



**2023 REPORT**

# 2024-25 Five-Year Capital Outlay

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office | Dr. Sonya Christian, Chancellor

# 2024-25 FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY REPORT

---

---

Prepared By

**College Finance and Facilities Planning Division**



California  
Community  
Colleges

**DR. SONYA CHRISTIAN**  
Chancellor

February 13, 2024

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

**RE: Report on California Community Colleges Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan  
for 2024-25**

Dear Governor Newsom:

Pursuant to California Government Code sections 13100-13102, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors are pleased to release the 2024-25 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan report. The Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan is presented to the California Legislature in conjunction with the Governor's Budget, and it clarifies statewide needs and priorities of the California Community Colleges.

The report shows that proper educational facilities play a vital role in supporting the goals and commitments outlined in the multi-year roadmap between the Newsom Administration and the California Community Colleges and Vision 2030, our system's roadmap for improving student outcomes. While the 2024-25 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan offers important technical information about statewide community college facilities planning and priorities, it also demonstrates our intent to provide our students with the best possible educational learning environment.

If you have any further questions on this report, please contact Vice Chancellor of Fiscal Health and Accounting, College Finance and Facilities Planning Division, Wrenna Finche at [wfinche@cccoco.edu](mailto:wfinche@cccoco.edu).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sonya Christian".

Dr. Sonya Christian, Chancellor

**Chancellor's Office**

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 | 916.445.8752 | [www.cccoco.edu](http://www.cccoco.edu)

**Chancellor's Office**

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 | 916.445.8752 | [www.cccco.edu](http://www.cccco.edu)

# Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> . . . . .	<b>9</b>
BACKGROUND . . . . .	9
2024-25 FIVE YEAR PLAN SUMMARY . . . . .	9
Total Facilities Needs and Costs . . . . .	9
DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS & COSTS (Table 2A - 2C) . . . . .	11
Areas of Understatement. . . . .	12
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN . . . . .	12
Plan Constraints . . . . .	13
ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATEWIDE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM . . . . .	13
Review and Approval of District Projects . . . . .	13
OTHER BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE CAPITAL OUTLAY RESPONSIBILITIES	17
Voluntary Local Contributions . . . . .	17
<b>ENROLLMENT AND FACILITIES NEEDS</b> . . . . .	<b>17</b>
ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS. . . . .	17
NET ENROLLMENT NEED . . . . .	18
ENROLLMENT PROJECTION MODEL. . . . .	18
TRANSLATING ENROLLMENT NEED INTO CAPITAL OUTLAY FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS. . . . .	19
Other Space. . . . .	19
<b>INVENTORY AMOUNT AND TYPE OF EXISTING SPACE AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b> . . . . .	<b>20</b>
CURRENT CAPACITY . . . . .	20
EXCESS CAPACITY . . . . .	21
MODERNIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES. . . . .	21

Systemwide Facilities Needs . . . . .	21
Cost Estimates . . . . .	22
Critical Life Safety Renovations . . . . .	25
Modernization/Renovation . . . . .	25
Replace Temporary Facilities . . . . .	26
ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DELIVERY AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION . . . . .	26
Alternative Methods of Instruction . . . . .	26
NEW FACILITIES FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH. . . . .	27
TOTAL UNMET NEEDS AND COSTS. . . . .	27
<b>FACILITIES TO MEET UNMET NEED . . . . .</b>	<b>28</b>
FACILITIES PROPOSED IN FIVE-YEAR PLAN. . . . .	28
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth . . . . .	28
Modernization . . . . .	28
DEFERRED COSTS OF SYSTEM NEEDS. . . . .	28
Out-year Costs . . . . .	28
Need Carryover. . . . .	29
<b>CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ADDRESSING IDENTIFIED NEEDS . . . . .</b>	<b>29</b>
VISION 2030 . . . . .	29
ENROLLMENT PRESSURES . . . . .	30
SUSTAINABILITY. . . . .	30
California Community Colleges Goals for Addressing Climate Change and Furthering Environmental Sustainability . . . . .	31
STUDENT HOUSING . . . . .	34

<b>ALIGNMENT TO PREVIOUS PLAN . . . . .</b>	<b>35</b>
SUMMARY OF TOTAL COST DIFFERENCE . . . . .	35
2023-24 Plan . . . . .	35
2024-25 Plan . . . . .	36
<b>CONCLUSION. . . . .</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDICES . . . . .</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTIONS 13100-13102 . . . . .</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE, SECTIONS 67500-67503 . . . . .</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: FY 2024-25 SPENDING PLAN . . . . .</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR THE CCC SYSTEM . . . . .</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS. . . . .</b>	<b>45</b>
PROPOSED PRIORITY - FUNDING CATEGORY SCORING METRICS . . . . .	46
BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRIORITY FUNDING CATEGORIES . . . . .	46
CATEGORY A – LIFE AND SAFETY PROJECTS . . . . .	46
CATEGORY M – MODERNIZATION PROJECTS. . . . .	48
CATEGORY G– GROWTH . . . . .	50
LOCAL CONTRIBUTION/HARDSHIP METRIC . . . . .	53
FUNDING ALLOCATION BETWEEN CATEGORIES . . . . .	53
DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLANS. . . . .	54
DISTRICT MASTER PLANS . . . . .	54
EDUCATION MASTER PLANS . . . . .	55
FACILITIES MASTER PLANS . . . . .	55
INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS . . . . .	57

FINAL PROJECT PROPOSALS . . . . .	57
SCOPE APPROVAL. . . . .	57
ANNUAL CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN . . . . .	58
PROJECT PHASING . . . . .	58
READY ACCESS PROJECTS. . . . .	58
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECTS. . . . .	58
ANNUAL “ZERO-BASED” BUDGETING METHOD. . . . .	59
APPEALS PROCESS . . . . .	59
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE/LEGISLATIVE PROCESS . . . . .	59
<b>APPENDIX F: ENROLLMENT AND WSCH PROJECTIONS BY DISTRICT . . . . .</b>	<b>60</b>



## INTRODUCTION

The California Community Colleges is the largest postsecondary educational system in the United States, serving nearly 2 million students annually. California Community Colleges students represent 20% of the nation's community college students and more than 70% of California's public postsecondary undergraduate students.

The California Community Colleges consists of 73 community college districts encompassing 116 colleges, 80 approved off-campus centers and 24 separately reported district offices. The system's assets include more than 25,000 acres of land, 6,000 buildings and 87 million gross square feet, which includes approximately 56 million assignable square feet of space. In addition, the system has many off-campus outreach centers at various locations.

Annually, the Chancellor's Office calculates enrollment projections and provides this data to districts for utilization in the districts' five-year construction plans. The estimated 2024-25 fall enrollment of 1.48 million students guides this Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. This is based on a combination of variables including student participation rates, current enrollment, weekly student contact hours to enrollment ratios, and population projections. The Chancellor's Office expects enrollment to grow to an estimated 1.51 million students in 2028-29, an increase of approximately 24,568 students (see Appendix F).

## BACKGROUND

California Government Code sections 13100-13102 require the Governor to submit a five-year capital infrastructure plan to the California Legislature in conjunction with the Governor's Budget Proposal annually. To accomplish this, every entity of state government is required to provide the California Department of Finance information related to capital infrastructure needs and costs for a five-year period. Additionally, California Education Code sections 67501 and 67503 require the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) to prepare a five-year capital outlay plan that identifies the statewide needs and priorities of the California Community Colleges.

## 2024-25 FIVE YEAR PLAN SUMMARY

### Total Facilities Needs and Costs

The 2024-25 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (Five-Year Plan) for the California Community Colleges covers the period from 2024-25 through 2028-29, and totals \$24.7 billion (see Table 1, Section B). This amount includes \$5.1 billion for construction of new facilities for enrollment growth and \$19.5 billion for modernization of existing facilities.

In addition to capital facility needs, the California Community Colleges needs deferred to future years total \$2.8 billion (see Table 1, Section C). This amount includes \$633 million of out-year costs for continuing phases of projects started within the Five-Year Plan period and \$2.2 billion carried over into subsequent plan years, primarily for modernization projects. Please see Table 2 to understand how these deferred facilities needs and costs are distributed. In addition to capital facility needs, California Community Colleges has a deferred maintenance backlog total of \$1.6 billion over the five-year period, from 2023-24 through 2027-28 which is not included in the unmet needs. Currently, the total unmet facilities need for the California Community Colleges are approximately \$27.5 billion for the five-year period of this plan (see Table 1, Section A).

## TOTAL FACILITIES NEEDS AND COSTS (Table 1A - 1C)

### Table 1A Unmet Facilities Needs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	3,879,582	\$4,170,550,650
Modernization of Existing Facilities	30,813,449	\$23,337,459,446
Total Unmet Needs	34,693,034	\$27,508,010,096

### Table 1B Proposed Facilities in 5-Year Plan

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,778,609	\$5,137,004,675
Modernization of Existing Facilities	25,744,042	\$19,535,630,476
Total Proposed Facilities	30,522,651	\$24,672,635,151

### Table 1C Deferred Facilities Needs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	—	\$633,410,500
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445
Total Deferred Needs	4,170,380	\$2,835,374,945

## DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS & COSTS (TABLE 2A - 2C)

**Table 2A Continuing Phases of Projects Started in Plan**

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$236,367,500
Modernization of Existing Facilities	N/A	\$397,043,000
Total Continuing Phases	N/A	\$633,410,500

**Table 2B Need Carryover**

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	—	\$—
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445
Total Need Carryover	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445

**Table 2C Total Deferred Needs**

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$633,410,500
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445
Total Deferred Needs	4,170,380	\$2,835,374,945

## Areas of Understatement

The estimated \$27.5 billion of the California Community Colleges' systemwide total unmet facilities needs and costs is conservative. The cost estimates used to determine systemwide needs are potentially understated in the following ways:

- The average includes less expensive space types, while the facilities needed by community colleges are projected to include more expensive space types (e.g., laboratory and library space).
- Site development costs are not included in the cost estimates as they vary substantially from project to project.
- For the statewide modernization projects, the Chancellor's Office assumes that buildings more than 25 years old will be modernized at 75% of the cost of a new building. Since many community college buildings are more than 30 years old, it is likely that many of the buildings will need to be demolished and replaced at a significantly greater cost rather than if they were to be remodeled.
- Since 2020-21, inflation has been impacting construction costs across the state of California. The cost of materials has made project costs for current on-going projects go beyond what was initially estimated. The inflationary costs are not taken into account for the projects in FUSION as the system is unable to calculate the increases.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

This Five-Year Plan was developed to meet the requirements of California Government Code sections 13100-13102 and Education Code sections 67500-67503. The Chancellor's Office evaluated individual projects with respect to the following:

- Funding priorities for the system per the Board of Governors, California Community Colleges (Board of Governors) Priority Criteria.
- Capacity-to-load ratios (e.g., existing facility capacity to enrollment load) for the various space types at each campus.
- The community college district's ability to successfully complete projects within the timeframe of the plan.

## **Plan Constraints**

The Chancellor’s Office continues to improve the Five-Year Plan so that it quantifies and articulates the capital infrastructure needs of the California Community Colleges with accuracy, pursuant to existing law. Additionally, districts continue to refine their local Five-Year Construction Plans by using the Facility Utilization Space Inventory Option Net (FUSION) data system and following guidance from both the Chancellor’s Office Facilities Planning Unit and the Association of Chief Business Officials (ACBO) Facilities Advisory Committee.

Despite continual efforts to improve the accuracy of the Five-Year Plan, the local Five-Year Construction Plans do not completely represent the unmet capital needs of the California Community Colleges. The Chancellor’s Office will continue to estimate a portion of the unmet needs throughout the system and, in consultation with the ACBO Facilities Advisory Committee, identify best practices and streamline existing processes to ensure high- quality district capital outlay planning.

## **ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATEWIDE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM**

### **Review and Approval of District Projects**

#### **Project Submittal Process**

To apply for state Capital Outlay Program funding, community college districts must annually submit project proposals to the Chancellor’s Office in two parts. The first part, an Initial Project Proposal, is a three-page concept paper used by the Chancellor’s Office for systemwide needs analysis and prioritization. This portion of the proposal review process allows the Chancellor’s Office to assess the district’s capital outlay needs on a systemwide priority basis before the district invest a significant amount of time and money in planning these projects; Initial Project Proposals are submitted by July 1 each year.

