



2019 REPORT

Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report Year 5 (Fiscal Year 2017-18)

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office | Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor



California
Community
Colleges

ELOY ORTIZ OAKLEY
Chancellor

February 19, 2019

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Governor of California
State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: California Community College Proposition 39 Projects

Dear Governor Newsom:

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is pleased to share with you the successes of the community college districts in implementing the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act program. Year 5 of funding has supported 578 energy projects at 71 community college districts, resulting in one-time incentives, ongoing energy and monetary savings, job creation and better physical environments for California's 2.1 million community college students.

The energy projects implemented on community college campuses through Year 5 of Proposition 39 funding will result in annual savings of 74 million kilo-watt hours of electricity and more than 1.3 million gas therms, generating \$11.4 million in annual energy cost savings and \$8.8 million in one-time energy incentives. The energy saved by these Proposition 39 energy projects can power more than 13,500 homes a year. These savings can be redirected to educational programs and other support services to improve student outcomes.

The 578 projects are at various stages of the completion process with 139 projects completely finished, including project measurement, verification and closeout documentation, and 439 projects under construction or in the closeout process. The jobs created by these energy projects include construction jobs and construction-related jobs such as consultants, energy auditors, architects, engineers, and office staff. The 139 completed projects have generated a total of 155 job years. Based on these results, we estimate the remaining 439 projects will generate an additional 807 job years. Additionally, 27 trainee job years will be generated once all 578 projects are completed and closed out.

Chancellor's Office

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 | 916.445.8752 | www.cccco.edu

The Workforce and Economic Development Division's Proposition 39 program grant data show that in Years 3 and 4 (July 2017 – December 2018) more than 10,300 students have completed degrees, certificates, or industry certifications.

Finally, we wish to express our appreciation for your support of the California Community Colleges' energy efficiency and sustainability efforts. Proposition 39 California Clean Energy Act programs continue to be successfully implemented by the California Community Colleges.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eloy Ortiz Oakley', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor

Enclosure: Report

CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD
PROPOSITION 39 CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT
YEAR 5 (FISCAL YEAR 2017-18) SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared By

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

Facilities Planning and Utilization

Workforce and Economic Development

Table Of Contents

Executive Summary	9
Board of Governor’s Sustainability and Energy Awards	11
Identifying Energy Savings	21
Implementation Overview	21
Funding Status	21
Results of Closed-out and In-Progress Projects	25
Energy Usage Data Summary	38
Workforce and Economic Development Division	53
Community College Program Years 3 and 4	55
Appendices	58



Photo: College of the Desert

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) progressively makes great improvement 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 5 of this five-year program has been instrumental in reducing energy usage, cost savings and creating clean energy jobs throughout the community college system. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by 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 Newcomb Anderson McCormick, now known as 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.

Community college districts are working with investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc. to close out local energy efficiency projects. Thirty-eight districts have closed out 139 projects in Year 5 for a total project cost of \$28 million. These energy efficiency projects have resulted in 11.5 million kilowatt-hours and 328,000 gas therms savings resulting in \$1.8 million in energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$1.2 million in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. Additionally, these energy efficiency projects produced 155 direct job years and trainee job years on district campuses. The annual energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 2,280 homes a year.

California community colleges continue to work on energy efficiency projects in the leading order established in the 2003 Energy Action Plan. Since energy efficiency and demand response are prioritized, in Year 4, lighting projects have the highest rate of closeout. Of the 139 projects closed-out, 83 were lighting projects, which is 60 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 5 at 51 projects. These projects amount to 37 percent of the total number of projects completed in Year 5. The remaining projects such as self-generation, Retrocommissioning and Monitoring Based Commissioning (RCx/MBCx), Tech Assist and Other amount to 3 percent of the total.

The Workforce and Economic Development Division has a grant application process for districts to obtain Proposition 39 funding. The grant process takes districts more time to complete, which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development Division is working on closing out all of the grants by June 2019. The funding allocated to community colleges have resulted in more than 7,000 students becoming unique completers and 10,300 students having completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in Years 3 and 4.

The combined efforts of the two Chancellor's Office divisions 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 at California community colleges. 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 current 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 winners 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 full-time equivalent students (FTES).

