

# Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report

Year 2 (FY 2014-15) and Year 3 (FY 2015-16)



ELOY ORTIZ OAKLEY Chancellor 1102 Q Street, Suite 4400 | Sacramento, California 95811 6539 t: 916.322.4005 | f: 916.322.4783 CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu

February 3, 2017

The Honorable Edmund G. Brown Governor of California State Capitol Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: California Community College Proposition 39 Projects

Dear Governor Brown:

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's office is pleased to share with you the successes of the community college districts in implementing the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act program. Year 2 and 3 of funding have supported 735 energy projects at 72 community college districts resulting in one-time incentives, ongoing energy and monetary savings, job creation and better physical environments for California's community college students.

The energy projects implemented on community college campuses in these two years of Proposition 39 funding will result in annual savings of 74.6 million kilo-watt hours of electricity and 1.6M gas therms, generating \$11.2 million in annual energy cost savings and \$15.6 million in one-time energy incentives. The energy saved by these Proposition 39 energy projects can power approximately 14,000 homes year. These savings can be redirected to educational programs and other support services to improve student outcomes.

The jobs created by these energy projects include construction jobs and construction related jobs such as consultants, energy auditors, architects, engineers, and office staff. The 254 completed projects have generated a total of 300 job years. Based on these results, we estimate the remaining 481 projects will generate an additional 605 job years.

The Proposition 39 funds have also provided training for community college students and instructors in energy efficiency related areas. Currently, more than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates, or industry certifications in year two of the program.

We wish to express our appreciation to you for your support of the community colleges, energy efficiency and sustainability.

Sincerely,

Eloy Ortiz Oakley Chancellor

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary5
Identifying Energy Savings7
Implementation Overview7
Funding Status7
Results of Closed-Out and In-Progress Projects10
District Energy Usage Data Summary37
Workforce and Economic Development Summary53
Appendices60

## Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) has been making great strides with the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act. Proposition 39 is an approved initiative for the purposes of creating jobs in California by improving energy efficiency and expanding clean energy generation. The progress made in Year 2 and Year 3 of this 5-year program has been instrumental in reducing energy usage, cost savings and creating clean energy jobs throughout the community college system. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by SB 73 (Ch. 29, Stats. 2013). The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit oversees the funding allocated towards improving energy efficiency on community college campuses. The Workforce and Economic Development Division oversees the workforce training and development program on community college campuses.

The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit has partnered with investor-owned utility groups and the consulting firm Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick to work with districts on reviewing, approving, administering and verifying clean energy projects and energy savings. The investor-owned utility

groups and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick have been an integral part of the partnership with the Chancellor's Office in assisting community colleges across the state. The Workforce and Economic Development Division is in charge of the funding, which is allocated to districts on a grant basis. They have collaborated with a sector navigator that specializes in energy, construction and utilities to assist districts in the development of regional career pathways. The Facilities Planning Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division have been working in tandem to educate the staff and students to improve energy efficiency on campuses in the community college system.

Community college districts are working with their investor-owned utility groups and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick on closing out their energy efficiency projects. Fifty-seven districts have closed out 254 projects in Year 2 and 3 for a total project cost of \$54.9 million. This has resulted in 29.9 million kWh and 316,000 therm savings resulting in \$4 million energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$6 million in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. There were 300 direct job years and eight trainee job years produced from these energy efficiency projects on district campuses. The amount of energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 5,000 homes.

California community colleges are continually working on energy efficiency projects in the loading order established in the 2003 Energy Action Plan. Since energy efficiency and demand response are prioritized, lighting projects are still leading the way in years 2 and 3 in terms of being closed-out. They amount to 155 projects, which is more than 60 percent of the total amount of projects that were closed-out. Lighting projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and will continue to be integral projects in order for districts to meet requirements. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) projects place second in Year 2 and Year 3, respectively, at 44 and 43 projects. These projects amount to 17 percent each of the total amount of projects completed in Year 2 and Year 3. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Tech Assist and Other amount to 4 percent of the total.

The Workforce and Economic Development Division has an application process in order for districts to obtain funding. This is a longer process for districts, which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development Division is currently finishing Year 2 and currently working on Year 3. Year 3 results will be forthcoming in the following year's report. The funding allocated to community colleges have resulted in more than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in Year 2.

The combined efforts of the two Chancellor's Office divisions assisting California community colleges on clean energy efficiency and workforce development promotes a greater sustainability and economic growth for the future of California.

#### **IDENTIFYING ENERGY SAVINGS**

As required by Proposition 39, the districts' projects must meet the energy savings requirements in order to be eligible for funding. The detailed method and procedure for determining energy savings for Prop 39 funded projects are outlined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the California Community Colleges Prop 39 Guidelines (<a href="http://cccutilitypartnership.com">http://cccutilitypartnership.com</a>). These procedures follow California Public Utility Commission (CPUC)-approved protocols for determining energy savings for projects. There are different protocols for project type (energy efficiency, solar PV, MBCx/RCx, etc.) and the standards for each project type are outlined in the guidelines. Energy savings are based on the difference between annual energy use under existing conditions and annual energy use under proposed conditions, and the corresponding cost of energy saved, as described in SB 73.

These annual energy savings, and the corresponding annual energy cost savings, will be used to determine the cost-effectiveness of Proposition 39 projects and for program reporting. For certain projects, the utility incentive programs measure energy savings against state energy code baselines rather than actual usage, and this will be used as the basis for the utility incentive payment. Once the proposed energy savings are calculated or determined following the process described above, a Form B and utility incentive application (if appropriate) is submitted by the district for review and approval.

Final project energy savings are determined after project installation through a Measurement & Verification process described in Section 12 of the Prop 39 Guidelines. This process for projects funded with Proposition 39 funds follow the general approach of the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol guidelines for measurement of savings and verification of project completion. The utility Measurement & Verification process for projects implemented under the incentive programs are leveraged to the fullest extent possible to avoid duplication of efforts.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW**

The Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 program for Year 2 and Year 3 continued the momentum of Year 1. As such, there were no changes made in these two years for the Proposition 39 program.

## **FUNDING STATUS**

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office requests districts to create a project list every first quarter of the calendar year. A master list of projects was created when Proposition 39 was initiated. Since then, districts have used their master list as a basis for upcoming projects. In consultation with the investor-owned utility groups and NAM, districts also have projects generated by the consultants. The Chancellor's Office also uses the systemwide database, FUSION, to generate a list of potential projects. Districts enter scheduled maintenance projects as well as capital outlay projects, which is a potential pool of Proposition 39 projects.

Districts work with their local investor-owned utility group and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick on determining the types of projects that are viable. These projects are in loading order as determined by the California Public Utilities Commission and take into consideration the cost effectiveness to reach a savings-to-investment-ratio of 1.05.

Funds are distributed to districts on a full-time equivalent student basis. However, funds are not released to districts until they submit project request forms (Form B) to the Chancellor's Office. The investor-owned utility groups and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick review the Form Bs before

they are submitted to the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office releases the funds to the districts when they have a viable project.

As can be seen in the figures below, the Chancellor's Office splits the Proposition 39 funding between the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division. The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit garners the majority of the funding, which is used for the actual construction work done on district campuses. A portion of the allocation is set aside for the consultant for the administration of the program as well as assisting districts with the engineering work and verification of the projects.

#### California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 Allocation

Chancellor's Office Division Allocation	Allocation	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
Workforce & Economic Development	12.8%	\$4,790,000	\$4,950,000
Facilities Planning & Utilization	87.2%	\$32,710,000	\$33,787,000
District Allocation		\$31,595,000	\$32,672,000
Prop 39 Consulting Contract		\$1,115,000	\$1,115,000
Total	100%	\$37,500,000	\$38,737,000

The districts are allocated their share based upon their percentage of the total systemwide full-time equivalent student, as seen below. This methodology is in line with how the Chancellor's Office allocates the Physical Plant and Instructional Support program funding to districts.

#### Proposition 39 District Allocation for 2014-15 and 2015-16 Based on FTES

District	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	
Allan Hancock CCD	\$267,805	\$276,091	
Antelope Valley CCD	\$312,751	\$323,104	
Barstow CCD	\$70,779	\$73,327	
Butte-Glenn CCD	\$312,752	\$302,949	
Cabrillo CCD	\$288,439	\$311,480	
Cerritos CCD	\$473,761	\$509,415	
Chabot-Las Positas CCD	\$459,356	\$486,956	
Chaffey CCD	\$404,023	\$416,729	
Citrus CCD	\$319,844	\$326,779	
Coast CCD	\$919,343	\$933,341	

District	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	
Compton CCD	\$170,812	\$167,654	
Contra Costa CCD	\$762,321	\$811,601	
Copper Mountain CCD	\$41,711	\$42,396	
Desert CCD	\$210,393	\$231,370	
El Camino CCD	\$520,611	\$548,251	
Feather River CCD	\$45,037	\$46,405	
Foothill-DeAnza CCD	\$765,555	\$781,572	
Gavilan CCD	\$151,093	\$152,244	
Glendale CCD	\$428,411	\$442,909	
Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD	\$503,413	\$520,610	
Hartnell CCD	\$193,392	\$204,839	
Imperial CCD	\$186,738	\$196,648	
Kern CCD	\$528,394	\$536,098	
Lake Tahoe CCD	\$47,790	\$49,657	
Lassen CCD	\$45,861	\$49,495	
Long Beach CCD	\$561,172	\$583,855	
Los Angeles CCD	\$2,862,377	\$2,983,565	
Los Rios CCD	\$1,415,870	\$1,492,597	
Marin CCD	\$123,359	\$111,122	
Mendocino-Lake CCD	\$66,104	\$85,454	
Merced CCD	\$269,370	\$279,045	
Mira Costa CCD	\$295,774	\$299,433	
Monterey Peninsula CCD	\$187,723	\$186,049	
Mt. San Antonio CCD	\$836,777	\$894,792	
Mt. San Jacinto CCD	\$304,321	\$318,687	
Napa Valley CCD	\$156,200	\$161,690	
North Orange County CCD	\$994,456	\$1,028,932	
Ohlone CCD	\$222,353	\$230,705	
Palo Verde CCD	\$39,526	\$51,634	
Palomar CCD	\$532,456	\$552,755	
Pasadena Area CCD	\$601,546	\$645,894	
Peralta CCD	\$505,306	\$557,886	
Rancho Santiago CCD	\$816,070	\$831,201	
Redwoods CCD	\$106,017	\$112,611	
Rio Hondo CCD	\$357,353	\$358,444	
Riverside CCD	\$746,762	\$792,993	
San Bernardino CCD	\$408,718	\$427,006	
San Diego CCD	\$1,185,998	\$1,221,937	