The second part of the capital outlay process, the Final Project Proposal, is a fully developed project proposal intended to be considered for inclusion in the Governor’s Budget Proposal. The Final Project Proposal provides ample detail about the project and budget. Additionally, it describes the proposed project’s relationship to the district’s comprehensive education and facility master plans. Final Project Proposals include an analysis of viable alternatives to the proposed project.

## Board of Governors Priority Criteria

Project “scope approval” is defined as a project that meets the Board of Governors criteria for prioritizing capital outlay projects and may be eligible for state funding. Additionally, projects must follow the requirements, standards, and guidelines outlined in the following:

- California Education Code
- California Code of Regulation, title 5
- Board of Governors Policy on Utilization and Space Standards (Space Standards)
- State Administrative Manual/Capitalized Assets
- California Community Colleges Facilities Planning Manual

Community college districts submitted 2024-25 Final Project Proposals to the Chancellor’s Office for funding consideration in July 2022. The Chancellor’s Office staff use the Board of Governors Capital Outlay Priority Criteria to rank capital outlay projects. Requests for Category A1, Life and Safety, projects are the highest priority, as they permanently mitigate the life safety conditions in buildings or systems that create imminent danger to the life or limb of facility’s occupants. Category A3 projects demonstrate seismic deficiencies or potential seismic risk posed by existing buildings. Category A4 projects demonstrate infrastructure failure or loss; the intent of this category is to repair or replace the immediate failing infrastructure within a structure or campus system. The Capital Outlay Priority Criteria states that no more than 50% of state funds available for community college capital outlay projects be committed to address Life and Safety projects.

Once continuing phases of previously funded projects and new Life and Safety projects are prioritized, projects in the remaining two categories are prioritized based on various factors using the Capital Outlay Priority criteria. The funding configuration for Growth (Category G) and Modernization (Category M) is as follows:

## Board Of Governors Priority Criteria

Category Code	Category	Funding Formula
<b>A</b>	Health and Safety	Up to 50% of total
		Of the Remaining Total
<b>G</b>	Growth	35% of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.
<b>M</b>	Modernization	65% of remaining funds after funding Category A projects.

Based on the Chancellor’s Office review of the Final Project Proposals, the eligible “new start” (versus continuing) projects are prioritized and presented to the Board of Governors annually for review and project scope approval.

## **Funding Approval Process**

The Chancellor’s Office develops and submits an annual Capital Outlay Spending Plan to the Department of Finance to be considered for inclusion in the next budget cycle, with a prioritized list of scope-approved projects. Chancellor’s Office staff use eligibility points to rank Capital Outlay Spending Plan Growth and Modernization projects, from highest to lowest.

The Capital Outlay Spending Plan traditionally includes a maximum of one project from the Growth or Modernization Categories per authorized site, per year. However, to provide as many districts as possible the opportunity to compete for state bond funds, the current policy allows one project from the Growth or Modernization Categories per site for a two-year period. If more than one project is eligible for potential funding from the Growth or Modernization Categories per authorized site, the project with the highest local ranking from the district’s five-year capital outlay plan is included in the proposal for state funding. Life and Safety projects are the highest priority, so they are not subject to the two-year rule established for the other categories.

Annual funding of projects is contingent upon the project’s ability to meet the State Budget priorities and the availability of funds. The Governor’s Office and Legislative Budget Committees scrutinize all capital construction projects to determine if projects meet current priorities (i.e., seismic, life-safety, vital infrastructure, major code deficiencies and increased instructional access).

The Chancellor’s Office develops an annual Capital Outlay Spending Plan using a “zero-based budgeting” method in which all eligible proposals are evaluated and prioritized to ensure the highest priority projects are included in the spending plan based on the funds available. Final Project Proposals that are not included in a specific year’s Capital Outlay Spending Plan must compete in a subsequent budget cycle. Between budget cycles, districts may update or modify the proposals to reflect changing local needs or priorities. Final Project Proposals submitted for state funding that do not receive appropriations in a Budget Act have no special standing when proposed for inclusion in subsequent state budgets.

## **Methods to Support Districts with the Capital Outlay Process**

In partnership with the ACBO Facilities Advisory Committee and system stakeholders, the Chancellor’s Office has implemented the following methods described in this section to support districts with administering the capital outlay program.

## **FUSION**

The Facility Utilization Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) is a web-based project planning and management tool. The districts initiated the development of this tool to assist with their facilities planning efforts and communicate them to the Chancellor's Office efficiently. At the core of FUSION is the Facilities Condition Assessment, which evaluates the physical condition of California Community Colleges' facilities throughout the state. This assessment provides useful data to help analyze local and statewide modernization needs. Districts are also able to use other components of this tool for project planning, project management and fiscal administration. Additionally, FUSION supports other activities that assist with identifying needed facilities and bringing those facilities on-line in an efficient manner.

## **Ready Access**

[Ready Access](#) is a project development method initiated by the Chancellor's Office to streamline the capital outlay process with the purpose of bringing facilities on-line faster and at a lower cost. Ready Access provides a lump-sum of state funding for all project phases in one Budget Act appropriation. The goal of Ready Access is to save State bond dollars, with no cost to the California General Fund. Ready Access also allows local community college districts to complete their projects faster so that they can address their local growth and modernization facility needs expeditiously. Currently, there is no change to the administrative and legislative oversight of capital outlay projects under Ready Access.

Ready Access projects have the potential to save the state money. To participate, districts are required to make a local contribution that will offset state supportable costs. Additionally, participating districts are able to complete their projects at least one year earlier than traditional modes of project delivery, which alleviates the state from funding additional annual expenses related to project management and avoids cost escalation for construction materials and equipment.

## **Design-Build**

In an effort to reduce costs and expedite capital projects, California Community Colleges has received approval from the California Legislature to utilize the Design-Build project delivery system. Design-Build allows a district to enter into a single contract with a design-build entity for both the design and construction of a building. Senate Bill 614, enacted in 2007, gave all community college districts the option to enter into design-build contracts for state and/or locally funded projects exceeding \$2.5 million. Senate Bill 1509, enacted in 2012, extended the authority of community college districts to use the design-build delivery method to January 1, 2020 and Assembly Bill 695, Statutes of 2019, extended the design-build project delivery method to January 1, 2030.



## OTHER BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE CAPITAL OUTLAY RESPONSIBILITIES

### Voluntary Local Contributions

The Board of Governors adopted [criteria](#) for prioritizing capital outlay projects that emphasizes a “least cost to the state” policy. This policy stretches scarce state resources to help meet enrollment growth and modernization needs by providing an incentive for districts to contribute local resources to projects.

California community college districts must use local bonds to fund non-state supportable but educationally essential capital outlay such as land acquisition, parking, cafeterias, bookstores, and health centers. Land acquisition is particularly significant because the land costs can be equal to or greater than the cost of the buildings, depending on the location of the district.

Additionally, California Community Colleges do not augment project costs once approved in the Budget Act. Therefore, districts pay for cost overruns at bid award for construction contract. Since cost overruns are determined later in the process, this Five-Year Plan cannot capture these additional local contributions.

## ENROLLMENT AND FACILITIES NEEDS

### ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

The California Community Colleges serves nearly 2 million students annually. The total number of students is the actual unduplicated enrollment rate for the system, and it represents the total number of students served in every term of the academic year. The number is described as “unduplicated” because a student enrolled in fall and spring semester would count as one student.

The estimated fall enrollment of 1.48 million students in 2024-25<sup>1</sup> guides this Five-Year Plan. The Chancellor’s Office expects enrollment to grow to an estimated 1.51 million students in 2028-29, an increase of approximately 24,568 students (see Appendix F). The Chancellor’s Office calculates enrollment projections and provides this data to districts for utilization in the districts’ five-year construction plans.

The 2023-24 Five-Year Plan estimated fall enrollment was 1.64 million students compared to 1.48 million in the current year. The difference is 160,000, a 9% decrease between the 2023-24 Five-Year Plan and the 2024-25 Five-Year Plan. This decrease in the estimate is due to an update to the enrollment projection methodology and statewide demographic fluctuations. Specifically, additional data elements were included to account for students enrolled in independent study and noncredit courses.

---

1 Enrollment projections sourced from the Weekly Student Contact Hours Forecast Report prepared by the Research and Planning Group of California Community Colleges for the Chancellor’s Office.

## NET ENROLLMENT NEED

Table 3 below shows that the California Community Colleges will need approximately 5.1 million assignable square feet to accommodate projected enrollment over the next five years. This estimate is based on the assignable square feet (ASF) needed to accommodate projected enrollment growth, less than the net capacity currently available to meet that enrollment demand.

**Table 3 — Net Enrollment Need**

Space Category	Total ASF Needed: Current Deficiency	Future Enrollment Growth	Total ASF Needed: Total
Lecture	-260,457	344,203	83,746
Laboratory	128,542	809,713	938,255
Office	183,484	200,920	384,404
Library	706,991	83,773	790,764
AV/TV	935,011	-15,373	919,638
Other	866,153	1,189,816	2,055,969
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,559,724</b>	<b>2,613,052</b>	<b>5,172,776</b>

## ENROLLMENT PROJECTION MODEL

The enrollment projection model forecasts enrollment for each district based on a combination of variables including student participation rates, current enrollment, weekly student contact hours to enrollment ratios, and adult population projections based on Geographic Information Systems zip code data. The model aims to minimize volatility to result in a stable and accurate planning tool for community college facilities.

Due to enrollment declines as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and changing demographics statewide, the Chancellor’s Office continues to assess the enrollment projection methodology to determine if additional variables should be included or whether the methodology warrants revisions to improve accuracy.

Table 4 below shows a projection of approximately 1.66% growth in enrollment and a 5.89% increase in weekly student enrollment contact hours (WSCH) over the Five-Year Plan period. WSCH rates are the product of the number of students and the scheduled class periods in which they are enrolled, in graded and ungraded community college classes convened prior to 10:00 p.m. during a census week. A class period is not less than 50 minutes and not more than 60 minutes (Cf. CCR, title 5, §57001(e)). Please see Appendix F for both multi-year enrollment and WSCH projection data.

**Table 4 – Summary of Projected Enrollment and Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)**

Category	2024-25	2028-29	Difference	% Difference
Enrollment <sup>2</sup>	1,484,143	1,508,711	24,568	1.66%
WSCH	15,049,514	15,936,609	887,095	5.89%

## TRANSLATING ENROLLMENT NEED INTO CAPITAL OUTLAY FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS

Table 5 shows the need to accommodate the enrollment projected over the next five years. The assignable square footage needs for these space types have been determined based on the enrollment projections, which utilize the formulas provided in the Space Standards.

**Table 5 – Gross Enrollment Needs**

Space Category	Assignable Square Feet
Lecture	5,383,123
Lab	11,797,596
Office	6,658,600
Library	5,000,252
AV/TV	1,419,504
Other	20,140,734
<b>Total</b>	<b>50,399,809</b>

### Other Space

The total enrollment need of the 50.4 million assignable square footage includes 20.1 million assignable square footage of “other” space. The Space Standards lay out the parameters for calculating needed lecture, laboratory, office, library, and AV/TV space categories based on a comparison of inventory and enrollment at a campus. In addition to the instructional space specified in the Space Standards, this Five-Year Plan also must account for the “other” space category that comprises the whole of the physical inventory for each campus.

<sup>2</sup> The total number of students is the actual unduplicated enrollment rate for the system, and it represents the total number of students served in every term of the academic year. The number is described as “unduplicated” because a student enrolled in fall and spring semester would count as one student.

The “other” space category consists of both instructional (e.g., physical education, performing arts and child development) and non-instructional support spaces that are essential to fulfilling the educational mission at each campus. However, there are no formulas specified in the Space Standards to define the “other” space category by comparing inventory capacity with projected enrollment. Since the “other” space category is essential to support the various space categories, it must be added to campuses as space increases.

To that end, this Five-Year Plan looks at two different factors to identify the need for “other” space at each campus: campus and system ratios. The first model assesses the physical inventory for each campus to calculate “other” space as a percentage of total space; this is the campus ratio. The physical inventory identifies each campus in the community college system as one of four types: college campus, center, district office or campus with district office. The campus ratio determines how much of the existing inventory is identified as “other” space in relation to total space for each campus.

The second factor of the model assesses the average ratio of “other” space to total space for each of these campus types; this is the systemwide ratio. The systemwide ratio determines, on average, how much of the existing inventory is identified as “other” space in relation to total space for each campus type.

