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Introduction

A Facilities Utilization Master Plan is a document that serves as a reference upon which decisions are made for future facility needs. Facility planning requires building and modernizing schools for a rapidly changing tomorrow. With this in mind, planners should consider educational needs projected into a future that will serve the needs of all students.

Facilities planning involves research, consultation with experts, and a process that is broad-based. The most successful school planning is one that is continual in the process of planning over time. A plan that has built-in flexibility based on reasonable data and a keen understanding of the students served by the district is necessary.

Due to the lack of facility construction funding from the state level and minimal local funding availability, realistic expectations must be applied to future modernization, new construction and or replacement projects.

This Facilities Utilization Master Plan, as all master plans, is not intended to answer all questions, nor circumvent future thinking. This master plan provides a foundation and will need to be flexible to the ever-changing environment of student population, curriculum, and the economic environment.

Included in this Facilities Utilization Master Plan is relevant information such as the educational program, the educational facilities, condition of the facilities, demographics and identification of possible funding sources.

The scope of the Facilities Utilization Master Plan is to:
- Summarize the facilities at the school site.
- Compare District facilities against facility standards to identify possible facility needs.
- Establish the capacity of the school site.
- Draw conclusions based on the data in the Facilities Utilization Master Plan.
- Describe options for funding school facility needs.
- Recommend next steps for addressing District facility needs.

Revisions to the Facilities Utilization Master Plan are recommended annually. A comprehensive school planning process under the leadership of the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent serves as a guide for the future needs of Camino Union School District.
SECTION I

Educational Program

Located in El Dorado County, 52 miles east of Sacramento along the Highway 50 corridor, Camino is a census-designated place located about half way between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe. Situated at roughly 3,100 foot elevation in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountain range, the community of Camino has a population of 1,750 as of the 2010 census within a land area of just over two square miles.

School District Community

The community and School District have a long history. Like many communities in Northern California, Camino’s history began with the California Gold Rush, which engendered a massive immigration to California and the region. As settlers arrived in the area, there was a need for lumber to build the new communities.

The American River Land and Lumber Company began logging the Georgetown Divide in 1890. Logs were delivered to the river via a chute and thus floated to a mill in Folsom. In 1901, the El Dorado Lumber Company first built their planning mill and box factory in Camino. Their rough cut mill was located across the canyon at Pino Grande and a narrow gauge railroad connected the two by way of a cable across the canyon. In 1928, Michigan-California Lumber Company remodeled the Camino mill. After a fire in 1949 that swept away the south tower of the cable, the rough cut mill was moved to the site at Camino. Sierra Pacific Industries purchased the mill in 1994 and carried on turning out lumber until the closing of the mill in July 2009.

As lumber was being harvested, Mr. James G. Eddy, an enterprising lumberman, realized that the country’s forests were being depleted much more rapidly than they were being replenished. In 1925, Mr. Eddy founded what would become the Institute of Forest Genetics. Mr. Eddy, in consultation with Mr. Burbank, the famous horticulturist who bred improved fruit and nut trees, decided that forest trees also could be improved by the application of genetics. In 1987, the Institute was placed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Camino is home to a successful apple growers’ organization established in 1964 with 16 ranches. It was motivated by the search for a sustainable economic use of the land with the concept of combining tourism and direct marketing. Today, there are over 55 ranches, and it is a leading seasonal attraction for the community.

Over the years, the population in Camino had increased along with school enrollment. The Camino Union School District was established in 1950 becoming one of the many small school districts operating in El Dorado County. Today, the Camino Union School District serves 529 students in kindergarten through eighth grade in its two schools: Camino Elementary School (K-8), and the Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter (K-8).
Board Vision, Core Messages and Goals

The educational programs offered by the Camino Union School District continue to reflect the aspirations of the broader community served by the District. It is the mission of the District to provide the highest quality education for all students in order that they fulfill their potential, become lifelong learners, and contribute to society as responsible citizens. The Board of Trustee’s vision and core message are as follows:

- The Camino Union School District is committed to assuring that all students succeed in mastering a challenging standards-based education.
- All curriculum, instruction, assessment, and organization shall be aligned to provide a foundation that supports student success in meeting district performance standards.
- With encouragement, careful monitoring, and meaningful evaluation, the District will inform parents of student progress and provide support to those students not meeting grade-level standards.
- The key to student success lies with our highly motivated, professional educators engaged in on-going staff development and collaboration in partnership with parents and the school community.

The dedication to this vision shall be reflected in Board goals, site plans, long range planning, daily decision-making, as well as our self-evaluation of success.

Core Messages

All Students: All students means the full range of learners with added emphasis on the learning needs of second language learners, special education students, those with learning differences, and advanced learners.

Standards Based: The focus of instruction should be on what students need to know and do at each grade level.

Curriculum: Curriculum will be comprehensive, research-based, District-adopted, systematic, standards-based, engaging, and sequential.

Instruction: Instruction will be differentiated, with appropriate grouping, and with appropriate materials.

Assessment: Assessment will be readily accessible, on-going, varied, and provide useful information to students, staff, and parents regarding progress towards standards. A goal of independent learners is to be able to assess their own progress.

Organization: Students will be grouped, schedules of all staff including specialists should be developed, lessons planned, and curriculum mapped so as to maximize all services.
Aligned: All areas of instruction and support must be related to student success and must all be coordinated for maximum impact on student achievement.

Monitoring: Monitoring of student progress will occur at frequent intervals and the data should be used to differentiate instruction, inform parents, and design student support.

Support: Students will first receive differentiated instruction in their classroom with further support available at both the school and district level.

Professional: Professional educators engage in reflection for self improvement, empower themselves as educators to improve student learning, work toward bettering their chosen field, and take responsibility for the outcome of their efforts.

Collaboration: Professional collaboration will include time to analyze data, study student work, share professional expertise, and examine instructional strategies in relation to student progress towards standards.

Success: Success is students seeing themselves as confident learners and good citizens.

Goals

- The District will improve academic achievement for all students.  
  Students will read, write, and master mathematical concepts at grade levels as defined by district/state standards.

- The District will integrate the use of technology into classroom instruction and school operations.  
  The goal is to integrate the use of technology into classroom instruction and school operation and increase technology proficiency of staff and students.

- The District will develop and implement a targeted professional development plan that is in alignment with District goals.  
  The District staff will actively engage in on-going staff development. Professional development will directly focus on helping to achieve student learning goals and supporting student learning needs.

- The District will wisely invest in our school facilities.  
  Our goal is to develop a master plan for all school facilities. Included in the plan will be maintenance and operations of the facilities to support students and staff.

