



# 2017 REPORT

# Citizens Oversight Board Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act Summary Report Year 2 (FY 2014-15) and Year 3 (FY 2015-16)





February 3, 2017

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

RE: California Community College Proposition 39 Projects

Dear Governor Brown:

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's office is pleased to share with you the successes of the community college districts in implementing the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act program. Year 2 and 3 of funding have supported 735 energy projects at 72 community college districts resulting in one-time incentives, ongoing energy and monetary savings, job creation and better physical environments for California's community college students.

The energy projects implemented on community college campuses in these two years of Proposition 39 funding will result in annual savings of 74.6 million kilo-watt hours of electricity and 1.6M gas therms, generating \$11.2 million in annual energy cost savings and \$15.6 million in one-time energy incentives. The energy saved by these Proposition 39 energy projects can power approximately 14,000 homes year. These savings can be redirected to educational programs and other support services to improve student outcomes.

The jobs created by these energy projects include construction jobs and construction related jobs such as consultants, energy auditors, architects, engineers, and office staff. The 254 completed projects have generated a total of 300 job years. Based on these results, we estimate the remaining 481 projects will generate an additional 605 job years.

The Proposition 39 funds have also provided training for community college students and instructors in energy efficiency related areas. Currently, more than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates, or industry certifications in year two of the program.

We wish to express our appreciation to you for your support of the community colleges, energy efficiency and sustainability.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eloy Ortiz Oakley'.

Eloy Ortiz Oakley  
Chancellor



# Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Identifying Energy Savings.....	7
Implementation Overview.....	7
Funding Status.....	7
Results of Closed-Out and In-Progress Projects.....	10
District Energy Usage Data Summary.....	37
Workforce and Economic Development Summary.....	53
Appendices.....	60

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

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) has been making great strides with the Proposition 39 Clean Energy Jobs Act. Proposition 39 is an approved initiative for the purposes of creating jobs in California by improving energy efficiency and expanding clean energy generation. The progress made in Year 2 and Year 3 of this 5-year program has been instrumental in reducing energy usage, cost savings and creating clean energy jobs throughout the community college system. The Proposition 39 program is managed by two divisions within the Chancellor's Office to implement the requirements set by SB 73 (Ch. 29, Stats. 2013). The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit oversees the funding allocated towards improving energy efficiency on community college campuses. The Workforce and Economic Development Division oversees the workforce training and development program on community college campuses.

The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit has partnered with investor-owned utility groups and the consulting firm Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick to work with districts on reviewing, approving, administering and verifying clean energy projects and energy savings. The investor-owned utility

groups and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick have been an integral part of the partnership with the Chancellor's Office in assisting community colleges across the state. The Workforce and Economic Development Division is in charge of the funding, which is allocated to districts on a grant basis. They have collaborated with a sector navigator that specializes in energy, construction and utilities to assist districts in the development of regional career pathways. The Facilities Planning Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division have been working in tandem to educate the staff and students to improve energy efficiency on campuses in the community college system.

Community college districts are working with their investor-owned utility groups and Newcomb, Anderson, and McCormick on closing out their energy efficiency projects. Fifty-seven districts have closed out 254 projects in Year 2 and 3 for a total project cost of \$54.9 million. This has resulted in 29.9 million kWh and 316,000 therm savings resulting in \$4 million energy cost savings for districts. Districts received approximately \$6 million in incentives from the investor-owned utility groups for these projects. There were 300 direct job years and eight trainee job years produced from these energy efficiency projects on district campuses. The amount of energy savings from these energy efficiency projects can power more than 5,000 homes.

California community colleges are continually working on energy efficiency projects in the loading order established in the 2003 Energy Action Plan. Since energy efficiency and demand response are prioritized, lighting projects are still leading the way in years 2 and 3 in terms of being closed-out. They amount to 155 projects, which is more than 60 percent of the total amount of projects that were closed-out. Lighting projects generate the highest savings-to-investment-ratio and will continue to be integral projects in order for districts to meet requirements. HVAC and controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls) projects place second in Year 2 and Year 3, respectively, at 44 and 43 projects. These projects amount to 17 percent each of the total amount of projects completed in Year 2 and Year 3. The remaining projects such as self-generation, MBCx/RCx, Tech Assist and Other amount to 4 percent of the total.

The Workforce and Economic Development Division has an application process in order for districts to obtain funding. This is a longer process for districts, which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development Division is currently finishing Year 2 and currently working on Year 3. Year 3 results will be forthcoming in the following year's report. The funding allocated to community colleges have resulted in more than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in Year 2.

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

## IDENTIFYING ENERGY SAVINGS

As required by Proposition 39, the districts' projects must meet the energy savings requirements in order to be eligible for funding. The detailed method and procedure for determining energy savings for Prop 39 funded projects are outlined in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the California Community Colleges Prop 39 Guidelines (<http://cccutilitypartnership.com>). These procedures follow California Public Utility Commission (CPUC)-approved protocols for determining energy savings for projects. There are different protocols for project type (energy efficiency, solar PV, MBCx/RCx, etc.) and the standards for each project type are outlined in the guidelines. Energy savings are based on the difference between annual energy use under existing conditions and annual energy use under proposed conditions, and the corresponding cost of energy saved, as described in SB 73.

These annual energy savings, and the corresponding annual energy cost savings, will be used to determine the cost-effectiveness of Proposition 39 projects and for program reporting. For certain projects, the utility incentive programs measure energy savings against state energy code baselines rather than actual usage, and this will be used as the basis for the utility incentive payment. Once the proposed energy savings are calculated or determined following the process described above, a Form B and utility incentive application (if appropriate) is submitted by the district for review and approval.

Final project energy savings are determined after project installation through a Measurement & Verification process described in Section 12 of the Prop 39 Guidelines. This process for projects funded with Proposition 39 funds follow the general approach of the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol guidelines for measurement of savings and verification of project completion. The utility Measurement & Verification process for projects implemented under the incentive programs are leveraged to the fullest extent possible to avoid duplication of efforts.

## IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

The Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 program for Year 2 and Year 3 continued the momentum of Year 1. As such, there were no changes made in these two years for the Proposition 39 program.

## FUNDING STATUS

The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office requests districts to create a project list every first quarter of the calendar year. A master list of projects was created when Proposition 39 was initiated. Since then, districts have used their master list as a basis for upcoming projects. In consultation with the investor-owned utility groups and NAM, districts also have projects generated by the consultants. The Chancellor's Office also uses the systemwide database, FUSION, to generate a list of potential projects. Districts enter scheduled maintenance projects as well as capital outlay projects, which is a potential pool of Proposition 39 projects.

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

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

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

As can be seen in the figures below, the Chancellor's Office splits the Proposition 39 funding between the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit and the Workforce and Economic Development Division. The Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit garners the majority of the funding, which is used for the actual construction work done on district campuses. A portion of the allocation is set aside for the consultant for the administration of the program as well as assisting districts with the engineering work and verification of the projects.

