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

2021 REPORT

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

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

California Community Colleges

**ELOY ORTIZ OAKLEY**
Chancellor

January 10, 2022

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 6 and 7 of funding has supported 403 energy projects at 69 community college districts, resulting in one-time incentives, ongoing energy and monetary savings, job creation, and better physical environments for California's community college students.

The energy projects implemented on community college campuses through Year 7 of Proposition 39 funding will result in annual savings of 52.4 million kilo-watt hours of electricity and more than 848 thousand gas therms, generating $8 million in annual energy cost savings and $5.3 million in one-time energy incentives. The energy saved by these Proposition 39 energy projects can power more than 9,400 homes year. These savings can be redirected to educational programs and other support services to improve student outcomes. 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 403 completed projects have generated a total of 210 job years and 36 trainee job years.

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 were successfully implemented by the California Community Colleges and we hope to continue this success with the Board of Governors' 2021 Climate Action and Sustainability Framework policy that was recently adopted.

Sincerely,

Eloy Ortiz Oakley, Chancellor

**Chancellor's Office**
1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 | 916.445.8752 | www.cccco.edu

# CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD
# PROPOSITION 39 CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT
# FINAL SUMMARY REPORT

## Facilities Planning and Utilization
## Final Summary Report

**Prepared By**

**California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office**
College Finance & Facilities Planning

# Table of Contents

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proposition 39 is an initiative to create jobs in California by improving energy efficiency and expanding clean energy generation. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) reviews and approves energy efficiency and energy generation projects submitted by the community college districts. With each year, the projects progressively makes improvements to their campuses using the funds from the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act.

Districts utilized the Proposition 39 program funding distributed for energy efficiency projects within the given deadline ending in fiscal year 2019-20. However, 23 districts realized project savings which resulted in remaining funds of $5.8 million. Therefore, the Chancellor's Office extended the Proposition 39 program, which allowed those districts to use the $5.8 million remaining funds to reduce energy usage, provide cost savings and create clean energy jobs.

The Proposition 39 program has also helped districts meet the State of California's climate change and sustainability goals. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by Senate Bill 73 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 29, Statutes of 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 the workforce program and issued a final report in March 2020.

The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit has partnered with investor-owned utility groups and consulting firm Willdan Group, Inc., to assist community colleges across the state to review, approve, administer and verify clean energy projects and energy savings.

# ENERGY SAVINGS

As required by Proposition 39, district 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 is 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, monitor-based commissioning (MBCx)/retrocommissioning (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, are 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

[1] http://cccutilitypartnership.com

code baselines, rather than actual usage, as the basis for the utility incentive payment. Once the proposed energy savings are 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 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 and verification process for projects implemented under the incentive programs is 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 $5.8 million in remaining funds, which will assist districts in meeting the climate change and sustainability goals established by the Chancellor's Office.

## 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 to select upcoming projects. In consultation with the investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc., districts may also generate new projects. The Chancellor's Office 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 are a potential pool of Proposition 39 projects.

Districts work with the local investor-owned utility group and Willdan Group, Inc. to determine the types of projects that are viable. These projects are loaded in 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, meaning for every $1.00 invested, a minimum of $1.05 must be saved over time.

Program funds are distributed to districts on a pro-rata share of full-time equivalent students; however, program funds are not released to districts until they submit project request forms. The investor-owned utility groups and Willdan Group, Inc. review the request forms before the districts submit to the Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office releases the funds to the districts when a viable project is approved.

As shown in Table 1, the Chancellor's Office split the Proposition 39 funding between the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit, which received 87.2% of the funds, and the Workforce and Economic Development Division, which received 12.8% of the funds. The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit distributed a total $184.9 million to the community college districts. A portion of the allocation was set aside for the consultant to administer of the program and assist districts with the engineering work and verification of the projects.

## Table 1: Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 Allocation (in thousands)

| Chancellor's Office Division Allocation | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Workforce & Economic Development** | $ 6,000 | $ 4,790 | $ 4,950 | $ 6,290 | $ 5,950 | $ 27,980 |
| **Facilities Planning & Utilization – District Allocation** | $ 39,800 | $ 31,595 | $ 32,672 | $ 41,875 | $ 38,962 | $ 184,904 |
| **Facilities Planning & Utilization – Administration/ Consultant Contract** | $ 1,200 | $ 1,115 | $ 1,115 | $ 1,115 | $ 1,588 | $ 6,133 |
| **Total** | **$ 47,000** | **$ 37,500** | **$ 38,737** | **$ 49,280** | **$ 46,500** | **$ 219,017** |

In Table 2, the remaining funds from project savings are broken out by district. Out of the 23 districts with savings, 16 districts were able to use their remaining funds. Lassen CCD was able to use their remaining funds towards a prior Proposition 39 project. The other districts were invoiced and have returned their remaining funds to the State of California.

