

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



California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office
Facilities Planning and Utilization
Final Summary Report

Executive Summary

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

Districts utilized the Proposition 39 program funding that was distributed to them for energy efficiency projects within the given deadline ending in fiscal year 2019-20. However, 23 districts had project savings that resulted in remaining funds of \$5.8 million. With assistance from General Counsel, the Proposition 39 program was extended, which allowed those districts to use those remaining funds. These projects helped reduced energy usage, cost savings and creating clean energy jobs throughout the community college system.

This program has also helping districts move towards meeting the goals for the State of California's goals in addressing climate change and sustainability. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by Senate Bill 73 (Ch. 29, Stats. 2013). The College Finance and Facilities Division's Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit oversees the funding allocated towards improving energy efficiency on community college campuses. The Workforce and Economic Development Division oversees the workforce training and development program on community college campuses. The Workforce and Economic Development Division closed out their program and reported last year.

The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit has partnered with investor-owned utility groups and the consulting firm Willdan Group, Inc., to work with districts on reviewing, approving, administering and verifying clean energy projects and energy savings. The investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc. have been an integral part of the partnership with the Chancellor's Office by assisting community colleges across the state.

The Proposition 39 extension brought back Willdan Group, Inc. to assist with the closeout of the program and their contract ended in December 2020.

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.¹ These procedures follow California Public Utility Commission-approved protocols for determining energy savings for projects. There are different protocols for project type (energy efficiency, solar photovoltaic, MBCx/RCx, etc.) and the standards for each project

¹<http://cccutilitypartnership.com>

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 was extended an additional year to allow districts to use their remaining funds, which will assist districts in meeting the new Climate Change and Sustainability goals established by the Chancellor's Office. As such, there were no changes made in the Proposition 39 program.

FUNDING STATUS

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

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

Program funds are distributed to districts on a full-time equivalent student basis; however, program funds are not released to districts until they submit project request forms (Form B) to the Chancellor's Office. The investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc. review the Form Bs before the districts submit to the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office releases the funds to the districts when they have a viable project.

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

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

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

Table 2: Chancellor’s Office Proposition 39 Total Allocation

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

In Table 3, the remaining funds are broken out by the districts that had projects savings. Out of the 23 districts that had the savings, only 16 were able to use their remaining funds. This was due to a small dollar amount remaining for some districts, COVID-19 restrictions, and a district (Lassen Community College District) being able to use their remaining savings in a prior Proposition 39 project.

Table 3. Program Extension – Revised Funding

District	Prop 39 Funds Available from Project Savings	Administration Fee	Revised Prop 39 Allocation
Barstow Community College District	\$ 16,271.00	\$ 1,141.00	\$ 15,130.00
Copper Mountain Community College District	\$ 14,356.00	\$ 1,007.00	\$ 13,349.00
Feather River Community College District	\$ 93,747.00	\$ 6,574.00	\$ 87,173.00
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	\$ 551,955.00	\$ 38,704.00	\$ 513,251.00
Gavilan Joint Community College District	\$ 10,422.00	\$ 731.00	\$ 9,691.00
Imperial Community College District	\$ 282,938.00	\$ 19,840.00	\$ 263,098.00
Lassen Community College District	\$ 41,514.00	\$ 2,911.00	
Long Beach Community College District	\$ 6,518.00	\$ 457.00	\$ 6,061.00
Los Angeles Community College District	\$ 474,681.00	\$ 33,286.00	\$ 441,395.00
Los Rios Community College District	\$ 135,445.00	\$ 9,498.00	\$ 125,947.00
Marin Community College District	\$ 1,678.00	\$ 5,026.00	\$ 66,652.00
Monterey Peninsula Community College District	\$ 158,552.00	\$ 11,118.00	\$ 147,434.00
North Orange County Community College District	\$ 691,234.00	\$ 47,961.00	\$ 643,273.00
Pasadena Area Community College District	\$ 12,585.00	\$ 7,895.00	\$ 104,690.00
Peralta Community College District	\$ 1,540,184.00	\$ 108,000.00	\$ 1,432,184.00
Redwoods Community College District	\$ 2,228.00	\$ 3,662.00	\$ 48,566.00
Riverside Community College District	\$ 2,234.00	\$ 157.00	\$ 2,077.00
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	\$ 9,623.00	\$ 675.00	\$ 8,948.00
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	\$ 16,258.00	\$ 1,140.00	\$ 15,118.00
Santa Monica Community College District	\$ 1,487,369.00	\$ 104,298.00	\$ 1,383,071.00
Sierra Joint Community College District	\$ 18.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 17.00
Sonoma County Junior College District	\$ 24,843.00	\$ 1,742.00	\$ 23,101.00
Yuba Community College District	\$ 18.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 17.00
TOTAL	5,794,671.00	405,825.00	5,350,243.00

