction, modernization, or reconstruction.

#### SENATE BILL (SB) 50

Title 5 Education Code of the California Code of Regulations governs all aspects of education within the State.

Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) and Proposition 1A, both of which passed in 1998, provided a comprehensive school facilities financing and reform program, in part by authorizing a \$9.2 billion school facilities bond issue, school construction cost containment provisions and an eight-year suspension of the Mira, Hart and Murrieta court cases. Specifically, the bond funds are to provide \$2.9 billion for new construction and \$2.1 billion for reconstruction/modernization needs. The provisions of SB 50 prohibit local agencies from denying either legislative or adjudicative land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate, and reinstates the school facility fee cap for legislative actions (e.g., General Plan amendments, specific plan adoption, zoning plan amendments) as was allowed under the Mira, Hart and Murrieta court cases. According to Government Code Section 65996, the development fees authorized by SB 50 are deemed to be "full and complete school facilities mitigation." These provisions are in effect until 2012 and will remain in place as long as subsequent State bonds are approved and available.

SB 50 establishes three levels of Developer Fees that may be imposed upon new development by the governing board of a school district depending upon certain conditions within a district. Level One Fees are the statutory fees, which can be adjusted for inflation every two years. Level Two Fees allow school districts to impose fees beyond the base statutory cap, under specific circumstances. Level Three Fees come into effect if the State runs out of bond funds after 2006, which would allow school districts to impose 100 percent of the cost of the school facility or mitigation minus any local dedicated school monies.



In order to accommodate students from new development projects, school districts may alternatively finance new schools through special school construction funding resolutions and/or agreements between developers, the affected school districts, and occasionally, other local governmental agencies. These special resolutions and agreements often allow school districts to realize school mitigation funds in excess of the developer fees allowed under SB 50.

#### 5.14.3 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A majority of the students residing within the City of Fullerton are served by the Fullerton School District (FSD) and Fullerton Joint Union High School District (FJUHSD). A small area of the City, east of SR-57, is served by the Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District (PYLUSD).

#### **FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT**

The FSD provides educational services for students in kindergarten through eighth grade. The district maintains 22 school facilities with a total student population of 13,450; refer to <u>Table 5.14-1</u>, <u>Fullerton School District Enrollment</u>, for enrollment information. FSD has expanded a limited number of schools in the past few years (Beechwood, Robert C. Fisler School, and Rolling Hills Elementary Schools, and D. Russell Parks Junior High School); as there has been minimal need to increase school capacities within the District. There are currently no plans for additional expansion within FSD.

#### **FULLERTON JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

The FJUHSD is responsible for all high school education in the City of Fullerton, providing educational services for students in ninth to twelfth grades. The district serves a 50 square mile area that includes the elementary districts of Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, and Lowell Joint. Six four-year comprehensive high schools are operated by the District: Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Sonora, Sunny Hills, and Troy High Schools. La Vista High School, a continuation high school and La Sierra High School, an alternative high school, also serve FJUHSD students; refer to Table 5.14-2, Fullerton Joint Union High School District Enrollment and Capacities.

Between 2003 and 2006 the District added a growth building to every school. The District is currently building an Engineering Building at Sunny Hills High School for student growth. There are insufficient funds available to support additional growth. According to FJUHSD, the District needs to perform a needs assessment and prepare a long-term facilities plan.<sup>1</sup>

FJUHSD offers an open enrollment policy where a Fullerton resident can elect to transfer to any school within the District. Acceptance in the school would depend on the capacity of that particular school, as well as other factors established by State law and District Board Policy. Because the FJUHSD averages over 1,000 student transfers annually, traditional enrollment and capacity analysis in not always applicable.

Page 5.14-2 Final Program EIR
May 2012 The Fullerton Plan

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Colleen Patterson, Assistant Superintendent, Fullerton Joint Union High School District, written correspondence, July 25, 2011.