## Table 2. Program Extension – Revised Funding

| District | Prop 39 Funds Available from Project Savings | Administration Fee | Revised Prop 39 Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barstow Community College District | $ 16,271 | $ 1,141 | $ 15,130 |
| Copper Mountain Community College District | $ 14,356 | $ 1,007 | $ 13,349 |
| Feather River Community College District | $ 93,747 | $ 6,574 | $ 87,173 |
| Foothill-DeAnza Community College District | $ 551,955 | $ 38,704 | $ 513,251 |
| Gavilan Joint Community College District | $ 10,422 | $ 731 | $ 9,691 |
| Imperial Community College District | $ 282,938 | $ 19,840 | $ 263,098 |
| Lassen Community College District | $ 41,514 | $ 2,911 | $ 0 |
| Long Beach Community College District | $ 6,518 | $ 457 | $ 6,061 |
| Los Angeles Community College District | $ 474,681 | $ 33,286 | $ 441,395 |
| Los Rios Community College District | $ 135,445 | $ 9,498 | $ 125,947 |
| Marin Community College District | $ 1,678 | $ 5,026 | $ 66,652 |
| Monterey Peninsula Community College District | $ 158,552 | $ 11,118 | $ 147,434 |
| North Orange County Community College District | $ 691,234 | $ 47,961 | $ 643,273 |

| District | Prop 39 Funds Available from Project Savings | Administration Fee | Revised Prop 39 Allocation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pasadena Area Community College District | $ 12,585 | $ 7,895 | $ 104,690 |
| Peralta Community College District | $ 1,540,184 | $ 108,000 | $ 1,432,184 |
| Redwoods Community College District | $ 2,228 | $ 3,662 | $ 48,566 |
| Riverside Community College District | $ 2,234 | $ 157 | $ 2,077 |
| San Joaquin Delta Community College District | $ 9,623 | $ 675 | $ 8,948 |
| San Luis Obispo County Community College District | $ 16,258 | $ 1,140 | $ 15,118 |
| Santa Monica Community College District | $ 1,487,369 | $ 104,298 | $ 1,383,071 |
| Sierra Joint Community College District | $ 18 | $ 1 | $ 17 |
| Sonoma County Junior College District | $ 24,843 | $ 1,742 | $ 23,101 |
| Yuba Community College District | $ 18 | $ 1 | $ 17 |
| **TOTAL** | **$ 5,794,671** | **$ 405,825** | **$ 5,350,243** |

# PROJECT RESULTS

## PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The final results of the Proposition 39 program are shown below in Tables 3 through 5. Table 3 displays the energy savings and electricity savings which totals $15.8 million and 106 million kWh/year respectively for the community college system. Table 4 displays the gas savings, greenhouse gas savings, and job years created which resulted in 1.7 million therms/year, 82,378 tons/CO2, and 321 job years created. Table 5 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.

Tables 3 through 5 reflect that in Year 6 (2018-19) there was a big push from the Chancellor's Office and the system to expend as much of the program funds as possible. The Proposition 39 program funding has ended as funds were no longer being appropriated. The Chancellor's Office was finishing off the program with the community college districts that had remaining funds. With this effort, expenditures tail off in Year 7 (2019-20) as can be seen in the number of projects and total project cost.

## Table 3. Proposition 39 Program Electricity Savings Summary

| 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 4. Proposition 39 Program Gas Savings and Job Creation Summary

| 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 5: Proposition 39 Project 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% |

| Project Type | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | Year 6 | Year 7 | Year 8 | Total | % of Total Projects |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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%** |

## 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 Attachment 3 – Projects Closed Out Year 8.

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

- 16 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 6). There were 15 lighting projects, which accounted for 60% of the total number of closed-out projects. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) accounted for seven projects, or 24% of the total number of closed-out projects. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx and other amount to 12% of the total.

### Table 6: 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%** |

## 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% 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 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.