2018 WINNERS

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects

Best Overall District—Large

Coast Community College District
Interior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

San Francisco Community College District
Controls Upgrade in the Batmale Classroom
Building

Best Overall District—Medium

Peralta Community College District
Interior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

San Mateo County Community
College District
Skyline College Exterior LED Lighting Project

Best Overall District – Small

Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community
College District
Multiyear Tehama Solar Photovoltaic Project

Honorable Mention

San Luis Obispo County Community
College District
Boiler Retrofit

Retrofit Project Winner

Orange Coast College
Stadium, Gym, and Theatre Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

College of San Mateo
Exterior LED Lighting Project

Commissioning Project Winner

Butte College
Main Campus Monitoring Based
Commissioning (MBCx) Project

Honorable Mention

Butte College
Skyway Center, Skyway Center Monitoring
Based Commissioning (MBCx) Project

Renewable Energy Winner

Butte College
Skyway Center, Solar Photovoltaic Project

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives:

Dr. William T. Scroggins, president and CEO
Mt. San Antonio College
Climate Action Plan

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion:

Marlene Dunn, vice president of
Business Services
Long Beach Community College District

Medhanie Ephrem, interim director
of Facilities
Long Beach Community College District
(now director of ATEP Development, South
County Orange Community College District)

PRIOR YEAR WINNERS

2012

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—District Leadership

Best District Leadership

Citrus College
Sustainability Template and Pilot Demonstration

Honorable Mention

San Diego Community College District
David Umstot, PE, vice chancellor of
Facilities Management

Long Beach Community College District
Sustainability Initiative

San Mateo County Community College District
Capital Improvement Program

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Facilities & Operations

Best Facilities & Operations

Butte College
Grid Positive

Honorable Mention

Desert Community College District
Sustainability Stewardship

Los Angeles Pierce College
Maintenance and Operations Facility and Net Zero CP

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives

Best Faculty/Student Initiatives

Cuyamaca College
Sustainable Urban Landscape Initiative

Honorable Mention:

Orange Coast College
An Affinity for Recycling

Cosumnes River College
Composting Project

2013

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—District Leadership

Best District Leadership

Victor Valley Community College District
Comprehensive Sustainability Program

Honorable Mention

Mira Costa Community College District
District-wide Sustainability Advisory Committee

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Facilities & Operations

Best Facilities & Operations

Santa Monica College
Santa Monica College Energy Project

Honorable Mention

Sonoma County Junior College District
Green Epicurean Delights

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiative

Best Faculty/Student Initiatives

West Valley College
Leadership in Energy and
Environmental Design (LEED) Internship

Honorable Mention

Skyline College
Solar and Building Science Learning Center

2014

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects

Retrofit Project Winner

Copper Mountain College
Campus-wide Exterior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

Palo Verde Community College
Exterior Lighting Retrofit

Commissioning Project Winner

College of the Desert
Retro-Commissioning (RCx) at the
Multi-Agency Library

Honorable Mention

Glendale Community College
Retro-Commissioning (RCx) Chilled Water
Plant No. 2 Optimization

Self-generation Project Winner

Cañada College, Solar PV Installation

Honorable Mention

Feather River College
Hatchery Solar PV

“Deemed” Incentive Project Winner

Imperial Valley College
Gym Boiler Replacement

Honorable Mention

Santa Monica College
Library Boiler Replacement

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiative

Faculty/Student Initiatives Winner

Skyline College
The Green Gorillas – Student-led
Waste Diversion

Honorable Mention

College of the Canyons
Water Conservation &
Petrochemical Devices

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion

Fred Harris, assistant vice chancellor of
College Finance and Facilities Planning
California Community Colleges
Chancellor’s Office

2015

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects

Best Overall District—Large

Mt. San Antonio Community College District
Mt. San Antonio College
Central Plant Tie-In - Building 2

Honorable Mention

Rancho Santiago Community College District,
Santa Ana College, Campus-wide Interior
Lighting Retrofit

Best Overall District – Small

Sequoias Community College District
College of the Sequoias
Exterior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

Victor Valley Community College District
Victor Valley Community College
Variable-Frequency Drives on HVAC Units

Retrofit Project Winner

Coast Community College District
Orange Coast College
Interior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

South County Orange Community
College District
Irvine Valley College
Exterior Lighting Retrofit - Phase 1

Commissioning Project Winner

Rancho Santiago Community College District
Santiago Canyon College
Retro-commissioning (RCx) at Science
Building

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives

N/A

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion

Fred Diamond, Director of
Facilities and Construction
Citrus Community College District

2016

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects

Best Overall District—Large

Rancho Santiago Community College District
Santiago Canyon College
Interior Lighting LED Retrofit

Honorable Mention

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, Las Positas College, HVAC Retrofit

Best Overall District – Small

Solano County Community College District
Solano Community College
Exterior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

Hartnell Community College District
Hartnell College
Campus-wide Exterior and Area
LED Lighting Retrofits

Retrofit Project Winner

Long Beach Community College District
Long Beach City College
HVAC Zone and Fan Static Pressure Reset

Honorable Mention

North Orange County Community College District, Cypress College, Interior Lighting Retrofit

Commissioning Project Winner

N/A

Honorable Mention

N/A

Renewable Energy Winner

N/A

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives

Maria Elena “Nena” Anguiano, director,
Butte College MESA Program
Butte-Glenn Community College District
Math Engineering Science Achievement (MESA)
Sustainability Program