## **Table 5.14-1 Fullerton School District Enrollment**

School/Address <sup>1</sup>	Enrollment (2008-2009) <sup>2</sup>
K-6 Schools	
Acacia Elementary School, 1200 N. Acacia Avenue	521
Beechwood Elementary School (K-8), 780 Beechwood Avenue	624
Commonwealth Elementary School, 2200 E. Commonwealth Avenue	431
Fern Drive Elementary School, 1400 W. Fern Drive	527
Golden Hill Elementary School, 732 Barris Drive	706
Hermosa Drive Elementary School, 400 E. Hermosa Drive	442
Laguna Road Elementary School, 300 Laguna Road	595
Maple Elementary School, 244 E. Valencia Drive	443
Orangethorpe Elementary School, 1400 S. Brookhurst	787
Pacific Drive Elementary School, 1501 W. Valencia Drive	695
Raymond Elementary School, 517 N. Raymond Avenue	456
Richman Elementary School, 700 S. Richman Avenue	796
Robert C. Fisler School (K-8), 1350 Starbuck Street	694
Rolling Hills Elementary School, 1460 E. Rolling Hills Drive	571
Sunset Lane Elementary School, 2030 Sunset Lane	741
Valencia Park Elementary School, 3441 W. Valencia Drive	693
Woodcrest Elementary School, 455 W. Baker Avenue	476
Total K-6 Schools	10,198
Junior High Schools	
Beechwood Elementary School (K-8), 780 Beechwood Avenue	175
D. Russell Parks Junior High School, 1710 Rosecrans Avenue	1,011
Ladera Vista Junior High School, 1700 E. Wilshire Avenue	957
Nicolas Junior High School, 1100 W. Olive Avenue	896
Robert C. Fisler School (K-8), 1350 Starbuck Street	189
Total Junior High Schools	3,228
Total Non-Public School Special Education	15
Total Home and Hospital Special Education	9
Total Enrolled Students in Fullerton School District	13,450

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Fullerton School District official website, http://www.fsd.k12.ca.us/schools.html, accessed October 2009.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Email Correspondence with Guillermina Serrano, Secretary to Dr. Gary Cardinale, Fullerton School District, dated July 29, 2009



# Table 5.14-2 Fullerton Joint Union High School District Enrollment and Capacities

School/Address <sup>1,2</sup>	Total Number of Students (2006-2007) <sup>2</sup>	Current Capacity <sup>2</sup>
Buena Park High School, 8833 Academy Drive	1,971	2,349
Fullerton Union High School, 201 E. Chapman Avenue	2,067	2,322
La Habra High School, 801 W. Highlander Avenue	2,267	2,349
La Sierra High School	N/A	N/A
La Vista High School, 909 N. State College Boulevard	372	495
Sonora High School, 401 S. Palm Street	2,126	2,133
Sunny Hills High School, 1801 Warburton Way	2,633	2,214
Troy High School, 2200 E. Dorothy Lane	2,642	2,445
Total Fullerton Joint Union High School District:	14,078	14,307

<sup>1</sup> Fullerton Joint Union High School District official website, http://fjuhsd.schoolwires.net/16551058171558900/site/default.asp? 1655Nav=|127|&NodeID=127, accessed October 2009.

#### PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Topaz Elementary School, located at 3232 Topaz Lane within the City of Fullerton is serviced by the PYLUSD. During 2006-2007, Topaz Elementary School had 483 students enrolled. There are currently no major deficiencies or overcrowding issues within the PYLUSD and now plans for facility expansion or new facilities.<sup>2</sup> In addition to collection of statutory required developer fees, growth in student population has been accommodated on a project-by-project basis. This has sometimes involved mitigation agreements as well as establishment of Community Facility Districts.

#### 5.14.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND CRITERIA

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains the Initial Study Environmental Checklist, which was included with the Notice of Preparation to show the areas being analyzed within the EIR; refer to Appendix A of this EIR. The Initial Study includes questions relating to schools. The issues presented in the Initial Study Checklist have been utilized as thresholds of significance in this Section. Accordingly, a project would typically have a significant impact on school facilities if the project would result in any of the following:

 Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which may cause significant environmental

Page 5.14-4 Final Program EIR
May 2012 The Fullerton Plan

<sup>2</sup> La Sierra High School is not included in the enrollment and capacity analysis for the District.