### California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Proposition 39 Allocation

<b>Chancellor's Office Division Allocation</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>
<b>Workforce &amp; Economic Development</b>	12.8%	<b>\$4,790,000</b>	<b>\$4,950,000</b>
<b>Facilities Planning &amp; Utilization</b>	87.2%	<b>\$32,710,000</b>	<b>\$33,787,000</b>
District Allocation		\$31,595,000	\$32,672,000
Prop 39 Consulting Contract		\$1,115,000	\$1,115,000
<b>Total</b>	100%	<b>\$37,500,000</b>	<b>\$38,737,000</b>

The districts are allocated their share based upon their percentage of the total systemwide full-time equivalent student, as seen below. This methodology is in line with how the Chancellor's Office allocates the Physical Plant and Instructional Support program funding to districts.

### Proposition 39 District Allocation for 2014-15 and 2015-16 Based on FTES

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>
Allan Hancock CCD	\$267,805	\$276,091
Antelope Valley CCD	\$312,751	\$323,104
Barstow CCD	\$70,779	\$73,327
Butte-Glenn CCD	\$312,752	\$302,949
Cabrillo CCD	\$288,439	\$311,480
Cerritos CCD	\$473,761	\$509,415
Chabot-Las Positas CCD	\$459,356	\$486,956
Chaffey CCD	\$404,023	\$416,729
Citrus CCD	\$319,844	\$326,779
Coast CCD	\$919,343	\$933,341



<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>
Compton CCD	\$170,812	\$167,654
Contra Costa CCD	\$762,321	\$811,601
Copper Mountain CCD	\$41,711	\$42,396
Desert CCD	\$210,393	\$231,370
El Camino CCD	\$520,611	\$548,251
Feather River CCD	\$45,037	\$46,405
Foothill-DeAnza CCD	\$765,555	\$781,572
Gavilan CCD	\$151,093	\$152,244
Glendale CCD	\$428,411	\$442,909
Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD	\$503,413	\$520,610
Hartnell CCD	\$193,392	\$204,839
Imperial CCD	\$186,738	\$196,648
Kern CCD	\$528,394	\$536,098
Lake Tahoe CCD	\$47,790	\$49,657
Lassen CCD	\$45,861	\$49,495
Long Beach CCD	\$561,172	\$583,855
Los Angeles CCD	\$2,862,377	\$2,983,565
Los Rios CCD	\$1,415,870	\$1,492,597
Marin CCD	\$123,359	\$111,122
Mendocino-Lake CCD	\$66,104	\$85,454
Merced CCD	\$269,370	\$279,045
Mira Costa CCD	\$295,774	\$299,433
Monterey Peninsula CCD	\$187,723	\$186,049
Mt. San Antonio CCD	\$836,777	\$894,792
Mt. San Jacinto CCD	\$304,321	\$318,687
Napa Valley CCD	\$156,200	\$161,690
North Orange County CCD	\$994,456	\$1,028,932
Ohlone CCD	\$222,353	\$230,705
Palo Verde CCD	\$39,526	\$51,634
Palomar CCD	\$532,456	\$552,755
Pasadena Area CCD	\$601,546	\$645,894
Peralta CCD	\$505,306	\$557,886
Rancho Santiago CCD	\$816,070	\$831,201
Redwoods CCD	\$106,017	\$112,611
Rio Hondo CCD	\$357,353	\$358,444
Riverside CCD	\$746,762	\$792,993
San Bernardino CCD	\$408,718	\$427,006
San Diego CCD	\$1,185,998	\$1,221,937

<b>District</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>
San Francisco CCD	\$735,451	\$668,303
San Joaquin Delta CCD	\$436,104	\$450,365
San Jose-Evergreen CCD	\$363,101	\$348,332
San Luis Obispo County CCD	\$236,770	\$203,859
San Mateo County CCD	\$532,775	\$514,266
Santa Barbara CCD	\$375,689	\$408,368
Santa Clarita CCD	\$429,972	\$439,363
Santa Monica CCD	\$606,330	\$621,744
Sequoias CCD	\$253,773	\$254,914
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity CCD	\$191,094	\$199,899
Sierra CCD	\$408,908	\$420,766
Siskiyou CCD	\$66,201	\$72,055
Solano County CCD	\$239,607	\$217,869
Sonoma County CCD	\$559,137	\$533,818
South Orange County CCD	\$700,863	\$795,973
Southwestern CCD	\$424,832	\$441,393
State Center CCD	\$746,614	\$803,256
Ventura County CCD	\$717,655	\$744,032
Victor Valley CCD	\$266,714	\$259,561
West Hills CCD	\$146,572	\$145,910
West Kern CCD	\$71,597	\$72,430
West Valley-Mission CCD	\$403,502	\$412,970
Yosemite CCD	\$469,131	\$474,168
Yuba CCD	\$186,615	\$218,179
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$31,595,000</b>	<b>\$32,672,000</b>

## **RESULTS OF CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS:**

### **SUMMARY OF YEAR 2 AND 3 CLOSED-OUT AND IN-PROGRESS PROJECTS**

The California Community Colleges currently have 735 projects for Years 2 and 3 of Proposition 39 (fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16) either closed-out or in-progress at a total cost of \$165 million. These projects will generate savings of 74.6 million kilowatt-hours and more than 1.6 million gas therms resulting in \$11.2 million of energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering approximately 14,000 homes. Additionally, 905 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSITION 39 TOTAL YEAR 2 AND 3 (FY 2014-15 AND FY 2015-16) CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

- 57 Districts\*
- 254 Total closed-out projects
- \$54,922,004 Total project costs
- 29,903,272 kWh Savings
- 2,758 kW Savings
- 316,566 Therm savings
- \$4,059,269 Energy cost savings
- 300.34 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 8.34 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 624,708 Direct job hours
- 17,353 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$5,976,024 Incentives Paid
- 5,158 Homes powered

Project Type	FY 2014-15		FY 2015-16		Total	
	Count	Percentage of Year 2 Projects	Count	Percentage of Year 3 Projects	Total Count	Percentage of Total Projects
Lighting	65	64%	90	59%	155	61%
HVAC	19	19%	25	16%	44	17%
Controls (combined lighting and HVAC controls)	11	11%	32	21%	43	17%
Self-Generation	0	0%	1 <sup>1</sup>	1%	1	0%
MBCx/RCx	1	1%	2	1%	3	1%
Other energy efficiency measures	3	3%	2	1%	5	2%
Tech Assist	3	3%	0	0%	3	1%
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup>San Mateo Community College District, Canada College: Solar PV Installation Project

\*Not all districts closed-out a project for each fiscal year. This may be due to multi-year projects, scheduling conflicts, contracting issues and other interruptions that take place during project development or construction.

## COMPLETED AND CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

There are **254 completed projects** that were closed out in fiscal years 2014-15 and 2015-16. Forty community college districts closed out 102 projects in fiscal year 2014-15 and 45 districts closed out 152 projects in fiscal year 2015-16. A summary of key data points for the 254 closed-out projects is provided below, with more detail available on the attached spreadsheets. The energy projects spreadsheets section has a summary of the total project information for each district in the front, followed by a spreadsheet for each district with detailed project information.