- The District staff will work systematically to promote our schools and the district.  
  The District will promote its schools through the website, newspaper, presentations, and other publications.
Instructional Program

The Camino Union School District is committed to the optimal development of each learner and to the belief that all students can learn and want to learn. The District is very fortunate to have a highly professional and dedicated staff, which recognizes that curriculum and instruction are not static. As our world changes, so do the demands on our future generations and its leaders.

Grade Level Configuration

Camino Union School District serves students in grades kindergarten through eighth grade in two schools located on one site: Camino Elementary School, K-8, and Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter, K-8.

The District continues to actively explore alternative patterns of school organization that are diverse and tailored to meet the individual needs of the community as they evolve. Support for students with exceptional needs is generally provided by utilizing support within the general education classroom and short-term assistance in areas outside the classroom.

Charter School

One of the ways the District provides parents with a choice of educational options is through the district-operated Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School program. A charter school differs from a traditional school because a charter school has more flexibility in the instructional program through its charter. This program provides an academically rigorous standards-based curriculum using natural resource based education as an integrating context for learning across the curriculum. As a charter school, Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School is accountable to the Board of Trustees for carrying out the charter. This school is located in five portable classrooms located on the Camino School site.

English Learner Program

The Camino Union School District provides English Language Development (ELD) programs for students who speak English as a second language. In the classroom, certificated staff provides English Language Development to English learners who are identified with the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). This is a state administered standardized assessment for all second language learners. Teachers use a variety of assessment tools to monitor student’s progress in acquiring English reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills on an on-going basis.
Special Education Program

The District operates a resource specialist program (RSP) for students who are assessed as being below grade level in core content areas and identified through a Student Study Team and Individual Educational Plan process. The District also provides Special Day Class (SDC) clusters for students who are two or more years below grade level in core content areas and meet other program criteria. The District also provides speech and language services to students with identified needs. The Camino Union School District is a member of the El Dorado County Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA).
SECTION II

Educational Facilities

Section II defines area allocation at the school compared to state guidelines. Included in this section is detailed information on the overall school facility, current and planned facility projects, facility projects completed, additional construction and maintenance needs, and site considerations and limitations.

State Facility Guidelines

The state school facility guidelines are the ‘standard’ used to determine the adequacy of school sites and facilities. These guidelines and definitions were applied to determine the relative adequacy of school sites that serve various grade levels. Following is a definition of the guidelines followed by tables that specify the area for core facilities based on the school enrollment. These guidelines have been applied to the schools on the site.

Building Area per Pupil

Although the current School Facilities Program (SFP) does not prescribe allowable building area as did the former Lease-Purchase Program (LPP), the California Department of Education continues to recommend that the size of schools be calculated at 59 square feet (the minimum) per pupil for kindergarten through grade six, and 80 square feet (the minimum) per pupil for grades seven and eight, as discussed in the Guide to School Site Analysis and Development, 2000, prepared by the California Department of Education. These recommended square footages per pupil, 59 square feet for (K-6), and 80 square feet for (7-8), are broken down further by types of facilities that are recommended for each pupil. The typical and approximate allocations for construction under the former Lease-Purchase Program to be used for this analysis are shown in Table II-1 and Table II-2.

Camino Elementary School and Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter (K-8)

The District is utilizing these schools as a (K-8) combined campus. In order to calculate the recommended building area, a combination of the California Department of Education’s recommended building area per pupil of 59 square feet for the K-6 pupils and 80 square feet for the 7-8 pupils is utilized. The District’s 2014 combined enrollments for this campus identified 429 (K-6) pupils, and 100 (7-8) pupils for a total of 529 students.

Based on the above enrollment distribution, the number of (K-6) pupils represent 81% (429/529) of the total number of pupils at this site and the (7-8) pupils represent 19% (100/529) of the total number of pupils at this site. Based on these percentages and the actual utilization of the facility, the estimated State capacity is 550 (K-6) pupils and 162 (7-8) pupils for a total State loading capacity of 712 pupils.
### TABLE II-1
Elementary School per Pupil Area Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Square Feet Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Rooms</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose/Kitchen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Covered Walk/Corridor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage/Custodial/Heater Room</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education

### TABLE II-2
Middle School per Pupil Area Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>Square Feet Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom (includes shops, art, science, homemaking, and music)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose, Type II (Large Group/Resource)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose/Kitchen</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower/Locker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage/Custodial/Heater Room</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Covered/Student Locker/Shelter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education

### Site Acreage

The California Department of Education identifies the site acreage for schools in *Guide to School Site Analysis and Development, 2000*. The adequacy of acreage at each site has been calculated using the guidelines in that publication.
Area Allocations Using District and State Loading Standards

Using the state guidelines in Table II-1 and Table II-2, the number of students to be housed and adequacy of core facilities can be determined with two loading standards. The two loading standards are the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data Systems (CALPADS) and the state standard under the State School Facilities Program. Following is an explanation of each loading standard.

**California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data Systems (CALPADS):** CALPADS represents a ‘count’ of students enrolled in each school on a selected day in October each year. The CALPADS loading shows the adequacy of facilities compared to the number of students who attend the school. This data is meaningful because it shows ‘present time’ adequacy of facilities for current students. Table 1 of Appendix A shows the adequacy of facilities based on the CALPADS enrollment of the school.

**State Loading Standards under the State School Facilities Program:** The state loading standard shows the state’s assumption about how many students can be housed at the school in the current building and how adequate the current facilities would be if the school were ‘full’ according to the state loading standard. The state standards are an average of 25 students per classroom for elementary school and 27 students for middle school. Table 2 of Appendix A shows the number of students that the state assumes can be housed at the school site based on the number of classrooms at the site.

**School Facility Inventory:** In addition to analyzing the area allocations for the site, the School Facility Inventory has been prepared for the school site to identify the age of the buildings and use of the space for purposes of a future State School Facilities Program. This summary can be found in Appendix B.

The inventory identifies building type by either permanent or portable. Under the State School Facilities Program, ‘portable classroom’ means: 1) a classroom building of one or more stories that is designed and constructed to be relocatable and transportable over public streets, 2) with respect to a single story portable classroom, is designed and constructed for relocation without the separation of the roof and floor from the building and 3) when measured at the most exterior walls, has a floor area not in excess of 2,000 square feet.

In the past, for purposes of determining the age of a building for modernization funding under the State School Facilities Program, the 25 year period for permanent building begins 12 months after the plans for the building were approved by the Division of the State Architect and the 20 year period for portable buildings begins 12 months after the plans for the building were approved by the Division of the State Architect.
Camino Elementary School and Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School

Grades: K-8
Camino Elementary School Enrollment: 423
Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School Enrollment: 106
Total K-8 Enrollment on the Site: 529
Acreage: 30.0
Total Classrooms: 28
Portable Classrooms: 17
Percentage of Area Allocation Based on Square Footage per Student (CALPADS): 150%

Overall
This school site is the location of Camino Elementary School and Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School. Camino Elementary School provides a strong standards-based curriculum in a caring, family-oriented, small-town environment. Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter School is a public charter school incorporated in August 2009 and is located on the southern portion of the campus in five portable classrooms. The program is designed to provide academically rigorous standards-based curriculum using natural resource based education as an integrating context for learning across the curriculum. The school uniquely uses its surroundings and community to make the educational program relevant, team-focused and community oriented.