District	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16
San Francisco CCD	\$735,451	\$668,303
San Joaquin Delta CCD	\$436,104	\$450,365
San Jose-Evergreen CCD	\$363,101	\$348,332
San Luis Obispo County CCD	\$236,770	\$203,859
San Mateo County CCD	\$532,775	\$514,266
Santa Barbara CCD	\$375,689	\$408,368
Santa Clarita CCD	\$429,972	\$439,363
Santa Monica CCD	\$606,330	\$621,744
Sequoias CCD	\$253,773	\$254,914
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity CCD	\$191,094	\$199,899
Sierra CCD	\$408,908	\$420,766
Siskiyou CCD	\$66,201	\$72,055
Solano County CCD	\$239,607	\$217,869
Sonoma County CCD	\$559,137	\$533,818
South Orange County CCD	\$700,863	\$795,973
Southwestern CCD	\$424,832	\$441,393
State Center CCD	\$746,614	\$803,256
Ventura County CCD	\$717,655	\$744,032
Victor Valley CCD	\$266,714	\$259,561
West Hills CCD	\$146,572	\$145,910
West Kern CCD	\$71,597	\$72,430
West Valley-Mission CCD	\$403,502	\$412,970
Yosemite CCD	\$469,131	\$474,168
Yuba CCD	\$186,615	\$218,179
Total	\$31,595,000	\$32,672,000

# RESULTS OF CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS:

#### SUMMARY OF YEAR 2 AND 3 CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS

The California Community Colleges currently have 735 projects for Years 2 and 3 of Proposition 39 (fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16) either closed-out or in-progress at a total cost of \$165 million. These projects will generate savings of 74.6 million kilowatt-hours and more than 1.6 million gas therms resulting in \$11.2 million of energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering approximately 14,000 homes. Additionally, 905 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 39 TOTAL YEAR 2 AND 3 (FY 2014-15 AND FY 2015-16) CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

- 57 Districts\*
- 254 Total closed-out projects
- \$54,922,004 Total project costs
- 29,903,272 kWh Savings
- 2,758 kW Savings
- 316,566 Therm savings
- \$4,059,269 Energy cost savings

- 300.34 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 8.34 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 624,708 Direct job hours
- 17,353 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,976,024 Incentives Paid
- 5,158 Homes powered

	FY 2014-15		FY 2015-16		Total	
Project Type	Count	Percentage of Year 2 Projects	Count	Percentage of Year 3 Projects	Total Count	Percentage of Total Projects
Lighting	65	64%	90	59%	155	61%
HVAC	19	19%	25	16%	44	17%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	11	11%	32	21%	43	17%
Self-Generation	0	0%	<b>1</b> <sup>1</sup>	1%	1	0%
MBCx/RCx	1	1%	2	1%	3	1%
Other energy efficiency measures	3	3%	2	1%	5	2%
Tech Assist	3	3%	0	0%	3	1%
Total Projects	102	100%	152	100%	254	100%

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>San Mateo Community College District, Canada College: Solar PV Installation Project

<sup>\*</sup>Not all districts closed-out a project for each fiscal year. This may be due to multi-year projects, scheduling conflicts, contracting issues and other interruptions that take place during project development or construction.

#### COMPLETED AND CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

There are **254 completed projects** that were closed out in fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16. Forty community college districts closed out 102 projects in fiscal year 2014-15 and 45 districts closed out 152 projects in fiscal year 2015-16. A summary of key data points for the 254 closed-out projects is provided below, with more detail available on the attached spreadsheets. The energy projects spreadsheets section has a summary of the total project information for each district in the front, followed by a spreadsheet for each district with detailed project information.

Projects are not counted as completed and closed-out until they have been installed, verified by the investor-owned utility (or consultant if they are located in publicly-owned utility territory), and the total project costs and job hours created by the project have been reported in the project close out forms.

As of June 30, 2016, the California community colleges have 254 completed and closed-out projects at a cost of \$55 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives, and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 30 million kilowatt-hours and nearly 317,000 gas therms resulting in \$4 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 5,000 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 300 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and eight training years in the communities served by the districts.

#### PROPOSITION 39 YEAR 2 AND YEAR 3 CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- 40 Districts
- 102 Total closed-out projects
- \$24,252,823 Total project costs
- 13,653,884 kWh Savings
- 1,622 kW Savings
- 175,042 Therm savings
- \$1,877,765 Energy cost savings
- 134.64 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3.74 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 280,051 Direct job hours
- 7,779 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$3,225,294 Incentives paid
- 2,397 Homes powered

- 45 Districts
- 152 Total closed-out projects
- \$30,699,181 Total project costs
- 16,249,388 kWh Savings
- 1,136 kW Savings
- 141,524 Therm savings
- \$2,181,504 Energy cost savings
- 165.70 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4.60 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 344,657 Direct job hours
- 9,574 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,750,730 Incentives paid
- 2,761 Homes powered

#### PROJECTS IN-PROGRESS

An additional 481 projects are in progress at a total cost of \$110 million, including Proposition 39, utility incentive and district funding. These projects will result in savings of 44.7 million kilowatt-hours and 1.3 million gas therms resulting in \$7.1 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering close to 9,000 homes. Additionally, 605 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

## PROPOSITION 39 PROJECTS TOTAL IN-PROGRESS (ESTIMATED) FOR FY 2014-15 AND FY 2015-16

- 72 Districts
- 481 In-progress projects
- \$110,078,730 Current total project costs
- 44,664,397 Current kWh savings
- 10,393 Current kW savings
- 1,283,918 Current therm savings
- \$7,115,261 Current annual energy cost savings
- 605.02 Current direct job years (FTEs)
- 16.81 Current trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1,177,438 Current job hours
- 35,211 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,595,916 Current incentives
- 8,816 Current homes powered

#### COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS SUMMARY BY DISTRICT

This document provides a summary of the data included in the attached spreadsheets for closed-out projects for each community college district, including total project costs, incentive amounts, kilowatthours and gas therms saved, and other project metrics.

#### PROPOSITION 39 DISTRICT PROJECTS COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT

## **Antelope Valley Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$385,457.50 Total project costs
- 205,830 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$26,757.90 Annual energy cost savings
- .21 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 267 Direct job hours
- 430.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$49,399.20 Verified incentives
- 32.52 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out project
- \$369,361.26 Total project costs
- 97,548 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$12,681.24 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .18 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 377 Direct job hours
- 102 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,411.52 Verified incentives
- 15.41 Homes powered

#### **Barstow Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$167,142.91 Total project costs
- 72,832 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,653.12 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 82 Direct job hours
- 82 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$17,479.68 Verified incentives
- 11.51 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out project
- \$76,456.00 Total project costs
- 8,856 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$1,151.28 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .02 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 32.75 Direct job hours
- 29.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,125.44 Verified incentives
- 1.40 Homes powered

#### **Butte-Glenn Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$10,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$0.00 Annual energy cost savings

- One closed-out project
- \$420,611.97 Total project costs
- 130,500 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 6,530 Verified therm savings
- \$110,930.00Annual energy cost savings

#### **Butte-Glenn Community College District**

- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 0 Homes powered

- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,981.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$37,850.00 Verified incentives
- 29.57 Homes powered

## **Cabrillo Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Five closed-out projects
- \$590,513.70 Total project costs
- 242,861 Verified kWh savings
- 30.97 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,805.76 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .57 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,194.90 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$58,286.64 Verified incentives
- 38.37 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Six closed-out projects
- \$379,365.38 Total project costs
- 349,771 Verified kWh savings
- 15.10 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$34,450.74 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .48 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,001.25 Direct job hours
- 47 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,526.40 Verified incentives
- 55.26 Homes powered

## **Cerritos Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$583,435.00 Total project costs
- 235,252 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$30,582.76 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .28 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 588 Direct job hours
- 117 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$56,460.48 Verified incentives
- 37.17 Homes powered

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$1,242,646.00 Total project costs
- 1,032,042 Verified kWh savings
- 88 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$134,165.46 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .95 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,970 Direct job hours
- 296 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$97,482.24 Verified incentives
- 163.06 Homes powered

#### **Chaffey Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$153,183.00 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 41,796 Verified therm savings
- \$25,453.76 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .07 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 138.32 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$52,200.00 Verified incentives
- 57.26 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five closed-out projects
- \$866,522.00 Total project costs
- 227,669 Verified kWh savings
- 10.7 Verified kW savings
- 17,583 Verified therm savings
- \$43,793.46 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .45 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 927.50 Direct job hours
- 12 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$67,446.00 Verified incentives
- 60.06 Homes powered

## **Citrus Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out Projects
- \$422,282.00 Total project costs
- 158,986 Verified kWh savings
- 4.97 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,668.18 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$538,958.00 Total project costs
- 301,099 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$24,593.22 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)

#### **Citrus Community College District**

- .22 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 454 Direct job hours
- 36 Apprentice direct job hours
- 30,870.48 Verified incentives
- 25.12 Homes powered

- .43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 903 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$66,200.16 Verified incentives
- 47.57 Homes powered

#### **Coast Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out Projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four closed-out projects
- \$1,613,996.60 Total project costs
- 799,440 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 3,400 Verified therm savings
- \$66,044.21 Annual energy cost savings
- .26 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.38 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,872 Direct job hours
- 547 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$199,459.12 Verified incentives
- 130.97 Homes powered

#### **Compton Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three closed-out Projects
- \$267,792.00 Total project costs
- 164,494 Verified kWh savings
- 19.23 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$21,384.22 Annual energy cost savings
- 1.81 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.64 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,406 Direct job hours
- 3,758 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$39,478.56 Verified incentives
- 25.99 Homes powered

- One closed-out projects
- \$200,679.00 Total project costs
- 77,571 Verified kWh savings
- 28.08 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$10,084.23 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 327 Direct job hours
- 110 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$18,617.04 Verified incentives
- 12.26 Homes powered

#### **Contra Costa Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out Projects
- Total project costs
- Verified kWh savings
- Verified kW savings
- Verified therm savings
- Annual energy cost savings
- Trainee job years (FTEs)
- Direct job years (FTEs)
- Direct job hours
- Apprentice direct job hours
- Verified incentives
- Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out projects
- \$12,428.00 Total project costs
- 3,678 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$308.95 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .01 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 15 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$650.00 Verified incentives
- .58 Homes powered

#### **Copper Mountain Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$201,930.00 Total project costs
- 111,454 Verified kWh savings
- 5.90 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$15,041.13 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 259 Direct job hours
- 29 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$22,609.68 Verified incentives
- 17.61 Homes powered

## **Desert Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$734,989.00 Total project costs
- 828,891 Verified kWh savings
- 16.98 Verified kW savings
- 4,588 Verified therm savings
- \$80,103.78 Annual energy cost savings

#### **Desert Community College District**

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .61 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,273 Direct job hours
- 209 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$203,522.16 Verified incentives
- 137.25 Homes powered

## **El Camino Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$441,694.28 Total project costs
- 320,901 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$45,530.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .25 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 520 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$77,016 Verified incentives
- 50.70 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$824,012.00 Total project costs
- 94,057 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 1,587 Verified therm savings
- \$12,556.44 Annual energy cost savings
- .20 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .80 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,668.75 Direct job hours
- 420.75 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$22,214.00 Verified incentives
- 17.03 Homes powered

## Foothill-DeAnza Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$200,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$0.00 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 0 Homes powered

