



2018 REPORT

Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report Year 4 (Fiscal Year 2016-17)

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office | Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor
Facilities Planning and Utilization | Workforce and Economic Development



CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

State of California

ELOY ORTIZ OAKLEY
Chancellor

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

February 7, 2018

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

RE: California Community College Proposition 39 Projects

Dear Governor Brown:

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office is pleased to share with you the successes of the community college districts in implementing the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act program. Year 4 of funding has supported 578 energy projects at 72 community college districts, resulting in one-time incentives, ongoing energy and monetary savings, job creation and better physical environments for California's community college students.

The energy projects implemented on community college campuses in Year 4 of Proposition 39 funding will result in annual savings of 67.6 million kilo-watt hours of electricity and 1.2 million gas therms, generating \$10.3 million in annual energy cost savings and \$9.2 million in one-time energy incentives.

The 578 projects are at various stages of the completion process with 123 projects completely finished, including project measurement, verification and closeout documentation, and 455 projects under construction or in the closeout process. The 123 completed projects have generated a total of 98 job years. Based on these results, we estimate the remaining 455 projects will generate an additional 750 job years. Additionally, 23 trainee job years will be generated once all 578 projects are completed and closed out.

Proposition 39 student program data continue to be analyzed for Year 4; however, Year 3 Workforce and Economic Development analyses show that more than 3,400 students have completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications. Once Year 4 Proposition 39 student program data are finalized, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office will submit an addendum with these findings to the Citizen's Oversight Board.

Thank you for your support of the California Community Colleges' energy efficiency and sustainability efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eloy Ortiz Oakley', written over a horizontal line.

Eloy Ortiz Oakley
Chancellor

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Identifying Energy Savings.....	7
Implementation Overview.....	7
Funding Status	7
Results of Closed-out and In-Progress Projects.....	11
Energy Usage Data Summary.....	22
Workforce and Economic Development Division.....	36
Appendices.....	38
Addendum	38

Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report

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 approved initiative for the purposes of creating jobs in California by improving energy efficiency and expanding clean energy generation. The progress made in Year 4 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 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 to work with districts on reviewing, approving, administering and verifying clean energy projects and energy savings. The investor-owned utility

groups and Newcomb Anderson McCormick have been an integral part of the partnership with the Chancellor's Office in assisting community colleges across the state. The Workforce and Economic Development Division is in charge of the funding, which is allocated to districts on a grant basis. They have collaborated with a sector navigator 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 Newcomb Anderson McCormick to close out their energy efficiency projects. Thirty-eight districts have closed out 123 projects in Year 4 for a total project cost of \$17.5 million. This has resulted in 8.8 million kWh and 251,000 therm savings resulting in \$1.4 million in energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$1.4 million in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. These energy efficiency projects produced 98 direct job years and trainee job years on district campuses. The annual energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 1,700 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 4, lighting projects have the highest rate of closeout. Of the 123 closed-out, 63 were lighting 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. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) projects place second in Year 4 at 33 projects. These projects amount to 27 percent of the total amount of projects completed in Year 4. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Tech Assist and Other amount to 22 percent of the total.

Community college districts apply for funding through the Workforce and Economic Development Division. This is a longer process for districts, which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development Division is currently finishing Year 3 and currently working on Year 4. Year 4 results will be forthcoming in the following year's report. The funding allocated to community colleges have resulted in more than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in Year 3.

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

IDENTIFYING ENERGY SAVINGS

As required by Proposition 39, the districts' projects must meet 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) (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 & 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 4 continued the momentum of the first three years. As such, there were no changes made in these four 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 Newcomb Anderson McCormick, districts also have projects generated by the consultants. The Chancellor's Office also uses the systemwide database, FUSION, to generate a list of potential projects. Districts enter scheduled maintenance projects as well as capital outlay projects, which is a potential pool of Proposition 39 projects.

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

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

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

As 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 consultation, administration of the program, and assisting districts with engineering work and verifying projects.