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion

Ken Albright, Director
Facilities Planning & Management
Butte-Glenn Community College District

2017

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Proposition 39 Projects

Best Overall District—Large

Coast Community College District
Orange Coast College
Interior Lighting Retrofit

Honorable Mention

Rancho Santiago Community College District
Santa Ana College
Campus-wide Interior Lighting Retrofit

Best Overall District—Medium

Palomar Community College District
Palomar College
Retrofit Exterior Lighting with LEDs

Honorable Mention

Yosemite Community College District
Modesto Junior College
Interior and Exterior Lighting Retrofit
on East Campus

Best Overall District – Small

Solano Community College District
Solano Community College
Variable Air Volume Conversion

Honorable Mention

Victor Valley Community College District
Victor Valley College
Constant to Variable Air Volume Air Handler
Upgrade

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Faculty/Student Initiatives

Dr. Mark Padilla, Professor of Physics
Chaffey College
Chaffey Community College District
Living Lab

Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Sustainability Champion

Joe Fullerton, Energy and Sustainability Manager
San Mateo County Community College District

Retrofit Project Winner

Butte-Glenn Community College District
Butte College
Skyway Center – EMS Upgrade

Honorable Mention

San Joaquin Delta Community
College District
San Joaquin Delta College
Exterior Lighting Retrofit

Commissioning Project Winner

Cerritos Community College District
Cerritos College
RCx at Math/Science Building

Honorable Mention

Los Angeles Community College District
Los Angeles Harbor College
Central Plant RCx

Renewable Energy Winner

Cabrillo Community College District
Cabrillo College
Solar Thermal Pool Heater

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](http://cccutilitypartnership.com) (<http://cccutilitypartnership.com>). 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 PV, MBCx/RCx, etc.) and the standards for each project type are outlined in the guidelines. Energy savings are based on the difference between annual energy use under existing conditions and annual energy use under proposed conditions, and the corresponding cost of energy saved, as described in 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 and 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 5 continued the momentum of the first four years. As such, there were no changes made in these five years for the Proposition 39 program.

FUNDING STATUS

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

Districts work with 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.

Funds are distributed to districts on a full-time equivalent student basis; however, funds are not released to districts until they submit project request forms (Form B) to the Chancellor’s Office. The investor-owned utility groups and 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 the figures below, the Chancellor’s Office splits the Proposition 39 funding between the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division. The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit garners the majority of the funding, which is used for the actual construction work done on district campuses. A portion of the allocation is set aside for the consultant for the administration of the program as well as assisting districts with the engineering work and verification of the projects.

CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE PROPOSITION 39 ALLOCATION

Chancellor’s Office Division Allocation	Allocation	Fiscal Year 2017-18
Workforce & Economic Development	12.8%	\$ 5,950,000
Facilities Planning & Utilization	87.2%	\$40,550,000
District Allocation		\$ 38,962,000
Proposition 39 Consulting Contract		\$ 1,588,000
Total	100%	\$46,500,000

The districts are allocated funding based upon their percentage of the total system-wide full-time equivalent student, as seen below. This methodology aligns with Chancellor’s Office funding allocation for the Physical Plant and Instructional Support program to districts.

PROPOSITION 39 DISTRICT ALLOCATION FOR 2017-18 BASED ON FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS

District	Fiscal Year 2017-18
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	\$ 343,880
Antelope Valley Community College District	\$ 400,230
Barstow Community College District	\$ 86,696
Butte-Glenn Community College District	\$ 341,603
Cabrillo Community College District	\$ 357,117
Cerritos Community College District	\$ 575,002

District	Fiscal Year 2017-18
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	\$ 533,585
Chaffey Community College District	\$ 567,608
Citrus Community College District	\$ 407,184
Coast Community College District	\$ 1,044,121
Compton Community College District	\$ 175,808
Contra Costa Community College District	\$ 916,431
Copper Mountain Community College District	\$ 50,753
Desert Community College District	\$ 313,566
El Camino Community College District	\$ 614,341
Feather River Community College District	\$ 55,716
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	\$ 891,732
Gavilan Joint Community College District	\$ 182,042
Glendale Community College District	\$ 533,575
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	\$ 656,629
Hartnell Community College District	\$ 252,646
Imperial Community College District	\$ 232,512
Kern Community College District	\$ 745,907
Lake Tahoe Community College District	\$ 59,759
Lassen Community College District	\$ 58,374
Long Beach Community College District	\$ 713,279
Los Angeles Community College District	\$ 3,694,332
Los Rios Community College District	\$ 1,801,723
Marin Community College District	\$ 127,248
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	\$ 106,176
Merced Community College District	\$ 327,916
Mira Costa Community College District	\$ 362,252
Monterey Peninsula Community College District	\$ 230,058
Mt. San Antonio Community College District	\$ 1,062,417
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	\$ 419,170

