

APPENDIX B: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE PROPOSITION 39 SUMMARY  
REPORT



**TO:** Adrienne Alvord, Chair  
Citizen's Oversight Board  
Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act

**FROM:** Hoang Nguyen, Director of Facilities  
College Finance and Facilities Planning Division  
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

**RE:** California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 Report Addendum

---

The Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act has been a successful program for the California Community Colleges, having distributed \$184.9 million statewide. The Proposition 39 program has enabled 72 districts to integrate more than 900 energy efficiency projects. Since last reported to the Citizens Oversight Board there has been updates to the project data. Willdan Energy Solutions did a report for cumulative summary report for the Citizens Oversight Board and found discrepancies in the project data that has already been reported.

The discrepancies were due to revisions to our submission forms and confusion on close-out dates, data entry of close-out dates after project data runs, and project revisions after the project has already been reported. The data has been updated in the database and will be reported in the addendum for the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 report and at the Citizens Oversight Board meeting on March 17, 2020. Please contact Hoang Nguyen at [hnguyen@cccco.edu](mailto:hnguyen@cccco.edu) or (916) 327-5363 for any questions.

Regards,

*Hoang Nguyen*

Hoang Nguyen  
Director of Facilities  
College Finance and Facilities Planning Division  
California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

cc: Randall Martinez, Vice Chair  
David Dias  
Barbara Lloyd  
Darrell Park  
Heather Rosenberg  
David Hochschild, Chair California Energy Commission  
President Marybel Batjer

California Community Colleges

# Proposition 39

## Clean Energy Jobs Act



# Topics Covered

- Updated Report Data



# Report Data Changes

Year 1 - The date range of this original report, generated on 10/15/16 and including everything closed out up to that point, did not correspond to the date ranges of subsequent reports, and overlapped with Year 2 and Year 3 reporting.

Year 2 - One project originally reported as closed out in Y2 had costs revised and was reported as closed out in Y6. One project had incentives revised post-close-out.

Year 3 - Seven projects had numbers revised post-close-out.

# Report Data Changes

Year 4 - Removed one project that was reported as closed out in both Year 3 and Year 4 COB reports due to changes in the close-out date. Added two projects that were previously unreported as closed out in Year 4 due to data entry errors.

Year 5 - Added 11 projects that were previously unreported as closed out in Year 5 due to data entry errors.

Year 6 - Year Removed five projects that were included in Year 6 report due to changes in the close out date. Four had originally been reported as closed out in Year 3, and one in Year 2.

Fiscal Year	No. of Projects Closed Out	Total Prop 39 Project Cost	kWh Savings	kW Savings	th Savings	Energy Cost Savings	Utility Incentives
Year 1	135	\$31,264,390	17,449,093	2,048	229,699	\$2,492,776	\$3,892,862
Year 2	102	\$24,252,823	13,653,884	1,622	175,042	\$1,877,765	\$3,225,294
Year 3	152	\$30,699,181	16,249,388	1,136	141,524	\$2,181,504	\$2,750,730
Year 4	123	\$17,503,255	8,803,643	3,232	251,092	\$1,383,382	\$1,449,546
Year 5	139	\$28,078,334	11,584,247	1,207	328,003	\$1,879,062	\$1,223,755
Year 6	289	\$103,825,719	38,127,370	6,628	588,356	\$5,855,357	\$4,484,252
Year 7	114	\$40,373,806	14,267,183	4,644	259,317	\$2,152,118	\$814,559
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1054</b>	<b>\$275,997,508</b>	<b>120,134,808</b>	<b>20,517</b>	<b>1,973,033</b>	<b>\$17,821,964</b>	<b>\$17,840,996</b>

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>No. of Projects Closed Out</b>	<b>Total Prop 39 Project Cost</b>	<b>kWh Savings</b>	<b>kW Savings</b>	<b>th Savings</b>	<b>Energy Cost Savings</b>	<b>Utility Incentives</b>
<b>Year 1</b>	6	\$1,395,145	1,266,885	234	0	\$164,695	\$248,574
<b>Year 2</b>	102	\$24,203,795	13,653,884	1,622	175,042	\$1,877,765	\$3,227,262
<b>Year 3</b>	152	\$30,727,779	16,249,388	1,136	140,748	\$2,180,901	\$2,752,290
<b>Year 4</b>	124	\$17,723,849	8,825,782	3,247	252,116	\$1,390,752	\$1,448,896
<b>Year 5</b>	150	\$30,705,953	12,580,075	1,274	328,003	\$2,020,195	\$1,499,465
<b>Year 6</b>	284	\$102,763,537	37,501,540	6,551	588,356	\$5,779,368	\$4,435,404
<b>Year 7</b>	114	\$40,373,806	14,267,183	4,644	259,317	\$2,152,118	\$814,559
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>\$247,893,863</b>	<b>104,344,737</b>	<b>18,707</b>	<b>1,743,582</b>	<b>\$15,565,795</b>	<b>\$14,426,449</b>



Citizens Oversight Board Proposition  
39 Clean Energy Jobs Act  
Summary Report

---



California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office  
Facilities Planning and Utilization  
Workforce and Economic Development  
Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19) Summary Report  
Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20) Summary Report

## Executive Summary

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) progressively make improvements with each year of the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act. Proposition 39 is an initiative to create jobs in California by improving energy efficiency and expanding clean energy generation.