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 Allocation

Chancellor's Office Division Allocation	Allocation	FY 2016-17
Workforce & Economic Development	12.8%	\$6,290,000
Facilities Planning & Utilization	87.2%	\$42,990,000
District Allocation		\$41,875,000
Prop 39 Consulting Contract		\$1,115,000
Total	100%	\$49,280,000

The districts are allocated funding based upon their percentage of the total systemwide 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 2016-17 Based on Full-time Equivalent Students

District	Fiscal Year 2016-17
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	\$337,762
Antelope Valley Community College District	\$426,082
Barstow Community College District	\$89,550
Butte-Glenn Community College District	\$401,653
Cabrillo Community College District	\$380,794
Cerritos Community College District	\$644,008
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	\$584,658
Chaffey Community College District	\$579,135
Citrus Community College District	\$432,135
Coast Community College District	\$1,192,413

District	Fiscal Year 2016-17
Compton Community College District	\$221,503
Contra Costa Community College District	\$1,036,882
Copper Mountain Community College District	\$54,100
Desert Community College District	\$298,989
El Camino Community College District	\$714,184
Feather River Community College District	\$59,541
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	\$990,244
Gavilan Community College District	\$189,306
Glendale Community College District	\$508,239
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	\$685,327
Hartnell Community College District	\$269,347
Imperial Community College District	\$253,742
Kern Community College District	\$748,112
Lake Tahoe Community College District	\$66,744
Lassen Community College District	\$56,523
Long Beach Community College District	\$759,362
Los Angeles Community College District	\$3,925,689
Los Rios Community College District	\$1,907,157
Marin Community College District	\$136,593
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	\$92,862
Merced Community College District	\$351,678
Mira Costa Community College District	\$389,983
Monterey Peninsula Community College District	\$236,752
Mt. San Antonio Community College District	\$1,135,557
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	\$433,234
Napa Valley Community College District	\$204,445
North Orange County Community College District	\$1,320,350
Ohlone Community College District	\$289,623
Palo Verde Community College District	\$71,216
Palomar Community College District	\$607,032
Pasadena Area Community College District	\$849,681
Peralta Community College District	\$712,918

District	Fiscal Year 2016-17
Rancho Santiago Community College District	\$1,055,957
Redwoods Community College District	\$131,004
Rio Hondo Community College District	\$457,923
Riverside Community College District	\$1,039,372
San Bernardino Community College District	\$564,154
San Diego Community College District	\$1,584,591
San Francisco Community College District	\$800,858
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	\$597,127
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District	\$432,929
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	\$303,381
San Mateo County Community College District	\$640,020
Santa Barbara Community College District	\$481,948
Santa Clarita Community College District	\$579,422
Santa Monica Community College District	\$794,724
Sequoias Community College District	\$343,574
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District	\$237,076
Sierra Joint Community College District	\$545,204
Siskiyou Joint Community College District	\$105,795
Solano County Community College District	\$303,701
Sonoma County Junior College District	\$706,087
South Orange County Community College District	\$934,887
Southwestern Community College District	\$563,258
State Center Community College District	\$1,063,722
Ventura County Community College District	\$938,872
Victor Valley Community College District	\$336,595
West Hills Community College District	\$193,030
West Kern Community College District	\$93,474
West Valley-Mission Community College District	\$516,757
Yosemite Community College District	\$605,710
Yuba Community College District	\$278,743
Total	\$41,875,000

RESULTS OF CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS

Summary of Year 4 Closed-Out and In-Progress Projects

The California community colleges currently have 578 projects for Year 4 of Proposition 39 (fiscal year 2016-17) that are either closed-out or in progress at a total cost of \$161.6 million.* These projects will generate savings of 67.6 million kilowatt-hours and more than 1.2 million gas therms resulting in \$9.2 million of energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering approximately 12,000 homes annually. Additionally, 848 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

Completed and Closed-Out Projects

One hundred and twenty-three completed projects were closed out by 38 community college districts in fiscal year 2016-17. A summary of key data points for the 123 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, 2017, the 123 projects were completed and closed-out at a cost of \$17.5 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 8.8 million kilowatt-hours and nearly 251,000 gas therms, resulting in \$1.4 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 1,700 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 97 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and three training years in the communities served by the districts.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 39 TOTAL YEAR 4 (FISCAL YEAR 2016-17) CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

- 38** Districts
- 123 Total closed-out projects
- \$17,503,255 Total project costs
- 8,803,643 kWh savings
- 3,232 kW savings
- 251,092 therm savings
- \$1,383,382 Energy cost savings
- 97.70 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2.71 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 203,217 Direct job hours
- 5,645 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$1,449,546 Incentives paid
- 1,735 Homes powered

* Please see Appendix D for a maps with data regarding project costs, total 2016-17 allocation, and in-progress and closed-out projects.