Projects are not counted as completed and closed-out until they have been installed, verified by the investor-owned utility (or consultant if they are located in publicly-owned utility territory), and the total project costs and job hours created by the project have been reported in the project close out forms.

As of June 30, 2016, the California community colleges have 254 completed and closed-out projects at a cost of \$55 million including Proposition 39 funds, utility incentives, and any district funding required to complete the project. The projects have generated savings of 30 million kilowatt-hours and nearly 317,000 gas therms resulting in \$4 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering more than 5,000 homes. The projects also generated the equivalent of 300 one-year jobs in construction and construction related fields and eight training years in the communities served by the districts.

## PROPOSITION 39 YEAR 2 AND YEAR 3 CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- 40 Districts
- 102 Total closed-out projects
- \$24,252,823 Total project costs
- 13,653,884 kWh Savings
- 1,622 kW Savings
- 175,042 Therm savings
- \$1,877,765 Energy cost savings
- 134.64 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3.74 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 280,051 Direct job hours
- 7,779 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$3,225,294 Incentives paid
- 2,397 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- 45 Districts
- 152 Total closed-out projects
- \$30,699,181 Total project costs
- 16,249,388 kWh Savings
- 1,136 kW Savings
- 141,524 Therm savings
- \$2,181,504 Energy cost savings
- 165.70 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4.60 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 344,657 Direct job hours
- 9,574 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,750,730 Incentives paid
- 2,761 Homes powered

## **PROJECTS IN-PROGRESS**

An additional 481 projects are in progress at a total cost of \$110 million, including Proposition 39, utility incentive and district funding. These projects will result in savings of 44.7 million kilowatt-hours and 1.3 million gas therms resulting in \$7.1 million in energy cost savings. This is the equivalent of powering close to 9,000 homes. Additionally, 605 one-year jobs will be created throughout California.

### **PROPOSITION 39 PROJECTS TOTAL IN-PROGRESS (ESTIMATED) FOR FY 2014-15 AND FY 2015-16**

- 72 Districts
- 481 In-progress projects
- \$110,078,730 Current total project costs
- 44,664,397 Current kWh savings
- 10,393 Current kW savings
- 1,283,918 Current therm savings
- \$7,115,261 Current annual energy cost savings
- 605.02 Current direct job years (FTEs)
- 16.81 Current trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1,177,438 Current job hours
- 35,211 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,595,916 Current incentives
- 8,816 Current homes powered

### **COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT PROJECTS SUMMARY BY DISTRICT**

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

# PROPOSITION 39 DISTRICT PROJECTS COMPLETED/CLOSED-OUT

## Antelope Valley Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$385,457.50 Total project costs
- 205,830 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$26,757.90 Annual energy cost savings
- .21 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 267 Direct job hours
- 430.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$49,399.20 Verified incentives
- 32.52 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out project
- \$369,361.26 Total project costs
- 97,548 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$12,681.24 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .18 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 377 Direct job hours
- 102 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,411.52 Verified incentives
- 15.41 Homes powered

## Barstow Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$167,142.91 Total project costs
- 72,832 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,653.12 Annual energy cost savings
- .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 82 Direct job hours
- 82 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$17,479.68 Verified incentives
- 11.51 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out project
- \$76,456.00 Total project costs
- 8,856 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$1,151.28 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .02 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 32.75 Direct job hours
- 29.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,125.44 Verified incentives
- 1.40 Homes powered

## Butte-Glenn Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One closed-out project
- \$10,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$0.00 Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out project
- \$420,611.97 Total project costs
- 130,500 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 6,530 Verified therm savings
- \$110,930.00 Annual energy cost savings

## Butte-Glenn Community College District

---

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 0 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 0 Direct job hours</li><li>• 0 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$0.00 Verified incentives</li><li>• 0 Homes powered</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 1.43 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 2,981.50 Direct job hours</li><li>• 0 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$37,850.00 Verified incentives</li><li>• 29.57 Homes powered</li></ul> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## Cabrillo Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Five closed-out projects
- \$590,513.70 Total project costs
- 242,861 Verified kWh savings
- 30.97 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,805.76 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .57 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,194.90 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$58,286.64 Verified incentives
- 38.37 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Six closed-out projects
- \$379,365.38 Total project costs
- 349,771 Verified kWh savings
- 15.10 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$34,450.74 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .48 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,001.25 Direct job hours
- 47 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,526.40 Verified incentives
- 55.26 Homes powered

## Cerritos Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$583,435.00 Total project costs
- 235,252 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$30,582.76 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .28 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 588 Direct job hours
- 117 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$56,460.48 Verified incentives
- 37.17 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Chabot-Las Positas Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- 4 Closed-out projects
- \$1,242,646.00 Total project costs
- 1,032,042 Verified kWh savings
- 88 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$134,165.46 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .95 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,970 Direct job hours
- 296 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$97,482.24 Verified incentives
- 163.06 Homes powered

## Chaffey Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$153,183.00 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 41,796 Verified therm savings
- \$25,453.76 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .07 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 138.32 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$52,200.00 Verified incentives
- 57.26 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five closed-out projects
- \$866,522.00 Total project costs
- 227,669 Verified kWh savings
- 10.7 Verified kW savings
- 17,583 Verified therm savings
- \$43,793.46 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .45 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 927.50 Direct job hours
- 12 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$67,446.00 Verified incentives
- 60.06 Homes powered

## Citrus Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two closed-out Projects
- \$422,282.00 Total project costs
- 158,986 Verified kWh savings
- 4.97 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,668.18 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Two closed-out projects
- \$538,958.00 Total project costs
- 301,099 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$24,593.22 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)



## Citrus Community College District

---

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• .22 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 454 Direct job hours</li><li>• 36 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• 30,870.48 Verified incentives</li><li>• 25.12 Homes powered</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• .43 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 903 Direct job hours</li><li>• 0 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$66,200.16 Verified incentives</li><li>• 47.57 Homes powered</li></ul> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## Coast Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out Projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four closed-out projects
- \$1,613,996.60 Total project costs
- 799,440 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 3,400 Verified therm savings
- \$66,044.21 Annual energy cost savings
- .26 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.38 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,872 Direct job hours
- 547 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$199,459.12 Verified incentives
- 130.97 Homes powered

## Compton Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three closed-out Projects
- \$267,792.00 Total project costs
- 164,494 Verified kWh savings
- 19.23 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$21,384.22 Annual energy cost savings
- 1.81 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.64 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,406 Direct job hours
- 3,758 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$39,478.56 Verified incentives
- 25.99 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One closed-out projects
- \$200,679.00 Total project costs
- 77,571 Verified kWh savings
- 28.08 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$10,084.23 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 327 Direct job hours
- 110 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$18,617.04 Verified incentives
- 12.26 Homes powered

## Contra Costa Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out Projects
- Total project costs
- Verified kWh savings
- Verified kW savings
- Verified therm savings
- Annual energy cost savings
- Trainee job years (FTEs)
- Direct job years (FTEs)
- Direct job hours
- Apprentice direct job hours
- Verified incentives
- Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out projects
- \$12,428.00 Total project costs
- 3,678 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$308.95 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .01 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 15 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$650.00 Verified incentives
- .58 Homes powered

