



2026-27 REPORT

Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan

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



California
Community
Colleges

SONYA CHRISTIAN
Chancellor

October 20, 2025

Secretary of the Senate
Erika Contreras
State Capitol, Room 305
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (Five-Year Plan)

Dear Secretary Contreras,

Pursuant to California Education Code sections 67501 and 67503, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors for California Community Colleges are pleased to release the 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (Five-Year Plan). This report identifies the statewide facilities needs and priorities of the California Community Colleges system.

The 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan reflects our continued commitment to providing safe, modern, and sustainable educational facilities that support student success. The plan identifies approximately \$28.6 billion in facility needs during the five-year period and an additional \$4 billion deferred to future years, representing a total unmet need of \$32.6 billion. As the largest higher education system in the nation, California's community colleges require proper facilities to ensure equitable access, deliver high-quality instruction, and support enrollment growth, modernization of aging infrastructure, and sustainability goals. These investments are essential to advancing Vision 2030 and the multi-year roadmap between the Newsom Administration and the California Community Colleges, ensuring our campuses remain resilient, future-ready, and aligned with the needs of students and communities across the state.

For any questions regarding this report, please contact Christopher Ferguson, Executive Vice Chancellor of Finance and Strategic Initiatives, at chris.ferguson@cccco.edu.

Sincerely,

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

Sonya Christian, Chancellor

Enclosure: Report

CC:
Sue Parker, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Office of Legislative Counsel
Department of Finance

Chancellor's Office

1102 Q Street, Sacramento, CA 95811 | 916.445.8752 | www.cccco.edu

2026-27 FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN

Prepared By

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

College Finance and Facilities Planning Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
2026-27 FIVE YEAR PLAN SUMMARY	1
Total Facilities Needs and Costs	1
Areas of Understatement	3
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN	3
Plan Constraints	4
ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATEWIDE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM.	4
Review and Approval of District Projects	4
OTHER BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE CAPITAL OUTLAY RESPONSIBILITIES	7
Voluntary Local Contributions.	7
ENROLLMENT AND FACILITIES NEEDS	7
ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS	7
NET ENROLLMENT NEED.	8
ENROLLMENT PROJECTION MODEL	8
TRANSLATING ENROLLMENT NEED INTO CAPITAL OUTLAY FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS	9
Other Space	9
INVENTORY AMOUNT AND TYPE OF EXISTING SPACE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.	10
CURRENT CAPACITY.	10
EXCESS CAPACITY	11
MODERNIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES	11
Systemwide Facilities Needs	11
Cost Estimates	12

Critical Life Safety Renovations	14
Modernization/Renovation	14
Replace Temporary Facilities	14
ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DELIVERY AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION.	15
Alternative Methods of Instruction	15
NEW FACILITIES FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH	15
TOTAL UNMET NEEDS AND COSTS	16
FACILITIES TO MEET UNMET NEED	16
FACILITIES PROPOSED IN FIVE-YEAR PLAN	16
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	16
Modernization.	16
DEFERRED COSTS OF SYSTEM NEEDS	17
Out-year Costs	17
Need Carryover	17
CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ADDRESSING IDENTIFIED NEEDS.	17
VISION 2030	17
ENROLLMENT PRESSURES	17
SUSTAINABILITY	18
California Community Colleges Goals for Addressing Climate Change and Furthering Environmental Sustainability	18
STUDENT HOUSING.	21
ALIGNMENT TO PREVIOUS PLAN	22
SUMMARY OF TOTAL COST DIFFERENCE	22
CHANGES TO PLAN YEARS 2025-26 AND 2026-27	23
2025-26 Plan.	23
2026-27 Plan.	23

CONCLUSION	23
APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTIONS 13100-13102	25
APPENDIX B: CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE, SECTIONS 67500-67503	27
APPENDIX C: 2026-27 SPENDING PLAN	29
APPENDIX D: METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES	31
APPENDIX E: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CAPITAL OUTLAY GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS	33
PROPOSED PRIORITY-FUNDING CATEGORY SCORING METRICS	33
BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRIORITY FUNDING CATEGORIES	34
CATEGORY A – LIFE AND SAFETY PROJECTS	34
CATEGORY M – MODERNIZATION PROJECTS.	36
CATEGORY G– GROWTH	37
LOCAL CONTRIBUTION/HARDSHIP METRIC	38
FUNDING ALLOCATION BETWEEN CATEGORIES.	39
DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLANS	39
DISTRICT MASTER PLANS	40
EDUCATION MASTER PLANS.	40
FACILITIES MASTER PLANS	40
INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS	42
SCOPE APPROVAL	43
ANNUAL CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN	43
PROJECT PHASING	43
READY ACCESS PROJECTS	43
DESIGN-BUILD PROJECTS	43
ANNUAL “ZERO-BASED” BUDGETING METHOD	44

APPEALS PROCESS	44
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE/LEGISLATIVE PROCESS	44
APPENDIX F: ENROLLMENT AND WSCH PROJECTIONS BY DISTRICTS.	45

INTRODUCTION

The California Community Colleges is the largest postsecondary educational system in the United States, serving 2.1 million students annually. California community college students represent roughly 20% of the nation's community college students and more than 70% of California's public postsecondary undergraduate students.

The California Community Colleges consists of 73 community college districts encompassing 116 colleges, 82 approved off-campus centers and 24 separately reported district offices. The system's assets include more than 25,000 acres of land, 6,000 buildings and 87 million gross square feet, which includes approximately 56 million assignable square feet of space. In addition, the system has many off-campus outreach centers at various locations.

Annually, the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (Chancellor's Office) calculates enrollment projections and provides this data to districts for utilization in the districts' five-year construction plans. The estimated 2026-27 fall enrollment of 1.31 million students guides this Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan. This is based on a combination of variables including student participation rates, current enrollment, weekly student contact hours to enrollment ratios, and population projections. The Chancellor's Office expects enrollment to grow to an estimated 1.32 million students in 2030-31, an increase of approximately 10,848 students (see Appendix F).

BACKGROUND

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

2026-27 FIVE YEAR PLAN SUMMARY

Total Facilities Needs and Costs

The 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (Five-Year Plan) for the California Community Colleges covers the period from 2026-27 through 2030-31, and totals \$28.6 billion (see Table 1, Section B). This amount includes \$6.1 billion for construction of new facilities for enrollment growth and \$22.6 billion for modernization of existing facilities.

In addition to capital facility needs, the California Community Colleges needs deferred to future years total \$4 billion (see Table 1, Section C). This amount includes \$372 million of out-year costs for continuing phases of projects started within the Five-Year Plan period and \$3.6 billion carried over into subsequent plan years, primarily for modernization projects. Please see Table 2 to understand how these deferred facilities' needs and costs are distributed. In addition to capital facility needs, California Community Colleges has a deferred maintenance backlog total of \$2.2 billion over the five-year period, from 2025-26 through 2028-29 which is not included in the unmet needs. Currently, the total unmet facilities need for the California

Community Colleges are approximately \$32.6 billion for the five-year period of this plan (see Table 1, Section A).

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

Table 1A Unmet Facilities Needs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,095,187	\$5,258,219,787
Modernization of Existing Facilities	30,700,772	\$27,391,548,227
Total Unmet Needs	34,795,959	\$32,649,768,014

Table 1B Proposed Facilities in 5-Year Plan

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,721,848	\$6,062,852,832
Modernization of Existing Facilities	25,264,942	\$22,580,067,082
Total Proposed Facilities	29,986,790	\$28,642,919,914

Table 1C Deferred Facilities Needs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	—	\$372,156,000
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100
Total Deferred Needs	4,809,169	\$4,006,848,100

DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS & COSTS (Table 2A - 2C)

Table 2A Continuing Phases of Projects Started in Plan

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$173,184,000
Modernization of Existing Facilities	N/A	\$198,972,000
Total Continuing Phases	N/A	\$372,156,000

Table 2B Need Carryover

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	—	\$—
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100
Total Need Carryover	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100

Table 2C Total Deferred Needs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$372,156,000
Modernization of Existing Facilities	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100
Total Deferred Needs	4,809,169	\$4,006,848,100

Areas of Understatement

The estimated \$32.6 billion of the California Community Colleges' systemwide total unmet facilities needs and costs is conservative. The cost estimates used to determine systemwide needs are potentially understated in the following ways:

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

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN

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

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

Plan Constraints

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

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

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STATEWIDE CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM

Review and Approval of District Projects

Project Submittal Process

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

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

Board of Governors Priority Criteria

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

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

Community college districts submitted 2026-27 Final Project Proposals to the Chancellor’s Office for funding consideration in July 2024. The Chancellor’s Office staff use the Board of Governors Capital Outlay Priority Criteria to rank capital outlay projects. Requests for Category A1, Life and Safety, projects are the highest priority, as they permanently mitigate the life safety conditions in buildings or systems that create imminent danger to the life or limb of facility’s occupants. Category A3 projects demonstrate seismic deficiencies or potential seismic risk posed by existing buildings. Category A4 projects demonstrate infrastructure failure or loss; the intent of this category is to repair or replace the immediate failing infrastructure within a structure or campus system. The Capital Outlay Priority Criteria states that no more than 50% of state funds available for community college capital outlay projects be committed to address life and safety projects.