** 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 123 projects closed-out in Year 4, 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 63 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 50 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 33 projects, or 27 percent of the total number of closed-out projects in Year 4. The remaining 22 percent of projects closed out in Year 4 include those in the MBCx/RCx, Self-Generation, and Other Energy Efficiency Measures categories.

CATEGORY OF PROJECTS CLOSED OUT IN YEAR 4 | FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

Project Type	Count	Percentage of Total Projects	Savings to Investment Ratio
Lighting	63	51%	14.75
HVAC	33	27%	5.14
Controls	9	7%	1.52
MBCx/RCx	7	6%	3.07
Self-Generation	1	1%	0.44
Other Energy Efficiency Measures	10	8%	19.52
Total Projects	123	100%	7.41

Projects In-Progress

An additional 455 projects are in progress, including Proposition 39, utility incentive and district funding, at a total cost of \$144 million. These projects will result in savings of 58.8 million kilowatt-hours and 1.0 million gas therms resulting in \$8.9 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of annually powering close to 10,700 homes. Additionally, 750 one-year jobs will be created in throughout California.

PROPOSITION 39 PROJECTS TOTAL IN-PROGRESS (ESTIMATED) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

- 69 Districts
- 455 In-progress projects
- \$144,049,552 Current total project costs
- 58,810,604 Current kWh savings
- 11,295 Current kW savings
- 1,019,821 Current therm savings
- \$8,878,111 Current annual energy cost savings
- 750.72 Current direct job years (FTEs)
- 20.85 Current trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1,485,247 Current job hours
- 48,649 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,729,559 Current incentives
- 10,689 Current homes powered

Completed/Closed-Out Projects Summary by District

This document provides a summary of the data included in [Appendix B](#) for completed projects that were closed out 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

Allan Hancock Joint Community College District

- 10 Closed-out projects
- \$551,220.46 Total project costs
- 316,775 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 12,547 Verified therm savings
- \$44,793.72 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .19 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 393 Direct job hours
- 75 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$56,904.38 Verified incentives
- 67.24 Homes powered

Barstow Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$79,734.56 Total project costs
- 7,901 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$1,185.15 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .02 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 40 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours

- \$1,896.17 Verified incentives
- 1.25 Homes powered

Cabrillo Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$345,905.38 Total project costs
- 103,842 Verified kWh savings
- 27.90 Verified kW savings
- 8,033 Verified therm savings
- \$22,178.82 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,253 Direct job hours
- 2.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,770.00 Verified incentives
- 27.41 Homes powered

Cerritos Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$898,637.26 Total project costs
- 376,547 Verified kWh savings
- 53.50 Verified kW savings
- 6,929 Verified therm savings
- \$53,108.51 Annual energy cost savings
- .19 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .67 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,400 Direct job hours

- 386 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$74,987.00 Verified incentives
- 68.99 Homes powered

Chaffey Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$30,294.00 Total project costs
- 23,130 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$3,582.84 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 64.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,551.26 Verified incentives
- 3.65 Homes powered

Citrus Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$367,315.41 Total project costs
- 170,255 Verified kWh savings
- 16.10 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$22,133.15 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .24 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 493.47 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,153.28 Verified incentives
- 26.90 Homes powered

Contra Costa Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$62,276.00 Total project costs
- 65,061 Verified kWh savings
- 5.80 Verified kW savings
- 538 Verified therm savings
- \$8,759.73 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 112.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$650.00 Verified incentives
- 11.02 Homes powered

Desert Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$303,522.00 Total project costs
- 54,943 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0A Verified therm savings
- \$4,395.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 302 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$12,619.92 Verified incentives
- 8.68 Homes powered

El Camino Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$491,110.00 Total project costs

- 313,224 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$40,462.56 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .15 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 305.02 Direct job hours
- 104 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$75,173.76 Verified incentives
- 49.49 Homes powered

Gavilan Community College District

- 6 Closed-out projects
- \$322,523.68 Total project costs
- 122,521 Verified kWh savings
- 6.83 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$17,269.02 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 259 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,546.16 Verified incentives
- 19.15 Homes powered