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$873,780 Total project costs
- 283,279 Verified kWh savings
- 49.40 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$48,157.43 Annual energy cost savings
- .38 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.10 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,282 Direct job hours
- 796.99 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$52,681.80 Verified incentives
- 44.76 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### **Hartnell Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$332,273.72 Total project costs
- 132,360 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$15,883.20 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 723 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$31,766.40 Verified incentives
- 20.91 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Imperial Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$320,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 11,389 Verified therm savings
- \$8,074.29 Annual energy cost savings

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

## **Imperial Community College District**

- .54 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .07 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 139.92 Direct job hours
- 1,119 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$19,740 Verified incentives
- 15.60 Homes powered

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### **Kern Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$946,046.52 Total project costs
- 409,340 Verified kWh savings
- 37.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$51,771.5 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,374.08 Direct job hours
- 133 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$85,675.92 Verified incentives
- 64.68 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$545,268.64 Total project costs
- 277,661 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$36,095.93 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .50 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,041 Direct job hours
- 173.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$21,120.48 Verified incentives
- 43.87 Homes powered

## **Lake Tahoe Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- 3 Closed out Projects
- \$76,150.92 Total project costs
- 80,234 Verified kWh savings
- 14.5 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,825.74 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 173.7 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$10,019.95 Verified incentives
- 12.68 Homes powered

- 3 Closed out Projects
- \$56,787.36 Total project costs
- 22,920 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$2,521.20 Annual energy cost savings
- .00Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 91.50 Direct job hours
- 4 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,965.60 Verified incentives
- 3.62 Homes powered

#### Long Beach Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out project
- \$1,680,109.00 Total project costs
- 1,137,319 Verified kWh savings
- 390 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$147,851.47 Annual energy cost savings
   N/A Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 2.04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4,245.20 Direct job hours
- 24 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$273,584.28 Verified incentives
- 179.70 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Marin Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$133,985.00 Total project costs
- 142,757 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 64,697 Verified therm savings
- \$68,888.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 62.25 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$98,958.68 Verified incentives
- 111.19 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$91,500.00 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 3,717 Verified therm savings
- \$2,973.60 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .02 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 43 Direct job hours
- 12 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 5.09 Homes powered

## **Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

- Eight Closed-out projects
- \$191,815.16 Total project costs
- 172,201 Verified kWh savings
- 7.03 Verified kW savings
- 1,521 Verified therm savings
- \$23,312.75 Annual energy cost savings

#### **Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .26 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 534 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$18,941.64 Verified incentives
- 29.29 Homes powered

#### Mt. San Antonio Community College District

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$2,712,774.00 Total project costs
- 801,941 Verified kWh savings
- 75 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$104,252.33 Annual energy cost savings
   N/A Annual energy cost savings
- .46 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .97 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,013.50 Direct job hours
- 955 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$192,465.84 Verified incentives
- 126.71 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Mt. San Jacinto Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$286,474.07 Total project costs
- 109,468 Verified kWh savings
- 35.65 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$14,230.84 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 170 Direct job hours
- 16 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,469.68 Verified incentives
- 17.30 Homes powered

#### **Napa Valley Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$352,754.00 Total project costs
- 322,469 Verified kWh savings
- 10.2 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$44,144.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .07 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 374.50 Direct job hours
- 144 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$63,264.72 Verified incentives
- 50.95 Homes powered

## **North Orange County Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$1,268,878.76 Total project costs
- 1,338,247 Verified kWh savings
- 482.78 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$173,972.11 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.30 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,709.50 Direct job hours
- 297 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$321,179.28 Verified incentives
- 211.44 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$2,608,353.13 Total project costs
- 781,972 Verified kWh savings
- 137.30 Verified kW savings
- 19,836 Verified therm savings
- \$148,005.32 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.44 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,001 Direct job hours
- 127 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$142,559.84 Verified incentives
- 150.73 Homes powered

## **Ohlone Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$360,069.50 Total project costs
- 144,410 Verified kWh savings
- 17.60 Verified kW savings
- Verified therm savings
- \$16,952.40 Annual energy cost savings

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$248,520.46 Total project costs
- 184,422 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$19,302.62 Annual energy cost savings

#### **Ohlone Community College District**

- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 278 Direct job hours
- 101.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$32,923.56 Verified incentives
- 22.17 Homes powered

- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .11 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 220.50 Direct job hours
- 86.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$43,695.60 Verified incentives
- 29.14 Homes powered

#### **Palo Verde Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$101,920 Total project costs
- 99,517 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$12,937.21 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .01 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 13.75 Direct job hours
- 110 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,884.08 Verified incentives
- 15.72 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Pasadena Area Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$1,798,222.48 Total project costs
- 683,989 Verified kWh savings
- 52.96 Verified kW savings
- 5,374 Verified therm savings
- \$106,360.15 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.37 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,851 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$109,701.24 Verified incentives
- 115.43 Homes powered

#### **Peralta Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$647,618.00 Total project costs
- 663,960 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$86,132.11 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .83 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,717.50 Direct job hours
- 175 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$157,928.92 Verified incentives
- 104.91 Homes powered

#### Rancho Santiago Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,575,833.22 Total project costs
- 1,345,065 Verified kWh savings
- 209.42 Verified kW savings
- 20,686 Verified therm savings
- \$187,270.05 Annual energy cost savings
   \$157,056.12 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .89 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,843.31 Direct job hours
- 162 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$321,066.88 Verified incentives
- 240.86 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,031,176.00 Total project costs
- 911,897 Verified kWh savings
- 255.80 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.55 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,226 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$216,820.56 Verified incentives
- 144.08 Homes powered

## **Rio Hondo Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$775,714.74 Total project costs
- 859,422 Verified kWh savings
- 89.91 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$111,724.86 Annual energy cost savings

#### **Rio Hondo Community College District**

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- .11 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .30 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 629 Direct job hours
- 230 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$191,233.73 Verified incentives
- 135.79 Homes powered

## **Riverside Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$98,043.00 Total project costs
- 258,465 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,600.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 72 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$15,508.00 Verified incentives
- 40.84 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$796,048.00 Total project costs
- 512,442 Verified kWh savings
- 29.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$54,118.49 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 898.50 Direct job hours
- 288.25 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$65,246.00 Verified incentives
- 80.97 Homes powered

## San Bernardino Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$568,699.00 Total project costs
- 605,928 Verified kWh savings
- 1 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$78,770.64 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 890.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$145,422.72 Verified incentives
- 95.74 Homes powered

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## San Joaquin Delta Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$848,463.77 Total project costs
- 569,928 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$48,443.88 Annual energy cost savings
- .46 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .46 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 953.50 Direct job hours
- 951 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$136,783.00 Verified incentives
- 90.05 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$305,966.00 Total project costs
- 98,561 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,377.69 Annual energy cost savings
- .19 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .27 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 564 Direct job hours
- 403 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,564.64 Verified incentives
- 15.57 Homes powered

## San Jose/Evergreen Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$714,152.00 Total project costs
- 369,765 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,597.67 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .26 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 535 Direct job hours
- 300 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$71,203.20 Verified incentives
- 58.42 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$403,198.00 Total project costs
- 96,680 Verified kWh savings
- 25.04 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$14,527.99 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .33 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 688 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,134.00 Verified incentives
- 15.28 Homes powered

#### San Luis Obispo County Community College District

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$315,315.00 Total project costs
- 126,996 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$377,823.40 Total project costs
- 212,660 Verified kWh savings
- 34 Verified kW savings
- -834 Verified therm savings

#### San Luis Obispo County Community College District

- \$15,239.52 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 161 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,479.04 Verified incentives
- 20.07 Homes powered

- \$28,623.20 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .41 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 845 Direct job hours
- 169 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$42,455.04 Verified incentives
- 32.46 Homes powered

#### **San Mateo County Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out Project
- \$5,264,392.58 Total project costs
- 2,163,305 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$249,981.51 Annual energy cost savings
- 2.03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 19.09 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 6,002.65 Direct job hours
- 4,224.87 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,000.74 Verified incentives
- 341.80 Homes powered

## **Santa Barbara Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$556,058.00 Total project costs
- 284,810 Verified kWh savings
- 75.41 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$37,025.30 Annual energy cost savings
- .17 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .23 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 470 Direct job hours
- 354.99 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$68,354.40 Verified incentives
- 45 Homes powered

- One Closed-out project
- \$459,740.00 Total project costs
- 241,970 Verified kWh savings
- 62 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$31,456.10 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .49 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,015 Direct job hours
- 13 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,444.40 Verified incentives
- 38.23 Homes powered

#### **Santa Clarita Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$1,058,909.64 Total project costs
- 415,197 Verified kWh savings
- 40.60 Verified kW savings
- 24,411 Verified therm savings
- \$72,693.45 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 3.59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 7,464.75 Direct job hours
- 60.75 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$116,706.08 Verified incentives
- 99.04 Homes powered

#### **Santa Monica Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$888,573.00 Total project costs
- 347,099 Verified kWh savings
- 16 Verified kW savings
- 6,014 Verified therm savings
- \$49,332.67 Annual energy cost savings
- .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .29 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 604.50 Direct job hours
- 209 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$83,941.68 Verified incentives
- 63.08 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Sequoias Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$324,991.08 Total project costs
- 157,310 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 24,900 Verified therm savings

- One Closed-out projects
- \$289,859.25 Total project costs
- 97,431 Verified kWh savings
- .44 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings

## **Sequoias Community College District**

- \$40,370.30 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 73 Direct job hours
- 60 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,954.43 Verified incentives
- 58.97 Homes powered

- \$12,666.03 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .15 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 312 Direct job hours
- 156 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,383.44 Verified incentives
- 15.39 Homes powered

#### **Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$277,000.00 Total project costs
- 110,400 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,040.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .09 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 179 Direct job hours
- 163 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$25,963.20 Verified incentives
- 17.44 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$59,709.00 Total project costs
- 83,394 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,339.40 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 100 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 13.18 Homes powered

## **Sierra Joint Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$847,236.21 Total project costs
- 576,335 Verified kWh savings
- 103.80 Verified kW savings
- 3,810 Verified therm savings
- \$72,208.20 Annual energy cost savings
- .27 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .81 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,685.25 Direct job hours
- 552.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$120,714.30 Verified incentives
- 96.28 Homes powered

- One Closed-out project
- \$173,462.31 Total project costs
- 78,258 Verified kWh savings
- 37.5 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,034.38 Annual energy cost savings
- .13 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 254 Direct job hours
- 271 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$16,920.72 Verified incentives
- 12.36 Homes powered

#### **Siskiyous Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$175,004.00 Total project costs
- 228,724 Verified kWh savings
- .8 Verified kW savings
- 4,994 Verified therm savings
- \$41,235.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 276.25 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$37,417.00 Verified incentives
- 42.98 Homes powered

## **Solano Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$547,949.00 Total project costs
- 614,355 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$67,506.38 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,218 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$146,538.24 Verified incentives
- 97.07 Homes powered

## **Sonoma County Junior College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$427,811.00 Total project costs
- 559,213 Verified kWh savings
- 53.46 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$76,571.61 Annual energy cost savings

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

#### **Sonoma County Junior College District**

- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .49 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,019 Direct job hours
- 160 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$134,211.12 Verified incentives
- 88.36 Homes powered