Finally, the model compares the campus and systemwide ratios and bases the estimate of need for “other” space at each campus on the higher of the two ratios. This approach is conservative because the need could be understated if the campus has not yet constructed some of the facilities that are comprised of a majority of “other” space.

With the system ratio, the need for “other” space is based on the average of “other” space for that campus type. This ratio is used to estimate the need for other space for 60% of the campuses in the system. The ratios for some campuses are higher and some are lower, and the need for “other” space is essentially capped by this ratio for more than half the campuses in the system. In the long term, this approach understates the need for “other” facilities.

## **INVENTORY AMOUNT AND TYPE OF EXISTING SPACE AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **CURRENT CAPACITY**

As the largest system of higher education in the state, California Community Colleges infrastructure consists of 73 districts, 116 community colleges, 80 approved off-campus centers, 24 separately reported district offices, and assets of approximately 25,000 acres of land, 6,000 buildings, and 87 million gross square feet of space. These buildings provide the following assignable square feet in the various Board of Governors space categories as shown in Table 6 below:

**Table 6 – Net Capacity**

Space Category	Current Total Assignable Square Feet	Less Excess Capacity	Net Capacity
Lecture	8,100,719	-2,801,342	5,299,377
Laboratory	13,778,860	-2,919,519	10,859,341
Office	8,850,575	-2,576,379	6,274,196
Library	4,849,965	-640,477	4,209,488
AV/TV	570,804	-70,938	499,866
Other	20,967,535	-2,882,770	18,084,765
<b>Total</b>	<b>57,118,458</b>	<b>-11,891,425</b>	<b>45,227,033</b>

The current capacity of 57.1 million assignable square feet, detailed in Table 6, is based on the systemwide 2021-22 Space Inventory reported by the districts.

**EXCESS CAPACITY**

There are many individual campuses within the system that have severe capital facility shortages while some campuses within the system may appear to have excess capacity in various space categories. Therefore, the capacity needs for the system are estimated on a campus-by-campus basis. Facilities capacity exceeding 100% at individual campuses, which is currently approximately 11.9 million assignable square feet (see Table 6, column 2), were eliminated for the purpose of estimating the need for additional facilities. Using this approach, excess capacity will not artificially decrease the true facilities needs on other campuses.

Previous reports have defined the excess space capacity of the California Community Colleges as having a “mismatch” problem. Examples of this “mismatch” are improper size classrooms on a particular campus that do not fit courses planned to be offered in them, antiquated designs that cannot accommodate modern media presentations, insufficient Americans with Disabilities Act required access, or improper wiring for computers or multi-media equipment.

**MODERNIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES**

**Systemwide Facilities Needs**

The Five-Year Construction Plans submitted by districts do not fully reflect their total facility needs. This Five-Year Plan includes specific projects detailed in the district’s individual five-year construction outlay plans over the same period. However, since there are still systemwide needs that are not reflected in the districts’ individual five-year construction plans, the Chancellor’s Office has estimated some of these systemwide needs on a statewide basis.

The systemwide facilities needs estimated in this section do not add or remove capacity from the system. However, these systemwide needs are in addition to the projects submitted in the districts' Five-Year Plans and must be included in this analysis to provide a more accurate picture of the California Community Colleges' systemwide facility needs. Specifically, the Chancellor's Office has estimated the systemwide need for modernization of existing facilities, including critical life safety renovations, modernization/renovation, and replacement of temporary facilities projects.

Table 7 outlines the rules for estimating these needs. Years one through five of the plan include actual projects submitted by districts in the individual district five-year capital outlay plans for these project types, including both state and locally funded projects. Systemwide facilities needs are estimated only after the space impacts of all projects submitted by the districts have been taken into consideration.

## Cost Estimates

The costs for the additional systemwide needs were estimated based on the California Community Colleges building cost guidelines at California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) 8823. The cost estimates include an allowance for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction. Cost estimates for the replacement of relocatable facilities with permanent facilities include an additional allowance for demolition.

The cost estimates do not include an allowance for site development costs because it is impossible to estimate the average site cost per assignable square foot. After all, site development costs vary substantially from project-to-project. Cost estimates for the statewide needs are therefore substantially underestimated.

This Five-Year Plan defines total systemwide modernization needs of 31 million assignable square feet (ASF) at a cost of \$23.3 billion. Due to the magnitude of California Community Colleges' modernization needs, the proposal in the 2024-25 Five-Year Plan includes only a portion of the modernization needs of the system. This Five-Year Plan calls for the modernization of only 25.7 million assignable square feet over the next five years at a cost of \$19.5 billion. This amount includes the cost of:

- Critical life safety renovations,
- The modernization/renovation of only those permanent buildings more than 40 years old and buildings reported by districts as being in need of major renovation, and
- The replacement of temporary buildings more than 10 years old.

This approach would result in the renovation of the oldest buildings and those in the poorest condition first. The out-year cost of approximately \$397 million reflects modernization/renovation projects started in the plan year. The carryover cost of approximately \$2.2 billion represents modernization or renovation of 4.1 million assignable square feet of buildings more than 25-years but less than 40-years old and temporary buildings less than 10-years old deferred beyond the plan timeframe.

**Table 7 – Systemwide Facilities Needs Methodology**

<b>Driver</b>	<b>Objective</b>	<b>Basis for Determining Need</b>	<b>Projects</b>
<b>Critical Life Safety Renovations (includes fire/ life safety, seismic and infrastructure)</b>	To maintain ongoing funding based on history.	Average statewide spending for the first two years of the 5YP for critical projects. Assignable square feet is not applicable.	2024-25 through 2028-29  Projects identified by the districts with costs.  2024-25 through 2028-29  (\$450 million in estimated unplanned costs)
<b>Modernization/ Renovation</b>	To modernize all permanent buildings more than 25 years old.	Assignable square feet for buildings in bad condition plus assignable square feet for buildings more than 25 years old; projects address buildings more than 40 years old.	2024-25 through 2028-29  Projects identified by the districts with costs.  2024-25 through 2028-29  One systemwide need project per year; projects to start in each year.  Cost Formula = ASF x \$742  \$742 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings=\$85, construction=\$657)

Driver	Objective	Basis for Determining Need	Projects
<b>Replacement of Temporary Buildings</b>	To minimize the use of temporary buildings.	ASF for temporary buildings more than 10 years old.	2024-25 through 2028-29  One systemwide need project per year.  Cost formula = ASF x \$1,078  \$1,078 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings=\$114, construction=\$876, Demolition=\$88)
<b>Enrollment</b>	To address 100% of the enrollment need at all sites, excluding needs met through alternative methods.	Enrollment projections converted to assignable square feet using the space standards adopted by Board of Governors.	2024-25 through 2028-29  Projects identified by the districts with costs.  2024-25 through 2028-29  One systemwide need project per year.  Cost Formula = ASF x \$1,075  \$1,075 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings=\$114, construction=\$876, equipment=\$85)



## Critical Life Safety Renovations

Critical life safety means that a building poses imminent danger to the life or safety of the building occupants, has a potential seismic risk, or has potential for immediate infrastructure failure. Because of the risk associated with critical life safety issues, many of the projects are funded at the local level. If projects are submitted for state funding and the Chancellor's Office finds that they require state money to mitigate the critical life safety issues, those projects are funded as soon as possible. Therefore, district five-year construction plans typically would not contain unfunded critical life safety projects.

For the purposes of this submittal, the Chancellor's Office has an estimated need of \$830 million, which both reflects \$380 million from projects by districts during this Five-Year Planning period and the estimated annual costs for critical life safety projects not yet identified on a statewide basis. Since these projects are not always planned, \$450 million has been projected for unknown critical life safety projects. The scope of these projects is constrained to only those renovations that mitigate the critical life safety aspects of the facilities, and any building code upgrades required by the California Department of General Services Division of the State Architect. Projects that completely modernize existing facilities are estimated below in the Modernization/Renovation category.

## Modernization/Renovation

More than 57% of California Community Colleges' permanent facilities are 25 years or older and more than 47% are more than 40 years old, and in dire need of renovation and/or modernization. Districts strive to maintain their facilities to every extent possible by using limited local and/or state resources.

Additionally, due to technological advances in teaching and learning, the California Community Colleges need to integrate extensive technology upgrades into its facilities so the system can deliver state-of-the-art instructional programs that keep pace with educational advances. Major renovations are required to make buildings "smarter" by providing cabling and deliverance systems to the instructional space.

Due to the magnitude of the system's modernization and renovation needs, the proposal in this Five-Year Plan includes only a portion of the modernization/renovation needs of the system. The FUSION system only captures five years' worth of projects/needs, but the system plans for beyond this timeframe. The Five-Year Plan includes 25.7 million assignable square feet to be modernized over the next five years at a cost of \$19.5 billion and includes only those buildings more than 40 years old and buildings reported by districts as needing major renovation. The cost estimate for modernization/renovation needs is based on 75% of the cost of a new building, excluding equipment (\$742 per assignable square feet).

## Replace Temporary Facilities

The California Community Colleges inventory includes temporary facilities that are operating far beyond their useful life. It is the policy of the Board of Governors that districts provide permanent facilities rather than relocatable buildings to meet student access requirements. Temporary facilities are not as effective for providing certain instructional programs, and are more costly to operate and maintain than permanent structures. The Chancellor’s Office estimates the statewide cost for replacing temporary facilities with permanent facilities at \$1.4 billion over the next five years.

## ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DELIVERY AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

### Alternative Methods of Instruction

Alternative methods of instruction such as distance learning are also an important component in providing increased student access for the California Community Colleges. Many districts are actively pursuing online and hybrid courses as a method of instruction in order to provide greater access for students as well as reducing the need for new facilities.

In 2021-22, distance education full-time equivalent students (FTES) accounted for 62% (604,823/974,431) of total FTES, compared to 60% in 2020-21. Additionally, COVID-19 has led to an overall decrease in FTES by nearly 91,544 between the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years, dropping from 1,065,975 in 2020-21 to 974,431 in 2021-22.

In this analysis, the Chancellor’s Office assumed campuses with lower enrollment will meet 10% of their total enrollment needs through the alternative methods of delivery, such as distance education, as shown in Table 8. The 10% figure is derived from the Long-Range Master Plan for the California Community Colleges and is intended to provide incentive to districts to think first of alternative means of instruction to solve facilities shortages rather than defaulting to a proposal for new facilities. Bearing in mind the impacts of COVID-19 on facilities planning, Chancellor’s Office leadership may consider revisiting its assumptions for long range planning in future Five-Year Plans.

**Table 8 — Unmet Enrollment Need**

Space Category	ASF to Meet Enrollment Need	Less Alternative Means of Delivery	Unmet Enrollment Need
Lecture	83,746	-20,936	62,810
Laboratory	938,255	-234,564	703,691
Office	384,404	-96,101	288,303
Library	790,764	-197,691	593,073
AV/TV	919,638	-229,910	689,728
Other	2,055,969	-513,992	1,541,977
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,172,776</b>	<b>-1,293,194</b>	<b>3,879,582</b>

## NEW FACILITIES FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH

The 3,879,582 square feet needed, at a cost of \$4.2 billion, to accommodate current and future enrollment is shown in Table 9. This includes individual growth projects, both state and locally funded, submitted by districts for all five years of the plan and identified systemwide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan. The systemwide facilities needs are estimated only after the space impacts of all projects submitted by the districts have been taken into consideration.

An average building cost of \$1,075 per assignable square feet was used based on the California Community Colleges building cost guidelines at California Construction Cost Index 8823 and Equipment Price Index 5455. This amount represents the average building cost for all space types and includes an allowance for preliminary plans, working drawings and equipment (Preliminary Plans/ Working Drawings = \$114, Construction = \$876, and Equipment = \$85 per assignable square feet).

**Table 9 – Total Unmet Needs and Costs**

UNMET NEEDS	ASF	COSTS
<b>New Facilities for Enrollment Growth</b>	3,879,582	\$4,170,550,650
<b>Modernization of Existing Facilities</b>	30,813,449	\$23,337,459,446
<b>Total</b>	<b>34,693,031</b>	<b>\$27,508,010,096</b>

## TOTAL UNMET NEEDS AND COSTS

Table 9 shows that the total unmet facilities needs for California Community Colleges are \$27.5 billion. Unmet need consists of two components: 1) new facilities needed to accommodate current and future enrollment growth and 2) modernization of existing buildings.