As shown in Table 4 and Table 5, the energy savings and job creation throughout the life of the program can be seen. Year 6 (2018-19) represented a big push from the Chancellor’s Office and the system to expend as much of the program funds as possible and it tails off in Year 7 (2019-20) as can be seen in the number of projects and total project cost. In Table 6, it shows the distribution of different project types which include lighting, heating/ventilation/air condition (HVAC), controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls), self-generation, MBCx/RCx, other efficiency measures and technical assistance.

Table 4. Proposition 39 Program Summary 1

Program Year	No. of Projects Closed Out	Prop 39 Total Project Cost	Energy Cost Savings (\$/yr)	Electricity Savings (kWh/yr)
Year 1 (2013-14)	6	\$ 1,395,145	\$ 164,695	1,266,885
Year 2 (2014-15)	102	\$ 24,203,795	\$ 1,877,765	13,653,884
Year 3 (2015-16)	152	\$ 30,727,779	\$ 2,180,901	16,249,388
Year 4 (2016-17)	124	\$ 17,723,849	\$ 1,390,752	8,825,782
Year 5 (2017-18)	150	\$ 30,705,953	\$ 2,020,195	12,580,075
Year 6 (2018-19)	284	\$ 102,763,537	\$ 5,779,368	37,501,540
Year 7 (2019-20)	114	\$ 40,485,753	\$ 2,152,118	14,267,183
Year 8 (2020-21)	25	\$ 5,892,897	\$ 244,549	1,651,177
TOTAL	957	\$ 253,898,707	\$ 15,810,344	105,995,914

Table 5. Proposition 39 Program Summary 2

Program Year	Gas Savings (therm/yr)	Demand Savings (kW)	GHG Savings (tons-CO2)	Verified Trainee Job Years Created (FTEs)	Verified Direct Job Years Created (FTEs)
Year 1 (2013-14)	0	234	874	0.77	0.93
Year 2 (2014-15)	175,042	1,622	10,343	5.98	19.24
Year 3 (2015-16)	140,748	1,136	11,951	4.27	43.13
Year 4 (2016-17)	252,116	3,247	7,423	4.87	16.76
Year 5 (2017-18)	328,003	1,274	10,414	7.24	28.91
Year 6 (2018-19)	588,356	6,551	28,979	28.21	169.86
Year 7 (2019-20)	259,317	4,644	11,213	8.23	38.72
Year 8 (2020-21)	8,292	441	1,183	1.30	4.10
TOTAL	1,751,874	19,148	82,378	60.87	321.65

Table 6: Proposition 39 Projects Type Summary

Project Type	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Total	% of Total Projects
Lighting	5	65	90	62	89	160	70	15	556	58%
HVAC	1	19	25	34	35	61	22	6	203	21%
Controls	0	11	32	10	16	35	15	1	120	13%
Self-Generation	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	0	10	1%
MBCx/RCx	0	1	2	7	2	16	4	1	33	3%
Other energy efficiency measures	0	3	2	10	1	4	1	2	23	2%
Tech Assist	0	3	0	0	4	5	0	0	12	1%
Total Projects	6	102	152	124	150	284	114	25	957	100%

Results of Closed-out Projects:

SUMMARY OF YEAR 8 CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

Twenty-five completed projects were closed out by 16 community college districts in fiscal year 2020-21. This report provides a summary of key data points for the 25 closed-out projects 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.

The 25 projects were completed and closed-out at a cost of \$5.8 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 1.65 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) and more than 8,300 gas therms, resulting in than \$245,000 in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 272 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 4.1 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and 1.3 training years in the communities served by the districts.

Summary of Proposition 39 Total Year 8 Closed-Out Projects

- 16² Districts
- 25 Total Closed-out projects
- \$5,832,892 Total project costs
- 1,651,177 kWh savings
- 441 kW savings
- 8,292 therm savings
- \$244,549 Energy cost savings
- 4.1 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1.3 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 8,527 Direct job hours
- 2,713 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$6,541 Incentives paid
- 272 Homes powered

Of the 25 projects closed-out, the majority were lighting projects; these projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects for districts to meet the savings-to-investment ratio requirements (see Table 4). There were 15 lighting projects, which accounted for 60 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 7 projects, or 24 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx and other amount to 12 percent of the total.