Imperial Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$164,631.34 Total project costs
- 206,962 Verified kWh savings
- 6.60 Verified kW savings
- 4,808 Verified therm savings

- \$41,166.42 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .17 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 345 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$29,892.00 Verified incentives
- 39.29 Homes powered

Kern Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$512,409.66 Total project costs
- 207,120 Verified kWh savings
- 12 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$21,406.88 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 730 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$18,384.56 Verified incentives
- 32.72 Homes powered

Lake Tahoe Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$64,209.00 Total project costs
- 10,649 Verified kWh savings
- 2.5 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$1,171.39 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)

- 52.25 Direct job hours
- 42.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$1,597.35 Verified incentives
- 1.68 Homes powered

Long Beach Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$563,065.50 Total project costs
- 506,837 Verified kWh savings
- 2,602.80 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$71,096.51 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .37 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 770 Direct job hours
- 624 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$105,821.62 Verified incentives
- 80.08 Homes powered

Los Angeles Community College District

- 8 Closed-out projects
- \$1,185,486.22 Total project costs
- 511,800 Verified kWh savings
- 21.50 Verified kW savings
- 49,428 Verified therm savings
- \$88,963.29 Annual energy cost savings
- .12 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .94 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,947 Direct job hours
- 251 Apprentice direct job hours

- \$107,404.24 Verified incentives
- 148.58 Homes powered

Los Rios Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$743,501.43 Total project costs
- 852,212 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 32,199 Verified therm savings
- \$128,024.64 Annual energy cost savings
- .19 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.26 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,624 Direct job hours
- 388.25 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$8,323.89 Verified incentives
- 178.76 Homes powered

Merced Community College District

- 12 Closed-out projects
- \$642,117.35 Total project costs
- 307,768 Verified kWh savings
- 40.85 Verified kW savings
- 3,029 Verified therm savings
- \$44,398.15 Annual energy cost savings
- .48 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .61 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,277.50 Direct job hours
- 1,006.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$33,169.93 Verified incentives
- 52.78 Homes powered

Mira Costa Community College District

- 6 Closed-out projects
- \$752,551.00 Total project costs
- 352,927 Verified kWh savings
- 26.30 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$49,319.55 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .62 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,299.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$74,429.20 Verified incentives
- 55.76 Homes powered

Monterey Community College District

- 3 Closed-out project
- \$227,873.45 Total project costs
- 126,988 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,323.23 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 83 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$24,316.80 Verified incentives
- 20.06 Homes powered

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project

- \$449,480.00 Total project costs
- 125,923 Verified kWh savings
- 3 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$16,369.99 Annual energy cost savings
- .19 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 737 Direct job hours
- 403.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,221.52 Verified incentives
- 19.89 Homes powered

Napa Valley Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$203,144.00 Total project costs
- 198,832 Verified kWh savings
- 36 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,801.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .17 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 365.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$26,607.12 Verified incentives
- 31.42 Homes powered

North Orange County Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$518,030.40 Total project costs

- 180,260 Verified kWh savings
- 20 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$21,631.20 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .21 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 432 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$24,828.89 Verified incentives
- 28.48 Homes powered

Ohlone Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$265,475.13 Total project costs
- 228,490 Verified kWh savings
- 13 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$24,158.03 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .31 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 649 Direct job hours
- 79 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$26,856.65 Verified incentives
- 36.10 Homes powered

Palo Verde Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$179,022.55 Total project costs
- 118,689 Verified kWh savings
- 36.30 Verified kW savings

- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$16,773.02 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$27,863.76 Verified incentives
- 18.75 Homes powered

Palomar Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$1,994,850 Total project costs
- 622,174 Verified kWh savings
- 70.10 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$99,547.84 Annual energy cost savings
- .40 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,224 Direct job hours
- 831 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,580.56 Verified incentives
- 98.30 Homes powered

Rancho Santiago Community College District

- 6 Closed-out projects
- \$899,374.80 Total project costs
- 712,035 Verified kWh savings
- 107.82 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$100,208.29 Annual energy cost savings

- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,179.50 Direct job hours
- 286 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$87,824.00 Verified incentives
- 112.50 Homes powered

Redwoods Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$244,216.00 Total project costs
- 180,235 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,366.56 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .23 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 482 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$40,760.09 Verified incentives
- 28.48 Homes powered

