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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.
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,

Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor
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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 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 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

**Retrofit Project Winner**
Orange Coast College
Stadium, Gym, and Theatre Lighting Retrofit

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

**Honorable Mention**
College of San Mateo
Exterior LED Lighting Project

**Best Overall District—Medium**
Peralta Community College District
Interior Lighting Retrofit

**Commissioning Project Winner**
Butte College
Main Campus Monitoring Based Commissioning (MBCx) Project

**Honorable Mention**
San Mateo County Community College District
Skyline College Exterior LED Lighting Project

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

**Best Overall District – Small**
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District
Multiyear Tehama Solar Photovoltaic Project

**Renewable Energy Winner**
Butte College
Skyway Center, Solar Photovoltaic Project

**Honorable Mention**
San Luis Obispo County Community College District
Boiler Retrofit

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

Retrofit Project Winner
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 – 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

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

**Retrofit Project Winner**
Long Beach Community College District
Long Beach City College
HVAC Zone and Fan Static Pressure Reset

**Honorable Mention**
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, Las Positas College, HVAC Retrofit

**Honorable Mention**
North Orange County Community College District, Cypress College, Interior Lighting Retrofit

**Best Overall District – Small**
Solano County Community College District
Solano Community College
Exterior 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

**Retrofit Project Winner**
Butte-Glenn Community College District
Butte College
Skyway Center – EMS Upgrade

**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

**Commissioning Project Winner**
Cerritos Community College District
Cerritos College
RCx at Math/Science Building

**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

**Renewable Energy Winner**
Cabrillo Community College District
Cabrillo College
Solar Thermal Pool Heater

**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
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). 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chancellor’s Office Division Allocation</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>$5,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Planning &amp; Utilization</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>$40,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,962,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 39 Consulting Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Hancock Joint Community College District</td>
<td>$343,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley Community College District</td>
<td>$400,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow Community College District</td>
<td>$86,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte-Glenn Community College District</td>
<td>$341,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo Community College District</td>
<td>$357,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos Community College District</td>
<td>$575,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot-Las Positas Community College District</td>
<td>$ 533,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffey Community College District</td>
<td>$ 567,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Community College District</td>
<td>$ 407,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Community College District</td>
<td>$ 1,044,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Community College District</td>
<td>$ 175,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Community College District</td>
<td>$ 916,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain Community College District</td>
<td>$ 50,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Community College District</td>
<td>$ 313,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Community College District</td>
<td>$ 614,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather River Community College District</td>
<td>$ 55,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill-DeAnza Community College District</td>
<td>$ 891,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan Joint Community College District</td>
<td>$ 182,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale Community College District</td>
<td>$ 533,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District</td>
<td>$ 656,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell Community College District</td>
<td>$ 252,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Community College District</td>
<td>$ 232,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern Community College District</td>
<td>$ 745,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Community College District</td>
<td>$ 59,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen Community College District</td>
<td>$ 58,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Community College District</td>
<td>$ 713,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Community College District</td>
<td>$ 3,694,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Rios Community College District</td>
<td>$ 1,801,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Community College District</td>
<td>$ 127,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino-Lake Community College District</td>
<td>$ 106,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Community College District</td>
<td>$ 327,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Costa Community College District</td>
<td>$ 362,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula Community College District</td>
<td>$ 230,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Antonio Community College District</td>
<td>$ 1,062,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Jacinto Community College District</td>
<td>$ 419,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2017-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Valley Community College District</td>
<td>$ 186,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orange County Community College District</td>
<td>$ 1,193,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone Community College District</td>
<td>$ 279,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde Community College District</td>
<td>$ 71,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar Community College District</td>
<td>$ 621,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Area Community College District</td>
<td>$ 823,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Community College District</td>
<td>$ 610,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santiago Community College District</td>
<td>$ 993,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwoods Community College District</td>
<td>$ 136,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo Community College District</td>
<td>$ 423,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Community College District</td>
<td>$ 995,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino Community College District</td>
<td>$ 541,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Community College District</td>
<td>$ 1,511,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Community College District</td>
<td>$ 699,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta Community College District</td>
<td>$ 458,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Evergreen Community College District</td>
<td>$ 409,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo County Community College District</td>
<td>$ 250,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Community College District</td>
<td>$ 567,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Community College District</td>
<td>$ 422,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Community College District</td>
<td>$ 564,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Community College District</td>
<td>$ 737,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoias Community College District</td>
<td>$ 332,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District</td>
<td>$ 247,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Joint Community College District</td>
<td>$ 480,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou Joint Community College District</td>
<td>$ 92,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano County Community College District</td>
<td>$ 248,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Junior College District</td>
<td>$ 575,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County Community College District</td>
<td>$ 937,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Community College District</td>
<td>$ 535,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Center Community College District</td>
<td>$1,011,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County Community College District</td>
<td>$872,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Valley Community College District</td>
<td>$325,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Community College District</td>
<td>$188,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kern Community College District</td>
<td>$90,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley-Mission Community College District</td>
<td>$460,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Community College District</td>
<td>$563,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba Community College District</td>
<td>$261,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$38,962,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 ration 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Projects</th>
<th>Savings to Investment Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBCx/RCx</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other energy efficiency meas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 240 Direct job hours
- 152 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
- .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