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **South Orange County Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$1,465,875.50 Total project costs
- 536,775 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$69,780.75 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.38 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,873 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$128,826.00 Verified incentives
- 84.81 Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **State Center Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$1,154,926.09 Total project costs
- 558,854 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$83,828.10 Annual energy cost savings
- .31 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,350.92 Direct job hours
- 634.90 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$103,000.80 Verified incentives
- 88.30 Homes powered

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$401,149.40 Total project costs
- 181,791 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$17,171.59 Annual energy cost savings
- .11 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 278 Direct job hours
- 238 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,000 Verified incentives
- 28.72 Homes powered

#### **Ventura County Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$863,300.00 Total project costs
- 758,015 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$98,541.95 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .28 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 576 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$181,923.60 Verified incentives
- 119.77 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,196,394.00 Total project costs
- 650,876 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$50,768.33 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .53 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,105 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$142,613.28 Verified incentives
- 102.84 Homes powered

## **Victor Valley Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$287,374.47 Total project costs
- 143,950 Verified kWh savings
- 10.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,153.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .20 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 412 Direct job hours
- 201 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,006.72 Verified incentives
- 22.74 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$268,161.00 Total project costs
- 119,950 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 15,167 Verified therm savings
- \$23,811.40 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .34 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 711 Direct job hours
- 58 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$28,788.00 Verified incentives
- 39.73 Homes powered

#### **West Hills Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savingsN/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

- Two Closed-out Projects
- \$254,191.00 Total project costs
- 226,751 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,407.59 Annual energy cost savings

#### **West Hills Community College District**

- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 341 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$54,040.32 Verified incentives
- 35.83 Homes powered

## **West Kern Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$207,966.50 Total project costs
- 149,343 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$18,907.53 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .15 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 312.49 Direct job hours
- 70 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$29,249.26 Verified incentives
- 23.60 Homes powered

## **West Valley-Mission Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$772,036.52 Total project costs
- 224,868 Verified kWh savings
- 8 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$29,300.30 Annual energy cost savings
- .35 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.47 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,061.34 Direct job hours
- 724.15 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$27,798.00 Verified incentives
- 35.53 Homes powered

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$575,280.00 Total project costs
- 136,536 Verified kWh savings
- 43.80 Verified kW savings
- 24,524 Verified therm savings
- \$40,057.06 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 281 Direct job hours
- 39.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 55.17 Homes powered

#### **Yosemite Community College District**

## Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$92,140.00 Total project costs
- 43,865 Verified kWh savings
- 10.52 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$5,702.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 260 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 6.93 Homes powered

#### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$983,199.00 Total project costs
- 581,965 Verified kWh savings
- 66.50 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$70,286.83 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.33 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,758 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$48,848.00 Verified incentives
- 91.95 Homes powered

#### **Yuba Community College District**

#### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$146,507.00 Total project costs
- 105,683 Verified kWh savings
- 11.60 Verified kW savings
- 2,221 Verified therm savings
- \$13,585.97 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 336 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$28,065.88 Verified incentives
- 19.74 Homes powered

- 12 Closed-out projects
- \$784,620.00 Total project costs
- 306,242 Verified kWh savings
- 37.80 Verified kW savings
- 9,126 Verified therm savings
- \$41,769.81 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,174 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$80,475.03 Verified incentives
- 60.89 Homes powered

<b>District</b>	Energy	Usage	<b>Data</b>	Summar	V

# **ENERGY USAGE DATA SUMMARY**

The following data is submitted and self-certified by the districts on a fiscal year basis. At a glimpse, by comparing the 2014-15 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data the system-wide energy usage has been reduced by 7.63 percent. A total of 40 districts have reduced their energy usage on campus while 14 districts have increased their usage as compared to the energy usage baseline data. A total of 18 districts have not reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2014-15 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change at their district.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2015-16 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2015-16 progress data to compare against the base year. For further detail and information, please see the attached spreadsheet showing the energy usage data summary and per district.

#### SYSTEM-WIDE ENERGY USAGE DATA

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week:
   1,624
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,500
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.63 percent

#### **ENERGY USAGE PER DISTRICT**

#### **Allan Hancock Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,673
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Antelope Valley Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,516
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1754
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 15.66 percent

#### **Barstow Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (Baseline Year) Average British thermal units per GSF per week: 1,581
- Fiscal year 2014-15 Average British thermal units per GSF per week: 1,486
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 56.85 percent

#### **Butte - Glenn Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,119
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,062
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.03 percent

#### Cabrillo

- Fiscal year2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,789
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,356
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -54.21 percent

#### **Cerritos Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,855
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,553
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.29 percent

## **Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,134
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,921
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.98 percent

#### **Chaffey Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,696
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,290
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -52.14 percent

#### **Citrus Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,752
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -19.16 percent

#### **Coast Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,459
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,463
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .3 percent

#### **Compton Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 678
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.02 percent

#### **Contra Costa Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,784
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,627
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -8.81 percent

#### **Copper Mountain Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,943
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Desert Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,825
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,166
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -36.13 percent

#### **El Camino Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,553
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Feather River Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 994
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 985
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -.88 percent

## **Foothill-De Anza Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,921
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,773
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.77 percent

#### **Gavilan Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,660
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,285
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.10 percent

#### **Glendale Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,365
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.03 percent

## **Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,187
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 963
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.83 percent

#### **Hartnell Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,837
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Imperial Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 963
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 822
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.62 percent

#### **Kern CCD**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,169
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,253
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 7.17 percent

#### **Lake Tahoe Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,621
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## **Lassen Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,144
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,055
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.17 percent

#### **Long Beach Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,218
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

# **Los Angeles Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,084
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 739
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.83 percent

#### **Los Rios Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,811
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Marin Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,749
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 975
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.69 percent

#### **Merced Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,420
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,327
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -37.48 percent

# **Mira Costa Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,731
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,757
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 2.57 percent

#### **Monterey Peninsula Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### Mt. San Antonio Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,950
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,190
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 12.31 percent

#### Mt. San Jacinto Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,694
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,512
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.74 percent

#### **Napa Valley Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,549
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.48 percent

# **North Orange County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,889
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Ohlone Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,391
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Palo Verde Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,036
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,354
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 30.80 percent

#### **Palomar Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 592
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -23.51 percent

#### **Pasadena Area Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 867
- Fiscal ear 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

# **Peralta Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average per gross square foot per week: 2,997
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,754
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -41.49 percent

#### Rancho Santiago Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,848
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,319
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.64 percent

#### **Redwoods Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,832
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Rio Hondo Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,444
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,642
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.67 percent

#### **Riverside Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,603
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,570
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -2.05 percent

#### San Bernardino Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,738
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,068
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -38.54 percent

#### San Diego Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 653
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 740
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.26 percent

#### **San Francisco Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,615
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### San Joaquin Delta Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,658
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,566
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.55 percent

#### San Jose-Evergreen Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) Average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .02 percent

#### San Luis Obispo County Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,698
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,459
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.11 percent

#### **San Mateo County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,214
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,874
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.36 percent

#### **Santa Barbara Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,308
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,070
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.15 percent

#### **Santa Clarita Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,099
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,050
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.46 percent

#### **Santa Monica Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average BTUs per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,101
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.60 percent

# **Sequoias Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,046
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,075
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 2.76 percent

#### **Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,057
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,394
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -32.22 percent

#### **Sierra Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,250
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,166
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.72 percent

#### **Siskiyou Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,513
- Fiscal 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week:
   1,751
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.32 percent

#### **Solano County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,442
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,138
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.43 percent

# **Sonoma County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,206
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,354
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 12.33 percent

#### **South Orange County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,800
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,638
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.77 percent

#### **Southwestern Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,566
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,309
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.41 percent

#### **State Center Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,339
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,207
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.88 percent

#### **Ventura County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,041
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 875
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.95 percent

# **Victor Valley Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,400
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,763
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 25.91 percent

#### **West Hills Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,505
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **West Kern Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 907
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **West Valley-Mission Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,709
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

#### **Yosemite Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,117
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,800
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.18 percent

#### **Yuba Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 978
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

# **Workforce and Economic Development Summary**

# WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Unlike the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit of the Chancellor's Office, the Workforce and Economic Development Division is authorized to annually allocate Proposition 39 funds to the Clean Energy Workforce Program Grant as well as job training and workforce development projects.

The Proposition 39 Clean Energy Workforce Program supports the following objectives for building the energy efficiency workforce:

- Targeting workforce-related incentive funds towards priority and emergent sectors important to California's regional economies.
- Staffing key talent roles that serve as first contacts for industry and our system, including sector navigators and regional consortia chairs. These roles facilitate in-region and multi-region coordination of training activities.
- Mobilizing community college training capacity by scoping grantees to collaborate with in-region colleges active in the sector.
- Applying common metrics and accountability measures on outcomes that drive student success and meet industry's need for skilled workers.
- Providing technical assistance and flexible mini-grants to support faculty coming together to update curriculum for industry needs.
- Build and sustain regional networks of colleges to prepare workforce for the energy sector to improve energy efficiency and expand clean energy generation in the built environment.
- Leverage assets at multiple colleges across a region to align and regionalize energy efficiency related curriculum.
- Assure compliance to codes and standards by upgrading workforce capacity, knowledge and skills over the life of the Proposition 39 (SB 73) funding stream.
- Develop sustainable partnerships and methods that link carbon reduction policy and economic development goals to industry needs and education and training programs.
- Elevate the quality of instruction at colleges that have made investments in education and training in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sector.
- Incentivize (through instructor stipends, etc.) regional cooperation, including curriculum alignment; increased access to certificates, degrees and state-certified apprenticeship programs; increased access to employment; and faculty professional development.
- Build career pathways that assure student success by connecting student learning outcomes directly to employment opportunities.
- Enroll all energy related pathway students in EDD's CalJOBS system and collect outcomes data via the Launchboard.
- Prepare the energy efficiency workforce to participate in the construction, repair and maintenance of commercial, industrial, and institutional buildings as required to meet AB 32 requirements.

 Coordinate efforts with the community college sector navigator and deputy sector navigators in the Energy Efficiency & Utilities Sector.

This is a longer application process for districts which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development is currently finishing Year 2 and currently working on Year 3. Year 3 results will be forthcoming in the following year's report.

#### **REPORT ON YEAR 2 PROPOSITION 39 FUNDS**

#### **Background**

Total Year 2 Proposition 39 funds for California Community was \$37,500,000. From the community colleges' Proposition 39 funds, 12.8 percent or \$4,790,000 of the total was allocated for workforce development.

Distribution of funds to the colleges enabled investments in the Energy, Construction and Utilities Sector for career technical education capacity, faculty professional development, curriculum alignment, recruiting additional full-time equivalent students, and technical assistance. Grants were made to five regional fiscal agents based on the population of completers by college. Fiscal agents then worked with the colleges in allocating funds via sub-grants for priority projects.