This is an older campus with early 1950’s construction requiring significant needs for updating infrastructure. There are a number of projects needed for this school. The school has received modernization in the past under the State Lease-Purchase Program and the State School Facilities Program, but the modernization needs were and are significantly greater than the resources that were provided. The staff has taken care of many maintenance issues at the school while waiting for more substantial work to be completed from resources that have yet to be identified.

Adequacy of Facility Based on State Guidelines

Currently, there are 529 students attending the schools based on the recent CALPADS enrollment reports. The school facility is operating at 150% of area allocation as recommended by the California Department of Education. Classroom area is being underutilized at 158% of the state guidelines. The area is more than adequate (188%) for the multi-purpose room/kitchen and more than adequate for the office (174%). The school has more than adequate (339%) area for small group rooms and just under the recommended square footage for the library (94%). Chart II-1 provides a comparison of the state guidelines for area utilizing the enrollment of the schools to the actual area of the school.
The state loading standard identifies available classroom space for 712 students. The school facility is operating at 110% of area allocation as recommended by the California Department of Education. The classrooms would be slightly underutilized at 117%, the library would be below the recommended area at 69% and the office would be at 129% of the area. The area for small group rooms is more than adequate at 254%. Chart II-2 provides a comparison of the state guidelines for area utilizing the state loading standards for the number of classrooms on the site to the actual area of the school.
From a practical standpoint, the spaces available and the grade levels of student who enroll do not align such that a school would be at 100% of capacity. Experience from school districts shows that a school is essentially full at 90% of capacity. This is known as the ‘90% rule’. Beyond 90%, schools have crowding problems such as needing to enroll multiple siblings at more than one school site due to inadequate capacity. Therefore, 90% of capacity is used as the practical capacity in the remainder of this study. The 90% capacity has been identified for each site.

Using the 90% rule, the practical capacity of the site is 640 students. The recommended acreage for the current enrollment is 15.30 acres. The school has 30.00 acres. The acreage is adequate for the state capacity of 640 students.
SECTION III

Condition of the Educational Facilities

This section addresses the condition of the Educational Facilities that are often overlooked in the facility process: maintenance and operations. The maintenance and operation of school facilities often receives little attention. Without a program and budget to maintain and operate educational facilities, student performance and behavior may be adversely affected.

History of State’s Role in School District Maintenance Program

In the past, the State Deferred Maintenance Program provided State matching funds, on a dollar-for-dollar district matching basis, to assist school districts with expenditures for major repair or replacement of existing school building components so that the educational process may safely continue. Typically, this included roofing, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical systems, wall systems, floor systems, etc. An annual Basic Grant was provided to districts for the major repair or replacement work listed on the District Five Year Plan which is a projection of deferred maintenance work to be performed on a district wide basis over the next five years. An Extreme Hardship Grant was provided in addition to the Basic Grant if the district had a critical project on the five year plan that had to be completed within one year due to health and safety or structural reasons. The State Deferred Maintenance Program funding had mainly relied on the funds provided through the State Budget Act.

In February of 2009, the Deferred Maintenance Program was impacted by Senate Bill X3 4 that established a funding baseline for the Deferred Maintenance Program through 2012/13 using the 2008/09 funding amounts. In addition, it provided a flexibility clause allowing districts to use the funding for “…any educational purpose through 2013.” School districts were considered to be in compliance with all program and funding requirements for five years. Further, the amount appropriated to the Deferred Maintenance Program from the annual State Budget Act was reduced.

In July of that same year, the Deferred Maintenance Program was further impacted by Assembly Bill X4 2 that suspended funding for new Deferred Maintenance Program Extreme Hardship projects until July 1, 2013 and suspended the district matching share requirement for Deferred Maintenance through fiscal year 2012/13.

Effective July 1, 2013 Assembly Bill 97 repealed the State Allocation Board apportionment authority for the Deferred Maintenance Program and provided for the governing boards of each school district to have full local control over deferred maintenance funds, expenditures, and earnings. However, the minimum requirement for Routine Restricted Maintenance Account district contributions still remains in the effect regardless of these recent changes.

The legislation implementing Local Control Funding Formula did not make any change to the School Facility Program requirements stipulated in Education Code Section 17070.75
regarding maintenance of facilities. School districts that received funds under the State School Facility Program are required to annually deposit a minimum of 3% of total general fund expenditures into a Routine Restricted Maintenance Account. This requirement persists for 20 years after receipt of funds provided under the State School Facility Program.

Through prior budget flexibility provisions (Education Code Section 17070.766), the Routine Restricted Maintenance contribution requirement was reduced to 1% or waived if facilities are maintained in good repair as described under the Williams settlement. This flexibility expires at the end of fiscal year 2014/15, and the 3% Routine Restricted Maintenance contribution requirement returns in fiscal year 2015/16.

**Considerations for a Maintenance and Operations Plan**

School districts now have full local control over their maintenance program, funding of the program, and the reporting of expenditures to the governing board. It is necessary for the school district to develop a maintenance program and budget necessary resources to maintain and operate the educational facilities.

Facilities maintenance includes a great deal more than keeping the grounds groomed and the rooms clean. The maintenance and operations staff have the responsibility for providing a safe and hygienic environment, for seeing to the facility’s security, for ensuring clean air and comfortable temperatures in buildings, and for managing water and waste control. The older the building, the more challenging these tasks can be. In some aging buildings, for example, maintenance and operations managers must deal with issues such as asbestos, mold and mildew in the walls, inadequate plumbing, lead in the drinking water, and air circulation systems built long before add-ons were tacked onto the structure and/or indoor spaces were subdivided.

There are typically four categories of maintenance. They are preventive, routine, emergency, and deferred. The one everyone dreads is emergency maintenance, the air conditioner fails on the warmest day of the year. If on the other hand, the pencil sharpener in Room 12 finally needs to be replaced, that is considered routine maintenance. Preventive maintenance is the scheduled maintenance of a piece of equipment, such as replacing air conditioner filters every ten weeks. Deferred maintenance is delayed for reasons such as the lack of funds or personnel.