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
- .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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College District</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>kWh Savings</th>
<th>kW Savings</th>
<th>Therm Savings</th>
<th>Annual Energy Cost Savings</th>
<th>Trainee FTEs</th>
<th>Direct FTEs</th>
<th>Direct Job Hours</th>
<th>Apprentice Direct Job Hours</th>
<th>Verified Incentives</th>
<th>Homes Powered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coast Community College District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,854,014</td>
<td>1,388,847</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>$193,331</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>$187,427</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Community College District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$223,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>$3,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,998</td>
<td>20.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Community College District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,880,101</td>
<td>250,801</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3,356</td>
<td>$48,261</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>$44,606</td>
<td>44.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain Community College District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,200</td>
<td>14,833</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$3,235</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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
- $26,643 Verified incentives
- 5.40 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

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
- $0.00 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
- $8,069 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College District</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Verified kWh Savings</th>
<th>Verified kW Savings</th>
<th>Verified therm Savings</th>
<th>Annual Energy Cost Savings</th>
<th>Trainee Job Years (FTEs)</th>
<th>Direct Job Years (FTEs)</th>
<th>Direct Job Hours</th>
<th>Apprentice Direct Job Hours</th>
<th>Verified Incentives</th>
<th>Homes Powered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Community College District</td>
<td>$3,281,449</td>
<td>1,352,970</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>$259,485</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$5,823</td>
<td>214.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Community College District</td>
<td>$1,675,797</td>
<td>607,425</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111,735</td>
<td>$136,186</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$58,988</td>
<td>249.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta Community College District</td>
<td>$308,849</td>
<td>131,568</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$17,581</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$58,988</td>
<td>20.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Evergreen Community College District</td>
<td>$171,193</td>
<td>107,575</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>$15,883</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$15,568</td>
<td>19.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>kWh Savings</td>
<td>kW Savings</td>
<td>Therm Savings</td>
<td>Annual Energy Cost Savings</td>
<td>Trainee Job Years</td>
<td>Direct Job Years</td>
<td>Direct Job Hours</td>
<td>Apprentice Job Hours</td>
<td>Verified Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo County Community College District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$571,651</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,120</td>
<td>$43,167</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$34,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Community College District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,905,891</td>
<td>1,365,081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$122,857</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>$236,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Community College District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$368,422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,948</td>
<td>$12,743</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>$17,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$763,342</td>
<td>208,251</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$50,194</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>$7,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td>Closed-out projects</td>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>Verified kWh savings</td>
<td>Verified kW savings</td>
<td>Verified therm savings</td>
<td>Annual energy cost savings</td>
<td>Trainee job years (FTEs)</td>
<td>Direct job years (FTEs)</td>
<td>Direct job hours</td>
<td>Apprentice direct job hours</td>
<td>Verified incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou Joint Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$221,587</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>$8,037</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Junior College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$450,873</td>
<td>198,719</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,312</td>
<td>$43,687</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>959.75</td>
<td>244.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,591,770</td>
<td>475,814</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$118,953</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>959.75</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Community</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,948,681</td>
<td>933,441</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$121,347</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>959.75</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

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
- $0.00 Verified incentives
- 13.90 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
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 glimpse, 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: 2,300
- 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: 1,733
- 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: -18.92 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 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.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Architectural Technology</td>
<td>$ 407,198</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance</td>
<td>$ 345,773</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Control Technology</td>
<td>$ 1,463,466</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Crafts Technology</td>
<td>$ 1,361,206</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Technology</td>
<td>$ 25,038</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing and Industrial Technology</td>
<td>$ 1,074,689</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil and Construction Management Technology</td>
<td>$ 31,800</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater Technology</td>
<td>$ 278,228</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 265,940</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 6,122,690</td>
<td>10,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant student advancement was realized in all regions, with awards by region continuing to show strength.

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

**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.
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