#### **Investments**

The grants were designed to better prepare students and incumbent workers to meet California's energy efficiency and renewable energy mandates set by AB 32 and updated by SB 350 (Ch. 547, Stats 2015). Investments were made in the following education and training programs:

Architecture and Architectural Technology	\$51,338
Electronics and Electric Technology	\$149,870
Electro-Mechanical Technology	\$73,292
Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance	\$115,162
Environmental Control Technology	\$1,521,608
Construction Crafts Technology	\$280,932
Drafting Technology	\$101,128
Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	\$229,360
Civil and Construction Management Technology	\$177,406
Water and Wastewater Technology	\$105,662
Other	\$63,272
	\$2,869,031

Proposition 39 workforce funding is planned for Years 4 and 5 at the same 12.8 percent allocation as prior years. These funds will leverage regional strong workforce investments in developing a statewide program that maps directly to the "qualified and fully engaged workforce" required by the California Long-range Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan to achieve mandates set by AB 32. Analysis is underway to determine new workforce requirements for meeting the SB 350 mandates, which will be reflected in plans for Year 4 and 5 investments.

#### **Grant Performance**

#### Year 1

The Chancellor's Office, consistent with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) definitions for post-college employment and earnings, calculates results for all course completers, regardless of completion status. This means that the Chancellor's Office must wait a full year to ensure that students do not re-enroll in additional coursework. Colleges are given three months to turn in their end of year numbers; student data is not available until 15 months after the end of the school year. At that point, Workforce and Economic Development sends a file of students meeting the course completer definition to the Employment Development Department, which matches the file against their state wage file, and returns the value to us. The information is then imported into the Cal-PASS Plus data system in order to build the LaunchBoard tables, where information can be sorted for factors like graduating from a Proposition 39 program. Historically, the match with the wage files was only done once a year.

The Chancellor's Office spent most of last year negotiating with Employment Development Department for more frequent data matches, which resulted in delays in getting the annual match done. Workforce and Economic Development Division has not yet received the file that would include students who graduated in fiscal year 2014-15, but anticipate having the information by the end of February 2017. Given the size of Workforce and Economic Development's data system, it takes three months to rebuild the data cubes and test the data to ensure that reload did not break any of the data fields. Workforce and Economic Development Division anticipate being able to provide more current information by the end of May.

Workforce and Economic Development Division calculated these figures by counting all students in the 113 California community colleges who earned awards that are coded in the subject areas that align with the Proposition 39 program. However, the Chancellor's Office is unable to discern whether Proposition 39 funding were used for these programs.

#### **Employment and Earnings Outcomes**

For students who graduated in 2013-14 (most recent available year)

	Number of Graduates Who Attained the Metric	Total Number of Graduates	Percentage
Employed Two Fiscal Quarters After Exit	3277	4749	69%
Employed Four Fiscal Quarters After Exit	3277	4749	69%
Median Annual Post-College Earnings	4749	4749	\$36,757
Median Increase in Earnings*	1757	4749	37%
Employed in Job Closely Related to Major**	293	358	82%

<sup>\*</sup> This metric could only be calculated for students with wage data both before and after attending community college

#### Year 2

More than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in year two. Completions were distributed as follows:

772 AA/AS Degrees

800 Certificates (6-8 units)

1,247 Certificates (>18 units)

2,590 Industry/Apprenticeship Certifications

#### Program Improvement initiatives funded in Year 2 included \$1,920,969

- Launched statewide Expert Networks as professional learning communities for faculty in HVAC, Advanced Lighting Controls, Building Science, and Energy Analytics and Auditing, attended by 40 faculty statewide.
- Engaged several thousand high school students and more than 200 career counselors in energy efficiency and renewable energy career awareness sessions.
- Developed a set of Zero Net energy career pathways at College of the Desert, organized into 13 certificate programs.
- Launched a new HVAC certificate program at West Hills Coalinga College.
- Certified seven new instructors as National Construction Crafts Education and Research instructors.

<sup>\*\*</sup> This metric is based on survey data, so only some of the total graduates are included in the figure, based on who replied to the survey

- Butte College hosted a four-day welding education event with participation from 53 high schools.
- Completed research into attracting likely completers into HVAC programs in collaboration with UC Davis and RP Group.
- Developed an online Interactive Decision Tree to guide students into energy efficiency careers.
- Launched a website that connects potential students with energy efficiency programs at Bay Area colleges.

#### **Proposition 39 Regions:**

**North/Far North** (Butte, Cosumnes River, American River, Mendocino, Sacramento City, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyous)

•	Approved (	Certificates/Degrees l	Earned in Energy	Efficiency Courses:	533

• Award: \$415,814

• Equipment: \$365,520

• Program Improvement: \$50,294

**Bay Area** (Cabrillo, Diablo Valley, Foothill, Laney\*, Las Positas, San Jose City, San Mateo, Santa Rosa, Skyline):

Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 725

• Award: \$300,000

• Equipment: \$50,830

• Program Improvement: \$249,170

**Central/Mother Lode/Coast** (Allan Hancock, Antelope Valley, Bakersfield\*, Canyons, Cerro Coso, Columbia\*\*, Cuesta, Fresno City\*\*, Merced, Modesto Junior\*\*, Moorpark\*\*, Oxnard, Porterville, Reedley\*\*, San Joaquin Delta, Santa Barbara, Sequoias, Taft, West Hills Coalinga\*\*)

Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 1,055

• Award: \$355,135

• Equipment: \$190,969

• Program Improvement: \$164,166

**Los Angeles/Orange County** (East Los Angeles, El Camino\*, Glendale Community, Los Angeles Trade-Technical, Los Angeles Valley, Mt. San Antonio, Rio Hondo, Santa Monica, Santiago Canyon)

Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 2,133

• Award: \$1,531,174

• Equipment: \$147,160

• Program Improvement: \$1,384,014

**San Diego/Imperial/Desert** (Barstow, Chaffey, Desert, Imperial Valley, MiraCosta\*, Norco, Palo Verde, Palomar\*, Riverside City, San Bernardino Valley, San Diego City, Victor Valley)

Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 963

• Award: \$266,908

• Equipment: \$201,421

• Program Improvement: \$65,487

# **Appendices**

(click to download)

Prop 39 Year 2 Closed-Out Data

Prop 39 Year 3 Closed-Out Data

Prop 39 Year 2 and Year 3 In-Progress Data

**Energy Usage Data** 

Front cover photos: American River College students and instructors work on various solar energy projects.

Photo at right: Students study a solar panel at City College of San Francisco.

Back cover photos: (left to right) College of the Desert students receive instruction on installing a solar panel; Contra Costa College students work on a clean energy project.



# Connect with us!

# **WEBSITES**

**California Community Colleges** 

CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu

**Student Success Scorecard** 

scorecard.ccco.edu

Salary Surfer

salarysurfer.cccco.edu

**Associate Degree for Transfer** 

adegreewithaguarantee.com

**Priority Registration** 

stepforward.cccco.edu

**Workforce & Economic Development** 

doingwhatmatters.ccco.edu

**Financial Aid** 

icanaffordcollege.com

# **SOCIAL MEDIA**

California Community Colleges
Facebook Page

facebook.com/CACommColleges

Financial Aid Facebook Page facebook.com/icanaffordcollege

California Community Colleges
Twitter Feed

twitter.com/CalCommColleges

Chancellor Eloy Oakley Twitter Feed twitter.com/EloyOakley

Workforce & Economic Development Twitter Feed

twitter.com/WorkforceVan

Financial Aid Twitter Feed twitter.com/ICanAfrdCollege

California Community Colleges
YouTube Page

youtube.com/CACommunityColleges

Financial Aid YouTube Page youtube.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE

California Community Colleges
Instagram Page

instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges

Financial Aid Instagram Page instagram.com/icanaffordcollege





California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office 1102 Q Street | Suite 4400 | Sacramento, CA 95811 CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu

# Projects Closed Out in Year 2 (July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015)

												Calculated										
												Total First										
							Verified		Calculated	Calculated		Year		Verified		First Year	Avg					
	No. of	<b>Verified Prop</b>	Prop 39		Verified	Verified	Annual	Nameplate	Total Direct	<b>Total Trainee</b>	Calculated	Apprentice	<b>Verified Direct</b>	Trainee Job		Apprentice	Number o	of Avg Time From	Verified GHG	Number of		
	Completed	39 Total	Funding % of	Verified Prop 39	Prop 39	Prop 39	<b>Energy Cost</b>	Rating	Job Years	Job Years	Total Direct	Direct Job	Job Years	Years	Direct Job	Direct Job	FTE	Award to Close	Reduction	Homes		
District	Projects	<b>Project Cost</b>	Total Cost	kWh Svgs	kW Svgs	th Svgs	Savings	(Self Gen)	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Job-Hours	Hours	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Hours	Hours	Months	Out	(tons CO2)	Powered	Verified Incentive	Notes
Antelope Valley Community College District	1	\$385,458	87%	205,830	0	0	\$26,758		2.16	0.06	4,490	125	0.13	0.21	267.00	430.50	1.54	330	142	33	\$49,399	
Barstow Community College District	1	\$167,143	52%	72,832	0	0	\$11,653		0.94	0.03	1,947	54	0.04	0.04	82.00	82.00	0.47	328	50	12	\$17,480	
Butte-Glenn Community College District	1	\$10,000	100%	0	0	0	\$0		0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	480	0	0	\$0	Technical assistance audit:
Cabrillo Community College District	5	\$590,514	65%	242,861	31	0	\$33,806		3.31	0.09	6,878	191	0.57	0.00	1194.90	0.00	1.38	279	167	38	\$58,287	
Cerritos Community College District	2	\$583,435	90%	235,252	0	0	\$30,583		3.27	0.09	6,796	189	0.28	0.06	588.00	117.00	1.70	363	162	37	\$56,460	
Chaffey Community College District	2	\$154,183	66%	0	0	41,796	\$25,454		0.86	0.02	1,796	50	0.07	0.00	138.32	0.00	0.40	171	222	57	\$52,200	
Citrus Community College District	2	\$422,282	91%	158,986	5	0	\$20,668		2.36	0.07	4,919	137	0.22	0.02	454.00	36.00	1.31	339	110	25	\$30,870	
Compton Community College District	3	\$267,792	80%	164,494	19	0	\$21,384		1.50	0.04	3,119	87	1.64	1.81	3406.00	3758.00	6.55	284	113	26	\$39,479	
El Camino Community College District	5	\$441,694	83%	320,901	0	0	\$45,530		2.47	0.07	5,145	143	0.25	0.00	520.00	0.00	0.60	252	221	51	\$77,016	
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	2	\$200,000	100%	0	0	0	\$0		0.00	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	343	0	0	\$0	Technical assistance audits
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	6	\$873,780	70%	283,279	49	0	\$48,157		4.89	0.14	10,178	283	1.10	0.38	2282.00	796.99	2.19	360	195	45	\$52,682	
Hartnell Community College District	1	\$332,274	71%	132,360	0	0	\$15,883		1.86	0.05	3,870	108	0.35	0.00	723.00	0.00	4.17	407	91	21	\$31,766	
Imperial Community College District	3	\$320,000	73%	0	0	11,389	\$8,074		1.79	0.05	3,727	104	0.07	0.54	139.92	1119.00	0.27	391	60	16	\$19,740	
Kern Community College District	3	\$946,047	70%	409.340	38	0	\$51,771		5.30	0.15	11.020	306	1.14	0.06	2374.08	133.00	4.57	269	282	65	\$85,676	
Lake Tahoe Community College District	3	\$76,151	70%	80,234	15	0	\$8,826		0.43	0.01	887	25	0.08	0.00	173.70	0.00	0.33	225	55	13	\$10.020	
Long Beach Community College District	6	\$1,680,109	42%	1,137,319	390	0	\$147,851		9.41	0.26	19.570	544	2.04	0.01	4245.20	24.00	4.08	372	784	180	\$273,584	
Marin Community College District	2	\$133,985	26%	142,757	0	64.697	\$68,888		0.75	0.02	1,561	43	0.03	0.00	62.25	0.00	0.18	468	441	111	\$98,959	
Mt. San Antonio Community College District	1	\$2,712,774	38%	801.941	75	0.,037	\$104.252		15.19	0.42	31.598	878	0.97	0.46	2013.50	955.00	11.62	515	553	127	\$192.466	
North Orange County Community College District	5	\$1,268,879	75%	1.338.247	483	0	\$173,972		7.11	0.20	14.780	411	1.30	0.14	2709.50	297.00	3.13	411	923	211	\$321.179	
Ohlone Community College District	4	\$360,070	78%	144,410	18	(471)	\$16,952		2.02	0.06	4.194	117	0.13	0.05	278.00	101.50	0.40	264	97	22	\$32,924	
Palo Verde Community College District	1	\$101,920	64%	99,517	0	0	\$12,937		0.57	0.02	1.187	33	0.01	0.05	13.75	110.00	0.08	301	69	16	\$23.884	
Rancho Santiago Community College District	3	\$1.575.833	65%	1.345.065	209	20.686	\$187.270		8.82	0.25	18.355	510	0.89	0.08	1843.31	162.00	3.55	306	1.037	241	\$321.067	
Riverside Community College District	1	\$98.043	84%	258.465	0	0	\$33,600		0.55	0.02	1.142	32	0.03	0.00	72.00	0.00	0.42	347	178	41	\$15.508	
San Bernardino Community College District	2	\$568.699	66%	605.928	1	0	\$78,771		3.18	0.09	6.624	184	0.43	0.00	890.50	0.00	1.71	256	418	96	\$145,423	
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	1	\$848.464	65%	569.928	0	0	\$48,444		4.75	0.13	9.883	275	0.46	0.46	953.50	951.00	5.50	374	393	90	\$136,783	
San Jose/Evergreen Community College District	2	\$714,152	68%	369.765	0	0	\$33.598		4.00	0.13	8.318	231	0.26	0.14	535.00	300.00	1.54	342	255	58	\$71.203	
San Jose/Evergreen Community Conege District		3714,132	0676	303,703	0	0	\$33,336		4.00	0.11	8,318	231	0.20	0.14	333.00	300.00	1.54	342	233	36	371,203	
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	1	\$315,315	90%	126,996	0	0	\$15,240		1.77	0.05	3.673	102	0.08	0.00	161.00	0.00	0.93	332	88	20	\$30.479	
Santa Barbara Community College District	1	\$556,058	88%	284,810	75	0	\$37,025		3.11	0.09	6.477	180	0.23	0.17	470.00	354.99	2.71	270	196	45	\$68.354	
Santa Monica Community College District	2	\$888.573	84%	347.099	16	6,014	\$49,333		4.98	0.09	10.350	288	0.29	0.17	604.50	209.00	1.16	238	271	63	\$83.942	
Sequoias Community College District	2	\$324,991	85%	157,310	0	24.900	\$40,370		1.82	0.05	3.785	105	0.04	0.10	73.00	60.00	0.21	411	240	59	\$47.954	
Sequolas Community College District	2	\$524,991	65%	157,510	U	24,900	\$40,570		1.02	0.03	3,763	103	0.04	0.03	75.00	60.00	0.21	411	240	39	\$47,954	
Chasta Tahana Trinita Isint Canananita Callaga District	1	\$277,000	91%	110 400	0	0	\$11,040		1.55	0.04	3,226	90	0.09	0.00	170.00	163.00	1 02	373	76	17	\$25,963	
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District	2	\$847,236	84%	110,400 576,335	104	3.810			4.74	0.04	9.869	274	0.09	0.08 0.27	179.00 1685.25	552.50	1.03 3.24	352	418	96	\$25,963	
Sierra Joint Community College District	3		69%		53	3,810	\$72,208 \$76,572	<del> </del>	2.40	0.13	4,983	138	0.81	0.27	1019.00	160.00	1.96	352	386	96 88		
Sonoma County Junior College District	3	\$427,811		559,213		+ -	. ,	-			.,										\$134,211	
South Orange County Community College District	2	\$1,465,876	69%	536,775	0	0	\$69,781	-	8.21	0.23	17,075	474	1.38	0.00	2873.00	0.00	8.29	297	370	85	\$128,826	
State Center Community College District	ь	\$1,154,926 \$863.300	80% 79%	558,854 758.015	0	0	\$83,828 \$98.542	-	6.47 4.83	0.18	13,453 10.056	374 279	1.13 0.28	0.31	2350.92 576.00	634.90 0.00	2.26	325 294	385 523	88 120	\$103,001	
Ventura County Community College District	3	, ,		,		+ -	, , -	-			-,						1.11				\$181,924	
Victor Valley Community College District	1	\$287,374	90%	143,950	11	0	\$20,153		1.61	0.04	3,347	93	0.20	0.10	412.00	201.00	2.38	291	99	23	\$30,007	
West Valley-Mission Community College District	3	\$772,037	75%	224,868	8	0	\$29,300	1	4.32	0.12	8,993	250	1.47	0.35	3061.34	724.15	5.89	362	155	36	\$27,798	
Yosemite Community College District	1	\$92,140	47%	43,865	11	0	\$5,702	1	0.52	0.01	1,073	30	0.13	0.00	260.00	0.00	1.50	465	30	7	\$0	
Yuba Community College District	3	\$146,507	79%	105,683	12	2,221	\$13,586		0.82	0.02	1,707	47	0.16	0.00	336.00	0.00	0.65	260	85	20	\$28,066	
TOTAL	102	\$24,252,823	69%	13,653,884	1,622	175,042	\$1,877,765	0	134.64	3.74	280,051	7,779	19.24	5.98	40,020	12,433	2.28	335	10,343	2,397	\$3,225,294	

# CCCCO REPORT - PROJECT LEVEL Projects Closed Out in Year 3 (July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2016)