<sup>3</sup> Telephone and email correspondence, Colleen Patterson, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, Fullerton Joint Union High School District, dated July 29, 2009.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Mike Bailey, Maintenance & Facilities Department, Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District, August 15, 2011.



impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

#### 5.14.5 PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **SCHOOL FACILITIES**

■ IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FULLERTON PLAN COULD RESULT IN ADVERSE PHYSICAL IMPACTS TO FACILITIES WITHIN THE FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, FULLERTON JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA SCHOOL DISTRICT.

**Impact Analysis:** Together, the Fullerton, Fullerton Joint Union High School, and Placentia-Yorba Linda School Districts provide educational services for Fullerton students in kindergarten through 12th grade.

Implementation of The Fullerton Plan could result in the addition of 10,183 dwelling units (909 single-family and 9,410 multi-family) within the proposed Focus Areas. <u>Table 5.2-9</u>, <u>Forecast Population and Housing – Focus Areas</u>, summarizes the increase over existing conditions in residential and non-residential uses that would occur within each Focus Area Typically, school districts use generation factors to determine the potential number of students that would be generated by the amount of residential development. <u>Table 5.14-3</u>, <u>Estimated Student Generation</u>, identifies the number of potential students that would be generated from buildout of The Fullerton Plan.

Table 5.14-3
Estimated Student Generation

Grade Level	Student Generation Factor	Dwelling Units	Total Students Generated
Elementary/Middle School	$0.3 - 0.5^{1,2}$	10,1833	3,055 - 5,092
High School	0.1824,5	9,410 MFR	1,713
	0.205 <sup>5,6</sup>	909 SFR	186
Total			4,954 – 6,991

MFR = multiple-family residential dwelling units; SFR = single-family residential dwelling units.

- 1. Generation factors range based upon the location within the City.
- 2. Larry Lara, Director of Director of Maintenance, Operations & Facilities, Fullerton School District, July 8, 2011
- 3. Includes both single- and multiple-family dwelling units.
- 4. Generation factor for multiple-family units.
- 5. Colleen Patterson, Assistant Superintendent, Fullerton Joint Union High School District, July 20, 2011.
- 6. Generation factor for single-family units.

As indicated in <u>Table 5.14-3</u>, buildout of The Fullerton Plan could generate between 4,954 and 6,991 new students dispersed throughout all grade levels at various schools serving the City.

Final Program EIR

Page 5.14-5
The Fullerton Plan

May 2012



FSD and FJUHSD have indicated that capacity may not be available to serve the projected student enrollment associated with buildout of The Fullerton Plan. The PYLUSD serves students within the easternmost portion of the City. Some of the new students potentially generated within the Education and Southeast Industrial Focus Areas would attend schools within PYLUSD. PYLUSD estimates as many as 821 new students could be generated by potential new residential development associated with The Fullerton Plan. However, without knowing the exact location and timing of future residential development, it is not possible to accurately assess the impact on District facilities and/or programs. If development occurs within a short period of time (i.e., five years or less), a significant impact may occur on existing facilities and/or programs, and additional mitigation beyond the statutory developer fees may be required.<sup>3</sup>

It should be noted that buildout of The Fullerton Plan is anticipated to occur over 20 years, based on market demand; thus, any increase in demand for school services would occur gradually as additional development is added to the area. In order to maintain adequate classroom seating and facilities standards, individual development projects would be required to pay statutory fees, in effect at the time, to the school districts serving the project area in order to compensate for the impacts of development on school capacities. Additional mitigation measures beyond statutory fees would be determined on a project-by-project basis.

School Districts assess Development Fees against residential and commercial/industrial development to mitigate impacts resulting from the increase in demand for school related services. Pursuant to SB 50, payment of fees to the applicable school district is considered full mitigation for project impacts, including impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives for schools. Therefore, individual project applicants would be required to pay the statutory fees, so that space can be constructed, if necessary, at the nearest sites to accommodate the impact of project-generated students, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

#### **Proposed General Plan Update Policies and Actions:**

#### P10.6 Support for Educational System

Support policies, projects, and programs that bolster the efforts of local school districts, vocational schools, colleges, and universities to maintain an outstanding educational system that best prepares today's students for tomorrow's workplace.