District	Fiscal Year 2017-18
Napa Valley Community College District	\$ 186,044
North Orange County Community College District	\$ 1,193,124
Ohlone Community College District	\$ 279,489
Palo Verde Community College District	\$ 71,246
Palomar Community College District	\$ 621,823
Pasadena Area Community College District	\$ 823,587
Peralta Community College District	\$ 610,304
Rancho Santiago Community College District	\$ 993,328
Redwoods Community College District	\$ 136,285
Rio Hondo Community College District	\$ 423,221
Riverside Community College District	\$ 995,850
San Bernardino Community College District	\$ 541,383
San Diego Community College District	\$ 1,511,351
San Francisco Community College District	\$ 699,286
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	\$ 458,961
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District	\$ 409,569
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	\$ 250,388
San Mateo County Community College District	\$ 567,226
Santa Barbara Community College District	\$ 422,436
Santa Clarita Community College District	\$ 564,085
Santa Monica Community College District	\$ 737,067
Sequoias Community College District	\$ 332,349
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District	\$ 247,167
Sierra Joint Community College District	\$ 480,934
Siskiyou Joint Community College District	\$ 92,574
Solano County Community College District	\$ 248,309
Sonoma County Junior College District	\$ 575,469
South Orange County Community College District	\$ 937,951
Southwestern Community College District	\$ 535,402

District	Fiscal Year 2017-18
State Center Community College District	\$ 1,011,617
Ventura County Community College District	\$ 872,049
Victor Valley Community College District	\$ 325,352
West Hills Community College District	\$ 188,834
West Kern Community College District	\$ 90,641
West Valley-Mission Community College District	\$ 460,303
Yosemite Community College District	\$ 563,780
Yuba Community College District	\$ 261,828
Total	\$38,962,000

RESULTS OF CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS:

SUMMARY OF YEAR 5 CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS

The California community colleges currently have 578 projects for Year 5 of Proposition 39 (fiscal year 2017-18) that are either closed-out or in progress at a total cost of \$179 million. These projects will generate savings of 74 million kilowatt-hours and more than 1.4 million gas therms resulting in \$8.8 million of energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 13,500 homes annually. Additionally, 962 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

COMPLETED AND CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

One hundred and thirty-nine completed projects were closed out by 38 community college districts in fiscal year 2017-18. A summary of key data points for the 139 closed-out projects follows, 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 139 projects were completed and closed-out at a cost of \$28 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 11.6 million kilowatt-hours and more than 328,000 gas therms, resulting in more than \$1.8 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 2,280 homes a year. The projects also generated the equivalent of 155 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 5 (Fiscal Year 2017-18) Closed-Out Projects

- 38* Districts
- 139 Total Closed-out projects
- \$28,078,334 Total project costs
- 11,584,247 kilowatt-hours savings
- 1,207 kilowatt savings
- 328,003 gas therms savings
- \$1,879,062 Energy cost savings
- 155 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 322,403 Direct job hours
- 8,956 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$1,223,755 Incentives paid
- 2,280 Homes powered annually

*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.

Of the 139 projects closed-out in Year 5, 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. There were 83 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 60 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 51 projects, or 37 percent of the total number of closed-out projects in Year 5. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Self-Generation, and Other amount to 3 percent of the total.

Projects Closed-Out in Year 5 (Fiscal Year 2017-2018)

Project Type	Count	Percentage of Total Projects	Savings to Investment Ratio
Lighting	83	60%	2.26
HVAC	35	25%	1.39
Controls	16	12%	2.41
MBCx/RCx	2	1%	1.16
Self-Generation	2	1%	1.39
Other energy efficiency measures	1	1%	3.30
Total Projects	139	100%	1.98

PROJECTS IN-PROGRESS

An additional 439 projects are in progress, including Proposition 39, utility incentive and district funding, at a total cost of \$150 million. These projects will result in savings of 62.5 million kilowatt-hours and 1.1 million gas therms resulting in \$7.5 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of annually powering close to 11,310 homes a year. Additionally, 807 one-year jobs will be created in throughout California.