**Desirable Elements of a Maintenance Plan**

A component of a successful maintenance and operation program is the need to establish an inspection process. In developing a comprehensive maintenance plan an organizational chart should be provided which defines each position and the line of responsibility. Annual budgetary minimums for maintenance and operation should be established on a yearly basis in order for staff to plan and finance the improvements. In addition, the plan should be structured so that the following categories of activities are readily apparent.
Preventative Maintenance – A planned program that includes lubricating, cleaning, painting, replacement of expendable parts and other activities designed to maintain the component as nearly as possible in its original condition. This category would include more sizable maintenance effort, usually occurring toward the end of the customary or specified life of an item or system, i.e., carpet, roof or boiler replacement. A rigorous preventive maintenance system results in fewer emergency events, preventive maintenance tends to cause fewer disruptions to the school schedule.

Routine Maintenance – Includes activities that cannot be programmed or forecast to correct breakdowns. This could include unscheduled repairs to the heating and air conditioning systems, repair of roof leaks, responding to vandalism, or security related repairs, etc.

Emergency Maintenance – This category includes activities that cannot be programmed or forecast, however, due to the nature of the breakdown the repairs and corrections are considered an emergency. These may include vandalism, security-related repairs, health and safety repairs, or temporary protective work aimed at preventing vandalism.

Deferred Maintenance – Usually is maintenance work that has been deferred to a future budget cycle. This may include scheduled activities, delayed or postponed for reasons such as lack of funds or personnel, changes in priorities, and change of use.

Life Expectancy of School Facilities Components

Many school districts have schools and buildings of various ages with school facilities components that can vary from the type of building materials used to construct the facilities to the type of equipment utilized to operate the school. Table III-1 should be used as a general guideline for anticipated life expectancy of school facilities components. Geographic location and environmental conditions can affect the anticipated life expectancy of the various components.

Again, as a school district develops their Maintenance Plan and the tracking of the life expectancy of replacement components, Table III-1, Life Expectancy of School Facilities Components, from the State Deferred Maintenance Program Handbook can be used as a general guide for assessing the facilities.

Maintenance and operations of school facilities is a continuous process, and a system for standards and inspections needs to be in place to ensure that the ongoing maintenance will continue to occur for the life of the building. Without a system of checks and balances that includes specific standards and guidelines, the likelihood of facilities becoming a low priority in terms of funding is greater. With evidence to support the relationship between condition of facilities and student achievement, maintenance and operations should become an integral part of the facility planning process.
Table III-1
Life Expectancy of School Facilities Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Facility Component</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Covering:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asphalt tile and vinyl tile</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carpeting</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting, Interior:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom, library, offices, cafeteria and hallways</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kitchen, lunchrooms and restrooms</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting, Exterior:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exterior stucco or masonry</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exterior wood and metal trim (including all woods, metal, and the siding on portables)</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical and Communications Systems:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electrical panels and switch boards</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signal systems, including fire alarm and public address</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roofing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clay or cement tile</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Slate</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Felt base, 40lb. and 80 lb. glass cap sheet with coated aluminum</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Felt, 5-ply, and gravel</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Felt, 15 lb. and 90 lb. cap sheet</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition shingles, 40 lb.</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition shingles</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flashings, gutters and downspouts</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heating/ventilation/air-conditioning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gas fired unvented wall heaters/other heaters (boilers and piping)</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual heating units except gas fire unvented wall heaters</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ventilation and air-conditioning systems:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central systems</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual units</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cafeteria and automotive fume exhaust systems</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wall systems:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doors</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Door hardware</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Window assemblies - wood sash</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underground storage tanks</strong></td>
<td>17 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a - Replacement parts are no longer available or the electrical demands for the facility exceeds the current capacity
b - When accumulated single repair projects cost equal the unit acquisition cost
Facility Inspection System

The *Williams v. State of California* case began on May 17, 2000 with the class-action lawsuit filed on behalf of public school children against the State of California, claiming the State and its agencies have denied thousands of California children their fundamental right to an education under the California Constitution by failing to give them the basic tools necessary for that education. A Settlement Agreement was reached on August 13, 2004 and on September 29, 2004, five bills implementing the details of the Settlement Agreement were signed into law. The *Williams* settlement requires that all students have instructional materials and that their school be clean and safe.

As part of the *Williams* settlement, Senate Bill 550 directed the Office of Public School Construction to develop the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) as a definition of good repair for school facilities. This law also required the Legislature to adopt a permanent standard of good repair by September 1, 2006, which was achieved with the passage of Assembly Bill 607. In addition, Senate Bill 550 modified Education Code Section 17070.75(e), which requires that school districts participating in the School Facility Program after July 1, 2005 establish a Facilities Inspection System.

AB 607 adopted the existing IEI definitions in statute, expanded the good repair standards to include the overall cleanliness of school facilities, and added a ranking and scoring system to evaluate the conditions of schools on or before July 1, 2007. The result of the requirement is the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT), which was adopted by the State Allocation Board on June 27, 2007.

Facility Inspection Tool

The first component of a successful maintenance and operations program is the need to establish an inspection process. The Facility Inspection Tool established by the State Allocation Board provides an opportunity for school districts to annually inspect their facilities and utilize the findings as a basis for developing the maintenance plan.

The Facility Inspection Tool is designed to identify areas of a school site that are in need of repair based upon a visual inspection of the site. Good repair is defined to mean that the facility is maintained in a manner that ensures that it is clean, safe, and functional. As part of the school accountability report card, school districts are required to make specified assessments of school conditions including the safety, cleanliness, and adequacy of school facilities and needed maintenance to ensure good repair. The Facility Inspection Tool is comprised of three parts:
Part I - Good Repair Standard outlines the school facility systems and components that should be considered in the inspection of a school facility. The categories for facility inspection are:

1. Gas Leaks
2. Mechanical Systems
3. Sewer
4. Interior Surfaces (Floors, Ceilings, Walls, and Window Casings)
5. Overall Cleanliness
6. Pest/Vermin Infestation
7. Electrical (Interior and Exterior)
8. Restrooms
9. Sinks/Fountains (Inside and Outside)
10. Fire Safety
11. Hazardous Materials (Interior and Exterior)
12. Structural Damage
13. Roofs (Observed from the ground, inside/outside the building)
14. Playground/School Grounds
15. Windows/Doors/Gates/Fences (Interior and Exterior)

Part II - Evaluation Detail is a site inspection template to be used to evaluate the areas of a school on a category by category basis. The inspector should review each of the 15 categories and once the determination is made it should be recorded on the Evaluation Detail as follows:

- ✔ No Deficiency – Good Repair
- D Deficiency
- X Extreme Deficiency
- N/A Not Applicable

Part III - Category Totals and Ranking, Overall Rating, and a section for Comments and Rating Explanation: Once the inspector completes the site inspection, the document includes a rating system to evaluate each component and ranks the overall condition of the school. The inspector should note date, time, weather conditions, and any other pertinent inspection information in the specific areas in the Comments and Rating Explanation.

Implementation of Facility Inspection Tool

The Camino Union School District has implemented the Facility Inspection System utilizing the Facility Inspection Tool adopted by the State Allocation Board. The school is evaluated on a yearly basis by category totals and ranking, which are calculated along with the overall rating for the school.