Riverside Community College District

- 3 Closed-out projects
- \$223,971.00 Total project costs
- 339,508 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 3,453 Verified therm savings
- \$52,575.37 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .33 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 680 Direct job hours

- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$50,758.92 Verified incentives
- 58.37 Homes powered

San Bernardino Community College District

- 5 Closed-out projects
- \$455,916.95 Total project costs
- 309,019 Verified kWh savings
- 44.92 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$44,563.23 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 732.50 Direct job hours
- 74 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$74,164.56 Verified incentives
- 48.83 Homes powered

San Joaquin Delta Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$213,300.00 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 9,357 Verified therm savings
- \$5,333.49 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .17 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 355 Direct job hours
- 21 Apprentice direct job hours

- \$9,357.00 Verified incentives
- 12.82 Homes powered

San Luis Obispo County Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$261,317.11 Total project costs
- 100,627 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 17,150 Verified therm savings
- \$21,315.17 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .31 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 649.50 Direct job hours
- 80 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,998.00 Verified incentives
- 39.39 Homes powered

Sequoias Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$287,847.33 Total project costs
- 70,386 Verified kWh savings
- 6.57 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$9,150.18 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .32 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 671 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$13,084.49 Verified incentives
- 11.12 Homes powered

Sierra Joint Community College District

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$170,564.00 Total project costs
- 54,518 Verified kWh savings
- 13.86 Verified kW savings
- 8,190 Verified therm savings
- \$8,942.07 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .11 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 230.50 Direct job hours
- 112 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$17,166.24 Verified incentives
- 19.83 Homes powered

Solano County Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$1,517,996.00 Total project costs
- 706,880 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 90,231 Verified therm savings
- \$190,865.07 Annual energy cost savings
- 1.83 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 4.59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 9,550 Direct job hours
- 3,800 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$251,955.20 Verified incentives
- 235.30 A Homes powered

Sonoma County Junior College District

- 1 Closed-out project

- \$198,911.23 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 4,261 Verified therm savings
- \$3,621.85 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 5 Direct job hours
- 4 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$4,200.00 Verified incentives
- 5.84 Homes powered

West Hills Community College District

- 2 Closed-out projects
- \$337,712.86 Total project costs
- 79,651 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 1,093 Verified therm savings
- \$8,414.61 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .25 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 530 Direct job hours
- 78 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$6,820.00 Verified incentives
- 14.08 Homes powered

West Kern Community College District

- 1 Closed-out project
- \$53,015.00 Total project costs
- 35,998 Verified kWh savings

- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$4,751.74 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 63.50 Direct job hours
- 49.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$3,907.20 Verified incentives
- 5.69 Homes powered

West Valley-Mission Community College District

- 1 Closed-out Project
- \$720,727.00 Total project costs
- 102,956 Verified kWh savings
- 58 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$26,253.78 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .26 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 540 Direct job hours
- 175 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 16.27 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 2015-16 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data the systemwide energy usage has been reduced by 7.85 percent. A total of 44 districts have reduced their energy usage on campus while 13 districts have increased their usage as compared to the energy usage baseline data. A total of 14 districts have not yet reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2015-16 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change for their district. The Facilities Planning Utilization Unit and its partners continue to follow up with these districts to secure the missing data and will report the findings once those data have been analyzed.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2016-17 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2016-17 progress data to compare against the base year. For further detail and information, please see the attached spreadsheet showing the energy usage data summary 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,491
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.85 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,000
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 31.86 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 14,94
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.56 percent

BUTTE - GLENN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,119
- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,139
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.78 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,479
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.33 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,710
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.78 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

CHAFFEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,696

- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,965
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.11 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,499
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.41 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,412
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.19 percent

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,001
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 32.81 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,472
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.54 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 437
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.80 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,287
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -29.46 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

FEATHER RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 994
- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 720
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.51 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,942
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.10 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,233
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.07 percent

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352

- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 947
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -20.20 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,211
- 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,324
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.54 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,279
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 9.38 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,976
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.01 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 970
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -20.32 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 750
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.84 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,088
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.57 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,375
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.88 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,468
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.30 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,071
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 6.24 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.43 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,485
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.17 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,403
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.71 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,479
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 6.35 percent