Proposition 39 Projects Total In-progress (Estimated) for Fiscal Year 2017-18

- 71 Districts
- 439 In-progress projects
- \$150,586,511 Current total project costs
- 62,460,044 Current kilowatt-hours savings
- 13,747 Current kilowatt savings
- 1,051,759 Current therm savings
- \$9,521,402 Current annual energy cost saving
- 807 Current direct job years (FTEs)
- 22 Current trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1,453,409 Current job hours
- 52,628 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,549,611 Current incentives
- 11,310 Current homes powered a year

COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS SUMMARY BY DISTRICT

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

Proposition 39 District Projects Completed/Closed-out Year 5 (Fiscal Year 2017-18)

Butte-Glenn Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$1,319,577 Total project costs
- 285,597 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$46,466 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 4.5 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4,350 Direct job hours
- 95 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$12,914 Verified incentives
- 45.12 Homes powered

Cabrillo Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$180,712 Total project costs
- 145,123 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$12,770 Annual energy cost savings

- .07 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 240 Direct job hours
- 152 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$34,829 Verified incentives
- 22.93 Homes powered

Cerritos Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$277,354 Total project costs
- 171,475 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$22,291 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 165 Direct job hours
- 128 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$33,180 Verified incentives
- 27.09 Homes powered

Coast Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$1,854,014 Total project costs
- 1,388,847 Verified kWh savings
- 206 Verified kW savings
- 1,700 Verified therm savings
- \$193,331 Annual energy cost savings
- .68 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .95 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,982 Direct job hours
- 1,414 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$187,427 Verified incentives
- 222 Homes powered

Compton Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$223,800 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 3,838 Verified therm savings
- \$3,070 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .01 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 24 Direct job hours
- 5 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,998 Verified incentives
- 20.35 Homes powered

Contra Costa Community College District

- 6 Closed-out projects
- \$1,880,101 Total project costs
- 250,801 Verified kWh savings
- 47 Verified kW savings
- 3,356 Verified therm savings
- \$48,261 Annual energy cost savings
- .32 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,812 Direct job hours
- 673 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$44,606 Verified incentives
- 44.22 Homes powered

Copper Mountain Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$38,200 Total project costs
- 14,833 Verified kWh savings
- 6 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$2,254 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 96 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$3,235 Verified incentives
- 2.34 Homes powered

Desert Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$681,987 Total project costs
- 91,109 Verified kWh savings
- 29 Verified kW savings
- 1,452 Verified therm savings
- \$12,022 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .17 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 345 Direct job hours
- 165 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 16.38 Homes powered

El Camino Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$274,470 Total project costs
- 169,836 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$32,268 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 104 Direct job hours
- 128 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$26,643 Verified incentives
- 26.83 Homes powered

Feather River Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$16,940 Total project costs
- 34,159 Verified kWh savings
- 4.20 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$5,123 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,123 Verified incentives
- 5.40 Homes powered

Gavilan Joint Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$78,000 Total project costs
- 26,030 Verified kWh savings
- .10 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$2,342 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$6,247 Verified incentives
- 4.11 Homes powered

Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

- 15 Closed-out projects
- \$1,981,189 Total project costs
- 1,037,721 Verified kWh savings
- 241 Verified kW savings
- 12,374 Verified therm savings
- \$185,383 Annual energy cost savings
- .33 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.86 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,875 Direct job hours
- 695 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$173,908 Verified incentives
- 181 Homes powered

Imperial Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$103,186 Total project costs
- 192,731 Verified kWh savings
- 42 Verified kW savings
- 3,792 Verified therm savings
- \$26,746 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 332 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$26,461 Verified incentives
- 35.65 Homes powered

Kern Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$129,700 Total project costs
- 79,156 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$10,290 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 107 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$16,704 Verified incentives
- 12.51 Homes powered

Los Rios Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$673,172 Total project costs
- 556,012 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$66,721 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .81 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,683 Direct job hours
- 124 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$740 Verified incentives
- 87.85 Homes powered

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$559,352 Total project costs
- 247,725 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$32,204 Annual energy cost savings
- .31 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.39 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,892 Direct job hours
- 648 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$40,585 Verified incentives
- 39.14 Homes powered

Ohlone Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$294,558 Total project costs
- 109,614 Verified kWh savings
- 24.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$9,536 Annual energy cost savings
- .15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .36 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 753 Direct job hours
- 316 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,100 Verified incentives
- 17.32 Homes powered

Palo Verde Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$65,632 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 3,038 Verified therm savings
- \$2,127 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .07 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 150 Direct job hours
- 79 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$8,996 Verified incentives
- 4.16 Homes powered

Peralta Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$399,578 Total project costs
- 443,310 Verified kWh savings
- 142 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$58,960 Annual energy cost savings
- .15 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .79 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,638 Direct job hours
- 303 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$98,834 Verified incentives
- 70 Homes powered

Rancho Santiago Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$1,293,373 Total project costs
- 151,250 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$21,175 Annual energy cost savings
- .20 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.80 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,738 Direct job hours
- 415 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 24 Homes powered

Redwoods Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$98,699 Total project costs
- 65,645 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$7,418 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .06 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 120 Direct job hours
- 108 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$8,069 Verified incentives
- 10.37 Homes powered

Rio Hondo Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$425,016 Total project costs
- 261,155 Verified kWh savings
- 78 Verified kW savings
- 9,623 Verified therm savings
- \$38,074 Annual energy cost savings
- .11 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .31 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 638 Direct job hours
- 237 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$36,941 Verified incentives
- 54.45 Homes powered