The progress made in Year 6 and 7 of this program has been instrumental in reducing energy usage, cost savings and creating clean energy jobs throughout the community college system. This program has also helping districts move towards meeting the goals for the State of California's goals in addressing climate change and sustainability. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by Senate Bill 73 (Ch. 29, Stats. 2013). The College Finance and Facilities Division's 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 Willdan Group, Inc., to work with districts on reviewing, approving, administering and verifying clean energy projects and energy savings. The investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc. have been an integral part of the partnership with the Chancellor's Office by assisting community colleges across the state. The Workforce and Economic Development Division is in charge of allocating Proposition 39 funding to districts through grants. They have collaborated with a Sector Navigator who 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 staff and students to improve energy efficiency on campuses in the community college system.

The current Proposition 39 contract that the Chancellor's Office has with the Wildan Group, Inc. has ended in December 2019 and there are still \$5.8 million in project savings remaining. The Chancellor's Office is moving forward with a new contract to continue the Proposition 39 program for the remaining allocation to assist the community college system in meeting the State of California's climate change and sustainability goals. This report has data for Year 6 and partial Year 7 for the current Proposition 39 contract, which is using any district allocated funds from Proposition 39 program up to Year 5.

## YEAR 6 SUMMARY

Sixty districts have closed out 289 projects in Year 6 for a total project cost of \$103.8 million. These energy efficiency projects have resulted in 38 million kilowatt-hours and 588,000 therm savings resulting in \$5.8 million in energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$4.5 million in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. Additionally, these energy efficiency projects produced 565 direct job years and trainee job years on district campuses. The annual energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 6,830 homes.

California community colleges continue to work on energy efficiency projects in the loading order established in the 2003 Energy Action Plan. Since energy efficiency and demand response are

prioritized, in Year 6, lighting projects have the highest rate of closeout. Of the 289 projects closed-out, 164 were lighting projects, which is 57 percent of the total amount of closed-out projects. Lighting projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects in order for districts to meet the savings-to-investment ratio requirements. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) projects place second in Year 6 at 61 projects. These projects amount to 21 percent of the total amount of projects completed in Year 6. The remaining projects such as self-generation, and Monitoring Based Commissioning and Retro-commissioning (MBCx/ RCx), Tech Assist and Other amount to 22 percent of the total.

## YEAR 7 SUMMARY

Thirty-one districts have closed out 114 projects in Year 7 for a total project cost of \$40.4 million. These energy efficiency projects have resulted in 14.3 million kilowatt-hours and 259,000 therm savings resulting in \$2.2 million in energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$815 thousand in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. Additionally, these energy efficiency projects produced 231 direct job years and trainee job years on district campuses. The annual energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 2,609 homes.

The months of July through October will be labeled as Year 7 as it is the remainder of the current Proposition 39 contract. Of the 114 projects closed-out, 70 were lighting projects, which is 61 percent of the total amount of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) projects place second in Year 7 at 22 projects. These projects amount to 19 percent of the total amount of projects completed in Year 7. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx and RCx, Tech Assist and Other amount to 19 percent of the total.

The efforts Chancellor's Office to assist California community colleges on clean energy efficiency and workforce development continues to promote a greater sustainability and economic growth for the future of California.

## Board of Governor’s Sustainability and Energy Awards

The California Community Colleges Board of Governors established the Energy and Sustainability Awards in 2012 to honor leaders and exemplary energy and sustainability efforts within the California Community Colleges system. The Board of Governors presents these awards each year to recognize and promote the ongoing efforts of community colleges to achieve environmental sustainability. After Proposition 39 California Clean Energy Jobs Act was enacted, the awards evolved to include these projects. The California Community Colleges Board of Governors Energy and Sustainability Awards are granted for the following categories:

- **Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects:** The winners in this category are chosen based upon a points system that compares cost savings, energy savings, and jobs created by Proposition 39 energy projects.
- **Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives:** This category recognizes faculty and students who have excelled in developing sustainability initiatives for their college.
- **Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion:** This category recognizes contributions to the community college system in the area of energy and sustainability.

The selection process for the Excellence in Energy and Sustainability awards for the Sustainability Champion and the Faculty/Student Initiatives included a call for nominations to districts requesting nominations for both award categories. The California Community Colleges/Investor Owned Utilities (CCC/IOU) Energy Efficiency Partnership members then voted for the winner based on the submitted nominations for the Sustainability Champion and the Faculty/Student Initiative. The Excellence in Energy and Sustainability awards for Proposition 39 Projects did not require nominations, as the projects were scored using three metrics that align with Proposition 39 goals: Direct Job-Year Creation, Annual Energy Cost Savings, and Cost Effectiveness, normalized by district FTES.