Table 7: Proposition 39 Projects Closed Out in Year 8

Project Type	Count	% of Total Projects
Lighting	15	60%
HVAC	6	24%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	1	4%
Self-Generation	0	0%
MBCx/RCx	1	4%
Other energy efficiency measures	2	8%
Tech Assist	0	0%
Total Projects	25	100%

²Not 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

OVERALL: PROPOSITION 39 CLOSED OUT PROJECTS

Over the course of the entire Proposition 39 program, of the 957 total projects that were closed-out, the majority were lighting projects; these projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and continue to be integral projects for districts to meet the savings-to-investment ratio requirements (see Table 5). Additionally, there were 556 lighting projects, which accounted for more than 58 percent of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for 323 projects, or 34 % of the total number of closed-out projects. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, and other amount to approximately 8 % of the total or 78 projects.

Completed/Closed-Out Projects

SUMMARY BY DISTRICT

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

PROPOSITION 39 DISTRICT PROJECTS COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT

Barstow Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$18,923 Total project costs
40,656 Verified kWh savings
14.43 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$5,285 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
6.4 Homes powered

Copper Mountain Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$16,362 Total project costs
6,247 Verified kWh savings
.90 Verified kW savings

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
0 Verified therm savings
\$1,312 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.02 Direct job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job hours
40 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
1 Homes powered

Feather River Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$47,493 Total project costs
30,261 Verified kWh savings
20 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$3,631 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
5 Homes powered

Foothill-DeAnza Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$486,331 Total project costs
131,315 Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$24,161 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.09 Direct job years (FTEs)
198 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
21 Homes powered

Imperial Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
2 Closed-out projects
\$269,973 Total project costs
256,302 Verified kWh savings
45 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
35,882 Annual energy cost savings
.04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.19 Direct job years (FTEs)
404 Direct job hours
93 Apprentice direct job hours
\$6,541 Verified incentives
41 Homes powered

Long Beach Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$6,100 Total project costs
1,943 Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$252 Annual energy cost savings
.004 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.004 Direct job years (FTEs)
8 Direct job hours
8 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
.31 Homes powered

Los Angeles Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$571,201 Total project costs
95,902 Verified kWh savings
67 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$14,289 Annual energy cost savings
.14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.41 Direct job years (FTEs)

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
850 Direct job hours
300 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
15 Homes powered

Marin Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
2 Closed-out projects
\$72,816 Total project costs
49,094 Verified kWh savings
23 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$7,953 Annual energy cost savings
.01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.08 Direct job years (FTEs)
169 Direct job hours
14 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
7.8 Homes powered

Monterey Peninsula Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$118,402 Total project costs
0 Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings
637 Verified therm savings
\$586 Annual energy cost savings
.004 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.072 Direct job years (FTEs)
149 Direct job hours
8 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
.87 Homes powered

North Orange County Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
2 Closed-out projects
\$538,699 Total project costs
196,463 Verified kWh savings
64 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$25,540 Annual energy cost savings
.10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.22 Direct job years (FTEs)
448 Direct job hours
200 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
31 Homes powered

Pasadena Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$392,614 Total project costs
206,544 Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$35,112 Annual energy cost savings
.04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.18 Direct job years (FTEs)
364 Direct job hours
86 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
33 Homes powered

Peralta Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
2 Closed-out projects
\$1,848,822 Total project costs
211,540 Verified kWh savings
156 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$26,442 Annual energy cost savings
.56 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.48 Direct job years (FTEs)

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
3,081 Direct job hours
1,159 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
33 Homes powered

Riverside Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$2,551 Total project costs
13,456 Verified kWh savings
0 Verified kW savings
3 Verified therm savings
\$1,751 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
2 Homes powered

San Joaquin Delta Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
1 Closed-out projects
\$7,481 Total project costs
40,784 Verified kWh savings
8.8 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$5,098 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job years (FTEs)
0 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
6.4 Homes powered

Santa Monica Community College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
4 Closed-out projects
\$1,386,768 Total project costs
335,873 Verified kWh savings
39 Verified kW savings
7,652 Verified therm savings
52,378 Annual energy cost savings
.41 Trainee job years (FTEs)
1.29 Direct job years (FTEs)
2,688 Direct job hours
845 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
63.6 Homes powered