Riverside Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$749,041 Total project costs
- 402,036 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$41,870 Annual energy cost savings
- .09 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 274 Direct job hours
- 178 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$39,466 Verified incentives
- 63.52 Homes powered

San Diego Community College District

- 35 Closed-out projects
- \$3,281,449 Total project costs
- 1,352,970 Verified kWh savings
- 128 Verified kW savings
- 619 Verified therm savings
- \$259,485 Annual energy cost savings
- .12 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,368 Direct job hours
- 242 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,823 Verified incentives
- 214.62 Homes powered

San Francisco Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$1,675,797 Total project costs
- 607,425 Verified kWh savings
- 116 Verified kW savings
- 111,735 Verified therm savings
- \$136,186 Annual energy cost savings
- .32 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 2.06 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4,283 Direct job hours
- 660 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$58,988 Verified incentives
- 249.05 Homes powered

San Joaquin Delta Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$308,849 Total project costs
- 131,568 Verified kWh savings
- 31.50 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$17,581 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .21 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 435 Direct job hours
- 16 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$660 Verified incentives
- 20.79 Homes powered

San Jose-Evergreen Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$171,193 Total project costs
- 107,575 Verified kWh savings
- 2.35 Verified kW savings
- 2,044 Verified therm savings
- \$15,883 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 265 Direct job hours
- 14 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$15,568 Verified incentives
- 19.80 Homes powered

San Luis Obispo County Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$571,651 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 90,120 Verified therm savings
- \$43,167 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .69 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,437 Direct job hours
- 111 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$34,140 Verified incentives
- 123.46 Homes powered

Santa Monica Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$368,422 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 17,948 Verified therm savings
- \$12,743 Annual energy cost savings
- .34 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .79 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,642 Direct job hours
- 703 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$17,948 Verified incentives
- 24.59 Homes powered

San Mateo County Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$1,905,891 Total project costs
- 1,365,081 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$122,857 Annual energy cost savings
- .39 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.17 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,429 Direct job hours
- 816 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$236,219 Verified incentives
- 215.68 Homes powered

Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$763,342 Total project costs
- 208,251 Verified kWh savings
- 24.20 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$50,194 Annual energy cost savings
- .25 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 2.89 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,020 Direct job hours
- 524 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,685 Verified incentives
- 32.90 Homes powered

Siskiyou Joint Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$221,587 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 4,700 Verified therm savings
- \$8,037 Annual energy cost savings
- .17 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 339 Direct job hours
- 347 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 6.44 Homes powered

South Orange County Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$1,591,770 Total project costs
- 475,814 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$118,953 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 33.88 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 75.18 Homes powered

Sonoma County Junior College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$450,873 Total project costs
- 198,719 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 8,312 Verified therm savings
- \$43,687 Annual energy cost savings
- .12 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .46 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 959.75 Direct job hours
- 244.45 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$18,389 Verified incentives
- 42.79 Homes powered

Southwestern Community College District

- 14 Closed-out projects
- \$1,948,681 Total project costs
- 933,441 Verified kWh savings
- 77 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$121,347 Annual energy cost savings
- .66 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.75 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,632 Direct job hours
- 1,363 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,325 Verified incentives
- 147.48 Homes powered

Ventura County Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$104,490 Total project costs
- 16,730 Verified kWh savings
- 2.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$2,175 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 171 Direct job hours
- 32 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 2.64 Homes powered

West Valley-Mission Community College District

- 2 Closed-out Projects
- \$487,258 Total project costs
- 62,508 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 43,206 Verified therm savings
- \$36,008 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .34 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 707 Direct job hours
- 43 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 69.07 Homes powered

Victor Valley Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$519,428 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 10,146 Verified therm savings
- \$10,044 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .20 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 416 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,000 Verified incentives
- 13.90 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 2016-17 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data, the systemwide energy usage was reduced by six percent. A total of 36 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 19 districts have not reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2016-17 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change at their district.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2017-18 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2017-18 progress data to compare against the base year. For further detail and information, please see Appendix C 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: 1,618
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,521
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.00 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,823
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 20.24 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,175
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 5.07 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,595
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.86 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,579
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.85 percent

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,134
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,252
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 5.53 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,274
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.64 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,372
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.67 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,443
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.06 percent

Compton Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,109
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 47.14 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,601
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.31 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 410
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.83 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,524
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.51 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,460
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.02 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 706
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.91 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,937
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .82 percent

Gavilan Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,660
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Glendale Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,110
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.88 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 816
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.26 percent

Hartnell Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,206
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Imperial Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,151
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.74 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,558
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 33.25 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,756
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 4.61 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,829
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.71 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,079
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.39 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 740
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.75 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Marin Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,107
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 18.29 percent

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,362
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 10.73 percent

Merced Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,420
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,360
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.97 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,490
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -13.03 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,276
- 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,131
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -33.21 percent