The Facility Inspection Tool rating system totals up all the percentages for each of the categories and provides an overall school rating based upon a percentage range table provided on the form and presented below in Table III-2.
TABLE III-2
Facility Inspection Tool Percentage Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99%-100%</td>
<td>The school meets most or all standards of good repair. Deficiencies noted, if any, are not significant and/or impact a very small area of the school.</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%-98.99%</td>
<td>The school is maintained in good repair with a number of non-critical deficiencies noted. These deficiencies are isolated, and/or resulting from minor wear and tear, and/or in the process of being mitigated.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%-89.99%</td>
<td>The school is not in good repair. Some deficiencies noted are critical and/or widespread. Repairs and/or additional maintenance are necessary in several areas of the school site.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%-74.99%</td>
<td>The school facilities are in poor condition. Deficiencies of various degrees have been noted throughout the site. Major repairs and maintenance are necessary throughout the campus.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average percentage of the categories for the Camino Union School District is 57.62% and the school rating is ‘Poor’. Presented in Table III-3 is the current school rating.

TABLE III-3
Facility Inspection Tool – Districtwide School Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Overall Percentage</th>
<th>School Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camino Elementary School and Camino Science and Natural Resources Charter</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>57.62%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districtwide School Rating</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>57.62%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table above, it appears the facilities continue to age and maintenance resources have decreased in recent years. The District must continue to allow resources to be available for routine maintenance on the campus.

Starting this year, the Camino Union School District has expanded the Facilities Inspection Tool to provide an in-depth comprehensive review of the condition of the facilities. This expanded review found in Appendix C is intended to provide a baseline for the development of a comprehensive Maintenance Plan.
SECTION IV

Demographics

Demographic data is important for understanding the current population and planning for future population changes. Demographic data is first provided for California and El Dorado County to give context to the demographic data for Camino Union School District.

State of California

California is the most populous state in the country, home to one out of eight Americans. At the last official United States Census carried out in 2010, the population of California was declared at 37,253,956. In 2013, California’s population grew by 0.9 percent adding 356,000 residents to total 38,340,000 as of January 1, 2014, according to the April 2014 population report released by the California Department of Finance.

According to the Public Policy Institute of California report California’s Future released January 2014, California’s population is projected to reach 42.5 million by 2025. Annual growth rates are expected to be just 1 percent, similar to growth experienced in the first decade of the 2000’s but substantially slower than in earlier decades. Even so, average annual increases between now and 2025 will exceed 350,000.

Before 1990, most of California’s population growth was due to migration, primarily from the rest of the United States. Since 1990, most of the state’s growth has been due to natural increase (the excess of births over deaths). Over the past 10 years, gains through international migration have been fully offset by domestic migration losses. Population projections suggest this pattern will continue, with almost all of the state’s population growth expected to come from natural increase. Immigrants are projected to make up 29 percent of the state’s population in 2025, a modest increase from 27 percent in 2009.

No ethnic group composes a majority of California population, with whites (non-Hispanic) making up 40 percent of the state’s population and hispanic/latinos making up 38 percent. The California Department of Finance projects that in 2016 hispanic/latinos will replace whites as the largest ethnic group. By 2025, 42 percent of the state’s population will be hispanic/latino and 35 percent will be white. Hispanic/Latinos already make up 52 percent of children age 12 and younger. The hispanic/latino increases are due to both immigration and relatively high birth rates.

The California Department of Finance projects the number of state births are expected to increase each year over the ten-year projection period compared to the current 2012 level of births, the fertility rate of California’s female population is also projected to continue to gradually increase from historic low levels in 2011. The state’s fertility rate remains at 1.91 in 2012 and is then projected to recover over the rest of the decade to 1.99 by 2022. Hispanic fertility continues to fall, though at slowing rates, for the first years of the projection before slowly rising towards a long-run fertility rate of 2.2. While California women’s fertility rates
are anticipated to be lower in the next few years, continued differences in the number of births and the fertility rates among race/ethnic groups, especially at younger ages, will be evident. In general, births to women 30 and older will continue to increase, while births to younger women are projected to decline.

Over the next ten years Department of Finance projects California will experience a growth in public K-12 enrollment of 0.7 percent to reach a total of over 6,264,000 students. This growth will result in an additional 45,800 students by 2022-23, occurring mostly in secondary enrollment. Elementary enrollment is expected to remain fairly steady with a slight uptick by 2022-23 as births continue to remain flat. In contrast, the number of school-age children grew by more than 20 percent during the 1990s.

The state’s growing and changing population will put pressure on a variety of infrastructure needs and public services including schools. The relatively slow growth in the number of school-age children could give the state and school districts time to catch up on school infrastructure needs.

**El Dorado County**

El Dorado County is located in the Sierra Nevada foothills and the home to two distinct cities, Placerville and South Lake Tahoe. El Dorado County is thirty miles east of Sacramento, and offers many suburbs for those who commute to Sacramento. El Dorado County encompasses 1,786 square miles with a population of 181,058 according to the 2010 United States Census.

The incorporated areas of Placerville and South Lake Tahoe are home to 18% of the county’s population. The remaining 82% of residents live in outlying unincorporated areas. In the decade from 2000 to 2010, El Dorado County population grew by 15.8%, from 156,299 in 2000 to 181,058 in 2010. The largest age group in El Dorado County in 2010 is the 50-59 year-old range which represents 17.7 percent of the total county population. As indicated by the 2010 United States Census, the median age for residents of El Dorado County is 43.6 years, which is greater than the state’s median age of 35.2 years.

As the site of James Marshall’s gold discovery in 1848, El Dorado County became the epicenter for the gold rush that seized California. The gold rush brought individuals from other U.S. states and other counties. The county has a diverse range of topography with the Sierra Nevada mountain range including Lake Tahoe to the foothill areas.

**Community of Camino**

The community of Camino is situated at roughly 3,100 feet elevation, in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada mountain range and is located approximately 51 miles east of Sacramento. According to the 2010 United States Census, Camino had a population of 1,750 with a median age of 47.8 years.
There were 723 households, out of which 166 (23%) had children under the age of 18 years old. Of these 723 households, 71.1% were owner-occupied and 28.9% were rental units.

**Camino Union School District Trends**

Camino Union School District’s boundaries are primarily within the community of Camino. Over the past twenty years, the District experienced a decline in enrollment, from the peak of 592 students in 2001/02 to the low of 426 students in 2009/10. Since 2009, the enrollment has slowly increased to the current enrollment of 529 students. The District’s twenty-year enrollment pattern is illustrated in Table IV-1.

![Table IV-1](image)

**Table IV-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/96</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education, Data Quest, 1994-2013; Camino Union School District, 2014*

**2014/2015 Enrollment**

As of October 2014, enrollment in the Camino Union School District for both schools was 529 students in kindergarten through eighth grades.