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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,480
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 42.96 percent

PALOMAR COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 837
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.56 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,963
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -34.51 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,304
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -29.44 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,276
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.19 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,861
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 28.84 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,814
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -13.12 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,256
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.73 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,566
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.54 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,505
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.39 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,954
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.74 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,081
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.34 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,083
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.47 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,154
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.31 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,015
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .14 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,013
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -2.11 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,360
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -8.81 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,799
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.42 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,100
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.01 percent

SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,210
- Fiscal year 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,252
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.47 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,648
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.42 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,053
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -27.96 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,382
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -3.19 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 855
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.85 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,588
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.39 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,189
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -20.98 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,171
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 29.06 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,918
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.00 percent

YUBA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 978
- Fiscal year 2015-16 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 3 Proposition 39 funds for California Community Colleges was \$38,737,000. From the community colleges’ Proposition 39 funds, 12.8 percent or \$4,950,000 of the total was allocated for workforce development.

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

DATA COLLECTION DELAY

Investment data for 2015-2016 will be finalized before the end of the fiscal year, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office will submit an addendum with these findings to the Citizen’s Oversight Board.

INVESTMENTS

Proposition 39 workforce funding was allocated 12.8 percent for Year 4 and 5 as in prior years. These funds will leverage regional Strong Workforce investments in developing a statewide program that maps directly to the “qualified and fully engaged workforce” required by the California Long-range Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan to achieve mandates set by 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.

GRANT PERFORMANCE

Due to the personnel turnover, data is currently unavailable from the Bay Area, Los Angeles/Orange County and San Diego region colleges. Data is currently being collected from those regions and will be provided in an addendum to this report once available.

The data gathered thus far shows that more than 3,400 students from reporting Proposition 39 regional colleges completed degrees, certificates, or industry certifications in year three. Completions were distributed as follows:

199	AA/AS Degrees
580	Certificates (6-18 units)
1,082	Certificates (>18 units)
1,617	Industry/Apprenticeship Certifications

Proposition 39 Regions:

NORTH/FAR NORTH

(Butte, Cosumnes River, American River, Mendocino, Sacramento City, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 1,189

CENTRAL/MOTHER LODE/COAST

(Allan Hancock, Bakersfield*, Canyons, Cerro Coso, Merced, Oxnard, Porterville, San Joaquin Delta, Sequoias, Taft, Ventura)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 1,153

IMPERIAL/DESERT

(Barstow, Chaffey, Desert, Norco, Palo Verde, San Bernardino Valley, Victor Valley)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 1,428

Providing students with quality career training in sustainability continues to be a critical component of the California Community Colleges Proposition 39 efforts. Year 4 Proposition 39 student program data will be finalized before the end of the fiscal year, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office will submit an addendum with these findings to the Citizen's Oversight Board.

APPENDICES

(Click to Download)

Appendix A: **All In-Progress Projects**

(www.cccco.edu/Portals/1/images/Reports/Prop-39-Report/Appendix-A.xlsx)

Appendix B: **Projects Closed Out in Year 4**

(www.cccco.edu/Portals/1/images/Reports/Prop-39-Report/Appendix-B.xlsx)

Appendix C: **Site-Level Energy Usage Data**

(www.cccco.edu/Portals/1/images/Reports/Prop-39-Report/Appendix-C.xlsx)

ADDENDUM

(Click to Open)

Workforce Economic Development Proposition 39 Activity, 2016-17

(www.cccco.edu/Portals/1/images/Reports/Prop-39-Report/Addendum.pdf)

Appendix D: **Maps of California Community College District** **Proposition 39 Projects, Total Cost,** **and Total Allocation for 2016-17**

(www.cccco.edu/Portals/1/images/Reports/Prop-39-Report/Appendix-D.pdf)

Front cover photo: American River College

Photo at right: College of the Desert

Back cover photo: Butte 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

Workforce & Economic Development Twitter Feed

twitter.com/WorkforceVan

Financial Aid Twitter Feed

twitter.com/ICanAfrdCollege



California Community Colleges YouTube Page

youtube.com/CACommunityColleges

Financial Aid YouTube Page

youtube.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE



California Community Colleges Instagram Page

instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges

Financial Aid Instagram Page

instagram.com/icanaffordcollege



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