### 2019 Winners

#### EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—PROPOSITION 39 PROJECTS

**Best Overall District—Large:** North Orange Community College District, Cypress College, Chilled Water Thermal Energy Storage

**Honorable Mention:** Mt. San Antonio Community College District, Mt. San Antonio College, Permanent Load Shift – Chilled Water Thermal Energy Storage

**Best Overall District—Medium:** Chaffey Community College District, Chaffey College, Photovoltaic Installation

**Honorable Mention:** Palomar Community College District, Palomar College, Interior Lighting Retrofit

**Best Overall District – Small:** Victor Valley Community College District, Victor Valley College, Multi-year Campus-wide Exterior Lighting Retrofit

**Honorable Mention:** Imperial Valley Community College District, Imperial Valley College, Interior Lighting Retrofit Phase 3

**Retrofit Project Winner:** Saddleback College, Interior Lighting Retrofit Phase 1

**Honorable Mention:** Fresno City College, Interior Lighting Retrofit

**Commissioning Project Winner:** DeAnza College, DeAnza S-Quad Monitoring Based Commissioning

**Honorable Mention:** Glendale College, San Gabriel Building's Retro-commissioning AHU and Exhaust Systems Optimization – Electric

**Self-Generation Project Winner:** San Bernardino Community College District, San Bernardino Community College District Office's Solar Photovoltaic System

## **EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—FACULTY/STUDENT INITIATIVES:**

Julia Clevenger, Director of College and Community Support, Orange Coast College – Student Initiated Sustainability Plan

Mike Carey, Environmental Sustainability Coordinator, Orange Coast College – Student Initiated Sustainability Plan

## **EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—SUSTAINABILITY CHAMPION:**

Farrah Farzaneh, Director of Facilities Planning and Construction, San Bernardino Community College District

## Identifying Energy Savings

As required by Proposition 39, the districts' projects must meet energy savings requirements to be eligible for funding. The detailed method and procedure for determining energy savings for Proposition 39 funded projects are outlined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the California Community Colleges Proposition 39 Guidelines.<sup>1</sup> These procedures follow California Public Utility Commission-approved protocols for determining energy savings for projects. There are different protocols for project type (energy efficiency, solar photovoltaic, 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 Senate Bill 73.

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 Proposition 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 6 and 7 continued the momentum of previous years and will assist districts with meeting the new Climate Change and Sustainability goals established by the Chancellor's Office. As such, there were no changes made in these 6 years for the Proposition 39 program and will remain the same for the next contract.

## 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 Willdan Group, Inc., districts also have projects generated by the consultants. The Chancellor's Office also uses the system-wide Facilities Utilization Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) database to generate a list of potential projects.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://ccutilitypartnership.com>

Districts enter scheduled maintenance projects as well as capital outlay projects, which is a potential pool of Proposition 39 projects.

Districts work with local investor-owned utility group and Willdan Group, Inc. to determine 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.

Program funds are distributed to districts on a full-time equivalent student basis; however, program 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 Willdan Group, Inc. review the Form Bs before the districts submit to the Chancellor’s Office. The Chancellor’s Office releases the funds to the districts when they have a viable project.

As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the Chancellor’s Office splits the five years of Proposition 39 funding between the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division (Table 1). The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit distributed a total \$184.9 million to the community college districts, which is used for the actual construction work done on district campuses. Currently, there is only \$5.8 million in project savings from the \$184.9 million. 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.

**Table 1: Chancellor’s Office Proposition 39 Allocation (FY 2013-14 through FY 2017-18)**

Chancellor’s Office Division Allocation	Allocation	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
		2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
<b>Workforce &amp; Economic Development</b>	12.80%	\$6,000,000	\$4,790,000	\$4,950,000	\$6,290,000	\$5,950,000
<b>Facilities Planning &amp; Utilization</b>	87.20%					
District Allocation		\$39,800,000	\$31,595,000	\$32,672,000	\$41,875,000	\$38,962,000
Proposition 39 Consulting Contract		\$1,200,000	\$1,115,000	\$1,115,000	\$1,115,000	\$1,588,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$47,000,000</b>	<b>\$37,500,000</b>	<b>\$38,737,000</b>	<b>\$49,280,000</b>	<b>\$46,500,000</b>

**Table 2: Chancellor’s Office Proposition 39 Total Allocation**

<b>Chancellor’s Office Division Allocation</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Workforce &amp; Economic Development</b>	12.80%	\$27,980,000
<b>Facilities Planning &amp; Utilization</b>	87.20%	
District Allocation		\$184,904,000
Proposition 39 Consulting Contract		\$6,133,000
<b>Total</b>	100%	\$219,017,000



## Results of Closed-out Projects:

### SUMMARY OF YEAR 6 AND 7 CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

The California community colleges currently have 403 projects for Year 6 and 7 of Proposition 39 (fiscal years 2018-19 and 2019-20) that are closed-out at a total cost of \$144.2 million. These projects will generate savings of 52.4 million kilowatt-hours and more than 848 thousand gas therms resulting in \$8 million of energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 9,400 homes annually. Additionally, 210 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

## Completed and Closed-Out Projects

### YEAR 6

Two hundred and eighty-nine completed projects were closed out by 60 community college districts in fiscal year 2018-19. This report provides a summary of key data points for the 289 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, 2018, the 289 projects were completed and closed-out at a cost of \$103.8 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 38 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) and more than 588,000 gas therms (therms), resulting in more than \$5.9 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 6,800 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 565 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and four training years in the communities served by the districts.