Grade distribution is a key indicator of enrollment growth or decline. A school district that is experiencing a growth trend related to age will typically have a larger enrollment of younger students in the early stages of their educational careers. A school district with declining enrollment due to age will typically have larger classes in the upper grades. Camino Union School District distribution indicates there is enrollment growth as indicated in the larger enrollment of the lower grade students.
The current distribution of students among the grades of the Camino Union School District is shown in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2
Enrollment by Grade Level

Source: Camino Union School District, 2014

Ethnic minorities represent a small proportion of the District’s enrollment as of October 2014. Table IV-3 is a summary of students by ethnicity indicating that 64% of the students are white, followed by 28% Hispanic.

Table IV-3
Summary of Students by Ethnicity

Source: Camino Union School District, 2014
Potential Impact on Future Enrollment

The El Dorado County General Plan was adopted on July 19, 2004 by the Board of Supervisors and ratified by public referendum on March 15, 2005. This represents the first comprehensive General Plan update since 1996.

Prior to adoption of the 2004 General Plan, implementation of the previous 1996 General Plan was largely suspended in 1999 by a court order (“Writ of Mandate”) from the Sacramento Superior Court (El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth, et al. vs. El Dorado County Board of Supervisors) on the grounds that the 1996 General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) did not adequately analyze potential environmental impacts as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). On September 1, 2005, the County requested that the Court re-review the case after the completion of a new EIR associated with the new 2004 General Plan. The Court ruled that the County has satisfied every term of the writ and it was discharged. The Court’s ruling was appealed by the plaintiffs. However, on April 18, 2006, the County entered into a settlement agreement with the plaintiffs, settling the lawsuit and allowing full implementation of the 2004 General Plan.

Projected Enrollment

The District’s enrollment projection through the year 2024/25 is shown in Table IV-4. As indicated by the table, the District’s enrollment is projected to increase to 582 by the year 2024/25.

Several methodologies were used to arrive at the projections, including (1) basing the projections on historical District growth rates; (2) by preparing District cohort survival projections; and (3) reviewing the future new housing developments within the District’s boundaries.

The District’s enrollment has fluctuated from a high 592 students in 2001/02, to a low of 426 students in 2009/10. These enrollments seem to parallel both the boom of the housing market in 2001/02 and the closing of the mill in 2009. After the low enrollment of 2009/10, the enrollment has steadily increased to a current enrollment of 529. Projecting the District’s enrollment does not fall into normal projection models. Due to the recent increase in enrollment, especially at the kindergarten level, it is anticipated that normal cohort projection methods will overstate the 10-year enrollment projection of the District. Therefore, the enrollment projection below utilized a 10-year average enrollment as the base year and uses cohort methodology based on 10-year enrollment patterns in the District.

It is important to note that enrollment projections are speculative because factors such as local, state and national economy impact whether new homes will be built within the District. Historically, the District has had periods of slow growth and decline in enrollment. As Table IV-1 indicated, enrollment over the past twenty years has steadily decreased and recently
began a steady increase. If the future resembles the past, then growth in the District will continue at a fairly slow growth rate.

Table IV-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>10 Year Average</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22</th>
<th>22/23</th>
<th>23/24</th>
<th>24/25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change | 5    | 6    | 6    | 5    | 6    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 7    |       |
| %Change | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   | 1%   |       |

| Cumulative | 5    | 11   | 17   | 22   | 28   | 33   | 39   | 46   | 53   |       |
| %Cumulative | 1%   | 2%   | 3%   | 4%   | 5%   | 6%   | 7%   | 9%   | 10%  |       |


For purposes of filing applications under the past State School Facilities Program, the State Allocation Board uses a system of enrollment projection called the Cohort Survival Method. The weakness in this system is that it tends to project the most recent trend in enrollment activity in the District on a straight-line basis into the future. This system of projection has no way of reflecting when the current trend will begin to reverse itself. This method is not being utilized for purposes of this Facility Utilization Master Plan, but is utilized for purposes of filing applications with the State Allocation Board.
SECTION V

Implementation Plan

The Facilities Utilization Master Plan provides direction in a variety of areas that must be considered in planning for facilities. The District must consider options to modernize the aging facilities and infrastructure, address utilization of existing facilities, and explore possible options to expand the campus to better serve students, staff, and the community.

Aging Facilities and Infrastructure

The older permanent buildings on the campus are over sixty years of age and would benefit from a comprehensive modernization of the facilities to include the upgrade of the infrastructure. The School Insurance Group conducted an accessibility survey and provided the district with a detailed listing of noncompliant areas on the campus. Many of the concerns in the report are due to the age of the facility and the topography of the site.

There are many portables that were placed on the campus responding to enrollment increases over the years. Optimally, these portables should be replaced. At a minimum, extensive modernization of these portables is needed.

With the information provided in the expanded Facility Inspection Tool, the next critical step would be to determine the estimated construction cost for the areas in need of remediation.

Utilization of Existing Facilities

There are two multi-purpose/kitchen facilities on the campus. It would be desirable to expand the lower multi-purpose room to include a large bleacher section for seating at school and community events. The upper multi-purpose/kitchen facility would benefit from a complete modernization, including the expansion of the dry storage area and a new walk-in refrigerator/freezer.

These two facility renovation projects to better utilize the existing facilities could be completed in conjunction with the modernization of the campus discussed above. The next step would be to assess the feasibility and determine the construction costs for the expansion and renovation of multi-purpose/kitchen facilities.

Campus Expansion/Replacement

The lower campus, location to the library, five portable classrooms, and the charter school, would be a good location of a new permanent building providing a new library, computer lab, classrooms and a location for the district office. Another option to be considered is complete
replacement of the older permanent buildings with new facilities. Both options will require extensive feasibility and cost analysis to determine if the projects are viable.

Once the costs have been determined for modernizing the aging facilities and infrastructure, the renovation of the existing facilities and the campus expansion/replacement, the projects will need to be prioritized, modified, or possibly eliminated based on realistic funding expectations.

**District Facilities Sub-Committee**

As California recovers from the recent fiscal crisis, school districts statewide find themselves working with new funding processes from the general fund to the maintenance fund. With these new processes, school districts must assess their situation and move forward to address the needs of their schools and communities including facilities needs.

In July 2013, the Governor signed legislation that dramatically revised how California funds its schools creating the new Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF). The LCFF replaces California’s nearly half-century-old, state-controlled school finance system with one that promises more local control as well as greater transparency. It directs more funds to districts with low-income students, English learners and foster children, and shifts more authority to local districts to decide how to spend the money.