# FACILITIES TO MEET UNMET NEED

## FACILITIES PROPOSED IN FIVE-YEAR PLAN

### New Facilities for Enrollment Growth

The 2024-25 Five-Year Plan includes \$5.1 billion for new facilities to accommodate existing and future enrollment as shown in Table 10. This amount includes individual projects, both state and locally funded, submitted by districts for all five years of the plan and identified system-wide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan.

### Modernization

The modernization needs of \$21.3 billion includes individual projects, both state- and locally-funded, submitted by the districts for all five years of the plan and identified systemwide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan.

**Table 10 – Total Facilities Needs and Costs**

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,778,609	\$5,137,004,675
Modernization of Existing Facilities	25,744,042	\$19,535,630,476
<b>Total Deferred Needs</b>	<b>30,522,651</b>	<b>\$24,672,635,151</b>

## DEFERRED COSTS OF SYSTEM NEEDS

The California Community Colleges needs deferred to future years total \$2.8 billion (see Table 11). This amount includes \$633 million of out-year costs for continuing projects and \$2.2 billion carryover to future plan years as shown in Table 11.

### Out-year Costs

The out-year costs to complete continuing phases of projects started, but not assumed to be fully funded within the Five-Year Plan period, are estimated to be \$633 million. This amount includes approximately \$236 million for new facilities and \$397 million for modernization of existing facilities.

**Table 11 – Deferred Facilities Needs and Costs**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Deferred Need</b>	<b>Need Carryover</b>	<b>Total</b>
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	\$236,367,500	-	\$236,367,500
Modernization of Existing Facilities	\$397,043,000	\$2,201,964,445	\$2,599,007,445
<b>Total Continuing Needs</b>	<b>\$633,410,500</b>	<b>\$2,201,964,445</b>	<b>\$2,835,374,945</b>

### **Need Carryover**

Additional facilities needs, including 4.2 million assignable square feet at a cost of approximately \$2.2 billion, have been deferred beyond the period of this Five-Year Plan because the need in this area is too substantial to be accomplished in that time frame. There may also be carryover of new project costs from year-to-year within the Five-Year Plan period in order to accommodate project budgets and scheduling.

## **CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ADDRESSING IDENTIFIED NEEDS**

### **VISION 2030**

Vision 2030 is a framework for bold and thoughtful action — action for policy reform, fiscal sustainability, systems development and for process and practice reform in the field to support our students, our communities, and our planet. Vision 2030 is an ambitious, equity-focused strategy to help the California Community Colleges to bring college to our students and future learners and ensure their education experience delivers more. The framework has been guided by the Vision for Success (2017), the Governor’s Roadmap (2021) and current issues and future considerations.

## ENROLLMENT PRESSURES

To understand the California Community Colleges' facilities needs presented in this report and the potential consequences of not providing these needs, it is important to underscore the following contextual factors:

- The California Community Colleges is the largest system of higher education in the United States. Annually, California Community Colleges serve nearly 2 million students, which equates to 20% of the nation's community college students.
- To provide additional funding for California K-12 and California Community Colleges, voters passed Proposition 30 (2012) and Proposition 55 (2016). These ballot measures provided additional tax revenue to California's education budget through fiscal year 2030. The increase in funding continues to help California Community Colleges restore access to millions of students impacted by the budget reduction.
- This systemwide California Community Colleges Five-Year Plan identifies need for an additional approximately 5.1 million assignable square feet before taking into consideration additional enrollment growth forecasted in the plan.
- The capital outlay needs of the California Community Colleges are vast, and temporary drops in enrollment delay, rather than decrease, the system's need for facilities.

## SUSTAINABILITY

The California Community Colleges has taken significant measures toward an environmentally oriented future through a number of conservation efforts, as described below. The most recent sustainability effort includes the Board of Governors Climate Change and Sustainability Policy and Climate Change and Sustainability Resolution, which were adopted at the Board of Governors May 2019 meeting. California Community Colleges climate action efforts were refined in the [Board of Governors Climate Action and Sustainability Framework](#), which they adopted in September 2021.

The policy resolution, and framework align with California's broader climate change laws and directives related to energy conservation, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental sustainability, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32) and the California Climate Change Scoping Plan. Additionally, it integrates Governor Brown's Executive Order B-30-15 and existing California Community Colleges sustainability-related policies. The critical component of the Board of Governors Climate Action and Sustainability Framework include the eight goals for 2035, with incremental progress expected by 2025 and 2030:

# California Community Colleges Goals for Addressing Climate Change and Furthering Environmental Sustainability

## Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction

1. The California community colleges can conduct an emissions inventory baseline and create a climate action plan by 2025.
2. In alignment with statewide goals adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), California Community Colleges can strive to eliminate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2035. To achieve this, it is recommended to reduce campus/district GHG emissions by at least 75% by 2030 and 100% by 2035 to align with the state's goals. Emissions will include both state and auxiliary organization purchases of electricity and natural gas; fleet and marine vessel usage; and other emissions over which the college or self-support entity has direct control.
3. Districts and colleges can track and report of their greenhouse gas inventory in alignment with the American College and University President's Climate Commitment ([secondnature.org/webinars/getting-started-on-your-acupcc-climate-action-plan-2/](https://secondnature.org/webinars/getting-started-on-your-acupcc-climate-action-plan-2/)) guidelines. Possible metrics to measure include GHG emissions per FTES.
4. The California community colleges are encouraged to promote the use of alternative transportation and/or alternative fuels to reduce GHG emissions related to college-associated transportation, including commuter and business travel.

## Green Buildings

1. California community colleges are encouraged to benchmark their energy usage intensity for each building. Districts and colleges may develop a zero net energy (ZNE) and campus electrification strategy. They also have the option to conduct Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) or WELL assessment of existing buildings.
2. Districts and colleges are encouraged to strive for all new buildings and major renovations to be constructed as ZNE ready, all new buildings to be certified LEED or WELL Gold, and strive to reduce the use of natural gas in buildings by 30% by 2030.
3. Districts and colleges are encouraged to strive for all new buildings and major renovations to be constructed as ZNE and certified Zero Carbon, all existing buildings to be LEED Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Gold or WELL Gold equivalent, and for the use of natural gas in buildings to be reduced by at least 75% by 2035.

## Energy

1. California's local community colleges should consider establish a campus Energy Use Intensity (EUI) score and conduct Effective Useful Life (EUL) analysis of all gas-using appliances and systems; plan for electrification of systems with EUL of less than 10 years.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to decrease EUI by 25% compared to the campus benchmark and annually produce or procure 75% of site electrical consumption using renewable energy by 2030.
3. Districts and colleges should strive to decrease EUI by 40% compared to the campus benchmark and accomplish Net Zero Energy Campus by 2035.

## Water

1. Districts and colleges should consider local benchmarks for potable water usage. Districts can also identify potential non-potable water resources, create a landscape zoning map and irrigation metering strategy, and adopt best practices such as the California Community College Model Stormwater Management Program. Districts and colleges are encouraged to reduce potable water usage by 25%.
2. To achieve this goal, districts and colleges can ensure that landscape irrigation systems of 2500 square feet or greater are separately metered (unless using local or municipal reclaimed water system); ensure that landscape planting materials are 90% native species to the climate and geographical area of the college; ensure that irrigated turf grass does not exceed 50% of the landscaped areas on campus; and are recommended to follow Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems requirements by 2030.
3. By 2035, California community colleges are encouraged to reduce potable water usage from baseline level by 50%; limit stormwater runoff and discharge to predevelopment levels for temperature, rate, volume and duration of flow through the use of green infrastructure and low impact development for the campus; and limit stormwater runoff and discharge to predevelopment levels for temperature, rate, volume and duration of flow through the use of green infrastructure and low impact development for new buildings and major modifications.



## **Waste**

1. Districts and colleges are encouraged to conduct a waste categorization assessment; benchmark and comply with Title 14, Division 2, Chapter 5; benchmark and comply with Title 14, CCR Division 7; develop a total material consumption benchmark; conduct an AB 341 compliance assessment; and centralize reporting for waste and resource recovery by 2025.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to achieve zero waste to landfill, conduct a circularity analysis, and reduce total material consumption compared to the benchmark by 10% by 2030.
3. Districts and colleges are encouraged to strive to increase material circularity by 25% and decrease consumption of materials by 25% by 2035.

## **Purchasing and Procurement**

1. California's local community colleges are encouraged to benchmark sustainability characteristics of existing products and services, adopt a sustainable procurement policy and administrative procedure, and purchase environmentally preferable electronic products by 2025.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to increase procurement of sustainable products and services by 25% compared to benchmark levels by 2030.
3. Districts and colleges should strive to increase procurement of sustainable products and services by 50% compared to benchmark levels by 2035.

## **Transportation**

1. The California community colleges can conduct accounting and conditions assessment of fleet vehicles; assess remainder rolling stock for potential electrification; develop Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure to encourage faculty, staff, and students to use EVs; promote accessible shared transport methods; and make pedestrian and bicycle access improvements by 2025.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to have 50% of new fleet vehicles that are zero emission vehicles, 50% of rolling stock that are zero emissions, and can consider implementing green parking permits by 2030.
3. Districts and colleges should strive to have 100% of new fleet vehicles that are zero emission vehicles, and 100% of rolling stock that are zero emissions by 2035.

## Food Systems

1. Districts and colleges should strive to have campus food service organizations track their sustainable food purchases. Such tracking and reporting can be grounded in the Real Food Challenge guidelines, or equivalent, with consideration to campus-requested improvements.
2. Campuses are encouraged to strive to increase their sustainable food purchases to 20% of total food budget by 2030, and to have 80% of food served on campus meeting the goals of the Real Food Challenge or equivalent by 2035.

## STUDENT HOUSING

As part of the Budget Act of 2021, the state created the Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program to support the construction of affordable student housing across the three public higher education segments. The program was to receive funding over three years for three rounds of grants. The 2023 Budget Act eliminates the 2022-23 General Fund appropriation for the grants but provides \$78.5 million ongoing General Funds to support debt service for student housing projects in 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 funded with revenue bonds. UC and CSU housing projects will be funded with revenue bonds issued by those systems, and community college housing projects will be funded through local revenue bonds to be issued by community college districts or as part of a state pool. For 2023-24, the budget act specifies seven community college construction projects that have been approved for funding using local revenue bonds.

The enacted budget also appropriates \$200 million in one-time General Funds for the California Student Housing Revolving Loan Fund, which provides zero-interest loans for constructing affordable student housing and affordable faculty and staff housing. The budget designates 25% (\$50 million) to be available to community college district applicants, with the remainder to be allocated to the UC and CSU systems. It includes language specifying an intent to appropriate another \$300 million per year for the next five years, 2024-25 through 2028-29, with the same percentage allocation (25%, or \$75 million) to be available for community college districts. Unused funds from one segment could be made available to accommodate excess demand in another segment.

# ALIGNMENT TO PREVIOUS PLAN

## SUMMARY OF TOTAL COST DIFFERENCE

The total unmet need identified for the California Community Colleges in the 2024-25 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (“2024-25 Plan”) is \$27.5 billion. Of this amount, \$24.7 billion is included in the Five-Year Plan period and \$2.8 billion deferred to future years. The prior year’s 2023-24 Capital Outlay Five-Year Plan (“2023-24 Plan”) included total unmet needs of \$30.1 billion, with \$26.7 billion included in the Five-Year Plan and \$3.4 billion deferred to future years. The total decrease in costs between the two plans is therefore approximately \$2.6 billion as shown below in Table 12. This represents a decrease in costs between the two plans of 9%.

**Table 12 – TOTAL COST INCREASE (in billions)**

Categories	2024-25 Plan	2023-24 Plan	Difference
Proposed Facilities in Five-Year Plan	\$24.7	\$26.7	-\$2
Deferred Facilities Needs	\$2.8	\$3.4	-\$0.6
<b>Total Unmet Needs</b>	<b>\$27.5</b>	<b>\$30.1</b>	<b>-\$2.6</b>

## CHANGES TO PLAN YEARS 2023-24 AND 2024-25

### 2023-24 Plan

Although the 2023-24 plan is not a component of the 2024-25 Five-Year Plan, changes to the 2023-24 plan affect subsequent years. Specifically, last year’s 2023-24 Five-Year Plan included 12 continuing and six new start projects at approximately \$198 million (state funding only).