### Summary of Proposition 39 Total Year 6 Closed-Out Projects

- 60<sup>2</sup> Districts
- 289 Total Closed-out projects
- \$103,826,000 Total project costs
- 38,127,000 kWh savings
- 6,600 kW savings
- 588,000 therm savings
- \$5,855,000 Energy cost savings
- 550 Direct job years (FTEs)

---

<sup>2</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.

- 15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1,144,000 Direct job hours
- 31,800 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$4,484,000 Incentives paid
- 6,830 Homes powered

Of the 289 projects closed-out in Year 6, the majority were lighting projects; these projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects for districts to meet the savings-to-investment-ratio requirements (see Table 3). There were 164 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 57 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 97 projects, or 33 percent of the total number of closed-out projects in Year 6. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Self-Generation, and Other amount to 10 percent of the total.

**Table 3: Prop 39 Projects Closed Out in Year 6**

Project Type	Count	% of Total Projects
Lighting	164	57%
HVAC	61	21%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	36	12%
Self-Generation	3	1%
MBCx/RCx	16	6%
Other energy efficiency measures	4	1%
Tech Assist	5	2%
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>100%</b>

## YEAR 7

One hundred and fourteen completed projects were closed out by 31 community college districts in fiscal year 2019-20. This report provides a summary of key data points for the 114 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 December 30, 2019, the 114 projects were completed and closed-out at a cost of \$40.4 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 14.3 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) and more than 259,000 gas therms (therms), resulting in than \$2.1 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 2,600 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 231 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and four training years in the communities served by the districts.

## Summary of Proposition 39 Total Year 7 Closed-Out Projects

- 31<sup>3</sup>Districts
- 114 Total Closed-out projects
- \$40,374,000 Total project costs
- 14,267,000 kWh savings
- 4,600 kW savings
- 259,000 therm savings
- \$2,152,000 Energy cost savings
- 225 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 6 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 467,000 Direct job hours
- 13,000 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$815,000 Incentives paid
- 2,609 Homes powered

Of the 114 projects closed-out in Year 7, the majority were lighting projects; these projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects for districts to meet the savings-to-investment ratio requirements (see Table 4). There were 70 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 61 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 37 projects, or 32 percent of the total number of closed-out projects in Year 7. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Self-Generation, and Other amount to 7 percent of the total.

---

<sup>3</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

**Table 4: Prop 39 Projects Closed Out in Year 7**

Project Type	Count	% of Total Projects
Lighting	70	61%
HVAC	22	19%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	15	13%
Self-Generation	2	2%
MBCx/RCx	4	4%
Other energy efficiency measures	1	1%
Tech Assist	0	0%
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100%</b>

## OVERALL: PROP 39 CLOSED OUT PROJECTS

Over the course of the entire Prop 39 program, of the 932 total projects that were closed-out, the majority were lighting projects; these projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects for districts to meet the savings-to-investment ratio requirements (see Table 5). Additionally, there were 541 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 58 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 316 projects, or 34 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Self-Generation, and Other amount to approximately 8 percent of the total.

**Table 5: Prop 39 Projects Closed Out - Program Summary**

Project Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7*	Project Totals	% of Total Projects
Lighting	5	64	86	63	89	164	70	541	58%
HVAC	1	19	25	34	35	61	22	197	21%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	0	11	31	10	16	36	15	119	13%
Self-Generation	0	1	1	1	3	3	2	11	1%
MBCx/RCx	0	0	2	7	2	16	4	31	4%
Other energy efficiency measures	0	3	2	10	1	4	1	21	2%
Tech Assist	0	3	0	0	4	5	0	12	1%
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>932</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 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, kilowatt-hours (kWh) and gas therms (therms) saved and other project metrics.

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

#### Allan Hancock Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
N/A Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$1,072,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	297,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	0 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$46,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.25 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	4.5 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	2,600 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	514 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	47 Homes powered

#### Antelope Valley Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
2 Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
\$319,800 Total project costs	\$1,079,000 Total project costs
322,700 Verified kWh savings	362,000 Verified kWh savings
33 Verified kW savings	88 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$42,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$47,000 Annual energy cost savings
.06 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.34 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.27 Direct job years (FTEs)	1.56 Direct job years (FTEs)
567 Direct job hours	3,200 Direct job hours
123 Apprentice direct job hours	707 Apprentice direct job hours
\$33,000 Verified incentives	\$19,600 Verified incentives
51 Homes powered	57 Homes powered

**Barstow Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$160,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
111,200 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
21 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$14,500 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.04 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
92 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
18 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Butte-Glenn Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$69,200 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
40,500 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
16 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$5,200 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.05 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
106 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
6 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Cabrillo Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$867,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
101,400 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
41 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
4,000 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$17,300 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.3 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.27 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,600 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
633 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$10,200 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
21 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Cerritos Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,692,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
705,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
171 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
3,200 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$93,900 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.51 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.85 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
3,800 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
1,100 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$137,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
116 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered



**Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
10 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$2,263,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
535,800 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
49 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
88,600 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$121,700 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.12 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,100 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
246 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$113,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
206 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Chaffey Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$19,296,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
9,760,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$1,215,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
4.8 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
81 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
27,448 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
9,900 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
1,540 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Citrus Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,697,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
750,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
74 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
17,600 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$118,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.32 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,000 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
660 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$180,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
143 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Coast Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,790,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
740,700 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
116 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$96,600 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.25 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.4 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,900 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
527 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$54,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
117 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