## Copper Mountain Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$201,930.00 Total project costs
- 111,454 Verified kWh savings
- 5.90 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$15,041.13 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 259 Direct job hours
- 29 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$22,609.68 Verified incentives
- 17.61 Homes powered

## Desert Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$734,989.00 Total project costs
- 828,891 Verified kWh savings
- 16.98 Verified kW savings
- 4,588 Verified therm savings
- \$80,103.78 Annual energy cost savings

## **Desert Community College District**

---

- |                                   |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    | • .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)     |
| • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     | • .61 Direct job years (FTEs)      |
| • N/A Direct job hours            | • 1,273 Direct job hours           |
| • N/A Apprentice direct job hours | • 209 Apprentice direct job hours  |
| • N/A Verified incentives         | • \$203,522.16 Verified incentives |
| • N/A Homes powered               | • 137.25 Homes powered             |

## **El Camino Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$441,694.28 Total project costs
- 320,901 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$45,530.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .25 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 520 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$77,016 Verified incentives
- 50.70 Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$824,012.00 Total project costs
- 94,057 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 1,587 Verified therm savings
- \$12,556.44 Annual energy cost savings
- .20 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .80 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,668.75 Direct job hours
- 420.75 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$22,214.00 Verified incentives
- 17.03 Homes powered

## **Foothill-DeAnza Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$200,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$0.00 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 0 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 0 Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$873,780 Total project costs
- 283,279 Verified kWh savings
- 49.40 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$48,157.43 Annual energy cost savings
- .38 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.10 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,282 Direct job hours
- 796.99 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$52,681.80 Verified incentives
- 44.76 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Hartnell Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$332,273.72 Total project costs
- 132,360 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$15,883.20 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .35 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 723 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$31,766.40 Verified incentives
- 20.91 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Imperial Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$320,000 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 11,389 Verified therm savings
- \$8,074.29 Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

## Imperial Community College District

---

- |                                     |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • .54 Trainee job years (FTEs)      | • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    |
| • .07 Direct job years (FTEs)       | • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     |
| • 139.92 Direct job hours           | • N/A Direct job hours            |
| • 1,119 Apprentice direct job hours | • N/A Apprentice direct job hours |
| • \$19,740 Verified incentives      | • N/A Verified incentives         |
| • 15.60 Homes powered               | • N/A Homes powered               |

## Kern Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$946,046.52 Total project costs
- 409,340 Verified kWh savings
- 37.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$51,771.5 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,374.08 Direct job hours
- 133 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$85,675.92 Verified incentives
- 64.68 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$545,268.64 Total project costs
- 277,661 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$36,095.93 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .50 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,041 Direct job hours
- 173.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$21,120.48 Verified incentives
- 43.87 Homes powered

## Lake Tahoe Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- 3 Closed out Projects
- \$76,150.92 Total project costs
- 80,234 Verified kWh savings
- 14.5 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,825.74 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 173.7 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$10,019.95 Verified incentives
- 12.68 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- 3 Closed out Projects
- \$56,787.36 Total project costs
- 22,920 Verified kWh savings
- 2 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$2,521.20 Annual energy cost savings
- .00 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 91.50 Direct job hours
- 4 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$2,965.60 Verified incentives
- 3.62 Homes powered

## Long Beach Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out project
- \$1,680,109.00 Total project costs
- 1,137,319 Verified kWh savings
- 390 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$147,851.47 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 2.04 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 4,245.20 Direct job hours
- 24 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$273,584.28 Verified incentives
- 179.70 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Marin Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$133,985.00 Total project costs
- 142,757 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 64,697 Verified therm savings
- \$68,888.44 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 62.25 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$98,958.68 Verified incentives
- 111.19 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$91,500.00 Total project costs
- 0 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 3,717 Verified therm savings
- \$2,973.60 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .02 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 43 Direct job hours
- 12 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 5.09 Homes powered

## Mendocino-Lake Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Eight Closed-out projects
- \$191,815.16 Total project costs
- 172,201 Verified kWh savings
- 7.03 Verified kW savings
- 1,521 Verified therm savings
- \$23,312.75 Annual energy cost savings

## **Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

---

- |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    | • 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)      |
| • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     | • .26 Direct job years (FTEs)     |
| • N/A Direct job hours            | • 534 Direct job hours            |
| • N/A Apprentice direct job hours | • 0 Apprentice direct job hours   |
| • N/A Verified incentives         | • \$18,941.64 Verified incentives |
| • N/A Homes powered               | • 29.29 Homes powered             |

## **Mt. San Antonio Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- One Closed-out project
- \$2,712,774.00 Total project costs
- 801,941 Verified kWh savings
- 75 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$104,252.33 Annual energy cost savings
- .46 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .97 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,013.50 Direct job hours
- 955 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$192,465.84 Verified incentives
- 126.71 Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## **Mt. San Jacinto Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$286,474.07 Total project costs
- 109,468 Verified kWh savings
- 35.65 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$14,230.84 Annual energy cost savings
- .01 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .08 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 170 Direct job hours
- 16 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,469.68 Verified incentives
- 17.30 Homes powered

## **Napa Valley Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$352,754.00 Total project costs
- 322,469 Verified kWh savings
- 10.2 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$44,144.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .07 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 374.50 Direct job hours
- 144 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$63,264.72 Verified incentives
- 50.95 Homes powered

## **North Orange County Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$1,268,878.76 Total project costs
- 1,338,247 Verified kWh savings
- 482.78 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$173,972.11 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.30 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,709.50 Direct job hours
- 297 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$321,179.28 Verified incentives
- 211.44 Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$2,608,353.13 Total project costs
- 781,972 Verified kWh savings
- 137.30 Verified kW savings
- 19,836 Verified therm savings
- \$148,005.32 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.44 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,001 Direct job hours
- 127 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$142,559.84 Verified incentives
- 150.73 Homes powered

## **Ohlone Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$360,069.50 Total project costs
- 144,410 Verified kWh savings
- 17.60 Verified kW savings
- Verified therm savings
- \$16,952.40 Annual energy cost savings

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$248,520.46 Total project costs
- 184,422 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$19,302.62 Annual energy cost savings



## Ohlone Community College District

---

- |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)       | • .04 Trainee job years (FTEs)      |
| • .13 Direct job years (FTEs)        | • .11 Direct job years (FTEs)       |
| • 278 Direct job hours               | • 220.50 Direct job hours           |
| • 101.50 Apprentice direct job hours | • 86.50 Apprentice direct job hours |
| • \$32,923.56 Verified incentives    | • \$43,695.60 Verified incentives   |
| • 22.17 Homes powered                | • 29.14 Homes powered               |

## Palo Verde Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$101,920 Total project costs
- 99,517 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$12,937.21 Annual energy cost savings
- .05 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .01 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 13.75 Direct job hours
- 110 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,884.08 Verified incentives
- 15.72 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out Project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Pasadena Area Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$1,798,222.48 Total project costs
- 683,989 Verified kWh savings
- 52.96 Verified kW savings
- 5,374 Verified therm savings
- \$106,360.15 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.37 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,851 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$109,701.24 Verified incentives
- 115.43 Homes powered