												Calculated										
												Total First										
							Verified		Calculated	Calculated		Year		Verified		First Year	Avg					
	No. of		Prop 39		Verified	Verified	Annual	Nameplate	Total Direct	Total Trainee	Calculated	Apprentice	Verified Direct	Trainee Job		Apprentice	Number of	_	Verified GHG	Number of		
	Completed	Verified Prop 39 Total Project	Funding % of	Verified Prop 39	Prop 39	Prop 39	Energy Cost	Rating	Job Years	Job Years	Total Direct	Direct Job	Job Years	Years	Direct Job	Direct Job	FTE	Award to Close		Homes		
District	Projects	Cost	Total Cost	kWh Svgs	kW Svgs	th Svgs	Savings	(Self Gen)	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Job Hours	Hours	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Hours	Hours	Months	Out	(tons CO2)	Powered	Verified Incentive	Notes
Antelope Valley Community College District	1	\$369,361	94%	97,548	0	0	\$12,681		2.07	0.06	4,302	120	0.18	0.05	377.00	102.00	2.18	474	67	15	\$23,412	<b></b>
Barstow Community College District	1	\$76,456	93%	8,856	0		\$1,151		0.43	0.01	891	25	0.02	0.01	32.75	29.50	0.19	418	6	1	\$2,125	<b></b>
Butte-Glenn Community College District	1	\$420,612	91%	130,500	0	6,530	\$110,930		2.36	0.07	4,899	136	1.43	0.00	2981.50	0.00	17.20	582	125	30	\$37,850	<b></b>
Cabrillo Community College District	6	\$379,365	88%	349,771	15	0	\$34,451		2.12	0.06	4,419	123	0.48	0.02	1001.25	47.00	0.96	278	241	55	\$23,526	<b></b>
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	4	\$1,242,646	47%	1,032,042	88	0	\$134,165		6.96	0.19	14,474	402	0.95	0.14	1970.00	296.00	2.84	691	712	163	\$97,482	<u> </u>
Chaffey Community College District	5	\$866,522	92%	227,669	11	17,583	\$43,793		4.85	0.13	10,093	280	0.45	0.01	927.50	12.00	1.07	549	250	60	\$67,446	<u></u>
Citrus Community College District	2	\$538,958	59%	301,099	0	0	\$24,593		3.02	0.08	6,278	174	0.43	0.00	903.00	0.00	2.61	442	208	48	\$66,200	<u></u>
Coast Community College District	4	\$1,613,997	58%	799,440	2	3,400	\$66,044		9.04	0.25	18,800	522	1.38	0.26	2872.00	547.00	4.14	651	569	131	\$199,459	<u>.                                    </u>
Compton Community College District	1	\$200,679	91%	77,571	28	0	\$10,084		1.12	0.03	2,338	65	0.16	0.05	327.00	110.00	1.89	424	53	12	\$18,617	<u>.                                    </u>
Contra Costa Community College District	1	\$12,428	95%	3,678	0	0	\$309		0.07	0.00	145	4	0.01	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.09	330	3	1	\$650	i
Copper Mountain Community College District	2	\$201,930	48%	111,454	6	0	\$15,041		1.13	0.03	2,352	65	0.12	0.01	259.00	29.00	0.75	624	77	18	\$22,610	
Desert Community College District	5	\$734,989	64%	828,891	17	4,588	\$80,104		4.12	0.11	8,561	238	0.61	0.10	1273.00	209.00	1.47	724	596	137	\$203,522	
El Camino Community College District	2	\$824,012	97%	94,057	0	1,587	\$12,556		4.61	0.13	9,598	267	0.80	0.20	1668.75	420.75	4.81	371	73	17	\$22,214	
Kern Community College District	4	\$545,269	96%	277,661	0	0	\$36,096		3.05	0.08	6,351	176	0.50	0.08	1041.00	173.50	1.50	650	191	44	\$21,120	
Lake Tahoe Community College District	3	\$56,787	84%	22,920	2	0	\$2,521		0.32	0.01	661	18	0.04	0.00	91.50	4.00	0.18	654	16	4	\$2,966	1
Marin Community College District	1	\$91,500	95%	0	0	3,717	\$2,974		0.51	0.01	1,066	30	0.02	0.01	43.00	12.00	0.25	605	20	5	\$0	1
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	8	\$191,815	81%	172,201	7	1,521	\$23,313		1.07	0.03	2,234	62	0.26	0.00	534.00	0.00	0.39	450	127	29	\$18,942	1
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	5	\$286,474	89%	109,468	36	0	\$14,231		1.60	0.04	3,337	93	0.08	0.01	170.00	16.00	0.20	716	75	17	\$30,470	
Napa Valley Community College District	4	\$352.754	81%	322,469	10	0	\$44.144		1.98	0.05	4.109	114	0.13	0.07	274.50	144.00	0.40	657	222	51	\$63,265	i
North Orange County Community College District	4	\$2.608.353	45%	781.972	137	19.836	\$148.005		14.61	0.41	30.382	844	1.44	0.06	3001.00	127.00	4.33	458	644	151	\$142,560	i
Ohlone Community College District	2	\$248,520	82%	184.422	0	0	\$19.303		1.39	0.04	2.895	80	0.11	0.04	220.50	86.50	0.64	547	127	29	\$43,696	i
Pasadena Area Community College District	6	\$1,798,222	42%	683,989	53	5,374	\$106,360		10.07	0.28	20.946	582	1.37	0.00	2851.00	0.00	2.74	547	500	115	\$109,701	
Peralta Community College District	5	\$647.618	76%	663,960	0	0	\$86.132		3.63	0.10	7,543	210	0.83	0.08	1717.50	175.00	1.98	648	458	105	\$157,929	
Rancho Santiago Community College District	3	\$1.031.176	79%	911,897	256	0	\$157,056		5.77	0.16	12,011	334	1.55	0.00	3226.00	0.00	6.21	497	629	144	\$216.821	
Rio Hondo Community College District	5	\$775.715	75%	859.422	90	0	\$111.725		4.34	0.12	9.036	251	0.30	0.11	629.00	230.00	0.73	726	593	136	\$191,234	<u> </u>
Riverside Community College District	5	\$796.048	91%	512.442	30	0	\$54.118		4.46	0.12	9,272	258	0.43	0.14	898.50	288.25	1.04	528	353	81	\$65,246	
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	1	\$305,966	55%	98.561	0	0	\$8,378		1.71	0.05	3,564	99	0.27	0.19	564.00	403.00	3.25	510	68	16	\$23,655	
San Jose/Evergreen Community College District	4	\$403,198	90%	96.680	25	0	\$14,528		2.26	0.06	4,696	130	0.33	0.00	688.00	0.00	0.99	531	67	15	\$7.134	i
Surrose/Evergreen community conege District	7	Ş403,130	3070	30,000	23		ÿ14,520		2.20	0.00	4,050	150	0.55	0.00	000.00	0.00	0.55	331	- 07	13	γ1,15 <sup>-1</sup>	i
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	4	\$377.823	70%	212.660	34	(834)	\$28.623		2.12	0.06	4.401	122	0.41	0.08	845.00	169.00	1.22	415	142	32	\$42.455	i
San Mateo County Community College District	2	\$5,264,393	14%	2,163,305	0	0	\$249,982	1,250	23.27	0.65	48,392	1,344	19.09	2.03	6002.65	4224.87	11.55	816	1,492	342	\$47,001	i
Santa Barbara Community College District	1	\$459.740	88%	241.970	62	0	\$31,456	1,230	2.57	0.07	5.355	149	0.49	0.06	1015.00	130.00	5.86	600	167	38	\$47,444	
Santa Clarita Community College District	4	\$1,058,910	83%	415.197	41	24.411	\$72,693		5.93	0.16	12.334	343	3.59	0.03	7464.75	60.75	10.77	648	416	99	\$116.706	
Sequoias Community College District	1	\$289,859	82%	97.431	0	0	\$12,666		1.62	0.05	3,376	94	0.15	0.03	312.00	156.00	1.80	575	67	15	\$23,383	
Sequoias Community Conege District	1	\$269,659	8270	97,431	U	U	\$12,000		1.02	0.05	3,370	94	0.15	0.08	312.00	156.00	1.60	3/3	67	15	\$25,565	
Shasta Tahama Trinity Jaint Community College District	1	\$59,709	100%	83.394	0	0	\$8.339		0.33	0.01	695	19	0.05	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.58	399	58	13	\$0	i
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District Sierra Joint Community College District	1	\$59,709 \$173.462	90%	78,258	38	0	\$8,339	-	0.33	0.01	2,020	56	0.05	0.00	254.00	271.00	1.47	547	58	13	\$16,921	
, ,	4	\$173,462 \$175.004	79%	78,258 228.724	38 1	4.994	\$11,034		0.97		2,020	56		0.13	254.00		0.40	609	184	43	\$16,921	
Siskiyous Community College District	4	1 -7		-,		,	. ,	-		0.03	,		0.13			0.00					1 - /	
Solano Community College District		\$547,949	47%	614,355	0	0	\$67,506		3.07	0.09	6,383	177	0.59	0.00	1218.00	0.00	1.76	679	424	97	\$146,538	
State Center Community College District	4	\$401,149	98%	181,791	0	0	\$17,172		2.25	0.06	4,673	130	0.13	0.11	278.00	238.00	0.40	631	125	29	\$9,000	
Ventura County Community College District	3	\$1,196,394	77%	650,876	0	0	\$50,768		6.70	0.19	13,936	387	0.53	0.00	1105.00	0.00	2.13	708	449	103	\$142,613	
Victor Valley Community College District	1	\$268,161	89%	119,950	0	15,167	\$23,811		1.50	0.04	3,124	87	0.34	0.03	711.00	58.00	4.10	433	163	40	\$28,788	
West Hills Community College District	2	\$254,191	68%	226,751	0	0	\$20,408		1.42	0.04	2,961	82	0.16	0.00	341.00	0.00	0.98	782	156	36	\$54,040	
West Kern Community College District	5	\$207,967	79%	149,343	0	0	\$18,908		1.16	0.03	2,422	67	0.15	0.03	312.49	70.00	0.36	691	103	24	\$29,249	
West Valley-Mission Community College District	3	\$575,280	70%	136,536	44	24,524	\$40,057		3.22	0.09	6,701	186	0.14	0.02	281.00	39.50	0.54	654	224	55	\$0	
Yosemite Community College District	4	\$983,199	95%	581,965	67	0	\$70,287		5.51	0.15	11,452	318	1.33	0.00	2758.00	0.00	3.98	433	401	92	\$48,848	
Yuba Community College District	12	\$784,620	44%	306,242	38	9,126	\$41,770		4.39	0.12	9,139	254	1.05	0.00	2174.00	0.00	1.05	729	260	61	\$80,475	
	152	\$30,699,181	61%	16,249,388	1,136	141,524	\$2,181,504	1,250	165.70	4.60	344,657	9,574	43.13	4.27	56,005	8,879	2.53	570	11,955	2,761	\$2,750,730	