### Compton Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
N/A Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$409,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	173,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	56 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$24,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.25 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.86 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	1,800 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	526 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$11,000 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	27 Homes powered

### Contra Costa Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
16 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$4,361,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
1,367,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
150 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
26,900 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$238,300 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.43 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
3 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
6,300 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
896 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$116,800 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
253 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

### Copper Mountain Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
N/A Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$103,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	32,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	9 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$4,800 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.09 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	194 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	0 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$4,800 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	5 Homes powered

### El Camino Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
2 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$907,500 Total project costs	\$473,000 Total project costs
214,800 Verified kWh savings	335,000 Verified kWh savings
25 Verified kW savings	75 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$36,500 Annual energy cost savings	\$44,000 Annual energy cost savings
.12 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.44 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1 Direct job years (FTEs)	1.21 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,160 Direct job hours	2,500 Direct job hours
254 Apprentice direct job hours	900 Apprentice direct job hours
\$34,200 Verified incentives	\$25,000 Verified incentives
34 Homes powered	53 Homes powered

**Feather River Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$130,300 Total project costs	\$27,000 Total project costs
219,700 Verified kWh savings	13,000 Verified kWh savings
24 Verified kW savings	0 Verified kW savings
9,000 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$42,300 Annual energy cost savings	\$2,000 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.23 Direct job years (FTEs)	.11 Direct job years (FTEs)
478 Direct job hours	0 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
47 Homes powered	2 Homes powered

**Foothill-DeAnza Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
11 Closed-out projects	5 Closed-out projects
\$1,067,000 Total project costs	\$2,764,000 Total project costs
556,000 Verified kWh savings	717,000 Verified kWh savings
215 Verified kW savings	226 Verified kW savings
25,000 Verified therm savings	47,000 Verified therm savings
\$122,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$136,000 Annual energy cost savings
.23 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.13 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.72 Direct job years (FTEs)	.88 Direct job years (FTEs)
1,500 Direct job hours	1,800 Direct job hours
476 Apprentice direct job hours	270 Apprentice direct job hours
\$111,000 Verified incentives	\$37,000 Verified incentives
122 Homes powered	178 Homes powered

**Gavilan Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$309,000 Total project costs	\$148,000 Total project costs
105,000 Verified kWh savings	119,000 Verified kWh savings
69 Verified kW savings	49 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$16,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$18,000 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.15 Direct job years (FTEs)	.08 Direct job years (FTEs)
312 Direct job hours	165 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
17 Homes powered	19 Homes powered

**Glendale Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
10 Closed-out projects	7 Closed-out projects
\$567,000 Total project costs	\$2,786,000 Total project costs
922,000 Verified kWh savings	266,000 Verified kWh savings
46 Verified kW savings	270 Verified kW savings
11,000 Verified therm savings	45,000 Verified therm savings
\$135,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$71,000 Annual energy cost savings
.3 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.67 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1 Direct job years (FTEs)	3 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,536 Direct job hours	6,200 Direct job hours
619 Apprentice direct job hours	1,400 Apprentice direct job hours
\$11,000 Verified incentives	\$45,000 Verified incentives
161 Homes powered	104 Homes powered

**Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,389,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
238,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$40,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.09 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.48 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
992 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
194 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
38 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Hartnell Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$943,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
292,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
8 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
9,000 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$48,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.24 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.86 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
1,700 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
500 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$10,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
58 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

### Imperial Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
1 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$166,000 Total project costs	\$286,000 Total project costs
421,000 Verified kWh savings	223,000 Verified kWh savings
100 Verified kW savings	1,300 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$55,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$42,000 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.08 Direct job years (FTEs)	.34 Direct job years (FTEs)
170 Direct job hours	711 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	27 Apprentice direct job hours
\$39,000 Verified incentives	\$33,000 Verified incentives
67 Homes powered	35 Homes powered

### Kern Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$969,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
227,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
25 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$29,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.31 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
635 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$46,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
36 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered



**Lake Tahoe Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$169,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
73,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$8,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.01 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.09 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
191 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
11 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$10,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
12 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Lassen Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
N/A Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$230,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	0 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	0 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	18,000 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$24,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	0 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	0 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	0 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	25 Homes powered

### Long Beach Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
1 Closed-out projects	4 Closed-out projects
\$24,000 Total project costs	\$2,198,000 Total project costs
6,000 Verified kWh savings	666,000 Verified kWh savings
1 Verified kW savings	60 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$700 Annual energy cost savings	\$91,000 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.47 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.03 Direct job years (FTEs)	1.63 Direct job years (FTEs)
56 Direct job hours	3,400 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	990 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$31,000 Verified incentives
1 Homes powered	105 Homes powered

### Los Angeles Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
14 Closed-out projects	29 Closed-out projects
\$3,374,000 Total project costs	\$12,506,000 Total project costs
1,325,000 Verified kWh savings	4,704,000 Verified kWh savings
41 Verified kW savings	718 Verified kW savings
25,000 Verified therm savings	24,000 Verified therm savings
\$208,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$683,000 Annual energy cost savings
.82 Trainee job years (FTEs)	2.82 Trainee job years (FTEs)
2 Direct job years (FTEs)	12 Direct job years (FTEs)
4,300 Direct job hours	24,600 Direct job hours
1,700 Apprentice direct job hours	5,900 Apprentice direct job hours
\$239,000 Verified incentives	\$138,000 Verified incentives
244 Homes powered	776 Homes powered