Sonoma County Junior College District

Year 8 (Fiscal Year 2020-21)
3 Closed-out projects
\$48,355 Total project costs
34,797 Verified kWh savings
2.8 Verified kW savings
0 Verified therm savings
\$4,871 Annual energy cost savings
0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
.06 Direct job years (FTEs)
128 Direct job hours
0 Apprentice direct job hours
\$0.00 Verified incentives
5.5 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 2018-19 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data, the systemwide energy usage has been reduced by 7.29 %. A total of 34 districts have reduced their energy usage on campus while 16 districts have increased their usage as compared to the energy usage baseline data. A total of 22 districts have not reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2018-19 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change at their district.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2019-20 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2019-20 progress data to compare against the baseline year. For further detail

and information, please see the attached spreadsheet showing the energy usage data summary and per district.

SYSTEMWIDE ENERGY USAGE DATA

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,606
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,489
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.29 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Barstow Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,581
- Fiscal year 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,279
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 14.34 %

Cabrillo Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,789
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,497
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.76 %

Cerritos Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,855
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,067
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,130
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.08 %

Chaffey Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,696
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,812
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -32.77%

Citrus Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,752
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Coast Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,459
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,277
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.45 %

Compton Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,177
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 56.21 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,811
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.47 %

Copper Mountain Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 445
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 401
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.91 %

Desert Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,825
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,611
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.72 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 673
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -32.27 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,843
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.05 %

Gavilan Joint Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,660
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,758
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -33.92 %

Glendale Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,219
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.80 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 880
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.87 %

Hartnell Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 861
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,933
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -124.42 %

Imperial Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,338
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.55 %

Kern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,169
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Lassen Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,144
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,599
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.44 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,061
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.87 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 844
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -22.15 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,208
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -33.28 %

Marin Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,751
- 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,267
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 3.00 %

Merced Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,420
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 23,099
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 28.04 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,724
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 0.64 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,455
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -25.40 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 980
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -42.17 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,913
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.30 %

Ohlone Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,391
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Palo Verde Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 826
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,521
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 84.06 %

Palomar Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 558
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -35.70 %

Peralta Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,997
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Rancho Santiago Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,848
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,280
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.74 %

Redwoods Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,400
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,035
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -56.87 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,181
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 50.97 %

Riverside Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,603
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,993
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 24.32 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,184
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.89 %

San Diego Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 653
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 878
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 34.41

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,631
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -1.61 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,453
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 6.01 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,113
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.56 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,028
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.39 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,009
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -8.16 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -0.01 %

Sequoias Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,014
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,835
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.76 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,739
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 39.18 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,637
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -34.84 %

Solano Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,442
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,219
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.11 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,056
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.73 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,299
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -17.89 %

Southwestern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,461
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,286
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 56.42 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,353
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.00 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,757
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 25.44 %

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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,186
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.23 %

West Kern Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 907
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 756
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.70 %

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 2018-19 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 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,163
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.61 %

Yuba Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,198
- Fiscal year 2018-19 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

Board of Governor's Sustainability and Energy Awards

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

- **Excellence in Energy and Sustainability—Innovative Projects:** This category recognizes the use and implementation of innovative technologies and progressive practices within their project.
- **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 begins with a call to districts for nominations in all award categories. Award nominations are presented to the California Community Colleges/Investor Owned Utilities (CCC/IOU) Energy Resource and Sustainability Partnership (Partnership) for review and final selection.

The winners of the Board of Governors' Sustainability and Energy Awards are listed below. More information on the winning projects can be seen in the January 2021 Board of Governors Energy and Sustainability Award Program [Board Item](#).

2020 Winners

EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Best Overall Innovative Project — Large District: Contra Costa Community College District, Contra Costa College Science Building

Best Overall Innovative Project — Medium District: Citrus Community College District, Citrus College – Retro Commissioning (RCx) at Citrus College

Best Overall Innovative Project — Small District: Hartnell Community College District, Hartnell College

EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—FACULTY/STUDENT INITIATIVES:

The 2020 Board of Governors Faculty/Student Initiative Award winner is Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) for the development of the LACCD Virtual Climate Crisis Curriculum.

EXCELLENCE IN ENERGY AND SUSTAINABILITY—SUSTAINABILITY CHAMPION:

Peter Hardash, former Vice Chancellor of Business Operations of Rancho Santiago Community College District.