At the time this report was prepared, California had approved two new and 12 continuing projects for inclusion in the 2023-24 budget by the California Legislature and Office of the Governor.

## 2024-25 Plan

The 2024-25 budget year is the sixth year that capital outlay projects will have drawn from Proposition 51 general obligation bond funding and state resources. There are a variety of reasons that a project listed in the second year of the systemwide Five-Year Plan may not appear in the first year of a subsequent Five-Year Plan. The second year of the systemwide Five-Year Plan typically represents the Initial Project Proposals submitted by the districts that appear to be state-supportable. These Initial Project Proposals may be developed into Final Project Proposals in the next budget cycle and included in the Spending Plan.

The continuing phases of previously funded projects always have priority and first claim on funds available. New projects (those for which no previous phases have been funded) must compete every year for the remaining available funds. A project might appear to be very competitive when reviewed as an Initial Project Proposal but may have changed or been redesigned such that it is no longer state supportable or as competitive as a new Final Project Proposal. Even with a very competitive final proposal, there may not be enough funding available to include a particular project. A decision could also have been made at the district level to delay the project. In short, the second year of the Five-Year Plan will change as it becomes the first year of the subsequent Five-Year Plan, and the first year of the systemwide Five-Year Plan will always reflect the budget proposal submitted to the Department of Finance for inclusion in the Governor's Budget.

## CONCLUSION

The California Community Colleges needs deferred to future years total \$2.8 billion, which includes \$633 million of out-year costs for continuing projects and \$2.2 billion carryover to future plan years. The Chancellor's Office is committed to providing an accurate portrayal of California Community Colleges capital outlay needs and will continue to assess the enrollment projection methodology to determine whether revisions are needed in future years.

## APPENDICES

[A – Government Code Sections 13100 – 13102](#)

[B – Education Code Sections 67500 – 67503](#)

[C – 2023-24 Spending Plan](#)

[D – Methodology for Calculating Unmet Need for California Community Colleges](#)

[E – California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Grant Application Process](#)

[F – Enrollment and WSCH Projections by Districts](#)

## **APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTIONS 13100-13102**

13100. It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this article that the state shall establish and annually update a Five-Year Plan for funding infrastructure. The plan shall include input by the Legislature as provided in Section 13104. The plan shall identify state infrastructure needs and set out priorities for funding. The plan need not identify specific infrastructure projects to be funded, but it shall be sufficiently detailed to provide a clear understanding of the type and amount of infrastructure to be funded and the programmatic objectives to be achieved by this funding. The plan is intended to complement the existing state budget process for appropriating funds for infrastructure by providing a comprehensive guideline for the types of projects to be funded through that process.

13101. As used in this article, “infrastructure” means real property, including land and improvements to the land, structures and equipment integral to the operation of structures, easements, rights-of-way and other forms of interest in property, roadways, and water conveyances.

13102. In conjunction with the Governor’s Budget submitted pursuant to Section 13337, the Governor shall submit annually a proposed five-year infrastructure plan to the Legislature. This plan shall cover a five-fiscal-year period beginning with the fiscal year that is the same as that covered by the Governor’s Budget with which it is being submitted.

The infrastructure plan shall contain the following information for the five years that it covers:

- (a) (1) Identification of new, rehabilitated, modernized, improved, or renovated infrastructure requested by state agencies.
  - (2) Aggregate funding for transportation as identified in the four-year State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate prepared pursuant to Sections 14524 and 14525.
  - (3) Infrastructure needs for Kindergarten through grade 12 public schools necessary to accommodate increased enrollment, class size reduction, and school modernization.
  - (4) The instructional and instructional support facilities needs for the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges.
- (b) The estimated cost of providing the infrastructure identified in subdivision (a).
- (c) A proposal for funding the infrastructure identified in subdivision (a), that includes all of the following:
- (1) Criteria and priorities used to identify and select the infrastructure it does propose to fund, including criteria used to identify and select infrastructure that by January 1, 2005, shall be consistent with the state planning priorities specified pursuant to Section 65041.1 for infrastructure requested by state agencies pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a).
  - (2) Sources of funding, including, but not limited to, General Fund, state special funds, federal funds, general obligation bonds, lease revenue bonds, and installment purchases.

(3) An evaluation of the impact of the new state debt on the state's existing overall debt position if the plan proposes the issuance of new state debt.

(4) (A) Recommended specific projects for funding or the recommended type and amount of infrastructure to be funded in order to meet programmatic objectives that shall be identified in the proposal.

(B) Any capital outlay or local assistance appropriations intended to fund infrastructure included in the Governor's Budget shall derive from, and be encompassed by, the funding proposal contained in the plan.

## **APPENDIX B: CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE, SECTIONS 67500-67503**

67500. The California State University, any community college district, and the University of California may be reimbursed by the state for expenditures made for preliminary plans and working drawings for a capital outlay project, if all of the following conditions are met:

(a) The project was authorized in a budget act or other statute before the preliminary plans and working drawings were prepared.

(b) Funds for the reimbursement are appropriated by the Legislature.

(c) All other applicable procedures were followed by the California State University, the community college district, or the University of California in expending the funds. The advance of funds by the California State University, a community college district, or the University of California, for preliminary plans and working drawings, shall be made to promote early completion of a capital outlay project authorized by the Legislature.

67501. (a) The University of California may, and the California State University shall, submit to the Legislature on or before November 30 of each year a comprehensive five-year capital outlay plan that includes, but is not limited to, all of the following information:

(1) State and non-state projects proposed for each campus in each year of the plan, including a discussion of the programmatic bases for each project.

(2) An explanation of how each project contributes to accommodating needs associated with current or projected enrollments of graduate and undergraduate students, and other needs, and the rough estimates of the costs of meeting those needs.

(3) The estimated costs of each project, showing the schedule for when these funds will be needed, including a schedule of annual funding needs beyond the five years for those projects for which completion exceeds the timeframe of the plan and the relative priority on a campus and statewide basis.

(4) An explanation of how the plan addresses the Legislature's intent that the universities annually consider, as part of their annual capital outlay planning process, the inclusion of facilities that may be used by more than one segment of public higher education (intersegmental).

(5) Description and costs of activities that take place within the plan's timeframe related to the planning or establishment of new campuses.

(b) The California Community Colleges Chancellor's office shall prepare a five-year capital outlay plan identifying the statewide needs and priorities of the California Community Colleges. This plan shall be submitted to the Legislature on or before November 30 of each year. It is the intent of the Legislature not to consider any community college capital outlay project that is not included in the statewide five-year plan submitted to the Legislature. The five-year capital outlay plan shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following information:



- (1) Enrollment projections for each community college district.
  - (2) Projects proposed for each campus in each year of the plan.
  - (3) The estimated costs of each project, showing the schedule for when these funds will be needed and the relative priority on a statewide basis.
  - (4) An explanation of the Chancellor's office priorities and methodology for selecting projects for state capital outlay funding.
  - (5) An explanation of the Chancellor's office methodology for calculating unmet capital outlay needs for the community college system.
  - (6) An explanation of how the plan addresses the Legislature's intent that the community colleges annually consider, as part of their annual capital outlay planning process, the inclusion of facilities that may be used by more than one segment of public higher education (intersegmental).
- (c) The plans for the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges shall be updated annually, taking into consideration evolving circumstances in the planning process of the institutions. The Legislature recognizes that the annual plan is a flexible, working document subject to the evolutionary change inherent in the planning process. The plan shall be designed to reflect project data changes on a year-to-year basis, and the inclusion of a project in the plan does not guarantee its viability. It is further the intent of the Legislature that the project planning guides or capital outlay budget change proposals submitted for each state-funded project proposed for inclusion in the first year of the plan specify both of the following: (1) How each project meets needs for different types of space, including, but not limited to, classrooms, teaching laboratories, research laboratories, and faculty offices. (2) The direct and indirect project costs associated with the different types of space.

67502. No reference to community colleges.

67503. (a) On or before November 1, 2010, and at least biennially thereafter, the University of California is requested to, and the California State University shall, report on the utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories. The report shall include for each campus in their respective system the total number of rooms, number of stations, weekly student contact hours, and weekly station hours. The report shall also include the average weekly hours of station use and actual utilization as a percentage of the utilization standard.

(b) On or before November 1, 2010, and at least biennially thereafter, the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall report on the utilization of classrooms and teaching laboratories. The report shall include, for each college, the total number of rooms, number of stations, weekly student contact hours, average weekly student contact hours per station, and actual utilization as a percentage of the utilization standard.

## APPENDIX C: FY 2024-25 SPENDING PLAN

Board Cat.	District	Location	Project Name	Phase	2024-25 State	Phase	2024-25 Local	Phase	2025-26 State	Phase	2025-26 Local	Total
A	El Camino CCD	El Camino College	Hydronic Line Replacement	PW	\$785,000	PW	\$262,000	C	\$7,938,000	C	\$2,647,000	\$11,632,000
A	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Pierce College	Sewer Utility Infrastructure Replacement	PW	\$652,000	PW	\$217,000	C	\$6,115,000	C	\$2,037,000	\$9,021,000
A	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Valley College	Sewer Utility Infrastructure Replacement	PW	\$559,000	PW	\$187,000	C	\$4,834,000	C	\$1,613,000	\$7,193,000
			Total Life & Safety		\$1,996,000		\$666,000		\$18,887,000		\$6,297,000	\$27,846,000
M	Citrus CCD	Citrus College	New Career Technical Education Building	PW	\$2,921,000	PW	\$4,336,000	C	\$39,959,000	CE	\$58,146,000	\$105,362,000
M	Coast CCD	Golden West College	Fine Arts Renovation	C	\$14,085,000	CE	\$13,685,000	--	\$-	--	\$-	\$27,770,000
M	Coast CCD	Golden West College	PE - Rec (Gym) Replacement	PW	\$1,843,000	PW	\$1,959,000	C	\$25,066,000	CE	\$24,042,000	\$52,910,000
M	Coast CCD	Orange Coast College	Skills Lab Replacement	PW	\$1,027,000	PW	\$841,000	C	\$11,251,000	CE	\$11,087,000	\$24,206,000
M	Foothill-DeAnza CCD	De Anza College	Physical Education Complex Renovation	PW	\$3,116,000	PW	\$1,012,000	C	\$34,457,000	CE	\$11,182,000	\$49,767,000
M	Hartnell CCD	Hartnell College	Building F, G, H (Gymnasium) Renovation	PW	\$1,625,000	PW	\$1,302,000	C	\$16,307,000	CE	\$15,837,000	\$35,071,000
M	Imperial Valley CCD	Imperial Valley College	Gym Modernization	PW	\$994,000	PW	\$994,000	C	\$11,214,000	CE	\$11,288,000	\$24,490,000
M	Kern CCD	Bakersfield College	BC Center for Student Success	PW	\$1,779,000	PW	\$1,778,000	C	\$24,540,000	CE	\$23,490,000	\$51,587,000
M	Long Beach CCD	Liberal Arts Campus	Building B Replacement	PW	\$366,000	PW	\$471,000	C	\$22,193,000	CE	\$24,075,000	\$47,105,000
M	Merced CCD	Merced College	Music Art Theater Complex	PW	\$1,355,000	PW	\$2,254,000	C	\$20,984,000	CE	\$19,402,000	\$43,995,000
M	Peralta CCD	College of Alameda	Aviation Complex Replacement	C	\$13,269,000	CE	\$12,893,000	--	\$-	--	\$-	\$26,162,000
M	Peralta CCD	Merritt College	Replace Bldgs E and F - Kinesiology and Physical Training	PW	\$1,670,000	PW	\$1,669,000	C	\$21,085,000	CE	\$20,863,000	\$45,287,000
M	Rio Hondo CCD	Rio Hondo College	Business and Art Building Replacement	PW	\$1,463,000	PW	\$1,463,000	C	\$19,786,000	CE	\$19,188,000	\$41,900,000
M	San Mateo County CCD	College of San Mateo	Building 9 Library Modernization	C	\$20,005,000	CE	\$19,232,000	--	\$-	--	\$-	\$39,237,000
M	Siskiyou Jt. CCD	College of the Siskiyous	Remodel Theater and McCloud Hall	C	\$29,292,000	C	\$-	--	\$-	--	\$-	\$29,292,000
M	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. CCD	Shasta College	Life Sciences (Building 1600) Renovation	PW	\$629,000	PW	\$697,000	C	\$7,210,000	CE	\$6,886,000	\$15,422,000
M	State Center CCD	Reedley College	Modernization of Agriculture Instruction Complex	PW	\$1,196,000	PW	\$1,196,000	C	\$14,224,000	CE	\$13,153,000	\$29,769,000
M	West Valley-Mission CCD	West Valley College	P.E. / Gym Buildings Renovation	PW	\$1,668,000	PW	\$1,668,000	C	\$17,895,000	C	\$17,895,000	\$39,126,000
			<b>Total Modernization</b>		<b>\$98,303,000</b>		<b>\$67,450,000</b>		<b>\$286,171,000</b>		<b>\$276,534,000</b>	<b>\$728,458,000</b>
G	Mendocino-Lake CCD	Willits Center	Willits Center Phase II	PW	\$1,240,000	PW	\$668,000	C	\$12,124,000	CE	\$12,273,000	\$26,305,000
G	Riverside CCD	Moreno Valley College	Library Learning Resource Center (LLRC)	PW	\$3,276,000	PW	\$3,277,000	C	\$45,242,000	CE	\$43,255,000	\$95,050,000
G	Riverside CCD	Riverside City College	Cosmetology Building	PW	\$1,852,000	PW	\$1,852,000	C	\$22,410,000	CE	\$22,063,000	\$48,177,000
G	Sequoias CCD	Hanford Educational Center	Science Building	PW	\$3,742,000	PW	\$-	C	\$41,821,000	CE	\$14,937,000	\$60,500,000
G	State Center CCD	Clovis Community College	Kinesiology and Wellness Center	PW	\$1,605,000	PW	\$1,605,000	C	\$21,590,000	CE	\$21,509,000	\$46,309,000
			<b>Total Growth</b>		<b>\$11,715,000</b>		<b>\$7,402,000</b>		<b>\$143,187,000</b>		<b>\$114,037,000</b>	<b>\$276,341,000</b>
			<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$112,014,000</b>		<b>\$75,518,000</b>		<b>\$448,245,000</b>		<b>\$396,868,000</b>	<b>\$1,032,645,000</b>
			Total Continuing for FY 24/25 (4 projects)		\$76,651,000		\$45,810,000		\$-		\$-	\$122,461,000
			Total New FY 24/25 (22 projects)		\$35,363,000		\$29,708,000		\$448,245,000		\$396,868,000	\$910,184,000
			<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$112,014,000</b>		<b>\$75,518,000</b>		<b>\$448,245,000</b>		<b>\$396,868,000</b>	<b>\$1,032,645,000</b>