# CCCCO REPORT - PROJECT LEVEL In-Progress Projects (All Fiscal Years)

													Calculated	Calculated		Calculated First					
1													Direct	Trainee		Year Apprentice					
1	No. of Projects In	Current Prop 39	Prop 39 Funding % of		Current Prop 39		Current Annual Energy Cost	Nameplate Rating	Current Direct Job Years	Current Trainee Job Years		First Year Apprentice	Construction Job Years	Construction  Job Years	Direct Construction	Direct Construction	Avg Number of	Current GHG Reduction	Number of Homes		
District	Progress	Total Project Cost	Total Cost	Current Prop 39 kWh Svgs	kW Svgs	Current Prop 39 th Svgs	Savings	(Self-Gen)	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Direct Job Hours	Direct Job Hours	(FTEs)	(FTEs)	Job Hours	Job Hours	FTE Months	(tons CO2)	Powered	Current Incentive	Notes
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	11	\$1,209,890	92%	528,856	0	12,547	\$77,277		5.85	0.16	6176.10	235.63	1.52	0.15	1607.58	218.52	0.84	431	101	\$97,329	
Antelope Valley Community College District	2	\$296,582	79%	332,197	9	0	\$43,186		1.66	0.05	3454.58	95.96	0.43	0.04	899.19	88.99	2.59	229	52	\$61,756	
Barstow Community College District Butte-Glenn Community College District	3	\$124,050 \$1,631,375	59% 62%	34,852 732,961	0	8,686	\$5,228 \$82,881	150	7.46	0.02 0.21	1444.93 15507.85	40.14 430.77	0.18 1.94	0.02	376.10 4036.54	37.22 399.49	7.76	24 551	6 128	\$6,387 \$118,623	
Cabrillo Community College District	4	\$440,944	60%	121,674	37	5,358	\$25,273	130	2.15	0.06	3535.52	69.18	0.56	0.06	920.26	64.16	1.33	112	27	\$44,330	
Cerritos Community College District	7	\$1,786,730	74%	746,589	126	6,929	\$101,214		10.01	0.28	11744.50	673.35	2.60	0.26	3056.98	624.45	2.52	552	127	\$150,406	
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	11	\$1,720,588	79%	681,073	119	104,567	\$156,652		9.64	0.27	20041.41	556.71	2.51	0.25	5216.58	516.28	2.74	1024	251	\$144,682	
Chaffey Community College District	3	\$524,503	98%	176,071	48	0	\$27,273		2.94	0.08	6109.41	169.71	0.76	0.08	1590.22	157.38	3.06	121	28	\$10,757	
Citrus Community College District  Coast Community College District	4 5	\$388,544 \$2,444,178	84% 73%	170,255 1,716,547	274	1,700	\$22,133 \$231,230		2.18	0.06	4525.77 28469.78	125.72 790.83	0.57 3.56	0.06 0.35	1178.01 7410.41	116.59 733.40	1.70 8.55	117 1193	27 274	\$30,468 \$223,402	
Compton Community College District	1	\$223,800	70%	0	0	3,880	\$3,104		1.25	0.03	2606.82	72.41	0.33	0.03	678.53	67.15	3.92	21	5	\$3,880	
Contra Costa Community College District	23	\$4,090,800	82%	1,323,774	164	25,766	\$200,044		22.91	0.64	47574.76	1317.08	5.96	0.59	12383.25	1221.44	3.11	1049	244	\$144,610	
Copper Mountain Community College District	1	\$61,192	69%	15,564	6	0	\$2,366		0.34	0.01	712.76	19.80	0.09	0.01	185.53	18.36	1.07	11	2	\$3,512	
Desert Community College District	1	\$238,601	92%	86,772	0	0	\$6,942		1.34	0.04	2779.22	77.20	0.35	0.03	723.41	71.59	4.17	60	14	\$19,819	
El Camino Community College District Feather River Community College District	6	\$491,110 \$157,427	85% 80%	313,224 105.640	0 3633	0 9,015	\$40,463 \$42,839	2	2.75 0.86	0.08	305.02 1592.71	104.00 44.24	0.72 0.22	0.07	79.39 414.57	96.45 41.03	0.23	216 121	49 29	\$75,174 \$11,684	
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	11	\$2,386,191	80%	315,599	69	77,758	\$100,784	2	13.36	0.37	27794.36	772.07	3.48	0.34	7234.60	716.00	3.80	630	156	\$123,656	
Gavilan Joint Community College District	10	\$771,414	87%	261,951	62	(154)	\$43,575		4.32	0.12	4579.13	120.00	1.12	0.11	1191.90	111.29	0.69	180	41	\$19,484	
Glendale Community College District	14	\$1,296,726	72%	975,100	46	39,274	\$159,675		7.26	0.20	15104.27	419.56	1.89	0.19	3931.49	389.10	1.62	881	208	\$125,956	
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	13	\$1,466,920	60%	759,360	161	12,374	\$138,062		8.21	0.23	17086.68	474.63	2.14	0.21	4447.50	440.17	1.97	589	137	\$83,398	
Hartnell Community College District	1 7	\$400,000 \$785,829	100% 82%	160,500 437.654	74	7,602 8,738	\$27,910 \$73,907		2.24 4.40	0.06	4659.20 7580.71	129.42 200.99	0.58	0.06	1212.74 1973.19	120.02 186.40	7.00 1.63	151 348	36 81	\$0 \$61.863	
Imperial Community College District Kern Community College District	4	\$1,149,064	92%	512,296	0	8,738	\$47,382		6.43	0.12	12652.55	342.52	1.15	0.11	3293.34	317.64	4.75	353	81	\$42,011	
Lake Tahoe Community College District	1	\$64,702	90%	41,936	0	0	\$4,613		0.36	0.01	753.65	20.93	0.09	0.01	196.17	19.41	1.13	29	7	\$6,290	
Lassen Community College District	1	\$156,925	100%	0	0	7,351	\$9,630		0.88	0.02	1827.86	50.77	0.23	0.02	475.77	47.09	2.75	39	10	\$0	
Long Beach Community College District	8	\$1,627,030	87%	1,044,552	78	0	\$146,458		9.11	0.25	18197.32	501.76	2.37	0.23	4736.58	465.32	3.42	720	165	\$191,967	
Los Angeles Community College District Los Rios Community College District	42 31	\$12,306,564 \$4,719,840	94%	4,507,112 3,110,875	504 0	129,274 107,058	\$739,181 \$463,820		68.92 26.43	1.91 0.73	134358.16 54976.70	3783.50 1527.13	17.94 6.88	1.78 0.68	34972.12 14309.90	3508.77 1416.24	4.80 2.66	3793 2713	889 638	\$698,537 \$50,077	
Marin Community College District	1	\$610.603	69%	2,598	0	138	\$422		3.42	0.09	7112.30	197.56	0.89	0.09	1851.26	183.22	10.68	3	1	\$1,600	
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	1	\$103,149	100%	22,990	9	0	\$3,655		0.58	0.02	1201.48	33.37	0.15	0.01	312.73	30.95	1.80	16	4	\$0	
Merced Community College District	16	\$923,326	95%	422,283	64	176	\$50,817		5.17	0.14	9893.71	274.83	1.35	0.13	2575.24	254.87	0.93	292	67	\$26,740	
MiraCosta Community College District	9	\$1,224,337	86%	568,956	59	6,102	\$83,836		6.86	0.19	9995.56	263.52	1.78	0.18	2601.75	244.38	1.67	425	98	\$111,759	
Monterey Peninsula Community College District Mt. San Antonio Community College District	10	\$688,903 \$10,395,917	90%	383,882 4,440,333	22 1500	2,730	\$43,775 \$649,088	1920	3.86 50.66	0.11 1.41	5453.08 105370.20	149.17 2926.95	1.00 13.19	0.10 1.31	1419.38 27426.84	138.34 2714.42	0.82 79.13	279 3062	64 702	\$52,601 \$2,162,588	
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	2	\$951,000	76%	490.689	33	0	\$63,790	1920	5.33	0.15	11077.25	307.70	1.39	0.14	2883.30	285.36	8.32	338	78	\$126,206	
Napa Valley Community College District	1	\$203,144	87%	198,832	36	0	\$33,801		1.14	0.03	365.50	0.00	0.30	0.03	95.14	0.00	0.55	137	31	\$26,607	
North Orange County Community College District	4	\$7,772,837	30%	790,363	1113	16,718	\$237,087		43.53	1.21	90538.01	2514.94	11.33	1.12	23566.16	2332.33	34.00	634	148	\$813,012	
Ohlone Community College District	3	\$560,747	93%	338,104	38	0	\$33,694		3.14	0.09	3740.28	172.45	0.82	0.08	973.56	159.93	1.87	233	53	\$37,127	
Palo Verde Community College District Palomar Community College District	4	\$373,093 \$2,208,436	44% 54%	156,639 1,027,694	46 10	3,398 26.338	\$24,095 \$137.064		2.09	0.06 0.34	3031.09 15937.19	84.20 2068.58	0.54 3.22	0.05	788.96 4148.30	78.08 1918.37	1.14 3.42	126 848	29 198	\$37,819 \$259,309	
Pasadena Area Community College District	4	\$2,208,436	75%	538.648	56	51.225	\$116.655		9.29	0.34	19320.54	536.68	2.42	0.32	5028.95	497.71	7.25	643	155	\$137,593	
Peralta Community College District	15	\$2,558,327	52%	1,047,989	266	50,920	\$192,336		14.33	0.40	29799.39	827.76	3.73	0.37	7756.49	767.65	2.98	993	235	\$340,530	
Rancho Santiago Community College District	7	\$2,291,763	82%	870,194	183	0	\$126,428		12.83	0.36	19215.85	758.40	3.34	0.33	5001.70	703.33	4.12	600	137	\$132,209	
Redwoods Community College District	3	\$466,066	76%	224,049	0	0	\$25,318		2.61	0.07	5428.73	150.80	0.68	0.07	1413.05	139.85	2.72	154	35	\$58,789	
Rio Hondo Community College District	7	\$450,168	84%	254,348	52	10,873	\$38,133		2.52	0.07	5243.55	145.65	0.66	0.06	1364.85	135.08	1.13	233	55	\$70,429	
Riverside Community College District San Bernardino Community College District	10	\$1,846,690 \$790,105	90%	1,230,553 431,239	67 48	3,453	\$164,586 \$37,099		10.34 4.42	0.29	19581.43 7701.93	525.04 270.93	2.69	0.27 0.11	5096.86 2004.74	486.92 251.26	2.94	867 297	199 68	\$133,664 \$94,518	
San Diego Community College District	46	\$3,676,043	89%	1,591,892	182	2,619	\$313,980		20.59	0.57	42818.55	1189.40	5.36	0.53	11145.25	1103.04	1.40	1112	255	\$401,721	
San Francisco Community College District	7	\$2,986,482	93%	923,843	349	165,043	\$139,309		16.72	0.46	34786.54	966.29	4.35	0.43	9054.60	896.13	7.46	1512	372	\$73,905	
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	8	\$784,218	88%	405,889	22	16,104	\$58,959		4.39	0.12	7005.05	205.72	1.14	0.11	1823.35	190.79	1.32	365	86	\$55,685	
San Jose/Evergreen Community College District	3	\$293,212	95%	107,575	1	2,044	\$16,340		1.64	0.05	3415.33	94.87	0.43	0.04	888.98	87.98	1.71	85	20	\$15,493	
San Luis Obispo County Community College District San Mateo County Community College District	2	\$651,197 \$1.814.448	78% 58%	100,627 853,729	0	68,971	\$60,181 \$76.836		3.65 10.16	0.10	7000.45 21134.69	194.46 587.07	0.95 2.64	0.09	1822.15 5501.15	180.34 544.45	2.63	435 589	110 135	\$44,898 \$178.043	
Santa Barbara Community College District	1	\$994,113	90%	341,585	106	0	\$49,530		5.57	0.28	11579.43	321.65	1.45	0.14	3014.01	298.29	17.39	236	54	\$27,680	
Santa Clarita Community College District	5	\$1,424,081	76%	564,373	9	43,920	\$104,288		7.97	0.22	16587.70	460.77	2.08	0.21	4317.62	427.31	4.98	622	149	\$174,429	
Santa Monica Community College District	2	\$1,228,074	81%	251,990	27	20,494	\$59,909		6.88	0.19	14304.61	397.35	1.79	0.18	3723.35	368.50	10.74	282	68	\$80,972	
Sequoias Community College District	2	\$376,144	79%	139,532	9	0	\$18,139	442	2.11	0.06	4381.33	121.70	0.55	0.05	1140.42	112.87	3.29	96	22	\$26,444	
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District Sierra Joint Community College District	1 2	\$652,764 \$898,705	86% 80%	190,563 285,642	55	0	\$35,578 \$34,001	112	2.74 5.03	0.08 0.14	5702.55 10468.12	158.40 290.78	0.71 1.31	0.07	1484.32 2724.75	146.90 269.67	8.57 5.24	131 197	30 45	\$0 \$179,772	
Siskiyous Community College District	2	\$234,719	81%	0	0	3,729	\$6,377		1.31	0.14	2734.01	75.94	0.34	0.03	711.64	70.43	2.05	20	5	\$179,772	
Solano Community College District	1	\$1,517,996	30%	706,880	0	90,231	\$190,865		8.50	0.24	17738.49	492.74	2.21	0.22	4617.16	456.96	26.64	966	235	\$251,955	
Sonoma County Junior College District	13	\$2,132,997	85%	1,102,136	23	66,654	\$180,451		11.94	0.33	22533.23	629.78	3.11	0.31	5865.18	584.05	2.60	1113	265	\$316,351	
South Orange County Community College District	2	\$1,544,916	97%	462,471	0	0	\$115,618	·	8.65	0.24	17995.18	499.87	2.25	0.22	4683.97	463.57	13.51	319	73	\$48,080	
Southwestern Community College District	14	\$1,550,526 \$1,565,901	86% 74%	887,906 500,760	89 93	0	\$115,428 \$73,111		8.68 8.77	0.24 0.24	18060.53 18239.61	501.68 506.66	2.26	0.22	4700.98 4747.59	465.25 469.87	1.94 27.40	612 345	140 79	\$75,902 \$246,272	
State Center Community College District  Ventura County Community College District	7	\$1,565,901 \$1,824,140	60%	363,559	93	706	\$73,111 \$52,908		10.22	0.24	18239.61 21247.58	506.66	2.28	0.23	4/4/.59 5530.54	469.87 547.35	4.56	345 254	79 58	\$246,272 \$54,458	
Victor Valley Community College District	2	\$1,970,121	35%	613,723	71	0	\$88,990		11.03	0.31	22947.97	637.44	2.87	0.28	5973.13	591.16	17.23	423	97	\$115,493	
West Hills Community College District	4	\$486,479	60%	344,698	0	1,093	\$32,269		2.72	0.08	2262.83	126.13	0.71	0.07	588.99	116.98	0.85	243	56	\$29,370	
West Kern Community College District	1	\$76,438	95%	35,580	0	0	\$3,202		0.43	0.01	890.35	24.73	0.11	0.01	231.75	22.94	1.34	25	6	\$4,008	
West Valley-Mission Community College District	2	\$942,355	99%	502,744	178	62,410	\$126,482	·	5.28	0.15	10976.55	304.90	1.37	0.14	2857.09	282.76	8.24	678	165	\$0	
Yosemite Community College District	6	\$1,154,546 \$259,282	100% 84%	673,422 59,911	36 21	0 106	\$70,458 \$7,274		6.47 1.45	0.18 0.04	13448.15 3020.12	373.56 83.89	1.68 0.38	0.17 0.04	3500.42 786.11	346.43 77.80	3.37 2.27	464 42	106 10	\$0 \$21,828	
Yuba Community College District	2																				