**Los Rios Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
29 Closed-out projects	11 Closed-out projects
\$5,397,000 Total project costs	\$1,478,000 Total project costs
2,033,000 Verified kWh savings	1,015,000 Verified kWh savings
76 Verified kW savings	135 Verified kW savings
127,000 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$356,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$122,000 Annual energy cost savings
1.5 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.55 Trainee job years (FTEs)
7 Direct job years (FTEs)	1.32 Direct job years (FTEs)
14,500 Direct job hours	2,800 Direct job hours
3,200 Apprentice direct job hours	1,100 Apprentice direct job hours
\$13,000 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
495 Homes powered	160 Homes powered

**Marin Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$641,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
22,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
6 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
534 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$3,800 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.27 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.65 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
1,300 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
567 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$5,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
4 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$200,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
26,600 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
14 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
1,100 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$6,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.03 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.20 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
408 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
64 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
6 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Merced Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
6 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$354,000 Total project costs	\$674,000 Total project costs
192,000 Verified kWh savings	158,000 Verified kWh savings
43 Verified kW savings	30 Verified kW savings
366 Verified therm savings	29,000 Verified therm savings
\$25,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$44,000 Annual energy cost savings
.04 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.19 Direct job years (FTEs)	.49 Direct job years (FTEs)
392 Direct job hours	1,000 Direct job hours
79 Apprentice direct job hours	24 Apprentice direct job hours
\$13,400 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
31 Homes powered	65 Homes powered

**Mira Costa Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,093,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
581,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
51 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
25,000 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$100,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
2.65 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
5,500 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$43,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
126 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Monterey Peninsula Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
6 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$756,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
380,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
40 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
2,100 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$50,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.47 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
2.11 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
4,400 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
1,000 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$32,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
63 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Mt. San Antonio Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$5,275,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
302,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
1,500 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$90,500 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
2.45 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
7.72 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
16,052 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
5,000 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$1,313,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
48 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Mt. San Jacinto Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
N/A Closed-out projects	3 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$884,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	333,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	11 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	2,000 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$52,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.23 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.50 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	1,000 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	484 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$1,900 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	56 Homes powered

### Napa Valley Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
N/A Closed-out projects	6 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$472,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	271,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	91 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$29,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.44 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	910 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	314 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$7,000 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	43 Homes powered

### North Orange County Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
2 Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
\$8,125,000 Total project costs	\$388,000 Total project costs
513,000 Verified kWh savings	423,000 Verified kWh savings
1,000 Verified kW savings	51 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$197,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$55,000 Annual energy cost savings
3.34 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.09 Trainee job years (FTEs)
5.38 Direct job years (FTEs)	.37 Direct job years (FTEs)
11,000 Direct job hours	760 Direct job hours
6,900 Apprentice direct job hours	189 Apprentice direct job hours
\$618,000 Verified incentives	\$64,000 Verified incentives
81 Homes powered	67 Homes powered

**Ohlone Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$314,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
225,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
30 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$15,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.32 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.39 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
821 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
677 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$4,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
36 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Palo Verde Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$104,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
0 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
3,400 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$2,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.02 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.08 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
161 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
33 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$9,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
5 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered



**Palomar Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$3,130,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
1,081,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
334 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$165,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
1 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
5.58 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
11,600 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
2,000 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$39,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
171 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Pasadena Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	3 Closed-out projects
\$1,744,000 Total project costs	\$1,202,000 Total project costs
540,000 Verified kWh savings	221,000 Verified kWh savings
57 Verified kW savings	32 Verified kW savings
51,000 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$117,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$29,000 Annual energy cost savings
.04 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.09 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.92 Direct job years (FTEs)	.21 Direct job years (FTEs)
1,900 Direct job hours	442 Direct job hours
73 Apprentice direct job hours	178 Apprentice direct job hours
\$138,000 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
156 Homes powered	35 Homes powered

**Peralta Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$719,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
167,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
46 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
4,500 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$27,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.18 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.69 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
1,400 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
379 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$4,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
33 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Rancho Santiago Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$687,000 Total project costs	\$412,000 Total project costs
455,000 Verified kWh savings	38,000 Verified kWh savings
8 Verified kW savings	23 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$64,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$5,000 Annual energy cost savings
.48 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.09 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.32 Direct job years (FTEs)	.17 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,700 Direct job hours	357 Direct job hours
994 Apprentice direct job hours	188 Apprentice direct job hours
\$31,000 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
72 Homes powered	6 Homes powered

### Redwoods Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
1 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$43,000 Total project costs	\$254,000 Total project costs
52,000 Verified kWh savings	128,000 Verified kWh savings
14 Verified kW savings	29 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$5,800 Annual energy cost savings	\$14,000 Annual energy cost savings
.02 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.05 Direct job years (FTEs)	.15 Direct job years (FTEs)
98 Direct job hours	305 Direct job hours
39 Apprentice direct job hours	12 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
8 Homes powered	20 Homes powered