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

Board Of Governors Priority Criteria

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

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

Funding Approval Process

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

The Capital Outlay Spending Plan traditionally includes a maximum of one project from the Modernization or Growth categories per authorized site, per year. If more than one project is eligible for potential funding from the Modernization or Growth categories per authorized site, the project with the highest local ranking from the district’s five-year capital outlay plan is included in the proposal for state funding.

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

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

Methods to Support Districts with the Capital Outlay Process

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

FUSION

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

Ready Access

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

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

Design-Build

In an effort to reduce costs and expedite capital projects, California Community Colleges has received approval from the California Legislature to utilize the Design-Build project delivery

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

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

Voluntary Local Contributions

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

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

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

ENROLLMENT AND FACILITIES NEEDS

ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

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

The estimated fall enrollment of 1.31 million students in 2026-27¹ guides this Five-Year Plan. The Chancellor’s Office expects enrollment to grow to an estimated 1.32 million students in 2030-31, an increase of approximately 10,848 students (see Appendix F). The Chancellor’s Office calculates enrollment projections and provides this data to districts for utilization in the districts’ five-year construction plans.

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

The 2025-26 Five-Year Plan estimated fall enrollment was 1.38 million students compared to 1.31 million in the current year. The difference is 64,346, a 5% decrease between the 2025-26 Five-Year Plan and the 2026-27 Five-Year Plan. This decrease in the estimate is due to an update to the enrollment projection methodology and statewide demographic fluctuations. Specifically, additional data elements were included to account for students enrolled in independent study and noncredit courses.

NET ENROLLMENT NEED

Table 3 below shows that the California Community Colleges will need approximately 5.5 million assignable square feet to accommodate projected enrollment over the next five years. This estimate is based on the assignable square feet (ASF) needed to accommodate projected enrollment growth, less than the net capacity currently available to meet that enrollment demand.

Table 3 — Net Enrollment Need

Space Category	Total ASF Needed: Current Deficiency	Future Enrollment Growth	Total ASF Needed: Total
Lecture	-164,238	291,630	127,392
Laboratory	279,656	708,804	988,460
Office	121,527	498,280	619,807
Library	518,683	55,666	574,349
AV/TV	941,474	6,418	947,893
Other	901,682	1,300,667	2,202,349
Total	2,598,784	2,861,465	5,460,250

ENROLLMENT PROJECTION MODEL

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

Table 4 below shows a projection of approximately 0.83% growth in enrollment and a 3.71% increase in weekly student enrollment contact hours (WSCH) over the Five-Year Plan period.

WSCH rates are the product of the number of students and the scheduled class periods in which they are enrolled, in graded and ungraded community college classes convened prior to 10:00 p.m. during a census week. A class period is not less than 50 minutes and not more than 60 minutes (Cf. CCR, title 5, §57001(e)). Please see Appendix F for both multi-year enrollment and WSCH projection data.

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

Category	2026-27	2030-31	Difference	% Difference
Enrollment²	1,312,428	1,323,277	10,848	.83%
WSCH	13,864,149	14,377,995	513,847	3.71%

TRANSLATING ENROLLMENT NEED INTO CAPITAL OUTLAY FACILITIES REQUIREMENTS

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

Table 5 — Gross Enrollment Needs

Space Category	Assignable Square Feet
Lecture	5,106,655
Lab	11,323,216
Office	7,002,820
Library	4,584,983
AV/TV	1,398,133
Other	19,876,821
Total	49,292,628

Other Space

The total enrollment need of the 49.2 million assignable square footage includes 19.9 million assignable square footage of “other” space. The Space Standards lay out the parameters for calculating needed lecture, laboratory, office, library, and AV/TV space categories based on a comparison of inventory and enrollment at a campus. In addition to the instructional space specified in the Space Standards, this Five-Year Plan also must account for the “other” space category that comprises the whole of the physical inventory for each campus.

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

To that end, this Five-Year Plan looks at two different factors to identify the need for “other”

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

space at each campus: campus and system ratios. The first model assesses the physical inventory for each campus to calculate “other” space as a percentage of total space; this is the campus ratio. The physical inventory identifies each campus in the community college system as one of four types: college campus, center, district office or campus with district office. The campus ratio determines how much of the existing inventory is identified as “other” space in relation to total space for each campus.

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

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

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

INVENTORY AMOUNT AND TYPE OF EXISTING SPACE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

CURRENT CAPACITY

As the largest system of higher education in the nation, the California Community Colleges infrastructure consists of 73 districts, 116 community colleges, 82 approved off-campus centers, 24 separately reported district offices, and assets of approximately 25,000 acres of land, 6,000 buildings, and 87 million gross square feet of space. These buildings provide the following assignable square feet in the various Board of Governors space categories as shown in Table 6 below:

Table 6 — Net Capacity

Space Category	Current Total Assignable Square Feet	Less Excess Capacity	Net Capacity
Lecture	7,973,644	-2,994,381	4,979,263
Laboratory	13,450,028	-3,115,272	10,334,756
Office	9,046,956	-2,663,943	6,383,013
Library	4,839,566	-828,932	4,010,634
AV/TV	474,201	-23,961	450,240
Other	20,754,949	-3,080,477	17,674,472

Space Category	Current Total Assignable Square Feet	Less Excess Capacity	Net Capacity
Total	56,539,344	-12,706,966	43,832,378

The current capacity of 56.5 million assignable square feet, detailed in Table 6, is based on the systemwide 2023-24 Space Inventory reported by the districts.

EXCESS CAPACITY

There are many individual campuses within the system that have severe capital facility shortages while some campuses within the system may appear to have excess capacity in various space categories. Therefore, the capacity needs for the system are estimated on a campus-by-campus basis. Facilities capacity exceeding 100% at individual campuses, which is currently approximately 12.7 million assignable square feet (see Table 6, column 2), were eliminated for the purpose of estimating the need for additional facilities. Using this approach, excess capacity will not artificially decrease the true facilities needs on other campuses.

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

MODERNIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

Systemwide Facilities Needs

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

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

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

Cost Estimates

The costs for the additional systemwide needs were estimated based on the California Community Colleges building cost guidelines at California Construction Cost Index (CCCI) 9876. The cost estimates include an allowance for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction. Cost estimates for the replacement of relocatable facilities with permanent facilities include an additional allowance for demolition.

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

This Five-Year Plan defines total systemwide modernization needs of 31 million assignable square feet (ASF) at a cost of \$27.4 billion. Due to the magnitude of California Community Colleges' modernization needs, the proposal in the 2026-27 Five-Year Plan includes only a portion of the modernization needs of the system. This Five-Year Plan calls for the modernization of only 25.3 million assignable square feet over the next five years at a cost of \$22.6 billion. This amount includes the cost of:

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

This approach would result in the renovation of the oldest buildings and those in the poorest condition first. The out-year cost of approximately \$199 million reflects modernization/renovation projects started in the plan year. The carryover cost of approximately \$3.6 billion represents modernization or renovation of 4.8 million assignable square feet of buildings more than 25-years but less than 40-years old and temporary buildings less than 10-years old deferred beyond the plan timeframe.

Table 7 — Systemwide Facilities Needs Methodology

Driver	Objective	Basis for Determining Need	Projects
Critical Life Safety Renovations (includes fire/life safety, seismic and infrastructure)	To maintain ongoing funding based on history.	Average statewide spending for the first two years of the 5YP for critical projects. Assignable square feet is not applicable.	2026-27 through 2030-31 Projects identified by the districts with costs. 2026-27 through 2030-31 (\$450 million in estimated unplanned costs)
Modernization/ Renovation	To modernize all permanent buildings more than 25 years old.	Assignable square feet for buildings in bad condition plus assignable square feet for buildings more than 25 years old; projects address buildings more than 40 years old.	2026-27 through 2030-31 Projects identified by the districts with costs. 2026-27 through 2030-31 One systemwide need project per year; projects to start in each year. Cost Formula = ASF x \$876 \$876 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings=\$101, construction=\$775)
Replacement of Temporary Buildings	To minimize the use of temporary buildings.	ASF for temporary buildings more than 10 years old.	2026-27 through 2030-31 One systemwide need project per year. Cost formula = ASF x \$1,271 \$1,271 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings = \$134, construction=\$1,034, Demolition=\$103)
Enrollment	To address 100% of the enrollment need at all sites, excluding needs met through alternative methods.	Enrollment projections converted to assignable square feet using the space standards adopted by Board of Governors.	2026-27 through 2030-31 Projects identified by the districts with costs. 2026-27 through 2030-31 One systemwide need project per year. Cost Formula = ASF x \$1,284 \$1,284 = (preliminary plans/ working drawings = \$134, construction=\$1,034, equipment=\$116)

Critical Life Safety Renovations

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

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

Services Division of the State Architect. Projects that completely modernize existing facilities are estimated below in the Modernization/Renovation category.

Modernization/Renovation

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

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

Due to the magnitude of the system's modernization and renovation needs, the proposal in this Five-Year Plan includes only a portion of the modernization/renovation needs of the system. The FUSION system only captures five years' worth of projects/needs, but the system plans for beyond this timeframe. The Five-Year Plan includes 25.3 million assignable square feet to be modernized over the next five years at a cost of \$22.6 billion and includes only those buildings more than 40 years old and buildings reported by districts as needing major renovation. The cost estimate for modernization/renovation needs is based on 75% of the cost of a new building, excluding equipment (\$876 per assignable square feet).

Replace Temporary Facilities

The California Community Colleges inventory includes temporary facilities that are operating far beyond their useful life. It is the policy of the Board of Governors that districts provide permanent facilities rather than relocatable buildings to meet student access requirements. Temporary facilities are not as effective for providing certain instructional programs, and

are more costly to operate and maintain than permanent structures. The Chancellor's Office estimates the statewide cost for replacing temporary facilities with permanent facilities at \$1.4 billion over the next five years.

ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DELIVERY AND YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

Alternative Methods of Instruction

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

In 2023-24, distance education full-time equivalent students (FTES) accounted for 47% (522,450/1,103,741) of total FTES, compared to 49% in 2022-23. Additionally, there is an increase in FTES by nearly 91,559 between the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years, increasing from 1,012,182 in 2022-23 to 1,103,741 in 2023-24.

In this analysis, the Chancellor's Office assumed campuses with lower enrollment will meet 10% of their total enrollment needs through the alternative methods of delivery, such as distance education, as shown in Table 8. The 10% figure is derived from the Long-Range Master Plan for the California Community Colleges and is intended to provide incentive to districts to think first of alternative means of instruction to solve facilities shortages rather than defaulting to a proposal for new facilities.

Table 8 — Unmet Enrollment Need

Space Category	ASF to Meet Enrollment Need	Less Alternative Means of Delivery	Unmet Enrollment Need
Lecture	127,392	-31,848	95,544
Laboratory	988,460	-247,115	741,345
Office	619,807	-154,952	464,855
Library	574,349	-143,587	430,762
AV/TV	947,893	-236,973	710,920
Other	2,202,349	-550,587	1,651,762
Total	5,460,250	-1,365,062	4,095,188

NEW FACILITIES FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH

The 4.1 million square feet needed, at a cost of \$5.3 billion, to accommodate current and future enrollment is shown in Table 9. This includes individual growth projects, both state and locally funded, submitted by districts for all five years of the plan and identified systemwide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan. The systemwide facilities needs are estimated only after the space impacts of all projects submitted by the districts have been taken into consideration.

An average building cost of \$1,284 per assignable square feet was used based on the California Community Colleges building cost guidelines at California Construction Cost Index 9876 and Equipment Price Index 5455. This amount represents the average building cost for all space types and includes an allowance for preliminary plans, working drawings and equipment (Preliminary Plans/ Working Drawings = \$134, Construction = \$1,034, and Equipment = \$116 per assignable square feet).

Table 9 — Total Unmet Needs and Costs

Unmet Needs	ASF	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,095,187	\$5,258,219,787
Modernization of Existing Facilities	30,700,772	\$27,391,548,227
Total Deferred Needs	34,795,959	\$32,649,768,014

TOTAL UNMET NEEDS AND COSTS

Table 9 shows that the total unmet facilities needs for California Community Colleges are \$32.6 billion. Unmet need consists of two components: 1) new facilities needed to accommodate current and future enrollment growth and 2) modernization of existing buildings.

FACILITIES TO MEET UNMET NEED

FACILITIES PROPOSED IN FIVE-YEAR PLAN

New Facilities for Enrollment Growth

The 2026-27 Five-Year Plan includes \$6.1 billion for new facilities to accommodate existing and future enrollment as shown in Table 10. This amount includes individual projects, both state and locally funded, submitted by districts for all five years of the plan and identified system-wide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan.

Modernization

The modernization needs of \$22.6 billion includes individual projects, both state and locally funded, submitted by the districts for all five years of the plan and identified systemwide facilities needs for each campus for the final three years of the plan.

Table 10 — Total Facilities Needs and Costs

Category	Assignable Square Feet	Costs
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,721,848	\$6,062,852,832
Modernization of Existing Facilities	25,264,942	\$22,580,067,082
Total Deferred Needs	29,986,790	\$28,642,919,914

DEFERRED COSTS OF SYSTEM NEEDS

The California Community Colleges needs deferred to future years total \$4 billion (see Table 11). This amount includes \$372 million of out-year costs for continuing projects and \$3.6 billion carryover to future plan years as shown in Table 11.

Out-year Costs

The out-year costs to complete continuing phases of projects started but not assumed to be fully funded within the Five-Year Plan period, are estimated to be \$372 million. This amount includes approximately \$173 million for new facilities and \$199 million for modernization of existing facilities.

Table 11 — Deferred Facilities Needs and Costs

Category	Deferred Need	Need Carryover	Total
New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	\$173,184,000	-	\$173,184,000
Modernization of Existing Facilities	\$198,972,000	\$3,634,692,100	\$3,833,664,100
Total Continuing Needs	\$372,156,000	\$3,634,692,100	\$4,006,848,100

Need Carryover

Additional facilities needs, including 4.8 million assignable square feet at a cost of approximately \$3.6 billion, have been deferred beyond the period of this Five-Year Plan because the need in this area is too substantial to be accomplished in that time frame. There may also be carryover of new project costs from year-to-year within the Five-Year Plan period in order to accommodate project budgets and scheduling.

CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ADDRESSING IDENTIFIED NEEDS

VISION 2030

The [July 2025 Edition of Vision 2030](#) continues to reflect a framework for bold and thoughtful action — action for policy reform, fiscal sustainability, systems development and for process and practice reform in the field to support our students, our communities, and our planet. The July 2025 Edition of Vision 2030 is an ambitious, equity-focused strategy to help the California Community Colleges to bring college to our students and future learners and ensure their education experience delivers more. Welcoming and structurally sound campus facilities that are able to effectively meet enrollment needs are essential to provide equitable access for community college students.

ENROLLMENT PRESSURES

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

- The California Community Colleges is the largest system of higher education in the nation. Annually, California Community Colleges serve 2.1 million students, which equates to 20% of the nation's community college students.
- To provide additional funding for California K-12 and California Community Colleges, voters passed Proposition 30 (2012) and Proposition 55 (2016). These ballot measures provided additional tax revenue to California's education budget through fiscal year 2030. The increase in funding continues to help California Community Colleges restore access to millions of students impacted by the budget reduction.
- This systemwide California Community Colleges Five-Year Plan identifies need for an additional approximately 5.5 million assignable square feet before taking into consideration additional enrollment growth forecasted in the plan.
- The capital outlay needs of the California Community Colleges are vast, and temporary drops in enrollment delay, rather than decrease the system's need for facilities.

SUSTAINABILITY

The California Community Colleges has taken significant measures toward an environmentally oriented future through a number of conservation efforts, as described below. The most recent sustainability effort includes the Board of Governors Climate Change and Sustainability Policy and Climate Change and Sustainability Resolution, which were adopted at the Board of Governors May 2019 meeting. California Community Colleges climate action efforts were refined in the [Board of Governors Climate Action and Sustainability Framework](#), which they adopted in September 2021. In 2025 the Board of Governors Climate Action and Sustainability Framework was updated and refined to align with the State of California's Sustainability goals.

The policy resolution, and framework align with California's broader climate change laws and directives related to energy conservation, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and environmental sustainability, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32) and the California Climate Change Scoping Plan. Additionally, it integrates Senate Bill (SB) 416, SB 100, SB 375, Governor Brown's Executive Order B-30-15, and existing California Community Colleges sustainability-related policies. The critical component of the Board of Governors Climate Action and Sustainability Framework include the eight categories for 2035, with incremental progress expected by 2026, 2030 and 2035:

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

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction

1. The California community colleges can conduct an emissions inventory baseline and create a climate action plan by 2026.
2. In alignment with statewide goals adopted by the California Air Resources Board

(CARB), California Community Colleges can strive to eliminate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2035. To achieve this, it is recommended to reduce campus/district GHG emissions by at least 75% by 2030 and 100% by 2035.

3. Districts and colleges can track and report of their greenhouse gas inventory in alignment with the American College and University President's Climate Commitment, for generating a Scope 1,2,3 GHG emission inventory (secondnature.org/webinars/getting-started-on-your-acupcc-climate-action-plan-2/) guidelines. Metrics to measure include GHG emissions per FTES & FTE (per capita), and GHG emission per Square Footage.

Green Buildings and Grounds

1. California community colleges are encouraged to benchmark % all new construction/ major renovation buildings and landscapes that meet LEED Certification or equivalent Green building certification and striving for Platinum Certification or equivalent for all new construction /major renovation by 2035.
2. Districts and college are to align with California law SB 416 and California Executive Order B-30-15.
3. Districts and colleges are encouraged to strive for 25% of existing buildings and landscapes to achieve LEED Operations and Maintenance (O&M), SITES or equivalent Green building/ landscape operation & maintenance Certification by 2030 and 50% by 2035.

Energy

1. California community colleges benchmark campus energy use by submitting their annual Energy Use Intensity (EUI) each year in FUSION. Districts and colleges should strive to decrease their EUI by 25% compared to the campus benchmark by 2030 and 50% decrease by 2035.
2. Districts and colleges should benchmark % of energy comes from natural gas use and strive to reduce natural gas consumption 30% by 2030 and 75% reduction from baseline by 2035.
3. Districts and colleges should strive to benchmark % of energy that comes from Renewable Energy and strive to annually generate or procure 50% of energy from renewable energy sources by 2030 and 100% of energy from renewable energy sources by 2035.

Water

1. Districts and colleges should consider benchmarks for potable water usage. Districts can also identify potential non-potable water resources, create a landscape zoning

map and irrigation metering strategy, and adopt best practices such as the California Community College Model Stormwater Management Program. Districts and colleges are encouraged to conduct a water use profile. Understanding water end use such as for domestic use, irrigation, cooling towers, and pool make up water.

2. By 2030, California community colleges are encouraged to reduce potable water usage from baseline level by 25%; increase use of non-potable water sources to replace applicable potable water uses by 25% and limit stormwater runoff and discharge by prioritizing stormwater capture and infiltration across District campuses by 10 percent.
3. By 2035, California community colleges are encouraged to reduce potable water usage from baseline level by 50%; increase use of non-potable water sources to replace applicable potable water uses by 50% and limit stormwater runoff and discharge by prioritizing stormwater capture and infiltration across District campuses by 20 percent.

Waste

1. Districts and colleges are encouraged to conduct a waste categorization assessment; benchmark and comply with Title 14, Division 2, Chapter 5; benchmark and comply with Title 14, CCR Division 7; develop a total material consumption benchmark; conduct an AB 341 compliance assessment; and centralize reporting for waste and resource recovery by 2026.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to divert construction & demolition waste from landfill by 50% by 2030 and 75% by 2035.
3. Districts and colleges are encouraged to strive to reduce total waste generated per onsite FTES/FTE by 20% and 40% by 2035. In addition, districts and colleges should strive to divert 75% of waste generated from landfill by 2030, and 90% of waste generated from landfill by 2035.

Purchasing Procurement and Food Systems

1. California's local community colleges are encouraged to benchmark sustainability characteristics of existing products and services, dollars spent on sustainability related products/services, benchmarking food purchases for sustainability requirements, dollars spent on local products and services, and adopt a sustainable procurement policy and administrative procedure, by 2026.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to increase procurement of sustainable products and services by 25% compared to benchmark levels by 2030 and 50% compared to benchmark levels by 2035.
3. Districts and colleges should strive to increase procurement of local products and services as defined by the district boundary by 25% compared to benchmark levels by 2030 and by 50% compared to benchmark levels by 2035.

4. District and colleges should increase sustainable food purchase to 20% of total food expenses by 2030 and 80% by 2035.
5. District and colleges increase the sourcing of local food, ingredients, and food products by 25% by 2030 and 50% by 2035.

Transportation

1. California community colleges can conduct accounting and conditions assessment of fleet vehicles; assess remainder rolling stock for potential electrification; develop Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure to encourage faculty, staff, and students to use EVs by 2026.
2. Districts and colleges should strive to have 50% of new fleet vehicles that are zero emission vehicles, 50% of rolling stock that are zero emissions, by 2030 and 100% of new fleet vehicles that are zero emission vehicles, and 100% of rolling stock that are zero emissions by 2035.
3. California community colleges can conduct surveys to benchmark student, faculty, and staff commuting modes to and from their respective campuses. Districts and colleges should strive to increase the % of commuters that use alternative transportation to and from their campus by 25% by 2030 and 50% by 2035.
4. Districts and college can benchmark their total vehicles mile traveled (VMT) from student, staff, faculty to and from their respective campuses. Districts and colleges should strive to achieve a 25% reduction in VMT by 2030 and 50% by 2035.

General Sustainability University & College Performance

1. California community colleges can conduct overall college/district sustainability benchmarking using the Nationally recognized Sustainability Tracking and Assessment Rating System (STARS) developed by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) by 2026.
2. Districts and colleges can strive to achieve a Bronze STARS certification by 2030 and a Gold STARS certification by 2035.

STUDENT HOUSING

The 2023 Budget Act eliminated the 2022-23 General Fund appropriation for the Affordable Student Housing grants and instead called for those projects to be funded by locally issued lease revenue bonds. This change retroactively applied to the twelve community college projects originally funded in the 2022 Budget Act, and the seven community college housing projects authorized in the 2023 Budget Act. The 2023 Budget Act provided ongoing funds to support debt service for University of California (UC)/California State University (CSU) student housing projects in 2022-23 and 2023-24 funded with lease revenue bonds. Community college housing projects were to be funded through local revenue bonds to be issued by community college districts or as part of a state pool.

The 2024 Budget Act established a plan for a statewide lease revenue bond (SLRB) program as an alternative to local lease revenue bonds with SB 155. It authorized the State Public Works Board (SPWB) to issue revenue bonds in the amount of \$804.7 million to finance approved student housing projects, and to enter into agreements with the Board of Governors and the participating colleges to borrow funds for project costs. The bond program will cover 13 approved projects (excluding the four intersegmental projects to be funded by UC/CSU and the two California Community Colleges projects not appropriate for the SLRB). The two California Community Colleges projects that do not fit within the parameters of a state revenue lease bond will be funded with redirected annual rent subsidy funds from the \$61.5 million in non-Proposition 98 funds initially authorized by the Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program for debt service in 2023-24. No new projects are approved in 2024-25.

Santa Clarita Community College District provided formal notice of their withdrawal from the Affordable Student Housing program. Similarly, San Diego Community College District has provided informal notice that they also intend to withdraw. Santa Clarita Community College District cited escalating construction costs, the need for general fund subsidies under capped rents, and challenges with the revised funding structure as reasons for their withdrawal. San Diego Community College District is seeking to withdraw because they would prefer to operate under a public-private-partnership model, which is incompatible with the SLRB financing framework.

In the 2025 Budget Act, new Affordable Student Housing projects were neither considered nor approved by California Legislature. However, the budget approved \$2.47 million for ongoing debt service for existing projects.

ALIGNMENT TO PREVIOUS PLAN

SUMMARY OF TOTAL COST DIFFERENCE

The total unmet need identified for the California Community Colleges in the 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan (“2026-27 Plan”) is \$32.6 billion. Of this amount, \$28.6 billion is included in the Five-Year Plan period and \$4 billion deferred to future years. The prior year’s 2025-26 Capital Outlay Five-Year Plan (“2025-26 Plan”) included total unmet needs of \$33.5 billion, with \$28.3 billion included in the Five-Year Plan and \$5.2 billion deferred to future years. The total decrease in costs between the two plans is therefore approximately \$900 million as shown below in Table 12.

Table 12 – TOTAL COST INCREASE (in billions)

Category	Deferred Need	Need Carryover	Total
Proposed Facilities in Five-Year Plan	\$28.6	\$28.3	\$0.3
Deferred Facilities Needs	\$4.0	\$5.2	-\$1.2
Total Unmet Needs	\$32.6	\$33.5	-\$0.9

CHANGES TO PLAN YEARS 2025-26 AND 2026-27

2025-26 Plan

Although the 2025-26 plan is not a component of the 2026-27 Five-Year Plan, changes to the 2025-26 plan affect subsequent years. Specifically, last year's 2025-26 Five-Year Plan included two continuing and 27 new start projects at approximately \$79 million (state funding only).

At the time this report was prepared, the Budget Act of 2025 includes funding for one construction phase project and the preliminary plans and working drawings of 29 additional projects.

2026-27 Plan

The 2026-27 budget year includes capital outlay funding from Proposition 51 and 2. There are a variety of reasons that a project listed in the second year of the systemwide Five-Year Plan may not appear in the first year of a subsequent Five-Year Plan. The second year of the systemwide Five-Year Plan typically represents the Initial Project Proposals submitted by the districts that appear to be state-supportable. These Initial Project Proposals may be developed into Final Project Proposals in the next budget cycle and included in the Spending Plan.

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

CONCLUSION

The 2026-27 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan reflects the California Community Colleges' commitment to providing equitable access to quality education through safe, sustainable, and modernized facilities. With an identified unmet need of \$32.6 billion, which includes \$28.6 billion proposed during the plan period and \$4 billion deferred to future years, this plan outlines a comprehensive strategy to address enrollment growth, new construction, infrastructure modernization, and long-term sustainability goals.

As the state's largest system of higher education, serving more than 2 million students annually, the California Community Colleges must continually adapt to evolving instructional methods, demographic changes, and environmental priorities. This plan not only responds to the immediate and long-term capital needs of the system but also aligns with Vision 2030 and the Board of Governors' Climate Action and Sustainability Framework to ensure our campuses remain resilient, energy-efficient, and student centered. With continued state support and

district collaboration, the California Community Colleges system can deliver safe, sustainable, and future-ready campuses that meet the evolving needs of students and communities across the state.

APPENDICES

A — Government Code Sections 13100 – 13102

B — Education Code Sections 67500 – 67503

C — 2026-27 Spending Plan

D — Methodology for Calculating Unmet Need for California Community Colleges

E — California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Grant Application Process

F — Enrollment and WSCH Projections by Districts

APPENDIX A: CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTIONS 13100-13102

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B: CALIFORNIA EDUCATION CODE, SECTIONS 67500-67503

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Enrollment projections for each community college district.

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

67502. No reference to community colleges.

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

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

APPENDIX C: 2026-27 SPENDING PLAN

								FUTURE FUNDING				
Board Cat.	District	Location	Project Name	Phase	2026-27 State	Phase	2025-26 Local	Phase	2027-28 State	Phase	2027-28 Local	Total
A	El Camino CCD	El Camino College	Hydronic Line Replacement	C	\$8,530,000	CE	\$2,843,000	-	-	-	-	\$11,373,000
A	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Pierce College	Sewer Utility Infrastructure Replacement	C	\$6,576,000	CE	\$2,193,000	-	-	-	-	\$8,769,000
A	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Valley College	Sewer Utility Infrastructure Replacement	C	\$5,203,000	CE	\$1,735,000	-	-	-	-	\$6,938,000
A	Los Rios CCD	American River College	Davies Hall Replacement Health and Safety	C	\$55,655,000	CE	\$18,322,000	-	-	-	-	\$73,977,000
A	San Mateo CCD	Skyline College	Boiler Plant Replacement	C	\$5,519,000	CE	\$1,801,000	-	-	-	-	\$7,320,000
-	-	-	Total Life & Safety	-	\$81,483,000	-	\$26,894,000		-		-	\$108,377,000
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	Antelope Valley CCD	Antelope Valley College	Gymnasium Replacement	C	\$22,562,000	CE	\$19,991,000	-	-	-	-	\$42,553,000
M	Chaffey CCD	Chaffey College	Theater Building Renovation	PW	\$1,489,000	PW	\$654,000	C	\$16,359,000	CE	\$6,539,000	\$25,041,000
M	Citrus CCD	Citrus College	New Career Technical Education Building	C	\$43,784,000	CE	\$63,078,000	-	-	-	-	\$106,862,000
M	Coast CCD	Golden West College	PE - Rec (Gym) Replacement	C	\$26,907,000	CE	\$25,765,000	-	-	-	-	\$52,672,000
M	Coast CCD	Golden West College	Performing Arts Replacement	PW	\$1,542,000	PW	\$1,604,000	C	\$20,240,000	CE	\$19,439,000	\$42,825,000
M	Coast CCD	Orange Coast College	Skills Lab Replacement	C	\$12,086,000	CE	\$11,894,000	-	-	-	-	\$23,980,000
M	El Camino CCD	El Camino College	New Interdisciplinary Science Center (Replacement)	PW	\$4,259,000	PW	\$5,624,000	C	\$59,830,000	CE	\$77,214,000	\$146,927,000
M	Foothill-DeAnza CCD	De Anza College	Physical Education Complex Renovation	C	\$36,999,000	CE	\$12,003,000	-	-	-	-	\$49,002,000
M	Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD	Grossmont College	Gymnasium Replacement	C	\$13,831,000	CE	\$13,533,000	-	-	-	-	\$27,364,000
M	Hartnell CCD	Hartnell College	Building F, G, H (Gymnasium) Renovation	C	\$17,501,000	CE	\$16,970,000	-	-	-	-	\$34,471,000
M	Imperial Valley CCD	Imperial Valley College	Gym Modernization	C	\$11,759,000	CE	\$11,840,000	-	-	-	-	\$23,599,000
M	Kern CCD	Bakersfield College	BC Center for Student Success	C	\$26,363,000	CE	\$25,104,000	-	-	-	-	\$51,467,000
M	Kern CCD	Bakersfield College	BC Fine Arts Replacement	PW	\$1,861,000	PW	\$1,861,000	C	\$38,417,000	CE	\$10,786,000	\$52,925,000
M	Long Beach CCD	Liberal Arts Campus	Building B Replacement	C	\$24,400,000	CE	\$26,365,000	-	-	-	-	\$50,765,000
M	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles City College	Communications Building Replacement	PW	\$2,441,000	PW	\$3,125,000	C	\$34,129,000	CE	\$41,536,000	\$81,231,000
M	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles City College	Kinesiology South Replacement	C	\$16,298,000	CE	\$22,591,000	-	-	-	-	\$38,889,000
M	Los Angeles CCD	Los Angeles Trade-Tech College	Advanced Transportation & Manufacturing Replacement	C	\$85,114,000	CE	\$119,508,000	-	-	-	-	\$204,622,000
M	Merced CCD	Merced College	Gym Complex Replacement	PW	\$2,461,000	PW	\$1,296,000	C	\$33,165,000	CE	\$13,649,000	\$50,571,000
M	Merced CCD	Merced College	Music Art Theater Complex	C	\$22,604,000	CE	\$20,687,000	-	-	-	-	\$43,291,000
M	Peralta CCD	Merritt College	Replace Bldgs E and F - Kinesiology and Physical Training	C	\$21,158,000	CE	\$29,650,000	-	-	-	-	\$50,808,000
M	Rio Hondo CCD	Rio Hondo College	Business and Art Building Replacement	C	\$21,639,000	CE	\$20,987,000	-	-	-	-	\$42,626,000
M	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. CCD	Shasta College	Life Sciences (Building 1600) Renovation	C	\$7,889,000	CE	\$7,510,000	-	-	-	-	\$15,399,000
M	State Center CCD	Reedley College	Modernize Voc-Tech Complex: Aero, Auto, Welding	PW	\$2,647,000	PW	\$1,426,000	C	\$31,459,000	CE	\$15,784,000	\$51,316,000
M	State Center CCD	Reedley College	Modernization of Agriculture Instruction Complex	C	\$15,204,000	CE	\$14,031,000	-	-	-	-	\$29,235,000
-	-	-	Total Modernization	-	\$442,798,000	-	\$477,097,000	-	\$233,599,000	-	\$184,947,000	\$1,338,441,000

Project phases: P= Preliminary Plans; W= Working Drawings; C= Construction; E= Equipment.

								FUTURE FUNDING				
Board Cat.	District	Location	Project Name	Phase	2026-27 State	Phase	2025-26 Local	Phase	2027-28 State	Phase	2027-28 Local	Total
G	Kern CCD	Poerterville College	PC Career Technology Building	PW	\$2,217,000	PW	\$1,273,000	C	\$23,426,000	CE	\$23,236,000	\$50,152,000
G	Mendocino-Lake CCD	Willits Center	Willits Center Phase II	C	\$13,266,000	CE	\$13,315,000	-	-	-	-	\$26,581,000
G	Mt. San Antonio CCD	Mt. San Antonio College	Library Replacement	C	\$54,062,000	CE	\$95,257,000	-	-	-	-	\$149,319,000
G	North Orange County CCD	Fullerton College	STEM Vocational Center	C	\$25,092,000	CE	\$26,535,000	-	-	-	-	\$51,627,000
G	Riverside CCD	Ben Clark Training Center	Education Center Building 2 at Ben Clark Training Center	C	\$14,634,000	CE	\$21,025,000	-	-	-	-	\$35,659,000
G	Riverside CCD	Moreno Valley College	Library Learning Resource Center (LLRC)	C	\$40,665,000	CE	\$56,620,000	-	-	-	-	\$97,285,000
G	Riverside CCD	Riverside City College	Advanced Technology (Applied Technology)	PW	\$4,596,000	PW	\$7,286,000	C	\$66,001,000	CE	\$98,530,000	\$176,413,000
G	Riverside CCD	Riverside City College	Cosmetology Building	C	\$18,240,000	CE	\$25,905,000	-	-	-	-	\$44,145,000
G	Riverside CCD	Norco College	Library/Learning Resource (LLRC) and Student Services (SS)	C	\$31,247,000	CE	\$44,104,000	-	-	-	-	\$75,351,000
G	Sequoias CCD	Hanford Educational Center	Science Building	PW	\$4,182,000	PW	-	C	\$46,954,000	CE	\$15,945,000	\$67,081,000
G	State Center CCD	Clovis Community College	Kinesiology and Wellness Center	C	\$22,251,000	CE	\$22,137,000	-	-	-	-	\$44,388,000
-	-	-	TOTAL GROWTH	-	\$230,452,000	-	\$313,457,000	-	\$136,381,000	-	\$137,711,000	\$818,001,000
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	TOTAL	-	\$754,733,000	-	\$817,448,000	-	\$369,980,000		\$322,658,000	\$2,264,819,000
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	Total Continuing for FY 26/27 (30 projects)	-	\$727,038,000	-	\$793,299,000	-	-	-	-	\$1,520,337,000
-	-	-	Total New FY 26/27 (10 projects)	-	\$27,695,000	-	\$24,149,000	-	\$369,980,000	-	\$322,658,000	\$744,482,000
-	-	-	TOTAL	-	\$754,733,000	-	\$817,448,000	-	\$369,980,000	-	\$322,658,000	\$2,264,819,000

Project phases: P= Preliminary Plans; W= Working Drawings; C= Construction; E= Equipment.

APPENDIX D: METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: 2026-2027 FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN, METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING UNMET NEED FOR THE CCC SYSTEM

Formulas	Variables	Variables	Elements	"ASF 26-27 CCI 9876"	Costs 26-27
-	A	-	ASF NEEDED TO MEET PROJECTED ENROLLMENT	49,292,627	-
-	B	-	CURRENT NET CAPACITY ASF:	-	-
-	-	-	Lecture	4,979,263	-
-	-	-	Lab	10,334,756	-
-	-	-	Office	6,383,013	-
-	-	-	Library	4,010,634	-
-	-	-	AV/TV	450,240	-
-	-	-	Other	17,674,472	-
-	-	-	Total Capacity ASF	43,832,378	-
-	-	-	UNMET FACILITIES NEEDS:	-	-
A-B =	C	-	Additional ASF for Enrollment Growth	5,460,249	\$7,010,959,716
-	-	D	Less Alternative Means of Delivery	1,365,062	\$1,752,739,929
C-D=	E	-	Subtotal Net Enrollment Need	4,095,187	\$5,258,219,787
-	F	-	Modernization of Existing Facilities	-	-
-	-	-	Critical Life Safety Renovation	N/A	-
-	-	-	Modernization / Renovation	29,440,843	\$25,790,178,468
-	-	-	Replace Temporary Buildings	1,259,929	\$1,601,369,759
-	G	-	Subtotal Modernization of Existing Facilities	30,700,772	\$27,391,548,227
F+G=	H	-	TOTAL UNMET FACILITIES NEEDS	34,795,959	\$32,649,768,014
-	I	-	PROPOSED FACILITIES IN 5-YEAR PLAN	-	-
-	-	I-1	New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	4,721,848	\$6,062,852,832
-	-	-	Modernization of Existing Facilities Projects:	-	-
-	-	-	Critical Life Safety Renovation Projects	-	\$450,000
-	-	-	Modernization / renovation Projects	24,131,960	\$21,139,596,960
-	-	-	Replace Temporary Buildings	1,132,982	\$1,440,020,122
-	-	I-2	Subtotal Modernization	25,264,942	\$22,580,067,082
I.1+I.2=	I	-	TOTAL PROPOSED FACILITIES IN 5-YEAR PLAN	29,986,790	\$28,642,919,914
-	J	-	DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS:	-	-
-		-	Continuing Phases of Projects Started in 5-Year Plan:	-	-
-	-	-	New Facilities for Enrollment Growth	N/A	\$173,184,000

Formulas	Variables	Variables	Elements	"ASF 26-27 CCI 9876"	Costs 26-27
-	-	-	Modernization of Existing Facilities Projects	N/A	\$198,972,000
-	-	J.1	Subtotal Outyear Costs	N/A	\$372,156,000
-	-	-	Enrollment Need Carried Forward	-	-
-	-	-	Modernization Need Carried Forward	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100
-	-	J.2	Subtotal Need Carryover	4,809,169	\$3,634,692,100
J.1+J.2=	J	-	TOTAL DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS	4,809,169	\$4,006,848,100
I+J=	K	-	TOTAL PROPOSED 5-YEAR PLAN AND DEFERRED FACILITIES NEEDS	34,795,959	\$32,649,768,014

APPENDIX E: CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES CAPITAL OUTLAY GRANT APPLICATION PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED PRIORITY-FUNDING CATEGORY SCORING METRICS

For all capital outlay project funding categories, proposed projects must first be capacity load eligible; this includes modernizations where projects must not sustain or increase an overbuilt status. Additionally, community college districts that are proposing capital outlay

projects must be aligned with the California Community College Promise requirements (AB-19, Santiago 2017), as these requirements establish the minimum conditions for participating in the California Community Colleges capital outlay program. California Community College Promise requirement include the following:

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

BOARD OF GOVERNORS PRIORITY FUNDING CATEGORIES

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

Table 1: Proposed Project Categories, Definitions and Percentage Allocations

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

CATEGORY A – LIFE AND SAFETY PROJECTS

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

Table 2: Category A - Criteria

Life and Safety	Description	Local Contribution/ Hardship
A-1: Life Safety Projects	The intent of this category is to permanently mitigate the life safety conditions in buildings or systems that create imminent danger to the life or limb of facility's occupants.	Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points)
	One or more of the following must exist to be considered as an A-1 project: • Imminent Danger – immediate danger to the health, life or limb of the facility's occupants; • Health and Life Safety – obvious danger to health, life or limb exists. While danger is not immediate, remedy is needed to protect people; • Fire Safety – existing conditions could place people in grave peril and inadequate escape • The lack of compliance with existing code is not considered sufficient justification to warrant classification of an issue as a critical life-safety issue	AND Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional) • One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50% OR Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following: • District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project • Debt-level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)
	The Final Project Proposal (FPP) shall be accompanied by a third-party study that identifies the critical life safety issues and states that imminent danger exists to the facility's occupants (study must be performed by an independent, professional who is certified or licensed to perform the relevant study).	• Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M
A-3: Seismic Retrofit Projects	The intent of this category is to seismically retrofit structures subject to the likely probability of collapse during a seismic event of greater than 6.0.	
	Final Project Proposal (FPP) shall be accompanied by a third-party study/report that validates that the target building's structural deficiencies provides a risk that is equivalent to Risk Level 4 or greater as specified in the April 1998 CCC Seismic Survey, Report and Recommendations, prepared by the State Department of General Services – Real Estate Services Division. This study must be performed by an independent, professional who is certified or licensed to perform the relevant study and shall include possible mitigation measures	
A-4: Immediate Infrastructure Failure Projects	The intent of this category is to repair or replace the immediate failing infrastructure within a structure or campus system.	

CATEGORY M – MODERNIZATION PROJECTS

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

Table 3: Metrics for Modernization

Modernization	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points										
Age of Project Building	This factor provides priority to facilities 15 years and older that have a greater need for program space renovations. • Scale: One point for every year, starts with 15 years equal to 15 points and so forth to 60 years equal 60 points.	60	120										
Activates Unused Space	This factor supports renovation of existing space that currently cannot be used but can be activated after the renovation. Activated unused space (050), is at least 5% of total space to be renovated.	N/A	30										
Facility Condition Index (FCI)	FCI is from the FUSION assessments.	40	New										
FTES	<table><tr><th>FTES Scale</th><th>Points</th></tr><tr><td>500-999</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>1,000-9,999</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td>10,000-19,999</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>20,000+</td><td>20</td></tr></table>	FTES Scale	Points	500-999	6	1,000-9,999	12	10,000-19,999	16	20,000+	20	20	New
FTES Scale	Points												
500-999	6												
1,000-9,999	12												
10,000-19,999	16												
20,000+	20												
Vision for Success CTE Programs	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes. • Scale: Ratio (CTE Space: Project Space).	25	New										
Vision for Success Regions of High Need	Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North.	5	New										

Modernization	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points
Local Contribution/ Hardship	Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points) AND Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional) • One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50% OR Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following: • District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project • Debt level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV) • Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M	50	50
Total		200	200

CATEGORY G– GROWTH

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

Table 4: Metrics for Growth

Growth	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points
Enrollment Growth	This factor looks at the campus' enrollment (WSCH) change over a 5-year period; the higher the enrollment increase, the more points the project will be eligible for.	50	50
Existing Inventory	This calculation compares the existing space capacity to the enrollment need or load. The lower the capacity load ratio, the greater the need for additional space, therefore the more points the project will receive.	50	50
Assignable Square Footage (ASF) Change	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type.	N/A	50

Growth	Description	Proposed Points	Existing Points
FTES	FTES Scale Points 500-999 6 1,000-9,999 12 10,000-19,999 16 20,000+ 20	20	New
Vision for Success CTE Programs	This factor promotes projects that create the needed space type for CTE related TOP codes. • Scale: Ratio (CTE Space: Project Space).	25	New
Vision for Success Regions of High Need	Central Valley, Sierras, Inland Empire, and Far North.	5	New
Local Contribution/ Hardship	Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points) AND Local Contribution above minimum (maximum 25 points additional) • One point for every percent of local contribution up to 50% OR Hardship (25 points maximum) - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following: • District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it is not sufficient to fund the project • Debt-level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV) • Total district bonding capacity less than \$50M	50	50
Total		200	200

LOCAL CONTRIBUTION/HARDSHIP METRIC

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

- Minimum Local Contribution 25% (25 points)

AND

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

OR

- Hardship (25 points maximum)
 - Demonstrate local effort to raise revenues – provide evidence of at least one of the following:

- District passed a local GO bond within the past two years but it's not sufficient to fund the project at FPP submission
- Debt level of at least 70% of bonding capacity (2.5% of AV)
- Total district bonding capacity less than \$50 million

FUNDING ALLOCATION BETWEEN CATEGORIES

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

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

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

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

DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL OUTLAY PLANS

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

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

DISTRICT MASTER PLANS

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

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

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

EDUCATION MASTER PLANS

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

FACILITIES MASTER PLANS

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

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

- 1. Community College Change and Growth** – Community colleges facilities are inherently difficult to plan for because the only constant is change – change in the size of the campus, rules and regulations, educational programs, administration, staff and faculty, and a myriad of other factors. Community college campuses often grow to many times their original size over a long period of time so the need to plan for and respond to change must be integral to a facilities master plan.

2. **Campus Design Guidelines** – The facilities master plan must define campus design guidelines, not only to provide a cohesive look for the entire campus but to ensure access and functionality. The campus needs to be designed for flexibility so that facilities can change to the extent possible to support changes in the educational program.
3. **State Rules and Guidelines** – California’s community colleges are governed by laws, regulations and guidelines that are utilized by various governmental entities (i.e., Board of Governors, Department of Finance, Division of the State Architect) in the review of new campuses and building projects. The facilities master plan for any campus must be consistent with state rules and guidelines.
4. **California Environmental Quality Act** – The California Environmental Quality Act requires districts to define and possibly mitigate the negative impact of construction or new development on neighboring properties. Districts must evaluate the impact of vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic, storm water run-off, historic structures and features, greenhouse gas emissions, and a variety of other potential impacts on neighboring properties when developing a new site or starting a new project on an existing site.
5. **Operational Considerations** – The facilities planning process must take into account various operational issues, including those that influence staffing requirements and energy usage for new and/or modernized facilities. Incentives are provided by the Board and the various utility companies that encourage energy efficient design and construction. Laws and regulations impact staffing levels such as: the Fifty Percent Law requires all community college districts to spend at least half of their current expense of education for salaries of classroom instructors; funding caps which limit the growth of a district, and collective bargaining which determines class size limitations and other working condition issues. Classroom scheduling issues must also be taken into account when determining the number and size of classrooms: availability of rooms, size of rooms, and physical adequacy of rooms to teach specific types of courses.
6. **Funding Availability** – Funding for community college facilities is always less than what is required to support the facility needs of the community college system. State funding is dependent upon the passage of statewide general obligation bonds, and local funding is dependent upon the passage of local general obligation bonds. Moving forward, the availability of state funds to finance new community college projects is been constrained due to the lack of an education bond in 2020. Facilities master plans must plan to the extent possible for buildings that are efficient, flexible (can be used for more than one purpose and adaptable to change over time), and cost effective. Careful planning of classroom scheduling within existing facilities can increase facility utilization without the need for new buildings. Districts must explore alternative instructional delivery options such as distance education which can also mitigate the need for new facilities.

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

INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

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

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

FINAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

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

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

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

SCOPE APPROVAL

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

ANNUAL CAPITAL OUTLAY PLAN

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

PROJECT PHASING

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

READY ACCESS PROJECTS

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

DESIGN-BUILD PROJECTS

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

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

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

ANNUAL “ZERO-BASED” BUDGETING METHOD

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

APPEALS PROCESS

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

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE/LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

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

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

APPENDIX F: ENROLLMENT AND WSCH PROJECTIONS BY DISTRICTS

District	2026-27		2030-31		Difference		Percent Change	
-	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH
Allan Hancock Joint Community College District	12,186	113,453	12,399	116,790	213	3,338	1.75%	2.94%
Antelope Valley Community College District	11,985	127,856	11,956	131,208	-29	3,352	-0.24%	2.62%
Barstow Community College District	3,211	35,932	3,205	37,262	-5	1,329	-0.17%	3.70%
Butte-Glenn Community College District	10,217	115,844	10,266	119,672	48	3,828	0.47%	3.30%
Cabrillo Community College District	9,841	114,076	10,008	119,939	166	5,863	1.69%	5.14%
Cerritos Community College District	21,983	201,062	22,438	212,977	454	11,915	2.07%	5.93%
Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	17,547	183,641	18,001	193,298	454	9,658	2.59%	5.26%
Chaffey Community College District	20,272	192,304	20,656	197,581	384	5,276	1.89%	2.74%
Citrus Community College District	10,282	132,750	10,298	135,350	15	2,600	0.15%	1.96%
Coast Community College District	33,564	376,396	33,974	380,986	409	4,590	1.22%	1.22%
Compton Community College District	4,390	46,172	4,522	49,225	132	3,053	3.00%	6.61%
Contra Costa Community College District	28,914	332,194	29,233	339,462	319	7,268	1.10%	2.19%
Copper Mountain Community College District	1,619	17,759	1,661	19,610	43	1,850	2.64%	10.42%
Desert Community College District	11,898	142,009	12,056	154,596	158	12,587	1.33%	8.86%
El Camino Community College District	20,420	235,613	20,548	238,017	128	2,404	0.63%	1.02%
Feather River Community College District	1,357	20,070	1,326	19,607	-31	-463	-2.31%	-2.31%
Foothill-DeAnza Community College District	28,838	295,232	28,178	294,900	-660	-333	-2.29%	-0.11%
Gavilan Joint Community College District	5,576	63,717	5,722	68,350	145	4,633	2.60%	7.27%
Glendale Community College District	14,046	170,275	14,409	174,674	363	4,399	2.58%	2.58%
Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District	17,554	187,767	17,549	187,720	-4	-47	-0.03%	-0.03%
Hartnell Community College District	9,286	101,812	9,483	108,004	196	6,192	2.11%	6.08%
Imperial Valley Community College District	8,364	106,517	8,382	108,778	19	2,261	0.22%	2.12%
Kern Community College District	35,758	348,892	35,546	353,961	-212	5,069	-0.59%	1.45%
Lake Tahoe Community College District	2,952	28,672	2,949	31,824	-3	3,151	-0.11%	10.99%
Lassen Community College District	1,714	15,890	1,709	16,120	-5	230	-0.30%	1.45%
Long Beach Community College District	23,564	266,587	23,357	268,433	-207	1,846	-0.88%	0.69%
Los Angeles Community College District	110,965	1,135,225	113,242	1,158,527	2,278	23,302	2.05%	2.05%
Los Rios Community College District	57,173	565,172	57,975	573,094	801	7,922	1.40%	1.40%
Marin Community College District	5,313	47,894	5,321	47,962	7	67	0.14%	0.14%
Mendocino-Lake Community College District	4,239	34,917	4,278	39,669	39	4,751	0.91%	13.61%
Merced Community College District	10,921	121,070	10,694	119,905	-227	-1,165	-2.08%	-0.96%
MiraCosta Community College District	13,239	135,490	13,551	146,077	313	10,587	2.36%	7.81%

District	2026-27		2030-31		Difference		Percent Change	
-	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH
Monterey Peninsula Community College District	6,822	75,404	6,825	75,439	3	35	0.05%	0.05%
Mt. San Antonio Community College District	36,134	438,458	36,599	471,881	465	33,423	1.29%	7.62%
Mt. San Jacinto Community College District	16,969	163,098	17,152	165,687	183	2,589	1.08%	1.59%
Napa Valley Community College District	4,388	47,002	4,487	48,992	99	1,990	2.25%	4.23%
North Orange County Community College District	40,113	488,246	40,856	568,576	743	80,331	1.85%	16.45%
Ohlone Community College District	8,582	101,656	8,564	110,908	-17	9,252	-0.20%	9.10%
Palo Verde Community College District	4,640	35,809	4,551	35,125	-89	-684	-1.91%	-1.91%
Palomar Community College District	19,078	199,416	19,347	206,792	268	7,375	1.41%	3.70%
Pasadena Community College District	24,306	288,687	24,760	315,629	455	26,942	1.87%	9.33%
Peralta Community College District	20,725	189,878	21,180	194,048	455	4,170	2.20%	2.20%
Rancho Santiago Community College District	46,910	414,943	45,987	409,410	-923	-5,533	-1.97%	-1.33%
Redwoods Community College District	4,328	49,226	4,280	50,537	-48	1,310	-1.11%	2.66%
Rio Hondo Community College District	17,778	161,656	18,159	187,559	380	25,903	2.14%	16.02%
Riverside Community College District	33,778	408,208	34,599	418,129	821	9,920	2.43%	2.43%
San Bernardino Community College District	16,145	169,608	16,272	172,227	127	2,619	0.79%	1.54%
San Diego Community College District	48,519	526,133	49,410	535,797	891	9,664	1.84%	1.84%
San Francisco Community College District	21,028	196,849	21,326	201,615	299	4,766	1.42%	2.42%
San Joaquin Delta Community College District	15,863	172,308	15,563	177,636	-299	5,328	-1.89%	3.09%
San Jose-Evergreen Community College District	14,620	148,857	14,867	151,375	247	2,518	1.69%	1.69%
San Luis Obispo County Community College District	11,620	103,318	11,642	108,676	23	5,358	0.19%	5.19%
San Mateo County Community College District	17,885	182,406	18,465	188,324	580	5,918	3.24%	3.24%
Santa Barbara Community College District	16,874	209,653	17,171	249,588	297	39,936	1.76%	19.05%
Santa Clarita Community College District	21,195	207,680	20,869	226,907	-325	19,227	-1.53%	9.26%
Santa Monica Community College District	26,005	285,247	26,527	299,459	522	14,213	2.01%	4.98%
Sequoias Community College District	13,209	141,015	12,807	144,653	-403	3,638	-3.05%	2.58%
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. Comm. College District	7,763	84,438	7,625	87,390	-138	2,953	-1.78%	3.50%
Sierra Jt. Community College District	16,052	172,265	15,613	174,448	-439	2,183	-2.74%	1.27%
Siskiyou Jt. Community College District	1,332	17,277	1,335	17,368	3	90	0.21%	0.52%
Solano Community College District	8,269	82,417	8,116	81,614	-154	-803	-1.86%	-0.97%
Sonoma County Junior College District	21,233	189,555	21,770	203,175	537	13,619	2.53%	7.18%
South Orange County Community College District	33,790	326,602	33,833	341,686	44	15,084	0.13%	4.62%
Southwestern Community College District	17,638	204,837	17,737	205,984	99	1,147	0.56%	0.56%
State Center Community College District	37,698	392,414	37,780	393,269	82	855	0.22%	0.22%

District	2026-27		2030-31		Difference		Percent Change	
-	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment	WSCH
Ventura County Community College District	26,799	294,792	27,111	298,222	312	3,429	1.16%	1.16%
Victor Valley Community College District	13,183	154,262	13,194	154,390	11	127	0.08%	0.08%
West Hills Community College District	6,088	62,930	5,960	61,608	-128	-1,322	-2.10%	-2.10%
West Kern Community College District	4,055	30,931	4,067	36,248	12	5,317	0.29%	17.19%
West Valley-Mission Community College District	13,950	147,277	14,202	149,933	252	2,656	1.80%	1.80%
Yosemite Community College District	19,889	206,275	19,863	213,990	-26	7,715	-0.13%	3.74%
Yuba Community College District	7,987	80,855	7,915	80,126	-72	-728	-0.90%	-0.90%
Statewide Total	1,312,428	13,864,149	1,323,277	14,377,995	10,848	513,847	0.83%	3.71%

Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Research and Data Analytics Unit, Management Information System

-	Enrollment	WSCH"	Enrollment	WSCH	Enrollment Difference	% Difference	WSCH Difference	% Difference
Statewide Total CY 26-27 thru 30-31	1,312,428	13,864,149	1,323,277	14,377,995	10,848	0.83%	513,847	3.71%
Statewide Total PY 25-26 thru 29-30	1,376,774	13,867,290	1,399,794	14,951,780	23,020	1.67%	1,084,490	7.82%
Difference	-64,346	-3,141	-76,517	-573,785	-	-	-	-
% Change	-5%	0%	-5%	-4%	-	-	-	-

Front cover photo:
Sacramento City College

Photo at right:
LA Valley

Back cover photo:
I Can Go To College Photoshoot



Connect
with us!

WEBSITES

California Community Colleges
ccco.edu

Salary Surfer
salarysurfer.cccco.edu

I Can Go To College
ICanGoToCollege.com

SOCIAL MEDIA



California Community Colleges Facebook
facebook.com/CACommColleges



California Community Colleges X (Formerly Twitter)
x.com/CalCommColleges

Chancellor Sonya Christian X (Formerly Twitter)
x.com/sonyachristian

Government Relations X (Formerly Twitter)
x.com/CCGRAdvocates



California Community Colleges YouTube
youtube.com/CACommunityColleges



California Community Colleges Instagram
instagram.com/CaliforniaCommunityColleges



California Community Colleges LinkedIn
[linkedin.com/company/
CaliforniaCommunityColleges/](https://linkedin.com/company/CaliforniaCommunityColleges/)



California Community Colleges Threads
threads.com/@californiacommunitycolleges



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