## **Peralta Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$647,618.00 Total project costs
- 663,960 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$86,132.11 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .83 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,717.50 Direct job hours
- 175 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$157,928.92 Verified incentives
- 104.91 Homes powered

## **Rancho Santiago Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,575,833.22 Total project costs
- 1,345,065 Verified kWh savings
- 209.42 Verified kW savings
- 20,686 Verified therm savings
- \$187,270.05 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .89 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,843.31 Direct job hours
- 162 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$321,066.88 Verified incentives
- 240.86 Homes powered

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,031,176.00 Total project costs
- 911,897 Verified kWh savings
- 255.80 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$157,056.12 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.55 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,226 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$216,820.56 Verified incentives
- 144.08 Homes powered

## **Rio Hondo Community College District**

---

### **Year 2 (FY 2014-15)**

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

### **Year 3 (FY 2015-16)**

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$775,714.74 Total project costs
- 859,422 Verified kWh savings
- 89.91 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$111,724.86 Annual energy cost savings

## Rio Hondo Community College District

---

- |                                   |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    | • .11 Trainee job years (FTEs)     |
| • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     | • .30 Direct job years (FTEs)      |
| • N/A Direct job hours            | • 629 Direct job hours             |
| • N/A Apprentice direct job hours | • 230 Apprentice direct job hours  |
| • N/A Verified incentives         | • \$191,233.73 Verified incentives |
| • N/A Homes powered               | • 135.79 Homes powered             |

## Riverside Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$98,043.00 Total project costs
- 258,465 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,600.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .03 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 72 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$15,508.00 Verified incentives
- 40.84 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$796,048.00 Total project costs
- 512,442 Verified kWh savings
- 29.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$54,118.49 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 898.50 Direct job hours
- 288.25 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$65,246.00 Verified incentives
- 80.97 Homes powered

## San Bernardino Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$568,699.00 Total project costs
- 605,928 Verified kWh savings
- 1 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$78,770.64 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .43 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 890.50 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$145,422.72 Verified incentives
- 95.74 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## San Joaquin Delta Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$848,463.77 Total project costs
- 569,928 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$48,443.88 Annual energy cost savings
- .46 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .46 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 953.50 Direct job hours
- 951 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$136,783.00 Verified incentives
- 90.05 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out Project
- \$305,966.00 Total project costs
- 98,561 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,377.69 Annual energy cost savings
- .19 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .27 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 564 Direct job hours
- 403 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$23,564.64 Verified incentives
- 15.57 Homes powered

## San Jose/Evergreen Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$714,152.00 Total project costs
- 369,765 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$33,597.67 Annual energy cost savings
- .14 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .26 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 535 Direct job hours
- 300 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$71,203.20 Verified incentives
- 58.42 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$403,198.00 Total project costs
- 96,680 Verified kWh savings
- 25.04 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$14,527.99 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .33 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 688 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$7,134.00 Verified incentives
- 15.28 Homes powered

## San Luis Obispo County Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$315,315.00 Total project costs
- 126,996 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$377,823.40 Total project costs
- 212,660 Verified kWh savings
- 34 Verified kW savings
- -834 Verified therm savings

## San Luis Obispo County Community College District

---

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$15,239.52 Annual energy cost savings</li><li>• 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• .08 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 161 Direct job hours</li><li>• 0 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$30,479.04 Verified incentives</li><li>• 20.07 Homes powered</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$28,623.20 Annual energy cost savings</li><li>• .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• .41 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 845 Direct job hours</li><li>• 169 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$42,455.04 Verified incentives</li><li>• 32.46 Homes powered</li></ul> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## San Mateo County Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out Project
- \$5,264,392.58 Total project costs
- 2,163,305 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$249,981.51 Annual energy cost savings
- 2.03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 19.09 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 6,002.65 Direct job hours
- 4,224.87 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,000.74 Verified incentives
- 341.80 Homes powered

## Santa Barbara Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$556,058.00 Total project costs
- 284,810 Verified kWh savings
- 75.41 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$37,025.30 Annual energy cost savings
- .17 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .23 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 470 Direct job hours
- 354.99 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$68,354.40 Verified incentives
- 45 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$459,740.00 Total project costs
- 241,970 Verified kWh savings
- 62 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$31,456.10 Annual energy cost savings
- .06 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .49 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,015 Direct job hours
- 13 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$47,444.40 Verified incentives
- 38.23 Homes powered

## Santa Clarita Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$1,058,909.64 Total project costs
- 415,197 Verified kWh savings
- 40.60 Verified kW savings
- 24,411 Verified therm savings
- \$72,693.45 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 3.59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 7,464.75 Direct job hours
- 60.75 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$116,706.08 Verified incentives
- 99.04 Homes powered

## Santa Monica Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$888,573.00 Total project costs
- 347,099 Verified kWh savings
- 16 Verified kW savings
- 6,014 Verified therm savings
- \$49,332.67 Annual energy cost savings
- .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .29 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 604.50 Direct job hours
- 209 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$83,941.68 Verified incentives
- 63.08 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## Sequoias Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$324,991.08 Total project costs
- 157,310 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 24,900 Verified therm savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out projects
- \$289,859.25 Total project costs
- 97,431 Verified kWh savings
- .44 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings

## Sequoias Community College District

---

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$40,370.30 Annual energy cost savings</li><li>• .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• .04 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 73 Direct job hours</li><li>• 60 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$47,954.43 Verified incentives</li><li>• 58.97 Homes powered</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$12,666.03 Annual energy cost savings</li><li>• .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)</li><li>• .15 Direct job years (FTEs)</li><li>• 312 Direct job hours</li><li>• 156 Apprentice direct job hours</li><li>• \$23,383.44 Verified incentives</li><li>• 15.39 Homes powered</li></ul> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$277,000.00 Total project costs
- 110,400 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,040.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .09 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 179 Direct job hours
- 163 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$25,963.20 Verified incentives
- 17.44 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$59,709.00 Total project costs
- 83,394 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$8,339.40 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 100 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 13.18 Homes powered

## Sierra Joint Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$847,236.21 Total project costs
- 576,335 Verified kWh savings
- 103.80 Verified kW savings
- 3,810 Verified therm savings
- \$72,208.20 Annual energy cost savings
- .27 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .81 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,685.25 Direct job hours
- 552.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$120,714.30 Verified incentives
- 96.28 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$173,462.31 Total project costs
- 78,258 Verified kWh savings
- 37.5 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$11,034.38 Annual energy cost savings
- .13 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .12 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 254 Direct job hours
- 271 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$16,920.72 Verified incentives
- 12.36 Homes powered

## Siskiyou Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out project
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$175,004.00 Total project costs
- 228,724 Verified kWh savings
- .8 Verified kW savings
- 4,994 Verified therm savings
- \$41,235.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 276.25 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$37,417.00 Verified incentives
- 42.98 Homes powered

## Solano Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$547,949.00 Total project costs
- 614,355 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$67,506.38 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .59 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,218 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$146,538.24 Verified incentives
- 97.07 Homes powered