Napa Valley Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,549
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,766
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.48 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Palo Verde Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,036
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,370
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 32.32 percent

Palomar Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2016-17 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 550
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -36.61 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,355
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 11.95 percent

Rancho Santiago Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,848
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,329
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.05 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Rio Hondo Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,444
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,078
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.34 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,738
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 8.11 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,185
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.81 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

San Joaquin Delta Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,658
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,595
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.52 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 2016-17 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,142
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.25 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 989
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -24.37 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,022
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.99 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,306
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 4.92 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,049
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.46 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,908
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -41.39 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,583
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 26.65 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,021
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -19.60 percent

Solano County Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,442
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,131
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.51 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,392
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.57 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,315
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.83 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 844
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.92percent

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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,719
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 22.75 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,260
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.25 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 840
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.46 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 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Yosemite Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,117
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,016
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.25 percent

Yuba Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 978
- Fiscal year 2016-17 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

BACKGROUND

Total Year 5 Proposition 39 funds for California Community Colleges was \$46.5 million. From the community colleges' Proposition 39 funds, 12.8 percent, \$5.9 million, of the total was allocated for workforce development.

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

INVESTMENTS

As in previous years, Proposition 39 workforce funding was allocated 12.8 percent for Year 4 and 5. These funds will leverage regional Strong Workforce investments in developing a statewide program that maps directly to the “qualified and fully engaged workforce” required by the California Long-range Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan to achieve mandates set by Assembly Bill 32. Analysis is underway to determine new workforce requirements for meeting the Senate Bill 350 mandates, which will be reflected in plans for year four and five investments.

OBJECTIVES

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

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

- Targeting workforce-related incentive funds towards priority and emergent sectors important to California's regional economies.
- Staffing key talent roles that serve as first contacts for industry and our system, including sector navigators and regional consortia chairs. These roles facilitate in-region and multi-region coordination of training activities.
- Mobilizing community college training capacity by scoping grantees to collaborate with in-region colleges active in the sector.
- Applying common metrics and accountability measures on outcomes that drive student success and meet industry's need for skilled workers.

- Provide technical assistance and flexible mini-grants to support faculty coming together to update curriculum for industry needs.
- Build and sustain regional networks of colleges to prepare workforce for the energy sector to improve energy efficiency and expand clean energy generation in the built environment.
- Leverage assets at multiple colleges across a region to align and regionalize energy efficiency related curriculum.
- Assure compliance to codes and standards by upgrading workforce capacity, knowledge and skills over the life of the Proposition 39 funding stream.
- Develop sustainable partnerships and methods that link carbon reduction policy and economic development goals to industry needs and education and training programs.
- Elevate the quality of instruction at colleges that have made investments in education and training in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sector.
- Incentivize (through instructor stipends, etc.) regional cooperation, including curriculum alignment; increased access to certificates, degrees and state-certified apprenticeship programs; increased access to employment; and faculty professional development.
- Build career pathways that assure student success by connecting student-learning outcomes directly to employment opportunities.
- Enroll all energy related pathway students in the Employment Development Department's CalJOBS system and collect outcomes data via the Launchboard.
- Prepare the energy efficiency workforce to participate in the construction, repair and maintenance of commercial, industrial, and institutional buildings as required to meet Assembly Bill 32 requirements.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAM YEARS 3 AND 4

From July 2017 through December 2018, the California Community Colleges invested \$6.1 million in programs completed by 7,112 students. These rates represent Years 3 and 4, with the final year of the program to be completed May 2019. Regional distribution of Years 3 and 4 investment and completers through June 2018 is shown in the table below.

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

Region	Investment	Unique Completers
North Far North	\$ 1,564,753	1,152
Bay Area	\$ 1,211,659	1,422
Central Valley/South Central Coast	\$ 370,436	1,674
Los Angeles/Orange County	\$ 2,533,613	1,287
Inland Empire/San Diego/Imperial	\$ 442,229	1,577
Total	\$ 6,122,690	7,112

Major program improvements were enabled by Proposition 39 funds. 10,327 certificates and degrees were awarded statewide, distributed among programs as follows:

Program	Investment	Awards
Architecture and Architectural Technology	\$ 407,198	342
Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance	\$ 345,773	373
Environmental Control Technology	\$ 1,463,466	1,577
Construction Crafts Technology	\$ 1,361,206	2,374
Drafting Technology	\$ 25,038	320
Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	\$ 1,074,689	2,780
Civil and Construction Management Technology	\$ 31,800	227
Water and Wastewater Technology	\$ 278,228	596
Other	\$ 265,940	622
Total	\$ 6,122,690	10,327

Significant student advancement was realized in all regions, with awards by region continuing to show strength.