The funding law requires that in return for greater control over how they spend state funds, districts must involve parents and the public in setting academic goals and in linking expenditures to those goals. Districts must also subsequently share data on whether the spending achieved the desired results at the school site and district levels for all students and for student subgroups receiving additional dollars. The requirement that instructional and budget goals be tied together through a community process marks a fundamental shift in budgeting in California.

The framework for doing this will be the Local Control and Accountability Plan or LCAP, a three-year plan, which must be updated annually, that every district must create. In January 2014, after multiple revisions, the State Board of Education approved an LCAP template that all districts must use, starting July 1 with the 2014-15 budget year.

In response to these recent changes from the Governor and legislature, and to continue improving the campus for students and the community, the Camino Union School District Board of Trustees moved forward with assessing the existing facilities on the campus to determine the necessary health and safety improvements that are needed to ensure the District provides a safe environment for students, staff and the community.

Under the new LCFF, the District is moving forward with setting aside funds to address maintenance needs. The amount of funds needed to ‘catch-up’ on necessary maintenance projects would take years to have the adequate resources to address the current conditions.
In realizing this situation, the Board of Trustees established a 10-member Facilities Sub-Committee to develop criteria for prioritizing projects. With the assistance of an architect, the Sub-Committee reviewed the estimated costs for the necessary health and safety improvements and established a list of recommended projects.

The Sub-Committee identified three phases of projects to balance the district’s estimated bond authority, allow for an adequate contingency balance, and prioritize health and safety improvement projects. The final recommended list of health and safety improvement projects are:

**Phase I**
- Restroom replacement in the three primary wings
- Water and sewer line replacement in main original campus
- Parking lot reconfiguration and relocation of bus yard

**Phase II**
- Security and bell system replacement for entire campus
- Fencing at entrances of campus
- Window replacement in primary wings
- Conduits for electrical; gutters and overhangs

**Phase III**
- Multi-purpose room non-DSA structure removal and replacement
- Hardcourt area replacement
- Playfield area replacement

These recommendations were presented and accepted by the Board of Trustees on October 13, 2015. While the District will seek every other dollar available (see below), now for the first time ever, the District must reach out to the community for their support on a local general obligation bond to address the health and safety improvements needed for the Camino Union School District.

**Facility Funding Sources and Options**

There are a variety of funding options available to school districts to finance all or part of their facilities needs. An overview of the most realistic of those funding options is discussed below. As the district proceeds with planning the facilities program and discussing funding sources, a financial consultant, along with bond counsel, can provide specific detail on these options, including the requirements and the exclusions associated with each funding mechanism.

**State School Facility Program**

California has had a State School Building Program since 1948 funded by statewide general obligation bonds. There have been four versions of the program since its inception. The current program, the School Facilities Program (SFP), established in 1998, requires that school districts provide fifty percent of the cost of a project in order to qualify for new
construction funds and forty percent of the cost of a project in order to qualify for modernization funds. If a school district cannot provide its’ match, after much local effort, the State has a safety net program called Financial Hardship under which the State will provide the district’s share in addition to the State’s original share.

The State does not have a continuous funding source for its share. A statewide school bond has not been on the ballot since 2006, and the SFP bond authority has been exhausted. The uncertainty of state funding has made school facility planning more difficult, but not impossible.

Recently, as bond authority was being exhausted, emergency regulations were approved effective November 1, 2012. Applications will continue to be accepted and will undergo an “intake review” to verify that all required documents have been submitted. Application packages that include all required documentation will be placed on a newly created list called the ‘Applications Received Beyond Bond Authority List’ and presented to the State Allocation Board for acknowledgement, but not approval.

On January 12, 2015, an initiative, “Kindergarten Through Community College Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2016,” was submitted to the California State Attorney General’s Office to place a $9 billion facilities bond on the November 2016 ballot. On March 6, 2015, the Legislative Analyst’s Office provided the Attorney General with the Fiscal Impact Estimate Report for the initiative. On March 23, 2015, the Attorney General’s Office released the circulating title and summary.

The initiative proposes to place a $9 billion school facilities bond on the ballot for K-14 as follows:

- $3 billion for new construction of K-12 facilities*
- $3 billion for modernization of K-12 facilities*
- $2 billion for capital outlay financing needs of the California Community Colleges
- $500 million for school facilities for charter schools*
- $500 million for facilities for career technical education programs*

*The funds for K-12 facilities would be utilized under the existing Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, also known as the School Facility Program.

The proponents had until September 21, 2015, to collect 365,880 valid signatures to become eligible for the November 2016 ballot. On September 17, 2015, the proponents were deemed to have met the signature requirements necessary to qualify the measure, and it is now eligible for the November 2016 election.

The process of obtaining state funding is complex and time-consuming. A simple review includes the following: a district must do a careful analysis of the capacity of existing facilities and an enrollment projection using State guidelines to determine if the district has ‘eligibility’ for a project under state guidelines. Once it is determined to have eligibility, the district needs to spend its own share of funds to move the project forward and obtain construction drawings with a Division of State Architect stamp of approval before the State
Allocation Board will approve the project for funding. Once the district receives an apportionment, it cannot go back to the State Allocation Board for any more money (as, for example, any construction overages due to change orders or lawsuits).

**Local General Obligation Bonds**

In order to raise the local match to the state’s share of new construction and/or modernization projects, most districts rely on the long term financing of a general obligation bond. General obligation bonds are voter-approved long-term debt instruments which are secured by the legal obligation to levy and collect ad valorem property taxes sufficient to pay annual debt service on the bonds. Because general obligation bonds are secured by the taxing power of the school district, they are considered to pose the lowest risk to the investor, and therefore, provide the lowest borrowing cost to the school district of any of the financing techniques available.

As of 2000, California has two property value (ad valorem) general obligation bond mechanisms: the general obligation bond approved by two-thirds of the voters, and the Proposition 39 general obligation bond approved by 55% of the voters. There are differences between the two bonds that school districts should note before choosing one or the other approach. Following is a synopsis of those differences.

**Proposition 46, 1986, General Obligation Bond**: This mechanism requires a two-thirds vote of the electorate to pass. It is a district-wide obligation; the taxes are based on property value (ad valorem). The funds may be used for site acquisition and school construction or reconstruction, but not furniture and equipment or maintenance.

**Proposition 39, 2000, General Obligation Bond**: This mechanism requires only a 55% vote of the electorate to pass. It is a district-wide obligation; the taxes are based on property value (ad valorem). The funds may be used for “…construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of school facilities, including the furnishing and equipping of school facilities, or the acquisition… of real property for school facilities”. There are some conditions attached to Proposition 39 funds that are not associated with the older general obligation bond. These conditions include: (1) identifying the specific facility projects to be funded, (2) conducting an annual performance audit to ensure that the funds are spent in accordance with the ballot language, (3) conducting an annual financial audit until all of the bond proceeds have been expended, (4) establishing a citizens’ oversight committee to inform the public about the expenditure of bond proceeds, and (5) capping the tax rate for elementary and high school districts to no more than $30 per $100,000 of assessed valuation and for unified school districts to no more than $60 per $100,000 of assessed valuation.