## Sonoma County Junior College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$427,811.00 Total project costs
- 559,213 Verified kWh savings
- 53.46 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$76,571.61 Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings



## Sonoma County Junior College District

---

- |                                    |                                   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • .08 Trainee job years (FTEs)     | • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    |
| • .49 Direct job years (FTEs)      | • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     |
| • 1,019 Direct job hours           | • N/A Direct job hours            |
| • 160 Apprentice direct job hours  | • N/A Apprentice direct job hours |
| • \$134,211.12 Verified incentives | • N/A Verified incentives         |
| • 88.36 Homes powered              | • N/A Homes powered               |

## South Orange County Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Two Closed-out projects
- \$1,465,875.50 Total project costs
- 536,775 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$69,780.75 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.38 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,873 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$128,826.00 Verified incentives
- 84.81 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

## State Center Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Six Closed-out projects
- \$1,154,926.09 Total project costs
- 558,854 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$83,828.10 Annual energy cost savings
- .31 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,350.92 Direct job hours
- 634.90 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$103,000.80 Verified incentives
- 88.30 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$401,149.40 Total project costs
- 181,791 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$17,171.59 Annual energy cost savings
- .11 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 278 Direct job hours
- 238 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$9,000 Verified incentives
- 28.72 Homes powered

## Ventura County Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$863,300.00 Total project costs
- 758,015 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$98,541.95 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .28 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 576 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$181,923.60 Verified incentives
- 119.77 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$1,196,394.00 Total project costs
- 650,876 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$50,768.33 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .53 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 1,105 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$142,613.28 Verified incentives
- 102.84 Homes powered

## Victor Valley Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$287,374.47 Total project costs
- 143,950 Verified kWh savings
- 10.70 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,153.00 Annual energy cost savings
- .10 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .20 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 412 Direct job hours
- 201 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$30,006.72 Verified incentives
- 22.74 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- One Closed-out project
- \$268,161.00 Total project costs
- 119,950 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 15,167 Verified therm savings
- \$23,811.40 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .34 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 711 Direct job hours
- 58 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$28,788.00 Verified incentives
- 39.73 Homes powered

## West Hills Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Two Closed-out Projects
- \$254,191.00 Total project costs
- 226,751 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$20,407.59 Annual energy cost savings

## West Hills Community College District

---

- |                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)    | • 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)      |
| • N/A Direct job years (FTEs)     | • .16 Direct job years (FTEs)     |
| • N/A Direct job hours            | • 341 Direct job hours            |
| • N/A Apprentice direct job hours | • 0 Apprentice direct job hours   |
| • N/A Verified incentives         | • \$54,040.32 Verified incentives |
| • N/A Homes powered               | • 35.83 Homes powered             |

## West Kern Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- N/A Closed-out projects
- N/A Total project costs
- N/A Verified kWh savings
- N/A Verified kW savings
- N/A Verified therm savings
- N/A Annual energy cost savings
- N/A Trainee job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job years (FTEs)
- N/A Direct job hours
- N/A Apprentice direct job hours
- N/A Verified incentives
- N/A Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Five Closed-out projects
- \$207,966.50 Total project costs
- 149,343 Verified kWh savings
- 0 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$18,907.53 Annual energy cost savings
- .03 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .15 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 312.49 Direct job hours
- 70 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$29,249.26 Verified incentives
- 23.60 Homes powered

## West Valley-Mission Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$772,036.52 Total project costs
- 224,868 Verified kWh savings
- 8 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$29,300.30 Annual energy cost savings
- .35 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.47 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 3,061.34 Direct job hours
- 724.15 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$27,798.00 Verified incentives
- 35.53 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$575,280.00 Total project costs
- 136,536 Verified kWh savings
- 43.80 Verified kW savings
- 24,524 Verified therm savings
- \$40,057.06 Annual energy cost savings
- .02 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .14 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 281 Direct job hours
- 39.50 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 55.17 Homes powered

## Yosemite Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- One Closed-out project
- \$92,140.00 Total project costs
- 43,865 Verified kWh savings
- 10.52 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$5,702.45 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .13 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 260 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$0.00 Verified incentives
- 6.93 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- Four Closed-out projects
- \$983,199.00 Total project costs
- 581,965 Verified kWh savings
- 66.50 Verified kW savings
- 0 Verified therm savings
- \$70,286.83 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.33 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,758 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$48,848.00 Verified incentives
- 91.95 Homes powered

## Yuba Community College District

---

### Year 2 (FY 2014-15)

- Three Closed-out projects
- \$146,507.00 Total project costs
- 105,683 Verified kWh savings
- 11.60 Verified kW savings
- 2,221 Verified therm savings
- \$13,585.97 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- .16 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 336 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$28,065.88 Verified incentives
- 19.74 Homes powered

### Year 3 (FY 2015-16)

- 12 Closed-out projects
- \$784,620.00 Total project costs
- 306,242 Verified kWh savings
- 37.80 Verified kW savings
- 9,126 Verified therm savings
- \$41,769.81 Annual energy cost savings
- 0 Trainee job years (FTEs)
- 1.05 Direct job years (FTEs)
- 2,174 Direct job hours
- 0 Apprentice direct job hours
- \$80,475.03 Verified incentives
- 60.89 Homes powered

# District Energy Usage Data Summary

# ENERGY USAGE DATA SUMMARY

The following data is submitted and self-certified by the districts on a fiscal year basis. At a glimpse, by comparing the 2014-15 energy usage data with the 2012-13 baseline data the system-wide energy usage has been reduced by 7.63 percent. A total of 40 districts have reduced their energy usage on campus while 14 districts have increased their usage as compared to the energy usage baseline data. A total of 18 districts have not reported their baseline energy usage or reported their 2014-15 energy usage data so we are unable to calculate the change at their district.

Currently, districts are submitting their fiscal year 2015-16 energy usage data. Therefore, we currently do not have fiscal year 2015-16 progress data to compare against the base year. For further detail and information, please see the attached spreadsheet showing the energy usage data summary and per district.

## SYSTEM-WIDE ENERGY USAGE DATA

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,624
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,500
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -7.63 percent

## ENERGY USAGE PER DISTRICT

### Allan Hancock Joint Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,673
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### Antelope Valley Community College District

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,516
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1754
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 15.66 percent

### **Barstow Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (Baseline Year) Average British thermal units per GSF per week: 1,581
- Fiscal year 2014-15 Average British thermal units per GSF per week: 1,486
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 56.85 percent

### **Butte - Glenn Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,119
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,062
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.03 percent

### **Cabrillo**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,789
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,356
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -54.21 percent

### **Cerritos Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,855
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,553
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.29 percent

### **Chabot-Las Positas Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,134
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,921
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.98 percent

### **Chaffey Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,696
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,290
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -52.14 percent

### **Citrus Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,752
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,416
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -19.16 percent

### **Coast Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,459
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,463
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .3 percent

### **Compton Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 753
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 678
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.02 percent

### **Contra Costa Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,784
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,627
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -8.81 percent



### **Copper Mountain Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,943
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Desert Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,825
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,166
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -36.13 percent

### **El Camino Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,553
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Feather River Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 994
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 985
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -.88 percent

### **Foothill-De Anza Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,921
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,773
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.77 percent