**APPENDIX D - METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR THE CCC SYSTEM**

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: 2024-2025 FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN, METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR THE CCC SYSTEM**

Formulas	Variables	Variables	Elements	"ASF 24-25   CCI 8823"	Costs 24-25
	<b>A</b>		<b>ASF NEEDED TO MEET PROJECTED ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>50,399,809</b>	
	<b>B</b>		<b>CURRENT NET CAPACITY ASF:</b>		
			Lecture	5,299,377	
			Lab	10,859,341	
			Office	6,274,196	
			Library	4,209,488	
			AV/TV	499,866	
			Other	18,084,765	
			<b>TOTAL CAPACITY ASF</b>	<b>45,227,033</b>	
			<b>UNMET FACILITIES NEEDS:</b>		
<b>A-B =</b>	<b>C</b>		Additional ASF for Enrollment Growth	5,172,776	\$5,560,734,200
		<b>D</b>	Less Alternative Means of Delivery	1,293,194	\$1,390,183,550
<b>C-D=</b>	<b>E</b>		Subtotal Net Enrollment Need	3,879,582	\$4,170,550,650
	<b>F</b>		Modernization of Existing Facilities		
			Critical Life Safety Renovation	N/A	
			Modernization / Renovation	29,403,091	\$21,817,093,522
			Replace Temporary Buildings	1,410,358	\$1,520,365,924
	<b>G</b>		Subtotal Modernization of Existing Facilities	30,813,449	\$23,337,459,446
<b>F+G=</b>	<b>H</b>		<b>TOTAL UNMET FACILITIES NEEDS</b>	<b>34,693,031</b>	<b>\$27,508,010,096</b>
	<b>I</b>		<b>PROPOSED FACILITIES IN 5-YEAR PLAN</b>		
		<b>I-1</b>	New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,778,609	\$5,137,004,675
			Modernization of Existing Facilities Projects:		
			Critical Life Safety Renovation Projects		\$450,000
			Modernization / renovation Projects	24,455,050	\$18,145,647,100
			Replace Temporary Buildings	1,288,992	\$1,389,533,376
		<b>I-2</b>	Subtotal Modernization	25,744,042	\$19,535,630,476
<b>I.1+I.2=</b>	<b>I</b>		<b>TOTAL PROPOSED FACILITIES IN 5-YEAR PLAN</b>	<b>30,522,651</b>	<b>\$24,672,635,151</b>

Formulas	Variables	Variables	Elements	"ASF 24-25   CCI 8823"	Costs 24-25
	J		<b>DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS:</b>		
			Continuing Phases of Projects Started in 5-Year Plan:		
			New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$236,367,500
			Modernization of Existing Facilities Projects	N/A	\$397,043,000
		<b>J.1</b>	Subtotal Outyear Costs	N/A	\$633,410,500
			Enrollment Need Carried Forward		
			Modernization Need Carried Forward	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445
		<b>J.2</b>	Subtotal Need Carryover	4,170,380	\$2,201,964,445
<b>J.1+J.2=</b>	<b>J</b>		<b>TOTAL DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS</b>	<b>4,170,380</b>	<b>\$2,835,374,945</b>
<b>I+J=</b>	<b>K</b>		<b>TOTAL PROPOSED 5-YEAR PLAN AND DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS</b>	<b>34,693,031</b>	<b>\$27,508,010,096</b>

## **APPENDIX E: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS**

Community college districts have the responsibility to maintain, modernize, and expand as necessary the facilities at their institutions on behalf of the students they serve. To accomplish these objectives, community college districts are authorized to seek local and state financing for their facilities.

In addition to local efforts, the state's capital outlay program provides voter-approved statewide general obligation bonds through grants to fund capital outlay projects on community college campuses. These grants are developed pursuant to the annual state capital outlay grant application process and approved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Board). Districts often leverage these grants with local funds; however, for some districts with minimal local resources for facilities, funds provided from the state capital outlay grant application process are the only source of funds available to modernize facilities and/or construct new buildings.

The Board has adopted priority funding categories to assist districts in their capital planning efforts so that the capital outlay proposals submitted for consideration of state funding reflect the state's priorities. The Board priority funding categories give preference to projects that best meet the following priorities:

- Expand campuses appropriately to meet enrollment demands,
- Modernize aging facilities,
- Meet the space utilization standards referenced in California Code of Regulations, and,
- Leverage state funds with local funds to provide facilities at the least cost to the state.

The Chancellor's Office Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit administers the state capital outlay grant application process for the community college system on behalf of the Board of Governors. Under the policy guidance and direction of the Board of Governors, the Facilities Planning and Utilization unit assists districts in meeting guidelines, regulations, and other requirements to receive state funding for capital construction projects.

The capital outlay grant application process is based on the Board priority funding categories and has three district inputs that culminate in the annual capital outlay spending plan:

1. District five-year capital outlay plans,
2. Initial Project Proposals, and
3. Final Project Proposals.

**PROPOSED PRIORITY - FUNDING CATEGORY SCORING METRICS**

For all capital outlay project funding categories, proposed projects must first be capacity load eligible; this includes modernizations where projects must not sustain or increase an overbuilt status. Additionally, community college districts that are proposing capital outlay projects must be aligned with the California Community College Promise requirements (AB-19, Santiago 2017), as these requirements establish the minimum conditions for participating in the California Community Colleges capital outlay program. California Community College Promise requirement include the following:

- Partner with local educational agencies to establish an early commitment to college
- Partner with local educational agencies to improve student preparation for college
- Utilize evidence-based assessment and placement practices at the community college including multiple-measures
- Participate in the Guided Pathways program

**BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRIORITY FUNDING CATEGORIES**

There are three Priority Funding Categories including life and safety, growth, and modernization. Table 1 below illustrates the maximum share of state funding allocated to each category in a specific plan year as follows:

**Table 1: Proposed Project Categories, Definitions and Percentage Allocations**

Category	Definition	Proposed Allocation (from age of building data)
A	To provide for safe facilities and activate existing space	Up to 50% of Total
		Of the remaining Total
M	To modernize instructional and institutional support spaces.	65%
G	To increase instructional and institutional support spaces.	35%

**CATEGORY A – LIFE AND SAFETY PROJECTS**

The most critical projects, life and safety projects, are assigned to Category A. Projects in Category A involve life and safety issues and are ranked according to the number of people threatened or affected by the condition of a facility or site. Please see Table 2 for details about Category A priority-criteria.

**Table 2: Category A - Criteria**

Life and Safety	Description	Local Contribution/ Hardship
<p><b>A-1: Life Safety Projects</b></p>	<p>The intent of this category is to permanently mitigate the life safety conditions in buildings or systems that create imminent danger to the life or limb of facility’s occupants.</p> <hr/> <p>One or more of the following must exist to be considered as an A-1 project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imminent Danger – immediate danger to the health, life or limb of the facility’s occupants;</li> <li>• Health and Life Safety – obvious danger to health, life or limb exists. While danger is not immediate, remedy is needed to protect people;</li> <li>• Fire Safety – existing conditions could place people in grave peril and inadequate escape</li> <li>• The lack of compliance with existing code is not considered sufficient justification to warrant classification of an issue as a critical life-safety issue</li> </ul> <p>The Final Project Proposal (FPP) shall be accompanied by a third-party study that identifies the critical life safety issues and states that imminent danger exists to the facility’s occupants (study must be performed by an independent, professional who is certified or licensed to perform the relevant study).</p>	<p>Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points)</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50%</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project</li> <li>• Debt-level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)</li> <li>• Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M</li> </ul>

Life and Safety	Description	Local Contribution/ Hardship
<b>A-3: Seismic Retrofit Projects</b>	The intent of this category is to seismically retrofit structures subject to the likely probability of collapse during a seismic event of greater than 6.0.	
	Final Project Proposal (FPP) shall be accompanied by a third-party study/report that validates that the target building's structural deficiencies provides a risk that is equivalent to Risk Level 4 or greater as specified in the April 1998 CCC Seismic Survey, Report and Recommendations, prepared by the State Department of General Services – Real Estate Services Division. This study must be performed by an independent, professional who is certified or licensed to perform the relevant study and shall include possible mitigation measures.	
<b>A-4: Immediate Infrastructure Failure Projects</b>	The intent of this category is to repair or replace the immediate failing infrastructure within a structure or campus system.	
	Final Project Proposal (FPP) shall be accompanied by a third-party study that identifies the failing infrastructure and least cost mitigation measures that permanently mitigates the issues and restores the designed capability (study must be performed by an independent, professional who is certified or licensed to perform the relevant study).	

**CATEGORY M – MODERNIZATION PROJECTS**

Projects that modernize existing space earn eligibility points based upon the age and condition of the existing facility or its infrastructure and the extent to which local funds directly mitigate state costs of the project. Please see Table 3 for details about Category M priority-criteria.



**Table 3: Metrics for Modernization**

<b>Modernization</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proposed Points</b>	<b>Existing Points</b>										
<b>Age of Project Building</b>	<p>This factor provides priority to facilities 15 years and older that have a greater need for program space renovations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale: One point for every year, starts with 15 years equal to 15 points and so forth to 60 years equal 60 points.</li> </ul>	60	120										
<b>Activates Unused Space</b>	<p>This factor supports renovation of existing space that currently cannot be used but can be activated after the renovation. Activated unused space (050), is at least 5% of total space to be renovated.</p>	N/A	30										
<b>Facility Condition Index (FCI)</b>	<p>FCI is from the FUSION assessments.</p>	40	New										
<b>FTES</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>FTES Scale</b></th> <th><b>Points</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>500-999</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,000-9,999</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10,000-19,999</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20,000+</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>FTES Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>	500-999	6	1,000-9,999	12	10,000-19,999	16	20,000+	20	20	New
<b>FTES Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>												
500-999	6												
1,000-9,999	12												
10,000-19,999	16												
20,000+	20												
<b>Vision for Success</b> CTE Programs	<p>This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale: Ratio (CTE Space: Project Space).</li> </ul>	25	New										
<b>Vision for Success</b> Regions of High Need	<p>Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North.</p>	5	New										

Modernization	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points
<b>Local Contribution/ Hardship</b>	Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points) <b>AND</b>  Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50%</li> </ul> <b>OR</b> Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project</li> <li>• Debt level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)</li> <li>• Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M</li> </ul>	50	50
Total		200	200

**CATEGORY G– GROWTH**

Category G projects that expand space on sites earn eligibility scores based upon a site’s need for space, projected enrollment growth over the next five years, the extent to which the proposed solution provides the needed space, and the extent to which local funds directly mitigate state costs of the project. Please see Table 4 below for details about Category G priority-criteria.