**Mello Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)**

A Community Facilities District (CFD), named after the two legislators who crafted the bill in 1982, can encompass the entire school district or only a smaller territory within the school district. It has been used, typically, for large, new residential developments. The advantage
of Mello Roos Districts is that the funds can be used not only for schools but also for fire and police stations, libraries, infrastructure for the new development and to maintain those facilities into the future.

The Mello Roos District is created by the local public entity (e.g., school board) and the school board becomes the legislative body of the CFD. Once the school board decides to establish a Mello Roos District, an election must be held. If a Developer owns the land, he or she can vote to establish (or not establish) a Mello Roos District. If more than twelve individuals own the property, an election must be held for the registered voters with approval by a two-thirds majority. If approved, a parcel tax is established and collected annually to retire bonds sold to build the infrastructure (school facilities). This was a popular mechanism in the early 1980s before the general obligation bonds were re-established. Mello Roos Districts are less popular now that there is more flexibility with the property value (ad valorem) general obligation bonds.

Parcel Taxes

A parcel tax is different than a traditional ad valorem property tax, in that it is imposed by local government on a per-parcel basis. Local governments that may impose parcel taxes include cities, counties and special districts, such as schools, hospitals and public safety districts. This is another property tax in which the rate is based on some measure other than property value, such as overall size of property. It is a district-wide measure and requires a two-thirds vote to pass. Bond proceeds can be used for capital or programmatic purposes.

School Facility Fees

The passage of Proposition 1A, in 1998, fully implemented the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 50 (the most recent version of the state school building program). This bill had a tremendous impact on the ability of school districts to collect impact fees from developers. SB 50 imposed limitations on the powers of cities and counties to require mitigation of school facilities’ impacts as a condition of approving new development and suspended/repealed the series of cases know as “Mira/Hart/Murrieta”. However, it also authorized school districts to levy statutory developer fees at levels that may be significantly higher than those previously permitted, although school districts must follow a new and more stringent set of rules to do so. SB 50 provides authority for three different levels of fees described as follows:

- **Level 1 Fees** – The provisions of Education Code Section 17620 and Government Code Section 65995 relating to school impact fees for residential, commercial and industrial construction remain essentially intact after SB 50. The current fee amounts of $3.36 per square foot of assessable space for residential construction and $0.54 for commercial or industrial construction are maintained. These amounts are to be increased every even-numbered year thereafter in accordance with the statewide cost index as determined by the State Allocation Board at its January meeting.
**Level 2 Fees** – A new section enacted by SB 50, Government Code 65995.5, allows the governing board of a school district to impose a fee on residential construction that is higher than the limit set in Government Code Section 65995, if certain preconditions are met. This enhanced fee has been described as providing 50% of the cost of schools, because the formula used in its calculation uses cost figures that are approximately half of the statewide average cost of construction. Actual costs will doubtless be different, and the formula contains some other limitations that may reduce the fee to below 50% mitigation. The eligibility requirements for Level 2 Fees are:
1. Eligibility under the State School Facility Program
2. Adoption of a Facilities Needs Analysis Report
3. The District must satisfy at least two of the four requirements described below:
   a. At least 30% of K-6 students are on a multi-track year-round schedule
   b. General Obligation Bond election has been held within the last four years
   c. Issued or incurred other obligations
   d. At least 20% of teaching stations are in relocatable classrooms

**Level 3 Fees** – If State funding is no longer available; Government Code Section 65995.7 authorizes a school district that is eligible to levy the Level 2 Fee to a higher fee on residential construction. Government Code section 65995.7 provides that State funding is unavailable if the State Allocation Board is no longer approving apportionments for new construction due to a lack of funds. Under such circumstances, the State Allocation Board is required to notify the State Legislature in writing. Simply stated, the Level 3 Fee is approximately double the Level 2 Fee. The resulting fee amount still must be reasonably related to the cost of public facilities necessitated by land development.

On June 27, 2012, the Governor signed Senate Bill 1016, which suspended school districts’ ability to levy ‘Level 3’ developer fees until December 31, 2014.

**Planning Mitigation Fees**

*Mira Development Company City of San Diego* 205 Cal.App.3d1201 was decided in 1988, two years after many thought Assembly Bill (AB) 2926 (Stirling) had preempted cities and counties from assisting school districts to obtain mitigation for the impact of new development. The decision of the City of San Diego to deny a requested rezoning and general plan amendment was legal because those decisions were “legislative” and thus not controlled by AB 2926. Many school districts throughout the State of California began to work with local cities and counties to implement a “planning mitigation” fee program for their districts.

SB 50 repealed *Mira/Hart/Murrieta* and completely relieves cities and counties of the power to require development fees or other exceptions in excess of the statutory maximum amounts to help fund school facilities. SB 50 amended Government Code Section 65995(a) to provide only those fees expressly authorized by Education Code Section 17620 or Government Code Sections 65970. Subdivision (h) of section 65995 declares that the payment of the development fees authorized by Education Code Section 17620 is “full and complete
mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act...on the provision of adequate school facilities.” Section 65995(i) prohibits an agency from denying or refusing to approve a legislative or adjudicative act involving development “that exceeds the amounts authorized (by SB 50)”.

Similar to Government Code Section 65995, SB 50 limits a city or county’s power under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to mitigate school facilities impacts. In short, a local agency may not deny approval of a legislative or adjudicative action under CEQA relating to real estate development on the basis of the inadequacy of school facilities.

If a statewide general obligation measure for school facilities is submitted to the voters and the measure is not approved, Government Code Section 65996 would become inoperative and the provisions of Section 65997 would go into effect. While Section 65997 would permit a complete denial of a legislative development approval, it still would prohibit a public agency from requiring payment of “a fee, charge, dedication, or other financial requirement: in excess of those authorized by SB 50 as a condition of approval.” It would also prohibit a public agency from denying, pursuant to CEQA, approval of a project on the basis of adequate school facilities. Developer and Mira Fees are collected in full prior to the issuance of a building permit.

**Certificates of Participation (COP)**

Certificates of Participation (COP) are not specifically authorized in any Education Code or Taxation Code, nor do they require an election. A COP is merely a funding tool for school districts to lease or lease-purchase various capital outlay items.

The most important item to keep in mind regarding COP’s is that the ultimate funding source for repayment is the General Fund, unlike General Obligation Bonds, Mello-Roos Bonds and parcel taxes. Many districts might anticipate collecting enough developer fees or special agreement revenues to cover the long-term debt of the COP, but the actual debt is applicable to the school district General Fund should all other repayment sources dry up. This liability should be recorded as such.
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