### **Gavilan Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,660
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,285
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.10 percent

### **Glendale Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,352
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,365
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 1.03 percent

### **Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,187
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 963
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.83 percent

### **Hartnell Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,837
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Imperial Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 963
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 822
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.62 percent

### **Kern CCD**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,169
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,253
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 7.17 percent

### **Lake Tahoe Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,621
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Lassen Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,144
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,055
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.17 percent

### **Long Beach Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,218
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Los Angeles Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,084
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 739
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -31.83 percent

### **Los Rios Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,811
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Marin Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,749
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Mendocino-Lake Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 975
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -21.69 percent

### **Merced Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,420
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,327
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -37.48 percent

### **Mira Costa Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,731
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,757
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 2.57 percent

### **Monterey Peninsula Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Mt. San Antonio Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,950
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,190
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 12.31 percent

### **Mt. San Jacinto Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,694
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,512
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.74 percent

### **Napa Valley Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,549
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.48 percent

### **North Orange County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,889
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Ohlone Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,391
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Palo Verde Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,036
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,354
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 30.80 percent

### **Palomar Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 774
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 592
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -23.51 percent

### **Pasadena Area Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 867
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Peralta Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average per gross square foot per week: 2,997
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,754
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -41.49 percent

### **Rancho Santiago Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,848
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,319
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -28.64 percent

### **Redwoods Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,832
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Rio Hondo Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,444
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,642
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.67 percent

### **Riverside Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,603
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,570
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -2.05 percent

### **San Bernardino Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,738
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,068
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -38.54 percent

### **San Diego Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 653
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 740
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 13.26 percent

### **San Francisco Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,615
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **San Joaquin Delta Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,658
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,566
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.55 percent

### **San Jose-Evergreen Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) Average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,371
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: .02 percent

### **San Luis Obispo County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,698
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,459
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -14.11 percent



### **San Mateo County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,214
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,874
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.36 percent

### **Santa Barbara Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,308
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,070
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -18.15 percent

### **Santa Clarita Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,099
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,050
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -4.46 percent

### **Santa Monica Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average BTUs per gross square foot per week: 1,245
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,101
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -11.60 percent

### **Sequoias Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,046
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,075
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 2.76 percent

### **Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,057
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,394
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -32.22 percent

### **Sierra Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,250
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,166
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -6.72 percent

### **Siskiyou Joint Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,513
- Fiscal 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,751
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -30.32 percent

### **Solano County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,442
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,138
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -12.43 percent

### **Sonoma County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,206
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,354
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 12.33 percent

### **South Orange County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,800
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,638
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -5.77 percent

### **Southwestern Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,566
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,309
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -16.41 percent

### **State Center Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,339
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,207
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -9.88 percent

### **Ventura County Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,041
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 875
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -15.95 percent

### **Victor Valley Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,400
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,763
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: 25.91 percent

### **West Hills Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,505
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **West Kern Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 907
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **West Valley-Mission Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 1,709
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

### **Yosemite Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 3,117
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 2,800
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: -10.18 percent

### **Yuba Community College District**

- Fiscal year 2012-13 (baseline year) average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: 978
- Fiscal year 2014-15 average British thermal units per gross square foot per week: N/A
- Percent reduction/gain of baseline year: N/A

# Workforce and Economic Development Summary

# WORKFORCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Unlike the Facilities Planning and Utilization Unit of the Chancellor's Office, the Workforce and Economic Development Division is authorized to annually allocate Proposition 39 funds to the Clean Energy Workforce Program Grant as well as job training and workforce development projects.

The Proposition 39 Clean Energy Workforce Program supports the following objectives for building the energy efficiency workforce:

- Targeting workforce-related incentive funds towards priority and emergent sectors important to California's regional economies.
- Staffing key talent roles that serve as first contacts for industry and our system, including sector navigators and regional consortia chairs. These roles facilitate in-region and multi-region coordination of training activities.
- Mobilizing community college training capacity by scoping grantees to collaborate with in-region colleges active in the sector.
- Applying common metrics and accountability measures on outcomes that drive student success and meet industry's need for skilled workers.
- Providing technical assistance and flexible mini-grants to support faculty coming together to update curriculum for industry needs.
- Build and sustain regional networks of colleges to prepare workforce for the energy sector to improve energy efficiency and expand clean energy generation in the built environment.
- Leverage assets at multiple colleges across a region to align and regionalize energy efficiency related curriculum.
- Assure compliance to codes and standards by upgrading workforce capacity, knowledge and skills over the life of the Proposition 39 (SB 73) funding stream.
- Develop sustainable partnerships and methods that link carbon reduction policy and economic development goals to industry needs and education and training programs.
- Elevate the quality of instruction at colleges that have made investments in education and training in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sector.
- Incentivize (through instructor stipends, etc.) regional cooperation, including curriculum alignment; increased access to certificates, degrees and state-certified apprenticeship programs; increased access to employment; and faculty professional development.
- Build career pathways that assure student success by connecting student learning outcomes directly to employment opportunities.
- Enroll all energy related pathway students in EDD's CalJOBS system and collect outcomes data via the Launchboard.
- Prepare the energy efficiency workforce to participate in the construction, repair and maintenance of commercial, industrial, and institutional buildings as required to meet AB 32 requirements.

- Coordinate efforts with the community college sector navigator and deputy sector navigators in the Energy Efficiency & Utilities Sector.

This is a longer application process for districts which results in a longer program cycle overall, thus the Workforce and Economic Development is currently finishing Year 2 and currently working on Year 3. Year 3 results will be forthcoming in the following year's report.

## REPORT ON YEAR 2 PROPOSITION 39 FUNDS

### Background

Total Year 2 Proposition 39 funds for California Community was \$37,500,000. From the community colleges' Proposition 39 funds, 12.8 percent or \$4,790,000 of the total was allocated for workforce development.

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

### Investments

The grants were designed to better prepare students and incumbent workers to meet California's energy efficiency and renewable energy mandates set by AB 32 and updated by SB 350 (Ch. 547, Stats 2015). Investments were made in the following education and training programs:

Architecture and Architectural Technology	\$51,338
Electronics and Electric Technology	\$149,870
Electro-Mechanical Technology	\$73,292
Industrial Systems Technology and Maintenance	\$115,162
Environmental Control Technology	\$1,521,608
Construction Crafts Technology	\$280,932
Drafting Technology	\$101,128
Manufacturing and Industrial Technology	\$229,360
Civil and Construction Management Technology	\$177,406
Water and Wastewater Technology	\$105,662
Other	\$63,272
	<b>\$2,869,031</b>

Proposition 39 workforce funding is planned for Years 4 and 5 at the same 12.8 percent allocation as prior years. These funds will leverage regional strong workforce investments in developing a statewide program that maps directly to the “qualified and fully engaged workforce” required by the California Long-range Energy Efficiency Strategic Plan to achieve mandates set by AB 32. Analysis is underway to determine new workforce requirements for meeting the SB 350 mandates, which will be reflected in plans for Year 4 and 5 investments.