**Table 4: Metrics for Growth**

<b>Growth</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proposed Points</b>	<b>Existing Points</b>										
<b>Enrollment Growth</b>	This factor looks at the campus' enrollment (WSCH) change over a 5-year period; the higher the enrollment increase, the more points the project will be eligible for.	50	50										
<b>Existing Inventory</b>	This calculation compares the existing space capacity to the enrollment need or load. The lower the capacity load ratio, the greater the need for additional space, therefore the more points the project will receive.	50	50										
<b>Assignable Square Footage (ASF) Change</b>	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type.	N/A	50										
<b>FTES</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>FTES Scale</b></th> <th><b>Points</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>500-999</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,000-9,999</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10,000-19,999</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20,000+</td> <td>20</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>FTES Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>	500-999	6	1,000-9,999	12	10,000-19,999	16	20,000+	20	20	New
<b>FTES Scale</b>	<b>Points</b>												
500-999	6												
1,000-9,999	12												
10,000-19,999	16												
20,000+	20												
<b>Vision for Success</b> CTE Programs	<p>This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes.</p> <p>Scale: Ratio (CTE Space: Project Space).</p>	25	New										
<b>Vision for Success</b> Regions of High Need	Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North.	5	New										

Growth	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points
<b>Local Contribution/ Hardship</b>	<p>Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points) <b>AND</b></p> <p>Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50%</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project</li> <li>• Debt-level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)</li> <li>• Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M</li> </ul>	50	50
Total		200	200

## LOCAL CONTRIBUTION/HARDSHIP METRIC

The requirements for community college district eligibility for the local contribution hardship metric include the following:

- Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points)

### AND

- Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional)
  - One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50%

### OR

- Hardship (25 points maximum)
  - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following:
    - District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it's not sufficient to fund the project at FPP submission
    - Debt level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)
    - Total district bonding capacity less than \$50 million

## FUNDING ALLOCATION BETWEEN CATEGORIES

Category A projects involve health and safety issues and are the highest priority in the capital outlay spending plan. Category A projects are ranked according to the number of people threatened or impacted by the condition of a facility or site, and up to 50% of the annual allocation of state funds is made available for projects in this category.

Once the continuing phases of previously funded projects and new Category A projects are prioritized, projects in the remaining categories are prioritized based on various factors for each Priority Funding Category. The proposals compete for the highest ranking within each category based on points calculated using the age of the facility, age of the campus, enrollment capacity load ratios, cost, project scope, and local contribution.

Projects in Categories M and G are ranked by eligibility points (highest to lowest). The annual capital outlay spending plan includes a maximum of one project from any Category M or G per authorized site. With the exception of projects that address life and safety, seismic or infrastructure failure problems, only one “new start” project per year is funded per authorized site. This limit ensures that more campuses will likely have new proposals included in the annual capital outlay spending plan.

If more than one project is eligible for potential funding from Categories M and G per authorized site, the project with the highest local ranking from the district's five-year capital outlay plan is proposed for funding. In recent years, the number of proposals seeking state funds and obtaining Board of Governors' approval has greatly exceeded the amount of state funds available. Every year valid, meritorious proposals are excluded from the statewide spending plan. To mitigate such exclusions, the development of the proposed annual capital outlay spending plan may include a realignment of funds between categories.

## **DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLANS**

Education Code sections 81820-81823 require the governing board of each community college district to annually prepare and submit to the facilities planning and utilization unit a five-year plan for capital construction. California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 57014 requires districts to receive approval of their five-year capital outlay plans from the facilities planning and utilization unit prior to receiving state funding for projects. Districts are also required to complete district and campus master plans before preparing their five-year capital outlay plans. The districts' five-year capital outlay plans are submitted to the facilities planning and utilization unit on July 1 of each year, unless the Chancellor's Office delays this submission.

In adopting capital outlay plans, governing boards should confirm that the plans reflect the infrastructure necessary to achieve the goals aligned to the Vision for Success adopted by that local board.

## **DISTRICT MASTER PLANS**

The districts' five-year capital outlay plans are based on the local education master plan and facilities master plan for each campus. The California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 51008 requires districts to establish policies for, and approve, comprehensive or master plans which include academic master plans and long-range master plans for facilities.

Master plans define how a district will meet the needs of its students and the community. They outline the short and long-range goals for a community college district and for each of its major campuses. Districts use master plans as a tool to periodically reevaluate education programs and facilities needs in terms of past experience, current community requirements, and future goals.

An education master plan is therefore a prerequisite to the preparation of a facilities master plan. The preparation of a facilities master plan is in turn a prerequisite to the preparation of the five-year capital outlay plan districts submit annually to the facilities planning and utilization unit.

## EDUCATION MASTER PLANS

An education master plan defines a district's goals for the future of the education program. An education plan describes current programs and details how those programs should develop in the future. The plan may introduce new programs and describe how the programs will be integrated into the curriculum and the direction in which they will grow in the future. Districts must consider state codes and regulations, long-term budget considerations, staffing requirements, and new educational delivery methods and technology when developing their education master plans.

## FACILITIES MASTER PLANS

A facilities master plan is derived from the education master plan and provides a blueprint for the facilities and technology that will be required to fully implement the education master plan of a district for each campus. The decisions a district makes in developing a facilities master plan are critical due to the permanent nature of any decisions made. The construction process for buildings is lengthy and once buildings are constructed, change is very difficult. This is evidenced by the fact that 62% of buildings in the community college system are over 25-years old and 50% are over 40-years old.

Although educational programming is always supposed to drive facilities planning, the permanent nature of facilities will limit or dampen the ability of the education master plan to respond to rapid changes in the educational program, delivery systems and technology. Given this permanence, there are many factors districts must take into consideration as they develop facilities master plans:

- 1. Community College Change and Growth** - Community colleges facilities are inherently difficult to plan for because the only constant is change – change in the size of the campus, rules and regulations, educational programs, administration, staff and faculty, and a myriad of other factors. Community college campuses often grow to many times their original size over a long period of time so the need to plan for and respond to change must be integral to a facilities master plan.
- 2. Campus Design Guidelines** – The facilities master plan must define campus design guidelines, not only to provide a cohesive look for the entire campus but to ensure access and functionality. The campus needs to be designed for flexibility so that facilities can change to the extent possible to support changes in the educational program.
- 3. State Rules and Guidelines** – California's community colleges are governed by laws, regulations and guidelines that are utilized by various governmental entities (i.e., Board of Governors, Department of Finance, Division of the State Architect) in the review of new campuses and building projects. The facilities master plan for any campus must be consistent with state rules and guidelines.
- 4. California Environmental Quality Act** – The California Environmental Quality Act requires districts to define and possibly mitigate the negative impact of construction

or new development on neighboring properties. Districts must evaluate the impact of vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic, storm water run-off, historic structures and features, greenhouse gas emissions, and a variety of other potential impacts on neighboring properties when developing a new site or starting a new project on an existing site.

- 5. Operational Considerations** – The facilities planning process must take into account various operational issues, including those that influence staffing requirements and energy usage for new and/or modernized facilities. Incentives are provided by the Board and the various utility companies that encourage energy efficient design and construction. Laws and regulations impact staffing levels such as: the Fifty Percent Law requires all community college districts to spend at least half of their current expense of education for salaries of classroom instructors; funding caps which limit the growth of a district, and collective bargaining which determines class size limitations and other working condition issues. Classroom scheduling issues must also be taken into account when determining the number and size of classrooms: availability of rooms, size of rooms, and physical adequacy of rooms to teach specific types of courses.
- 6. Funding Availability** – Funding for community college facilities is always less than what is required to support the facility needs of the community college system. State funding is dependent upon the passage of statewide general obligation bonds, and local funding is dependent upon the passage of local general obligation bonds. Moving forward, the availability of state funds to finance new community college projects is been constrained due to the lack of an education bond in 2020. Facilities master plans must plan to the extent possible for buildings that are efficient, flexible (can be used for more than one purpose and adaptable to change over time), and cost effective. Careful planning of classroom scheduling within existing facilities can increase facility utilization without the need for new buildings. Districts must explore alternative instructional delivery options such as distance education which can also mitigate the need for new facilities.

Districts submit their five-year capital outlay plans using the Facility Utilization Space Inventory Options Net (FUSION) online database. FUSION is a web-based project planning and management tool activated in May 2003 and updated between 2017 and 2020. A consortium of community college districts provided the initial funds to develop FUSION, and all districts annually fund the operation and maintenance of FUSION. The Foundation for California Community Colleges and the facilities planning and utilization unit provide support for FUSION. FUSION provides facilities planning and utilization unit staff, district staff and consultants access to data and applications useful in assisting with the administration of district capital outlay programs. Districts use FUSION to better assess the various components of their current buildings, update their annual space inventory reports, and update their annual district five-year capital outlay plans. FUSION is also used to prepare Initial Project Proposals and selected components of Final Project Proposals as part of the application process for state capital outlay funds.



## INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

An Initial Project Proposal (IPP) is submitted by districts requesting state funding for projects included in the district's five-year capital outlay plan. The IPP provides a general project description including space, cost and funding schedule. Projects are to be submitted to the facilities planning and utilization unit by July 1 using the three-page IPP form.

The description of the intent and purpose of each project enables facilities planning and utilization unit staff to determine the appropriate board priority funding category to assign for the project. The IPP step in the screening process also allows the facilities planning and utilization unit to more accurately assess a district's capital outlay needs before there is a significant investment of time and money in projects by the district. After evaluating the IPPs, the facilities planning and utilization unit notifies the districts of those IPPs to be developed into Final Project Proposals which are due the following year for possible submission to the Board for project scope approval.

## FINAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

A Final Project Proposal (FPP) describes the scope, cost, schedule, and financing array of a project and includes conceptual drawings of the project. The description of the project in the FPP includes an assessment of the problems of the existing facilities, as well as an analysis of alternatives considered prior to proposing the recommended solution. The proposal includes a detailed space array, detailed cost estimate and summary calculation of the equipment allowance.

The facilities planning and utilization unit staff performs an in-depth analysis of each FPP. This analysis determines the following for each project:

- Accurate cost and scope,
- Board priority funding category for each project,
- Feasible calendar and timing of state funds, and
- Comparison of a project's merits with other projects in the same category.

## SCOPE APPROVAL

An FPP is eligible for inclusion in the annual capital outlay spending plan if it is consistent with the requirements, standards, and guidelines outlined in the Education Code, California Code of Regulations, title 5, and the State Administrative Manual/Capitalized Assets section 6800. The Chancellor's Office facilities planning and utilization unit staff determine whether or not a proposal satisfies the required governmental rules and regulations and works with districts to refine project proposals.

## **ANNUAL CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN**

The facilities planning and utilization unit develops an annual capital outlay spending plan that will be proposed for approval by the Board. The development of the spending plan draws upon a project's priority funding category, ranking among other projects within the same category, and total need for state funds versus the availability of state funds to determine which projects may be included in the plan. Following Board approval, the annual capital outlay spending plan is submitted to the Department of Finance for consideration of funding in the next budget cycle.

## **PROJECT PHASING**

The annual capital outlay spending plan includes projects seeking state financing to complete preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment phases. Brand new projects are known as “new start projects,” and projects seeking to obtain state funding for their remaining project phases are known as “continuing projects.”

## **READY ACCESS PROJECTS**

A “Ready Access” project is a special type of new start project that is seeking a state appropriation for all phases in a single budget cycle. A district is required to finance at least 10% of the state supportable cost for a Ready Access project and must commit to completing the project with no changes in scope or state financing.