Region	6-18 Unit Certificate	>18 Unit Certificate or Degree	Other
North Far North	347	970	404
Bay Area	446	1,005	31
Central Valley/South Central Coast	501	1,174	772
Los Angeles/Orange County	327	1,235	1,520
Inland Empire/San Diego/Imperial	287	1,236	72
Total	1,908	5,620	2,799

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR YEARS 3 AND 4 ARE HIGHLIGHTED BELOW:

- Launched CareerQuest, an online career assessment, to guide prospective students into energy, construction and utility careers targeting Orange County schools.
- Developed Construction Technology Pathway programs at Los Angeles Mission College and Los Angeles Southwest College.
- Sacramento City College completed a mobile HVAC/R demonstration and outreach trailer, and made it available for outreach activities throughout the north far north and Bay Area regions.
- College of the Siskiyous completed a mobile “tiny house” demonstration and added new energy and construction courses with stackable certificates.
- Partnered with the North State Building Industry Association (NSBIA) and the Los Rios District to implement an innovative outreach recruitment pilot that involved hiring, training, and deploying current students as outreach ambassadors.
- Developed online Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)-10 course intended for dual enrollment use.
- Developed a HVAC dual enrollment pathway at Fresno City College.
- Launched two new HVAC certificate programs at Bakersfield College and West Hills College – Coalinga.
- Created “Campus as a Living Lab” program at Oxnard College, with 25 participating students.

- Developed the Building & Energy Systems Professional (BESP) program, a set of energy, construction and utilities (ECU) career pathways at College of the Desert, organized into one associate of science degree inclusive of 13 individual certificate programs. More than 300 students have benefited from the program, which was recognized by the State Legislature in 2017.
- Hosted more than 100 faculty, teachers, and industry partners at a regional industry advisory in partnership with the Inland Empire Economic Partnership.
- Developed new San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) utility career training programs for gas and electric distribution planners and designers. The first cohort of 25 students was complete in December 2018 and was completely attended by incumbent workers needing to certify for SDG&E contract work.
- Initiated a partnership between high schools, regional community colleges, and the Southwestern Regional Carpenters Union for pre-apprenticeship education. Seventeen high schools in the Inland Empire have already begun their carpentry programs, which will articulate into several regional construction programs and pre-apprenticeships.
- Initiated a partnership with the California Construction & Industrial Materials (CalCIMA) to create an industry talent pipeline program designed to train and employ entry-level construction workers, equipment operators, diesel mechanics, and truck drivers.
- Partnered with Building Trades Council in Kern, Inyo, and Mono counties to conduct Women in Trades Workshop and Student Apprenticeship Workshops with 350 high school students in attendance.
- Developed on-line dual enrollment OSHA 10 course at Cuesta College, which is now available for statewide distribution and utilization.
- Fifteen community college faculty received National Center for Construction Education and Research (NCCER) Instructor Certification in order to embed NCCER certification in their classes.

APPENDICES

(Click to Download)

APPENDIX A

All In-progress Projects

(<https://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2019-Prop-39/cccco-report-all-in-progress-projects-091818.xlsx>)

APPENDIX B

Projects Closed Out in Year 5

(<https://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2019-Prop-39/cccco-report-projects-closed-out-year-5.xlsx>)

APPENDIX C

Site-level Energy Usage Data

(https://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2019-Prop-39/cob-report-site-level-energy-data-2016-2017_final.xls)

APPENDIX D

Maps of California Community College District Proposition 39 Projects, Total, and Total Allocation for 2017-18

(<https://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/Portals/0/Reports/2019-Prop-39/prop39-maps.pdf>)

Front cover photo: College of the Desert
First Solar's Thin-Film PV System

Photo at right: Sustainable Tech Students
at Santa Monica College

Back cover photo: Solar Energy Students
at American River College



Connect
with us!

WEBSITES

California Community Colleges

CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu

Student Success Scorecard

scorecard.cccco.edu

Salary Surfer

salarysurfer.cccco.edu

Associate Degree for Transfer

adegreewithaguarantee.com

Priority Registration

stepforward.cccco.edu

Workforce & Economic Development

doingwhatmatters.cccco.edu

Financial Aid

icanaffordcollege.com

SOCIAL MEDIA



California Community Colleges Facebook Page

facebook.com/CACommColleges

Financial Aid Facebook Page

facebook.com/icanaffordcollege



California Community Colleges Twitter Feed

twitter.com/CalCommColleges

Chancellor Eloy Oakley Twitter Feed

twitter.com/EloyOakley

Government Relations Twitter Feed

twitter.com/CCGRAdvocates

Financial Aid Twitter Feed

twitter.com/ICanAfrdCollege



California Community Colleges YouTube Page

youtube.com/CACommunityColleges

Financial Aid YouTube Page

youtube.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE



California Community Colleges Instagram Page

instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges

Financial Aid Instagram Page

instagram.com/icanaffordcollege



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