



San Benito High School District

1220 Monterey Street
HOLLISTER, CALIFORNIA 95023-4708
PHONE (831) 637-5831 ext. 132 • FAX (831) 636-1187
www.sbhsd.k12.ca.us

DR. SHAWN TENNENBAUM
SUPERINTENDENT

October 13, 2020

General Plan Advisory Committee
City of Hollister Planning Department
Old City Hall
339 Fifth Street
Hollister, CA 95023
Submitted Via Email: generalplan@hollister.ca.gov

RE: Meeting #2 – Visioning and Existing Conditions

Dear Members of the General Plan Advisory Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public input regarding the priorities of the San Benito High School District (“District”). As you may know, the future of the district will be greatly impacted by the future growth and development of the City of Hollister (“City”).

Currently, the District has a single high school campus that serves the residents of the City and County of San Benito (“County”). With the generous support of our community, residents approved Measure G in 2014 and Measure U in 2016, two voter approved general obligation bonds for the improvement, modernization, and expansion of our campus. These local bond measures enabled the District to secure State Facility Matching Funds from Proposition 51, the last State School Bond approved by voters in 2016. The high school campus currently serves 3,300 students, and is operating near capacity.

The impacts of population growth on the District over time will be substantial, and will leave the District without sufficient resources to accommodate the children from new development as they matriculate through the school system. Based on current and projected residential development projects, approximately 4,731 new housing units are anticipated over the next 10 years. The District estimates that new housing will generate approximately 1,650 additional students over this time period.

The Community Services and Facilities Element of the 2005 General Plan recognized these impacts by stating in relevant part that “the City will work with the San Benito High School District to construct a new high school.” The 2018 General Plan Annual Progress Report, dated March 18, 2019, further indicates that coordination is needed to support the construction of a second high school. The



District is optimistic that the City will provide the support necessary by encouraging developers to negotiate voluntary mitigation agreements that call for alternative financing mechanisms for a new high school. A Community Facilities District (“CFDs”) is one such mechanism that the District may utilize to achieve this goal.

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (“Act”) provides an alternative method of financing certain public capital facilities and services through special taxes. This State law empowers local agencies, including school districts, to establish Community Facilities Districts (CFDs) to levy special taxes. However, the Public Services and Recreation Chapter that was presented on October 6, 2020, omitted school districts as a local agency that can form a CFD. The description contained in Section 15.1.1.3 should be updated to show that schools are eligible for this alternative method of financing new construction, such as a new high school.

Section 15.1.1.4 Senate Bill (“SB 50”), correctly states that SB 50 is the statutory impact fee. However, the current maximum allowable Level I fee is capped at \$4.08 per square foot of new residential development. Level I fees are split with the high school district receiving 35% of \$4.08 or \$1.43 per square foot and the elementary school districts receiving 65% of the fee. The District is permitted to receive a higher, Level II fee of \$1.59 per square foot as it satisfies the requirements prescribed in the Government Code. The District can expect to receive \$3,086 per residential unit, based on the overall average square foot of a 1,941 new dwelling unit.

Under SB 50, the Level II fee is “deemed to be full and complete mitigation.” In reality, the Level II fee will only fund about 11% of a new high school leaving the existing community and State to fund the shortfall. Unfortunately, this is a far cry from the statement in Section 15.1.1.4 stating that “SB 50 generally provides for a 50/50 State and local school facilities funding match.”

In addition, no further State Matching Funds will be available until a new state school facility bond passes. Furthermore, even if future State bond funds become available, it is likely that the District may experience long delays in obtaining these funds.

The District recognizes that the City may not condition its approvals of projects on the full mitigation of school impacts by developers, but the City is not prohibited from taking the position that every developer should meet with the school district in good faith to consider ways they can ensure that ***schools are constructed to meet the needs of future homeowners***, just like parks, sewers, and roads. We ask that the GPAC recognize the reality that a feasible plan for constructing a new high school must be implemented concurrently with the General Plan Update.

The District looks forward to collaborating with the GPAC to address the resources and public infrastructure that is necessary to accommodate additional residential growth.

Sincerely,



Shawn Tennenbaum, Ed.D.
Superintendent