#### P15.4 Partnerships with Other Agencies

Support policies and programs that bolster appropriate partnerships between the City and agencies, including educational institutions, railroad franchises, utility companies, etc., to secure, co-locate or otherwise share parks, recreational facilities, and trails on school campuses, within public easements, and in other similar locations.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid.



#### P17.3 Vitality of Educational Resources

Support policies, projects, programs, and regulations that contribute to the long-term vitality of higher educational institutions, high schools and elementary schools, and the Fullerton Library system.

#### P17.4 Community Involvement

Support policies and programs that include educational providers, Fullerton Library staff, and the Fullerton community in planning educational facilities and programs to ensure a broad range of needs and concerns are addressed.

#### P17.8 Schools as Community Centers

Support policies, projects and programs that recognize and accommodate schools as community centers in which residents participate in programs, assist with education, help improve school facilities, hold community events and use recreational facilities.

#### P17.9 Healthy School Environments

Support policies and programs pertaining to school environments that are safe and provide access to educational, physical activity, and enrichment activities.

#### P17.14 Revitalization Near Campuses

Support policies, projects, and programs that prioritize revitalization activity around campuses and reflect the importance of schools in the community.

#### P17.15 Mitigate Growth Impacts on School Facilities

Continue to mitigate the impacts of growth by assessing school impact fees and other appropriate mitigation measures.

#### P17.16 Project Impact Mitigation

Support programs that foster coordination between the City and local school districts, colleges and universities to assess and mitigate project impacts pertaining to on- and off-campus development.

#### **Mitigation Measures:**

SCH-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits, individual project applicants shall submit evidence to the City of Fullerton that legally required school impact mitigation fees have been paid per the mitigation established by the applicable school district.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.



#### 5.14.6 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

■ FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FULLERTON PLAN AND OTHER CUMULATIVE DEVELOPMENT COULD RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE IMPACTS TO SCHOOL FACILITIES.

**Impact Analysis:** Buildout of The Fullerton Plan along with other related cumulative projects would potentially generate new students to the school districts serving the City. Individual development projects would be required to pay the appropriate school district (FSD, FJUHSD, and PYLUSD) Developer Fees based on the type and size of development proposed. Pursuant to SB 50, payment of fees to the appropriate school district is considered full mitigation for project impacts, including impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives for schools. Therefore, individual project applicants would be required to pay the statutory fees, so that space can be constructed, if necessary, at the nearest sites to accommodate the impact of project-generated students. Therefore, development of the proposed project and related cumulative projects would not result in significant cumulative impacts in regards to school services and facilities.

**Proposed General Plan Update Policies and Actions:** Refer to the Policies and Actions cited above.

**Mitigation Measures:** Refer to Mitigation Measure SCH-1. No additional mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

#### 5.14.7 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

With payment of school development fees (pursuant to SB 50) and compliance with recommended Mitigation Measure SCH-1, implementation of The Fullerton Plan would result in less than significant impacts in regards to school services and facilities. No significant and unavoidable impacts related to school services and facilities would occur as a result of buildout of The Fullerton Plan.

#### 5.14.8 SOURCES CITED

City of Fullerton Official Website, www.ci.fullerton.ca.us.

Colleen Patterson, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, Fullerton Joint Union High School District, telephone, electronic mail, and written correspondence, July 29, 2009 and July 20, 2011.



- Fullerton Joint Union High School District Official Website, http://fjuhsd.schoolwires.net/16551058171558900/site/default.asp?1655Nav=|127|&NodeID=127, accessed October 2009.
- Fullerton School District official website, http://www.fsd.k12.ca.us/schools.html, accessed October 2009.
- Guillermina Serrano, Secretary to Dr. Gary Cardinale, Fullerton School District, electronic mail, July 29, 2009.
- Larry Lara, Director of Maintenance, Operations & Facilities, Fullerton School District, electronic mail, July 8, 2011.
- Mike Bailey, Maintenance & Facilities Department, Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District, August 15, 2011.

RBF Consulting, The Fullerton Plan Draft, August 2011.

#### **School Facilities**



This page intentionally left blank.