## **DESIGN-BUILD PROJECTS**

“Design-Build” is a project delivery method that community college districts can use instead of the traditional Design-Bid-Build delivery method. A Design-Build project will be funded in two phases: 1) Design and 2) Construction. The Design-Build delivery method involves a process whereby district staff work with an architect to develop minimum design standards, room capabilities, and functional adjacencies for new or redesigned space without first establishing floor plans. These design standards are assembled into bid documents accompanied by the anticipated project budget and distributed to multiple Design-Builders so that they can develop proposed solutions with various floor plans and elevations. District staff review the various proposals and select a winning Design-Builder who in turn completes the development of construction documents and builds the project.

Following a successful pilot test involving more than 10 projects at eight districts, Senate Bill 614 (Stats. 2007, Ch. 471) authorized community colleges to use the Design-Build delivery method for both locally-funded and state-funded community college projects costing more than \$2.5 million.

Annual funding of the proposed projects is contingent on meeting the Governor's priorities and the availability of funds to meet continuing needs. The development of the annual capital outlay spending plan also considers the state funds needed by projects in future budget years so that a project included in the spending plan can have a reasonable expectation to receive the state funds necessary in future years to allow completion of the project.

## **ANNUAL “ZERO-BASED” BUDGETING METHOD**

The annual capital outlay spending plan is developed using a “zero-based” budgeting method in which all proposals eligible to compete in a specific fiscal year are evaluated to determine that the highest priority projects are included in the spending plan based on the funds available. FPPs not included in a specific year’s spending plan must compete in a subsequent budget cycle. Between budget cycles, districts may update or modify the proposals as needed to reflect changing local needs or priorities and resubmit in the next budget cycle. Otherwise FPPs that are submitted for state funding but do not receive appropriations in the annual state Budget Act have no automatic special standing in subsequent budget cycles.

## **APPEALS PROCESS**

An appeal process is available when a district believes that its project was omitted in error from either the state scope approval list or proposed annual capital outlay spending plan. Districts are urged to contact their facilities specialist in the facilities planning and utilization unit for an explanation of the project’s priority status. After discussions with the facilities specialist, if need be districts may appeal in writing to the Chancellor.

## **DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE/LEGISLATIVE PROCESS**

Once the annual capital outlay spending plan is approved by the Board, facilities planning and utilization unit staff advocate for state funding with the department of finance and the legislature for inclusion in the governor’s budget and the state budget act, respectively. The FPPs included in the capital outlay plan are transitioned into Capital Outlay Budget Change Proposals (COBCPs) and submitted to the Department of Finance on July 1 of each year (usually a year after the FPPs are submitted to the facilities planning and utilization unit).

The Department of Finance evaluates each COBCP for potential inclusion in the next Governor’s Budget. Once the project is included in the Governor’s Budget, it is then evaluated by Legislative staff for potential inclusion in the final state Budget Act. The Administration and Legislative Budget Committees thoroughly analyze all capital construction projects to determine if projects meet current state priorities, i.e., seismic, life-safety, vital infrastructure, major code deficiencies, and increased instructional access.

## APPENDIX F - ENROLLMENT AND WSCH PROJECTIONS BY DISTRICT

### California Community Colleges: District Enrollment Projections, Enrollment and WSCH Projections by District

District	2024-25		2028-29		Difference		Percent Change	
	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH
-								
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	11,544	107,864	11,818	111,316	274	3,452	2.37%	3.20%
Antelope Valley Community College District	12,693	135,272	13,074	143,478	381	8,205	3.00%	6.07%
Barstow Community College District	2,521	28,412	2,541	29,542	20	1,129	0.79%	3.98%
Butte-Glenn Community College District	9,936	117,475	10,224	128,906	288	11,431	2.90%	9.73%
Cabrillo Community College District	10,498	119,800	10,650	127,638	152	7,838	1.45%	6.54%
Cerritos Community College District	22,495	213,742	22,973	218,453	478	4,711	2.12%	2.20%
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	21,093	219,911	21,687	232,883	594	12,972	2.82%	5.90%
Chaffey Community College District	21,372	189,422	22,061	214,242	689	24,819	3.22%	13.10%
Citrus Community College District	12,591	163,926	13,002	176,545	411	12,619	3.26%	7.70%
Coast Community College District	41,284	442,200	42,329	482,517	1,045	40,318	2.53%	9.12%
Compton Community College District	4,832	50,506	4,999	54,421	167	3,914	3.46%	7.75%
Contra Costa Community College District	34,638	393,358	35,003	406,463	365	13,105	1.05%	3.33%
Copper Mountain Community College District	1,738	19,563	1,698	20,042	-40	479	-2.30%	2.45%
Desert Community College District	11,903	144,687	12,225	156,764	322	12,077	2.71%	8.35%
El Camino Community College District	20,325	232,653	20,084	241,103	-241	8,450	-1.19%	3.63%
Feather River Community College District	1,913	24,599	1,905	26,632	-8	2,032	-0.42%	8.26%
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	35,795	370,228	36,470	395,108	675	24,879	1.89%	6.72%
Gavilan Joint Community College District	5,252	57,758	5,308	58,778	56	1,020	1.07%	1.77%
Glendale Community College District	15,577	183,817	15,895	188,834	318	5,017	2.04%	2.73%
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	24,820	233,652	25,229	252,775	409	19,123	1.65%	8.18%
Hartnell Community College District	9,057	102,845	9,218	104,673	161	1,828	1.78%	1.78%
Imperial Valley Community College District	7,787	99,234	7,950	102,550	163	3,316	2.09%	3.34%
Kern Community College District	35,498	346,839	36,020	363,539	522	16,701	1.47%	4.82%
Lake Tahoe Community College District	2,430	25,917	2,414	28,759	-16	2,842	-0.66%	10.97%
Lassen Community College District	1,886	19,002	1,929	20,992	43	1,990	2.28%	10.47%
Long Beach Community College District	24,383	280,974	24,399	285,668	16	4,694	0.07%	1.67%
Los Angeles Community College District	138,164	1,339,634	141,570	1,438,651	3,406	99,016	2.47%	7.39%

District		2024-25		2028-29		Difference		Percent Change
Los Rios Community College District	72,176	649,541	72,980	697,651	804	48,109	1.11%	7.41%
Marin Community College District	5,341	47,720	5,389	48,149	48	429	0.90%	0.90%
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	3,648	32,654	3,680	34,368	32	1,714	0.88%	5.25%
Merced Community College District	11,546	128,627	11,614	132,742	68	4,115	0.59%	3.20%
MiraCosta Community College District	15,009	145,366	15,479	152,288	470	6,923	3.13%	4.76%
Monterey Peninsula Community College District	7,574	77,114	7,470	79,615	-104	2,502	-1.37%	3.24%
Mt. San Antonio Community College District	35,507	421,133	36,273	433,606	766	12,473	2.16%	2.96%
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	15,683	152,923	16,095	159,993	412	7,070	2.63%	4.62%
Napa Valley Community College District	5,183	56,731	5,211	57,734	28	1,004	0.54%	1.77%
North Orange County Community College District	51,922	537,426	53,718	556,016	1,796	18,590	3.46%	3.46%
Ohlone Community College District	9,315	111,745	9,291	120,322	-24	8,577	-0.26%	7.68%
Palo Verde Community College District	4,019	29,855	4,115	30,569	96	713	2.39%	2.39%
Palomar Community College District	21,933	228,409	22,329	238,671	396	10,262	1.81%	4.49%
Pasadena Community College District	26,063	326,839	25,792	328,778	-271	1,940	-1.04%	0.59%
Peralta Community College District	28,624	222,531	28,568	246,745	-56	24,214	-0.20%	10.88%
Rancho Santiago Community College District	45,934	401,672	46,691	408,292	757	6,620	1.65%	1.65%
Redwoods Community College District	4,205	46,063	4,229	49,939	24	3,876	0.57%	8.41%
Rio Hondo Community College District	16,636	171,103	16,988	174,724	352	3,620	2.12%	2.12%
Riverside Community College District	40,846	442,128	41,490	473,781	644	31,653	1.58%	7.16%
San Bernardino Community College District	18,679	194,883	19,034	207,650	355	12,767	1.90%	6.55%
San Diego Community College District	62,172	541,082	64,164	558,419	1,992	17,336	3.20%	3.20%
San Francisco Community College District	27,153	213,911	27,373	223,038	220	9,127	0.81%	4.27%
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	18,874	205,707	19,218	223,005	344	17,298	1.82%	8.41%
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District	17,638	169,839	17,682	184,711	44	14,872	0.25%	8.76%
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	11,014	104,722	11,213	111,474	199	6,752	1.81%	6.45%
San Mateo County Community College District	22,661	208,268	23,348	225,278	687	17,010	3.03%	8.17%
Santa Barbara Community College District	13,429	180,843	13,198	191,844	-231	11,001	-1.72%	6.08%
Santa Clarita Community College District	22,551	224,442	23,013	251,814	462	27,372	2.05%	12.20%
Santa Monica Community College District	29,618	324,768	29,917	337,732	299	12,964	1.01%	3.99%
Sequoias Community College District	13,115	140,859	13,163	149,526	48	8,667	0.37%	6.15%

District		2024-25		2028-29		Difference		Percent Change
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. Comm. College District	8,280	88,774	8,232	94,349	-48	5,575	-0.58%	6.28%
Sierra Jt. Community College District	18,307	194,591	18,624	209,392	317	14,801	1.73%	7.61%
Siskiyou Jt. Community College District	1,573	20,300	1,593	20,558	20	258	1.27%	1.27%
Solano Community College District	9,632	96,203	9,806	100,660	174	4,457	1.81%	4.63%
Sonoma County Junior College District	22,421	212,628	23,031	238,893	610	26,265	2.72%	12.35%
South Orange County Community College District	39,530	355,163	40,020	366,662	490	11,499	1.24%	3.24%
Southwestern Community College District	18,633	204,779	18,931	211,613	298	6,834	1.60%	3.34%
State Center Community College District	44,211	426,218	44,759	461,381	548	35,163	1.24%	8.25%
Ventura County Community College District	34,063	339,993	34,241	366,851	178	26,857	0.52%	7.90%
Victor Valley Community College District	11,085	130,053	11,165	138,350	80	8,297	0.72%	6.38%
West Hills Community College District	8,409	77,530	8,425	86,349	16	8,819	0.19%	11.37%
West Kern Community College District	3,611	32,187	3,679	32,793	68	606	1.88%	1.88%
West Valley-Mission Community College District	15,055	172,784	15,115	189,390	60	16,606	0.40%	9.61%
Yosemite Community College District	19,526	204,223	19,936	219,413	410	15,189	2.10%	7.44%
Yuba Community College District	9,714	91,893	9,754	100,214	40	8,321	0.41%	9.06%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>1,484,143</b>	<b>15,049,514</b>	<b>1,508,711</b>	<b>15,936,609</b>	<b>24,568</b>	<b>887,095</b>	<b>1.66%</b>	<b>5.89%</b>
<b>Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, Research and Data Analytics Unit, Management Information System</b>								
	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>WSCH</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>WSCH</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>Difference</b>		
Statewide Total PY 24-25 thru 28-29	<b>1,484,143</b>	<b>15,049,514</b>	<b>1,508,711</b>	<b>15,936,609</b>	<b>24,568</b>	<b>887,095</b>		
Statewide Total PY 23-24 thru 27-28	<b>1,639,870</b>	<b>16,973,835</b>	<b>1,715,344</b>	<b>18,124,843</b>	<b>75,474</b>	<b>1,151,009</b>		
Difference	-155,727	-1,924,321	-206,633	-2,188,234	-50,906	-263,913		
% Change	-9%	-11%	-12%	-12%	-67%	-23%		



Front cover photo:  
Coastline Community College

Photo at right:  
Los Angeles Pierce College

Back cover photo:  
Madera Community College



Connect  
with us!

## WEBSITES

**California Community Colleges**  
cocco.edu

**Salary Surfer**  
salarysurfer.cocco.edu

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

## SOCIAL MEDIA



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



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

**Chancellor Sonya Christian Twitter Feed**  
twitter.com/sonyachristian

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



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



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



**California Community Colleges LinkedIn**  
linkedin.com/company/  
californiacommunitycolleges/



**California Community Colleges Threads**  
threads.net/@californiacommunitycolleges





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

[www.cccco.edu](http://www.cccco.edu)