### Rio Hondo Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
N/A Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$2,034,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	1,395,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	75 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$161,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.43 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	1.41 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	2,900 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	900 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$356,000 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	220 Homes powered

### Riverside Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
4 Closed-out projects	6 Closed-out projects
\$1,534,000 Total project costs	\$1,390,000 Total project costs
473,000 Verified kWh savings	515,000 Verified kWh savings
7 Verified kW savings	143 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$64,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$75,000 Annual energy cost savings
.32 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.24 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1 Direct job years (FTEs)	1.10 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,100 Direct job hours	2,300 Direct job hours
662 Apprentice direct job hours	507 Apprentice direct job hours
\$37,000 Verified incentives	\$17,000 Verified incentives
75 Homes powered	81 Homes powered

### San Bernardino Community College District

Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)	Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)
4 Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
\$1,369,000 Total project costs	\$582,000 Total project costs
1,175,000 Verified kWh savings	42,000 Verified kWh savings
34 Verified kW savings	17 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	1,600 Verified therm savings
\$153,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$6,700 Annual energy cost savings
.21 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.18 Trainee job years (FTEs)
4 Direct job years (FTEs)	.31 Direct job years (FTEs)
1,600 Direct job hours	652 Direct job hours
444 Apprentice direct job hours	367 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
186 Homes powered	9 Homes powered

**San Diego Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
12 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$3,470,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
941,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
246 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$183,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
1.1 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
2.38 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
5,000 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
2,300 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
149 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**San Francisco Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
N/A Closed-out projects	7 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$3,527,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	545,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	170 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	67,000 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$118,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.40 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	3.89 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	8,000 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	839 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	177 Homes powered

**San Joaquin Delta Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	4 Closed-out projects
\$371,000 Total project costs	\$883,000 Total project costs
332,000 Verified kWh savings	572,000 Verified kWh savings
138 Verified kW savings	215 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	7,900 Verified therm savings
\$43,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$79,000 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.27 Direct job years (FTEs)	.65 Direct job years (FTEs)
572 Direct job hours	1,400 Direct job hours
2 Apprentice direct job hours	3 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
53 Homes powered	101 Homes powered

**San Jose-Evergreen Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,092,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
357,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
155 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$65,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.58 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.64 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
3,400 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
1,200 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$44,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
56 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**San Mateo Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,320,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
369,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
47 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$41,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.54 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.61 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
3,400 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
1,100 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$52,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
58 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Santa Barbara Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,447,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
434,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
147 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$62,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.15 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.14 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,400 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
300 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$42,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
69 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Santa Clarita Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
7 Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
\$1,482,000 Total project costs	\$586,000 Total project costs
614,000 Verified kWh savings	71,000 Verified kWh savings
52 Verified kW savings	22 Verified kW savings
43,000 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$120,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$11,000 Annual energy cost savings
.37 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.15 Direct job years (FTEs)	.26 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,400 Direct job hours	546 Direct job hours
800 Apprentice direct job hours	315 Apprentice direct job hours
\$190,000 Verified incentives	\$9,300 Verified incentives
156 Homes powered	11 Homes powered

**Santa Monica Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$860,000 Total project costs	\$304,000 Total project costs
258,000 Verified kWh savings	345,000 Verified kWh savings
31 Verified kW savings	629 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$47,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$48,000 Annual energy cost savings
.79 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.84 Direct job years (FTEs)	.20 Direct job years (FTEs)
3,800 Direct job hours	420 Direct job hours
1,600 Apprentice direct job hours	96 Apprentice direct job hours
\$60,000 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
41 Homes powered	55 Homes powered



**Sequoias Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
5 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$749,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
470,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
31 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
82 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$61,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.18 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.98 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,000 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
370 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$14,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
74 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
4 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$130,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
123,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
40 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$13,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.03 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.16 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
340 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
71 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$11,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
19 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Sierra Joint Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
6 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,414,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
708,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
291 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
48,200 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$115,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.14 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.42 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,900 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
290 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$17,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
178 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Siskiyou Joint Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$224,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
0 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
2,400 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$4,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.10 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.16 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
336 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
205 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
3 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Solano Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
N/A Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$637,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	117,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	32 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	18,000 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$39,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.80 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	1,7000 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	310 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	43 Homes powered

**Sonoma County Junior College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
9 Closed-out projects	1 Closed-out projects
\$2,005,000 Total project costs	\$357,000 Total project costs
950,000 Verified kWh savings	18,000 Verified kWh savings
78 Verified kW savings	5 Verified kW savings
54,000 Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
\$142,000 Annual energy cost savings	\$3,000 Annual energy cost savings
.19 Trainee job years (FTEs)	.02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
2.5 Direct job years (FTEs)	.14 Direct job years (FTEs)
5,200 Direct job hours	300 Direct job hours
400 Apprentice direct job hours	400 Apprentice direct job hours
\$226,000 Verified incentives	\$0 Verified incentives
224 Homes powered	3 Homes powered