## **Grant Performance**

### **Year 1**

The Chancellor’s Office, consistent with the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) definitions for post-college employment and earnings, calculates results for all course completers, regardless of completion status. This means that the Chancellor’s Office must wait a full year to ensure that students do not re-enroll in additional coursework. Colleges are given three months to turn in their end of year numbers; student data is not available until 15 months after the end of the school year. At that point, Workforce and Economic Development sends a file of students meeting the course completer definition to the Employment Development Department, which matches the file against their state wage file, and returns the value to us. The information is then imported into the Cal-PASS Plus data system in order to build the LaunchBoard tables, where information can be sorted for factors like graduating from a Proposition 39 program. Historically, the match with the wage files was only done once a year.

The Chancellor’s Office spent most of last year negotiating with Employment Development Department for more frequent data matches, which resulted in delays in getting the annual match done. Workforce and Economic Development Division has not yet received the file that would include students who graduated in fiscal year 2014-15, but anticipate having the information by the end of February 2017. Given the size of Workforce and Economic Development’s data system, it takes three months to rebuild the data cubes and test the data to ensure that reload did not break any of the data fields. Workforce and Economic Development Division anticipate being able to provide more current information by the end of May.

Workforce and Economic Development Division calculated these figures by counting all students in the 113 California community colleges who earned awards that are coded in the subject areas that align with the Proposition 39 program. However, the Chancellor’s Office is unable to discern whether Proposition 39 funding were used for these programs.



## Employment and Earnings Outcomes

For students who graduated in 2013-14 (most recent available year)

	Number of Graduates Who Attained the Metric	Total Number of Graduates	Percentage
Employed Two Fiscal Quarters After Exit	3277	4749	69%
Employed Four Fiscal Quarters After Exit	3277	4749	69%
Median Annual Post-College Earnings	4749	4749	\$36,757
Median Increase in Earnings*	1757	4749	37%
Employed in Job Closely Related to Major**	293	358	82%

\* This metric could only be calculated for students with wage data both before and after attending community college

\*\* This metric is based on survey data, so only some of the total graduates are included in the figure, based on who replied to the survey

### Year 2

More than 5,000 students completed degrees, certificates or industry certifications in year two. Completions were distributed as follows:

**772** AA/AS Degrees

**800** Certificates (6-8 units)

**1,247** Certificates (>18 units)

**2,590** Industry/Apprenticeship Certifications

### **Program Improvement initiatives funded in Year 2 included \$1,920,969**

- Launched statewide Expert Networks as professional learning communities for faculty in HVAC, Advanced Lighting Controls, Building Science, and Energy Analytics and Auditing, attended by 40 faculty statewide.
- Engaged several thousand high school students and more than 200 career counselors in energy efficiency and renewable energy career awareness sessions.
- Developed a set of Zero Net energy career pathways at College of the Desert, organized into 13 certificate programs.
- Launched a new HVAC certificate program at West Hills Coalinga College.
- Certified seven new instructors as National Construction Crafts Education and Research instructors.
- Butte College hosted a four-day welding education event with participation from 53 high schools.

- Completed research into attracting likely completers into HVAC programs in collaboration with UC Davis and RP Group.
- Developed an online Interactive Decision Tree to guide students into energy efficiency careers.
- Launched a website that connects potential students with energy efficiency programs at Bay Area colleges.

**Proposition 39 Regions:**

**North/Far North** (Butte, Cosumnes River, American River, Mendocino, Sacramento City, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 533
- Award: \$415,814
- Equipment: \$365,520
- Program Improvement: \$50,294

**Bay Area** (Cabrillo, Diablo Valley, Foothill, Laney\*, Las Positas, San Jose City, San Mateo, Santa Rosa, Skyline):

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 725
- Award: \$300,000
- Equipment: \$50,830
- Program Improvement: \$249,170

**Central/Mother Lode/Coast** (Allan Hancock, Antelope Valley, Bakersfield\*, Canyons, Cerro Coso, Columbia\*\*, Cuesta, Fresno City\*\*, Merced, Modesto Junior\*\*, Moorpark\*\*, Oxnard, Porterville, Reedley\*\*, San Joaquin Delta, Santa Barbara, Sequoias, Taft, West Hills Coalinga\*\*)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 1,055
- Award: \$355,135
- Equipment: \$190,969
- Program Improvement: \$164,166

**Los Angeles/Orange County** (East Los Angeles, El Camino\*, Glendale Community, Los Angeles Trade-Technical, Los Angeles Valley, Mt. San Antonio, Rio Hondo, Santa Monica, Santiago Canyon)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 2,133
- Award: \$1,531,174
- Equipment: \$147,160
- Program Improvement: \$1,384,014

**San Diego/Imperial/Desert** (Barstow, Chaffey, Desert, Imperial Valley, MiraCosta\*, Norco, Palo Verde, Palomar\*, Riverside City, San Bernardino Valley, San Diego City, Victor Valley)

- Approved Certificates/Degrees Earned in Energy Efficiency Courses: 963
- Award: \$266,908
- Equipment: \$201,421
- Program Improvement: \$65,487

# Appendices

(click to download)

[Prop 39 Year 2 Closed-Out Data](#)

[Prop 39 Year 3 Closed-Out Data](#)

[Prop 39 Year 2 and Year 3 In-Progress Data](#)

[Energy Usage Data](#)

Front cover photos: American River College students and instructors work on various solar energy projects.

Photo at right: Students study a solar panel at City College of San Francisco.

Back cover photos: (left to right) College of the Desert students receive instruction on installing a solar panel; Contra Costa College students work on a clean energy project.



Connect  
with us!

## WEBSITES

### California Community Colleges

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

### Student Success Scorecard

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

### Salary Surfer

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

### Associate Degree for Transfer

[adgreewithaguarantee.com](http://adgreewithaguarantee.com)

### Priority Registration

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

### Workforce & Economic Development

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

### Financial Aid

[icanaffordcollege.com](http://icanaffordcollege.com)

## SOCIAL MEDIA



### California Community Colleges Facebook Page

[facebook.com/CACommColleges](http://facebook.com/CACommColleges)

### Financial Aid Facebook Page

[facebook.com/icanaffordcollege](http://facebook.com/icanaffordcollege)



### California Community Colleges Twitter Feed

[twitter.com/CalCommColleges](http://twitter.com/CalCommColleges)

### Chancellor Eloy Oakley Twitter Feed

[twitter.com/EloyOakley](http://twitter.com/EloyOakley)

### Workforce & Economic Development Twitter Feed

[twitter.com/WorkforceVan](http://twitter.com/WorkforceVan)

### Financial Aid Twitter Feed

[twitter.com/ICanAfrdCollege](http://twitter.com/ICanAfrdCollege)



### California Community Colleges YouTube Page

[youtube.com/CACommunityColleges](http://youtube.com/CACommunityColleges)

### Financial Aid YouTube Page

[youtube.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE](http://youtube.com/ICANAFRDCOLLEGE)



### California Community Colleges Instagram Page

[instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges](http://instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges)

### Financial Aid Instagram Page

[instagram.com/icanaffordcollege](http://instagram.com/icanaffordcollege)



California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office  
1102 Q Street | Suite 4400 | Sacramento, CA 95811  
[CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu](http://CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu)