

ACBO FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

March 4, 2021

ATTENDEES

Task Force Members Present: Ann-Marie Gabel, Hussain Agah, Fred Diamond, George Estrada, Tim Flood, MacAdam Lojowsky, Lyndsay Maas, Pablo Manzo, Jose Nunez, Robert Parker, Jim Schrage, Erik Skinner, Richard Storti, Richard Williams

Chancellor's Office Staff: Hoang Nguyen, Harold Flood, Druv Bhat, Eric Thorson, Brian Turner, Lan Yuan, Chay Yang, Wrenna Finche

Foundation for CCCs: Shirley Asher, Eric Mittlestead

CCC/IOU EE Partnership: Lisa Hannaman

Other Resources: Ron Beeler, Jennifer Baker, Ida Clair, Joe Fullerton, Doug Humphrey, Bryan Frank

A. Committee Reports/Other Issues

- **FUSION Update – Tim Flood/Shirley Asher**

- i. The FUSION Committee met yesterday to go over their current progress. The committee completed a contact list of Steering Committee members to attach to the FUSION Charter and updated and completed Peralta CCD's contact information. At one district's request, the committee completed a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) report before that district can pay its invoices. The VPAT Report evaluates FUSION's accessibility and gives a roadmap to ensure FUSION's accessibility in the future. Additional updates to FUSION's modules are planned for later in March. All annual fee payments from districts were received except for Peralta CCD's. Even though Peralta's payment was planned for February 2021, Peralta has not paid so far. Nonetheless, on February 18, Peralta mentioned they are expediting their payment.
- ii. The FUSION Committee is also starting work on the 21/22 Budget. For 2021, the projected amount is a little under the 2022 level. The 2021 Revenues are projected at approximately \$1.6 million. The committee is also encountering significant savings when it comes to staffing and office expenses compared to the previous budget. With the additional money from these savings come greater allocations into the FUSION reserve to offset costs and possibly add more items. The 2021 Expenses are projected at approximately \$1.2 million. For 2021, the Foundation for California Community Colleges is projecting over \$200,000, with a forecast of approximately \$400,000, to place into the reserve. This could lead to a FUSION reserve of \$1.8 million.
- iii. FUSION 2.1 is planned to launch on March 15, but its rollout is sequenced around the FPU Call Letter. Once the call letter rolls out, the FPU will roll in the plan year. From there, there are plans to extract all the data from FUSION 2 in anticipation of FUSION 2's transition into FUSION 2.1. Once that occurs, capacity-load calculations will be triple-checked for accuracy. Because of this, they may not be perfect upon launch. Because of capacity-load calculations' technical nature, the committee plans to do this troubleshooting once the data finishes migrating from FUSION 2 to FUSION 2.1. From there, the committee will add the space criteria.
- iv. Regarding JCAF32, the committee is trying to work on escalation and midpoint calculations by synchronizing the spreadsheet workbooks used for these calculations and FUSION. The goal is to get to the point where people can use FUSION without relying on workbooks for cross-checking.

- v. For the April 30, 2021 rollout, the committee plans to work on space inventory and assessment updates. For July 1, 2021 rollout, the committee plans to continue working on space inventory. For October 2021 rollout, the committee plans to work on schedule maintenance and design build.
- vi. Even though revenues are increasing, the committee wants to examine FUSION's fees and reserve to avoid giving the false impression that FUSION is a for-profit effort. The committee also plans to further review FUSION's Facility Condition Index (FCI) calculations.
- vii. The FUSION Enhancement Project is on schedule, with over 200 participants. The next major release will go live on March 15 and the Space Inventory analysis will begin on mid-March. There will also be additional training in the upcoming months. Alongside an online training manual, virtual and in-person training options are provided.
- viii. Compared to earlier years, the number of customer support tickets submitted are down and overall, there is a faster resolution of issues within FUSION. 1 million sq ft added a year to the system as a whole. Seems it will level out when more modernization projects move forward.
- ix. The committee is still negotiating district assessment schedule and staffing as per that schedule. This is due to the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) wanting a three-year assessment schedule since they use FUSION's data for their internal processes. On the other hand, the FUSION Committee wants a four-year schedule due to multiple factors, including COVID-19.

B. Chancellor's Office Update – Hoang Nguyen

- The Chancellor's Office recently released a memo for reversions (projects that have gone through P and W phases and still have remaining funds). The Office is currently conducting work for escalations and determining reappropriations for current projects. There is also a March 5, 2021 deadline for sending DOF districts' lease revenue.
- Interviews will be held in a couple of weeks to backfill Ronnie Slimp's position. Additionally, Wrenna Finche was promoted to Assistant Vice Chancellor of College Finance and Facilities Planning.
- With COVID-19 and decreasing enrollment projections, there are plans to make changes to the Centers' Needs Assessment checklist over the next few months to better determine if centers are fully utilized and if there is a need for those centers. These plans include adding a couple of checkboxes based on COVID-19 and lower enrollment projection benchmarks to determine those centers' utilization as well as looking at utilization at the main campuses. After this is completed, the revised checklist will be brought to the ACBO-FTF Committee for their review.

C. Spending Plan – Hoang Nguyen

- According to Hoang, the spending plan was emailed out to everyone. From the last time around, Proposition 51 dollars were set at \$88 to \$91 million. There are plans to reduce this spending to around \$50 million. Since that time, Brian and Hoang are working on finding remaining dollars in older bonds. From there, they located potentially \$50 million from propositions 1D and 55, leading to the spending plan getting bumped up to \$90 million.
- Due to seismic upgrades, escalations, and potential future project costs, the spending plan takes into account the need for extra funds to help districts who have not allocated money for DSA's seismic upgrades. At the moment, the current spending plan is the projected amount due to the inability to determine seismic upgrade costs so far. Right now, it is around \$90 million unescalated, which is below the \$100 million marker set, but once escalation occurs, a better understanding of the total cost will emerge. As projects come in with DSA issues for seismic upgrades, the number of projects in the

spending plan will decrease until the spending plan matches the actual amount remaining.

- There are \$130-140 million with the older bonds, with \$50 million from Proposition 1D and 55 and \$88 million from Proposition 51. Once the older bonds are audited, it is hoped that there will be additional funds. Because of the ongoing revision of FUSION's systemwide five-year plan, there are plans to submit this proposal to the Board of Governors (BOG) in September 2021.

D. Small District Metric - Office Space – Hoang Nguyen

- The Facilities Planning Unit (FPU) is trying to update the small district metric to reflect the BOG-approved space utilization code and small community college districts. For this update, the FPU is looking into what a small community college district is. By looking at what is already present like Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) and basic allocation, metrics for small, medium, and large districts were obtained using full-time enrolled students (FTES) data.
- By using the 10,000 FTES used for SCFF and basic allocation, the FPU came up with the idea of using 5,000 FTES for rural districts. The FPU also came up with the idea of defining a small district for capacity load purposes as 5,000 FTES or less, which is in line with Title 5 and SCFF regulations.

E. Climate Change and Sustainability Policy Update – Joe Fullerton/Hoang Nguyen

- The BOG approved its climate change and sustainability policy in 2019. Since then, questions emerged around it and how it reflects the system's needs. In 2020, a steering committee was created, whose members include energy managers and CBOs. The committee is headed by Joe Fullerton. The committee has been evolving and developing new metrics, which are goals built around the original climate change and sustainability policy. The committee plans to bring these metrics to the BOG.
- According to Joe, some of the committee's issues like justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion in addressing the climate crisis are not easily achievable and take a fair bit of work. The BOG's May 2019 memo laid out goals, but did not provide tools or frameworks for the committee to abide by. Currently, the committee is trying to address that gap by developing benchmarks and improving those benchmarks over time. These benchmarks are displayed in the CCC BOG Goals, which is currently a working document. The committee is hoping to use resources from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE), a nonprofit Philadelphia-based international organization that is a lead in higher education sustainability efforts. The committee saw it as problematic to leave it up to every campus in accomplishing these sustainability goals and instead wanted to provide a tool for campuses to use. The conversation evolved from using campus-specific tools to using tools that are recognized, robust, sufficient in accomplishing goals, and pre-formulated. These tools are present in AASHE's Sustainability Tracking Assessment & Rating System (STARS). The committee is working with AASHE in obtaining reduced-cost pricing for membership and accessibility to these tools.
- The CCC BOG Goals is divided into categories, subcategories, plans for 2022 (gather data for developing benchmarks using STARS 2.2), plans for 2025 (building and institutionalizing reports using most recent STARS version), and plans for 2030 (making improvements and reassessments using STARS Bronze Minimum). The categories listed are Planning and Administration, Academics (AC), Engagement (EN), and Operations (OP). While most categories contain a single subcategory, EN's subcategories are Campus Engagement and Public Engagement. OP's subcategories are Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction, Green Buildings, Energy, Water, Waste, Purchasing and Procurement, and Transportation.

- There is still work needed to be done for Planning and Administration. The 2022 plans for this category are to have a diversity and equity committee, office, and/or officer and/or make diversity trainings and activities available. There are no future plans within this category so far.
- AC's plans are setting benchmarks on the inventorying of academic courses and conducting sustainability literacy assessments for 2022. Any subsequent improvements for that category are developed according to the STARS protocol and involve moving up from the 2022 baseline established in the category's benchmarks.
- EN's plan is to set benchmarks around campus and public engagements and, like AC, make improvements according to the STARS protocol. Campus engagement involves creating benchmarks around strong collaborations and partnerships within and between the campus/district and the campus community for 2022. Public engagement involves creating benchmarks around strong collaborations and partnerships within and between the campus/district and the surrounding community for 2022. For each subcategory, any subsequent improvements involve moving up from the 2022 baseline established in that subcategory's benchmarks.
- OP's plan is specific to California and aligned with state regulations. For greenhouse gas emissions reduction, the goal is to conduct an emissions inventory baseline and create a climate action plan by 2022, a 40% reduction from 2022 baseline or 1990 greenhouse gas emission levels by 2025 and a 75% reduction below 2022 baseline or 1990 greenhouse gas emission levels by 2030. According to Joel, this is not enough from a scientific perspective because International Panel of Climate Change believes we are nine years away from the tipping point where greenhouse gases fundamentally change life on earth.
- The green building goals aims to align with DSA's green building codes and standards. There is emphasis on a zero-net energy (ZNE) strategy, Energy Utilization Intensity (thousands of thermal unit per square foot of the building's space), and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and/or WELL Assessments across existing buildings. All new buildings are required to have zero net energy by 2025, but this may change depending on what DSA or the California Energy Commission comes with. By 2025, new buildings are required to be LEED or WELL Silver Certified and existing buildings are required to be LEED Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Certified.
- For energy goals, the aim is to look at Energy Utilization Intensity (EUI) for the entire campus as well as plan for electrification of systems with Effective Useful Life (EUL) of less than 10 years by 2022. For 2025, the goal is to decrease EUI by 25% over the building portfolio and procure or produce 100% of the site's electrical consumption on an annual basis using renewable energy. By 2030, the goal is to aim for a Zero Energy Campus, which is defined by the Department of Energy.
- Water goals are divided between potable water usage and stormwater. Joel believes the CCC system has done a good job on stormwater, but not on potable water. For potable water consumption, it is important to benchmark potable water usage and identify potential non-potable water sources by 2022. For stormwater, 2022 goals are creating a landscape zoning map and irrigation metering strategy and adopting the CCC Model Stormwater management program.
- The goals for waste are tied to the California Waste Management Authority's goal of zero-waste by 2025.
- Purchasing and procurement's goals emphasize sustainable procurement when it comes to organizations reducing their overall costs, risk of cost increases, and greenhouse gas emissions.
- For transportation, the state wants to ensure 100% of fleet vehicles and rolling stock are zero-emission by 2030 and the 2025 goals set a 50% zero-energy requirement for fleet vehicles and rolling stock.

- The committee is working with AASHE for cost efficiency and is discussing with CalEPA and General Service Agency on how to provide districts with the right tools and financial resources. For the recommendation to the BOG during their May 2021 meeting, the committee will also include a template the BOG can use for adopting these changes. For benchmarking, the committee is seeking further aid from the CCC-IOU as well as additional organizations to partner with for greater tools and funding. The committee will send a portfolio on this material to the ACBO early next week and also plans to refine this material for the May 2021 BOG Meeting.

F. DSA – Replacement Costs –DSA/Hoang

- Hoang invited Doug Humphrey and Bryan Frank to participate in this conversation on replacement costs. From there, Bryan invited Doug Humphrey and both of them are working on a standardized way to calculate these costs. Moving forward, Hoang is also considering bringing in Bryan and Doug to realign FUSION to prevent this from occurring when the FPU approves new projects in the future. According to Doug, even though DSA is assisting in cost estimation, cost estimation is neither one of DSA's talents nor intended roles, and DSA hopes to ultimately exit from this activity.
- Currently, preliminary packages currently being worked on and submitted. Questions are arising on replacement costs for facilities in terms of what local replacement values for projects are and what DSA is putting forward, which is causing districts to hit 50% replacement value threshold. This is leading to an increase in seismic replacement costs and then overall costs, impacting districts and bond funding.
- Previously, the 50% threshold did not get hit that often, but as California's buildings get older and older, this problem is increasingly encountered. For design professionals and districts, it is important to realize when the project will exceed 50% replacement cost early on in the plan so that it can be budgeted instead of running into this after submitting the project to the DSA. The DSA is planning to develop Interpretations of Regulations (IR) for release soon as possible. This IR aims to define the determination for the 50% threshold. For assessing replacement costs, the DSA reviewed FUSION and was impressed with the ways one can find replacement costs. Ultimately, the DSA wants to leave the role of cost estimation so that districts can determine replacement costs and whether they need to budget a seismic retrofit. The DSA also wants to release the IR with a link so that people can access FUSION or districts can provide professionals with this replacement cost. Soft costs are not a consideration for the DSA. When examining FUSION, the DSA is looking at building itself, 5 feet outside the building's footprint, and the replacement cost. When examining the replacement cost, DSA removes costs like retrofit, HVAC, and installation to determine the 50% replacement cost. However, the DSA believes that seismic retrofit should not be considered a disincentive when determining the replacement cost since it can be seen as an important campus asset. DSA also advocates for a uniform approach when it comes to assessing the 50% replacement cost.
- However, there is some uncertainty regarding the FUSION update's schedule and how the update impacts FUSION's replacement cost. DSA wants FUSION to be updated and ready as soon as possible. DSA is uncertain if there is a need for them to access FUSION, but it is necessary for design professionals to provide this information to indicate what this cost is and how they obtained it. That way, DSA move through these projects faster and everyone involved can better understand if a seismic retrofit is necessary.
- The ACBO and DSA discussed creating a DSA/FCI FUSION Sub-Committee to examine the accuracy of FUSION's calculations, including FUSION's FCI data. The ACBO and DSA also set June 2021 as the possible completion date of these assessments. The DSA/FCI FUSION Sub-Committee members are Shirley Asher, Pablo Manzo, Tim Flood, Richard Williams, Hussain Agah, Erik Skinner, Hoang Nguyen, and Eric Mittlestead. The DSA/FCI FUSION Sub-Committee's members will keep Ida Clair, Doug

Humphrey, and Bryan Frank informed of the sub-committee's activities.

G. Division of State Architects

- **Ida Clair, AIA – State Architect**

- i. The DSA's Sacramento Regional Office Manager Dan Levernier retired on October 30, 2020. DSA made a selection for the vacant Sacramento Regional Office Manager position, but it not yet announced because it is in the process of approvals, but the replacement is anticipated to start on April 1, 2021.
- ii. After holding interviews last week, the DSA selected a new Headquarters Principal Structural Engineer for Codes and Standards to replace Jim Hackett, who retired on December 30, 2020. Despite making the selection, the selection is not yet announced because it is currently in the process of approvals. The replacement is anticipated to start on April 1, 2021.
- iii. The DSA is proceeding with interim Regional Office Manager for Oakland office and selections for the position will be announced early next week. This position will only be for a couple of months to substitute for permanent Regional Office Manager, who is on medical leave.
- iv. For the DSA, February was very busy, with \$1 billion in plan review submitted. The most active regions were the South Area (Los Angeles, San Diego). There is approximately \$666 million in plan review expected for March, which is anticipated to be a busy month. The busiest regions are San Diego, with Oakland and Los Angeles a close second. With around \$347 million in plan review submitted, April is also anticipated to be a busy month.
- v. There is a CALGreen Workshop proposed for later this March. The DSA is partnering with Building Standards in that outreach. Proposals for this workshop are requirements for shade trees and CO2 monitors in K12 classrooms. There is also continued work on requiring EV charging station infrastructure installation within K12 and community colleges to include at least one Level 2 minimum charger. At the moment, the number of chargers scheduled for installation is based on a table indicating how many charging stations are installed.
- vi. The California Energy Commission is continuing with rulemaking on a prescriptive method and energy budgets for a performance method based on heat pump technology for water and HVAC systems. The commission is looking at a dual-fuel method of addressing prescriptive and performance methods for certain areas such as Climate Zone 1 (Tahoe) and Climate Zone 16 (North Coast). For performance methods, if one is looking to use fossil fuels, one will need to improve other areas in order to meet the energy budget. This requirement does not apply to Climate Zones 1 and 16 since they will use dual-fuel technology. The California Energy Commission is proceeding with the 45-day comment period for their rulemaking, which is set for either late March or early April 2021. Ida encourages subscribing to the California Energy Commission's announcements for obtaining more information on the comment period and how to provide comments during that time.
- vii. Effective January 1, 2023, the California Energy Commission's Solar Ready requirements mandate the installation of solar photovoltaics (PVs) on new building construction. This does not necessarily have to be on the building, but needs to be somewhere where it can power the building. Battery storage is also an option for meeting these requirements.
- viii. The Public School Construction Collaborative's first meeting is scheduled for March 12, 2021. In that meeting, the collaborative will discuss structural safety proposals for 2022 Code Amendments. After the March 12 meeting, there is also a public meeting later this March for the general constituency group to inform them of the structural safety regulation proposals. Because of the few access regulations currently available, a public meeting on that topic will

take place in either late March or early April 2021. Ida advocates subscribing to the collaborative's Listserve for further information

- ix. Achieving Net Zero, a new DSA page, was launched. Currently, the DSA is on session 8, meaning they are wrapping up on the existing cohort. After session 8, DSA will look for additional cohorts, likely a community college cohort. More information on this will come in the next couple of months. The Achieving Net Zero webpage also contains information on how facility managers can access National Energy Management Institute (NEMI) acceptance testing, which is virtual, online, free, and contains California Energy Commission tools on maintaining systems. The DSA is also working on providing similar information for lighting compliance for possible release in the next couple of months.

H. Legislative Update

- **Jennifer Baker (filling in for Rebekah Cearley) – Legislative Advocate**

- i. The legislature has started hearings on the Governor's Budget Proposal. There are concerns about lower COLA within the budget for community colleges compared to the K12 COLA. Right now, the hearings are informational and formal votes on these items will not occur until after the May revise, so Jennifer will continue monitoring this. The 21-22 Budget proposed an increase in community college capital outlay funding of a little over \$355 million. Of this, \$2.2 million is for a new start project in Riverside Community College and \$353.6 million are for the construction phases of 17 continuing projects. The continuing projects are anticipated to complete their design by the spring of 2022.
- ii. \$2 billion of bond authority from Proposition 51 was allocated for community college capital outlay. Most of this is already committed to existing projects, but a small amount is available for new project proposals.
- iii. Today, both the Assembly and the Senate voted on K12 School Reopening Package. The governor is expected to sign the legislative package in an expedited manner. The package contains \$6.6 billion in state funds for public schools and requires local agencies to offer in-person instruction. This package could ultimately lead to discussions on similar action at the community college level.
- iv. Two weeks ago, the governor signed a stimulus package of \$7.6 billion. This package contains financial aid for community college students, the extension of CalFRESH, and additional support for community college students. However, 40% of the costs for the expansion of the earned income tax credit was money that could have gone to K12 and community colleges, but this is not expected to be significant.
- v. Congress is moving forward with a \$1.9 trillion COVID-related legislative package. The House sent the package to the Senate, but the package does not have bipartisan support. The package includes a higher-education emergency relief fund where \$40 billion is appropriated to higher education institutions. Should this package move forward, there is an economic impact anticipated for California's higher education systems.
- vi. Of the 21-22 Legislative Session bills, there is SB 22 (Glazer), which is a K12-University bond. The bill will be heard next week on March 10. The CCFC supports this bill with some amendments. The amendments the CCFC requested are the removal of provisions that would increase bonding capacity across school and community college districts since those same amendments were in Proposition 13, which was rejected by voters. Jennifer has discussed how to amend the bill with Senator Glazer's office and plans to continue doing so.
- vii. CCFC supports AB 75 (O'Donnell), another education bond measure. The policy hearing for this

bill is possibly set for April, but there are no substantive changes expected while it is in the Assembly. The financial hardship provisions expected to be added back in the Senate and expect substantive changes once it moves to the Senate.

- viii. The Legislature introduced 2,400 bills for the 21-22 Legislative Session. Because of the large number of bills present, there are not so many policy or appropriation committee hearings compared to pre-pandemic years, so there may not be any time or capacity to move all those bills forward. According to Jennifer, this is a hectic and moving time for the legislature.
- ix. The new bills introduced this session include a number of housing bills. One bill is AB 306 (O'Donnell), which focuses on school and community college district or employee housing. This bill would exclude residential school and community college district or employee building from the Field Act.
- x. Another bill is AB 902 (O'Donnell), which is a design-build-contract measure sponsored by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). There are discussions with LAUSD to see where they want this to go and how this will move forward.
- xi. There is also AB 983 (Garcia), which looks at public contracts in relation to construction projects where public entities are authorized to enter into or require contractors to enter into a community workforce agreements for certain construction projects, including renewable energy projects.
- xii. Alongside these bills is AB 1277 (Rubio), which looks at CEQA and student housing projects in relation to expedited judicial review. This bill authorizes public university to certify a project as a student housing project if it meets certain requirements. Also, affordable student housing projects on a UC, CSU, or community college within two miles of campus are subject to expedited CEQA judicial review under this bill.
- xiii. AB 1377 (McCarty) would, subject to appropriation within the budget, establish a revolving loan fund and grant program to student housing. On a separate, but related issue, CCFC wrote a letter of support for establishing a \$5 million grant program within the 21-22 budget.
- xiv. There is also SB 45 (Portantino), which is the Wildfire Protection, Safe Drinking Water, Job Protection, Drought Preparation, and Flood Protection Bond Act of 2022. If approved by voters, this bill authorizes \$5.5 billion in bonds for the aforementioned purposes.
- xv. SB 234 (Wiener) establishes the Transition-Age Youth Housing Program and a council to implement this program. Jennifer is watching this bill to determine what direction Wiener proposes with it.
- xvi. There is also SB 330 (Durazo) regarding community college affordable housing, which, as written, limits lease-leasebacks for certain colleges to those with a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) or meets skilled and trained workforce labor requirements. Currently, Jennifer is obtaining additional information on this bill.

I. Prop 39 - CCC/IOU

• Prop 39 Extension – Hoang Nguyen

- i. Last month, Hoang presented to Citizen's Oversight Board on some of the final Proposition 39 numbers. Hoang will also meet with the Citizen's Oversight Board later this month to present a report recommending the Proposition 39 program's finalization. As part of his discussions with the Citizen's Oversight Board, Hoang is also advocating for additional funds through the California Energy Commission. In the Citizen Oversight Board's March meeting, when the motion to finalize the Proposition 39 program passes, Proposition 39 will close.

- **CCC/IOU Update – Lisa Hannaman**

- i. The CCC/IOU held a partnership meeting yesterday to go over updates. One update involves the existing Savings by Design program, which will formally transition to a third-party program for new construction starting August 2021. This change will apply to all utility service territories. The new program will be managed by PG&E.
- ii. Another update is that Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, and PG&E are still accepting applications for their existing Savings by Design program. This will still occur despite the aforementioned transition to avoid any gaps between the old and the new programs. PG&E will be seeing projects in the queue through provided they meet PG&E's minimum criteria, but are not accepting application for new projects. This was discussed in yesterday's partnership meeting where it was decided to update the documentation for the 2-3% bonus dollars available with state bond funding. Hoang and Lisa will work to update this documentation to ensure it aligns with the new Savings by Design program and accounts for the gap when the old program ends and the new program starts. As soon as the documentation is updated, Hoang and Lisa plan to get something out on this in the next couple of weeks.
- iii. The CCC/IOU also held three focus groups: one with the CCC/IOU management team for the partnership program, one with several directors of facilities, and one with CCC/IOU's energy managers. For the energy managers' meeting, the CCC/IOU put together a list of energy issues from a partnership perspective. The issues revolve around what more the CCC/IOU would like to do as well as what those energy managers would like to see changed or enhanced. The CCC/IOU provided the energy managers' focus group information to the CCC/IOU's community college management team members. Right now, those team members are examining these updates. From there, the team members will develop priorities to focus on for the next 18 months as the program transitions to an additional third-party program for the partnership. The CCC/IOU plans to send this information to the ACBO as soon as the prioritization list is established, which is currently set for March 15.
- iv. Hoang and Lisa will present to the Southern California Facilities Officers (SCFO) and the northern California groups the California Energy Commission's benchmarking work on facilities and how to define them. This work, according to Lisa, is especially applicable for large California campuses with one master meter and several hundred thousand square feet. This benchmarking work contains information explaining why it is significant and what it requires for those campuses. On the benchmarking of utility data, Hoang and Lisa are planning to meet with the California Energy Commission to discuss this.

Upcoming Meetings:

June 3, 2021

September 2, 2021

December 2, 2021

March 3, 2022