## TABLE 7: PROPOSITION 39 DISTRICT PROJECTS COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT

| District | Closed-out projects | Total project costs | Verified kWh savings | Verified kW savings | Verified therm savings | Annual energy cost savings | Trainee job years (FTEs) | Direct job years (FTEs) | Direct job hours | Apprentice direct job hours | Verified incentives | Homes powered |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Barstow CCD | 1 | $ 18,923 | 40,656 | 14 | - | $ 5,285 | 0 | 0 | - | - | $ - | 6.4 |
| Copper Mountain CCD | 1 | $ 16,362 | 6,247 | 1 | - | $ 1,312 | 0 | 0.02 | 40 | - | $ - | 1 |
| Feather River CCD | 1 | $ 47,493 | 30,261 | 20 | - | $ 3,631 | 0 | 0 | - | - | $ - | 5 |
| Foothill-DeAnza CCD | 1 | $ 486,331 | 131,315 | 0 | - | $ 24,162 | 0 | 0.09 | 198 | - | $ - | 21 |
| Imperial CCD | 2 | $ 269,973 | 256,302 | 45 | - | $ 35,882 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 404 | 93 | $ 6,541 | 41 |
| Long Beach CCD | 1 | $ 6,100 | 1,943 | 0 | - | $ 253 | 0.004 | 0.004 | 8 | 8 | $ - | 0.31 |
| Los Angeles CCD | 1 | $ 571,201 | 95,902 | 67 | - | $ 14,289 | 0.14 | 0.41 | 850 | 300 | $ - | 15 |
| Marin CCD | 2 | $ 72,816 | 49,094 | 23 | - | $ 7,953 | 0.01 | 0.08 | 169 | 14 | $ - | 7.8 |
| Monterey Peninsula CCD | 1 | $ 118,402 | - | 0 | 637 | $ 586 | 0.004 | 0.072 | 149 | 8 | $ - | 0.87 |
| North Orange County CCD | 2 | $ 538,699 | 196,463 | 64 | - | $ 25,540 | 0.1 | 0.22 | 448 | 200 | $ - | 31 |
| Pasadena CCD | 1 | $ 392,614 | 206,544 | 0 | - | $ 35,112 | 0.04 | 0.18 | 364 | 86 | $ - | 33 |
| Peralta CCD | 2 | $ 1,848,823 | 211,540 | 156 | - | $ 26,443 | 0.56 | 1.48 | 3,081 | 1,159 | $ - | 33 |
| Riverside CCD | 1 | $ 2,551 | 13,456 | 0 | 3 | $ 1,751 | 0 | 0 | - | - | $ - | 2 |
| San Joaquin Delta CCD | 1 | $ 7,481 | 40,784 | 9 | - | $ 5,098 | 0 | 0 | - | - | $ - | 6.4 |
| Santa Monica CCD | 4 | $ ,386,768 | 335,873 | 39 | 7,652 | $ 52,379 | 0.41 | 1.29 | 2,688 | 845 | $ - | 63.6 |
| Sonoma County JCD | 3 | $ 48,355 | 34,797 | 3 | - | $ 4,872 | 0 | 0.06 | 128 | - | $ - | 5.5 |
| **TOTAL** | **25** | **$5,832,892** | **1,651,177** | **441** | **8,292** | **$ 244,548** | **1.308** | **4.096** | **8,527** | **2,713** | **$ 6,541** | **272.88** |

# ENERGY USAGE DATA SUMMARY

Energy usage data is submitted and self-certified by the districts on a fiscal year basis. Districts are able to update prior submitted energy usage data, which may affect the current and prior year totals and calculations. At a glimpse, comparison of the 2018-19 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data shows that 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 have not completed submission of 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 Attachment 4 – Site Level Energy Data 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%

## 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: 2,299Percent 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%

### 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 GOVERNORS 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 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—INNVOVATIVE 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.

*Front cover photo: MiraCosta College*

*Photo at right: Citrus College*

*Back cover photo: Butte College*


# Connect with us!

## WEBSITES

**California Community Colleges**
cccco.edu

**Salary Surfer**
salarysurfer.cccco.edu

**I Can Go To College**
icangotocollege.com

## SOCIAL MEDIA

**California Community Colleges Facebook Page**
facebook.com/CACommColleges

**California Community Colleges Twitter Feed**
twitter.com/CalCommColleges

**Chancellor Eloy Oakley Twitter Feed**
twitter.com/EloyOakley

**Government Relations Twitter Feed**
twitter.com/CCGRAdvocates

**California Community Colleges YouTube Page**
youtube.com/CACommunityColleges

**California Community Colleges Instagram Page**
instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges

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