**South Orange Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,975,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
598,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
232 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$146,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.24 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
3.51 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
7,300 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
500 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$6,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
95 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Southwestern Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$752,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
206,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
36 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$30,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.49 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.49 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
1,000 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
1,000 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
33 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**State Center Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
2 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$3,825,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
929,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
178 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$162,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
2.19 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
5.91 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
12,300 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
4,600 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$98,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
147 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Ventura County Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
12 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$2,866,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
583,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
172 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
723 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$87,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
1.35 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
3.19 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
6,600 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
2,800 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$60,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
93 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Victor Valley Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$1,116,800 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
404,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$59,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.07 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.85 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
1,800 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
143 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$89,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
64 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**West Hills Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
3 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$544,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
370,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
7 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$75,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.19 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
404 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$3,500 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
58 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**West Kern Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
N/A Closed-out projects	2 Closed-out projects
N/A Total project costs	\$232,000 Total project costs
N/A Verified kWh savings	152,000 Verified kWh savings
N/A Verified kW savings	32 Verified kW savings
N/A Verified therm savings	0 Verified therm savings
N/A Annual energy cost savings	\$29,000 Annual energy cost savings
N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)	.02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job years (FTEs)	.18 Direct job years (FTEs)
N/A Direct job hours	378 Direct job hours
N/A Apprentice direct job hours	40 Apprentice direct job hours
N/A Verified incentives	\$15,000 Verified incentives
N/A Homes powered	24 Homes powered

**West Valley-Mission Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
1 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$564,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
0 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
4,700 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$3,700 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.04 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
.26 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
546 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
88 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$0 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
6 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Yosemite Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
14 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$2,745,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
1,686,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
122 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$195,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.02 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
2.15 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
4,500 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
48 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$49,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
266 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered

**Yuba Community College District**

<b>Year 6 (Fiscal Year 2018-19)</b>	<b>Year 7 (Fiscal Year 2019-20)</b>
9 Closed-out projects	N/A Closed-out projects
\$849,000 Total project costs	N/A Total project costs
546,000 Verified kWh savings	N/A Verified kWh savings
42 Verified kW savings	N/A Verified kW savings
106 Verified therm savings	N/A Verified therm savings
\$57,000 Annual energy cost savings	N/A Annual energy cost savings
.33 Trainee job years (FTEs)	N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.32 Direct job years (FTEs)	N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
2,700 Direct job hours	N/A Direct job hours
700 Apprentice direct job hours	N/A Apprentice direct job hours
\$77,000 Verified incentives	N/A Verified incentives
86 Homes powered	N/A Homes powered



## Energy Usage Data Summary

The following data is submitted and self-certified by the districts on a fiscal year basis. Districts are able to update prior submitted energy usage data so this may affect the current and prior year's totals and calculations. At a glance, by comparing the 2017-18 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data the systemwide energy usage has been reduced by 6.10 percent. A total of 43 districts have reduced their energy usage on campus while 17 districts have increased their usage as compared to the energy usage baseline data. A total of 12 districts have not reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2017-18 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change at their district.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2018-19 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2018-19 progress data to compare against the baseline year. For further detail and information, please see the attached spreadsheet showing the energy usage data summary and per district.

### SYSTEMWIDE ENERGY USAGE DATA

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,606
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,508
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.10 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,936
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 27.65 percent

#### Barstow Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,581
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,158
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.49 percent

## Cabrillo Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,789
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,506
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.25 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,618
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.75 percent

## Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,067
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,242
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 8.46 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,123
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.26 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,262
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.94 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,393
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.48 percent

## Compton Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,148
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 52.41 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,687
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.44 percent

## Copper Mountain Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 445
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 411
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.76 percent

## Desert Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,825
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,502
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.72 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,523
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.94 percent

## Feather River Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 994
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 758
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -23.71 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,871
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -2.59 percent

## Gavilan Joint Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,660
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,057
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -22.67

## Glendale Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,075
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -20.45 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 820
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.91 percent

## Hartnell Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 861
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 671
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -22.16 percent

## Imperial Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,253
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.56 percent

## Kern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,169
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,447
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 23.79 percent

## Lake Tahoe Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,635
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,068
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 16.47 percent

## Lassen Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,144
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,899
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.41 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,033
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.15 percent

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 789
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.22 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,348
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.58

## Marin Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,787
- 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: 1,230
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## Merced Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,420
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,551
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 5.39 percent

## Mira Costa Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,713
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,482
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -13.48 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,400
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.20 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,604
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.54 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,774
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.09 percent

## Ohlone Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,391
- Fiscal year 2017-18 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: 826
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,125
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 36.12 percent

## Palomar Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## Pasadena Area Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 867
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 727
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.14 percent

## Peralta Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,997
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,427
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -22.79 percent

## Redwoods Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,400
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,178
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.27 percent

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,247
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 55.58 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,923
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 19.95 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,044
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -39.92 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 751
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -53.49

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,601
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.42 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,564
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.94 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,036
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -8.05 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,024
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.70 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,140
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -94.74 percent

## Santa Monica Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,293
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.87 percent

## Sequoias Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,014
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,047
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.32 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,783
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.04 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,673
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 33.92 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 year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,873
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.46 percent

## Sonoma County Junior College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,210
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,099
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.17 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,937
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 4.91 percent

## Southwestern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,461
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,271
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -13.05 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,663
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 24.19 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 768
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -26.25 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 957
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.70 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,210
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -19.60 percent

## West Kern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 907
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 751
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.22 percent

## 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 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,608
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.89 percent

## Yosemite Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,117
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,968
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.79 percent

## Yuba Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,198
- Fiscal year 2017-18 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,128
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.88 percent