

ACBO FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

SUMMARY NOTES

December 2, 2021

ATTENDEES

Task Force Members Present: Hussain Agah, Susan Cheu, Terrence DeGray, Fred Diamond, George Estrada, Tim Flood, MacAdam Lojowsky, Lyndsay Maas, Pablo Manzo, Julia Morrison, Jim Schrage, Erik Skinner, Richard Storti, Jose Torres, Richard Williams

Chairperson: Ann-Marie Gabel

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

Foundation for CCCs: Shirley Asher, Eric Mittlestead

CCC/IOU EE Partnership: Lisa Hannaman

Other Resources: Ron Beeler, Rebekah Cearley, Ida Clair

A. Committee Reports/Other Issues

- **FUSION Update – Shirley Asher**

- i. In the June meeting, the FUSION Steering Committee discussed MOU updates for FUSION. Because the MOU was last updated in 2010, the committee believed it was necessary to revisit the MOU. The suggested FUSION MOU updates include yearly calculations of annual fees according to square footage. One MOU update is hosting FUSION in the cloud. Before this update, San Joaquin Delta Community College provided server and data security support to FUSION. Another MOU update is transforming FUSION into a custom software owned by California Community Colleges (CCCs) instead of a third party software. While the Steering Committee decided the Architectural Drawings Database was still needed, they wanted to see it in FUSION rather than an external application. The Steering Committee will discuss how to design the FUSION database in a manner that ensures districts can upload their plans to the Database in one place. Additional MOU updates are updating the number of colleges and task force reference names. Once these updates are implemented, the Steering Committee will route them to Tim and Ann-Marie for signatures. Before sending these updates for signatures, Shirley will send a red-lined version of these updates to Ann-Marie and Tim for their review. Ann-Marie will then take these updates to the ACBO Board for the Board's approval and for signature by Tim and ACBO President Morris Rodrigue.
- ii. For Enhancement Project updates, the Schedule Maintenance is planned to go live on December 15. There will also be a Schedule Maintenance training held on December 15 with email invites coming soon. The Design Build business requirements are completed pending FPU review. Some Design Build items need finalization, but that is planned for next week. The new DF14D form will go live on December 15. The Digital Signature rollout is complete, and the FPU

Plan Roll feature will go live on December 15. The Steering Committee also received positive feedback from the Community College Facility Coalition (CCFC) on FUSION's enhanced version.

- iii. For assessment updates, 24 assessments are scheduled for 2022. Assessors will complete the Los Rios assessments by January 2022. Assessment resources will be split between Northern California and Southern California. The 2022 assessment schedule will also contain a 33% increase in campus assessments. Robert "Barney" McClung will handle a lot of the smaller campuses on his own, while two assessors will be assigned to the larger campuses. The plan is to eventually get back to the three-year assessment cycle.
 - iv. For budget review, there are \$292,023 in outstanding annual fees. These fees are from Barstow CCD, Coast CCD, Los Angeles CCD, and Peralta CCD. Los Angeles CCD is where the majority of these fees are from, and they are awaiting board approval on December 15 to pay these fees. Los Angeles CCD does not expect any issues on this. The remaining districts were reached out to and are sending over their payments. For this fiscal year, it is anticipated the staffing budget will contain over \$100k in savings. For the development fund, fiscal year 2022 revenues consisted of \$1,601,944 in FUSION fee payments, \$5,000 in FUSION training revenues, and \$500 in interest. The FUSION Development Fund contains \$1,557,000 for fiscal year 2022. Fiscal year 2023 revenues included \$1,601,944 in FUSION fee payments, which is the same as what was present in fiscal year 2022. For fiscal year 2023, the FUSION Development Fund contains \$1,590,000. From fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2023, the FUSION Development Fund amount contains an overall positive trend.
 - v. For staffing updates, Kimberly Meador accepted another position at the Foundation and plans to retire in the next couple of years. Jacie Grimes will replace Kimberly on 11/29. Barney McClung was promoted to manager. Since July, Shirley has been supporting the Program Pathways Mapper (PPM) for 25%. At the PPM's request, Shirley will stay with them for another 25% to get the program up and running.
- **Cost Model Presentation – Shirley Asher and Barney McClung**
 - i. As part of the June meeting, the FUSION Steering Committee decided the cost models needed be updated as part of the Vision for Success scoring updates. The committee formed a sub-committee around this. The Committee recommended obtaining cost-model estimators to get the cost model updates. Barney had mapped the RSMeans data to the current cost model, but the results did not meet the Vision for Success requirements. Barney then reached out to 12 different firms, but only one responded. The other 11 firms declared they were either unfamiliar with the work or unwilling to work with the RSMeans data. In response to this, Barney decided to recreate and update the cost models.

There are no records for the original FUSION cost models' creation, meaning there were no backups for the cost models' formulas. As Barney worked on the existing cost models, he concluded those models were likely created in an impromptu manner since no reasoning was provided for the bottom-line numbers within those models' estimates. To Barney, this made recreating those

cost models difficult, especially when considering the need to automatically update those cost models' numbers from the RSMeans data. Barney looked at the existing cost models, sorted buildings 100 different ways, and ultimately came up with a model building of 20,000 square feet to build costs from. Barney also used 20,000 square feet as a mean (average) of the whole portfolio of buildings on the campus. Barney used this mean to build costs and came up with 115 line items to build into those costs. These 115 line-items were developed from RSMeans, allowing them to be updated.

This data is obtained from national average construction data. Barney took this data, built the cost models, created a spreadsheet to spread the costs, and assigned multiple items (out of the 115 line items) to each type of cost model. Barney then compared those cost-models' numbers to what was present in the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) City-based Optimization Model for Energy Technologies (COMET), which is an energy-environment-economic optimization model. Barney also compared those cost-models' numbers to similar information in a quarterly report from Cummings (one of the larger estimating firms who work for CCCs). Barney believes these numbers are accurate. These numbers and cost models are used for determining the building's replacement value and age-related deficiencies. For the observed deficiencies, a different set of cost models, which is pulled from RSMeans, is used, and Barney believes these cost models are accurate in this area. However, Barney believes estimations on replacement value and remediation cost according to the system's age need to be recreated.

To ensure the national averages match up with California's averages, the City Cost Index normalizes these averages by California's zip codes, allowing for a more accurate estimate of local areas' RSMeans construction costs. However, there is a slight disconnect in that the RSMeans construction costs are for commercial construction and not CCC construction. Despite this, Barney is confident of these costs creating a cost estimate for buildings that is fairly accurate and allows users to compare, rank, and prioritize buildings. Barney also believes the FPU can use this cost estimate for statewide ranking and rating since every building has been compared to the same model. The cost model numbers are also used to create each building's Facility Condition Index (FCI), which is then applied to the JCAF32. While Barney believes the cost estimates are not accurate at the project's start, those estimates are closer to the actual costs compared to what is currently present in FUSION. Currently, the plan is to annually update the RSMeans cost-model numbers.

- ii. Recently, the FUSION Steering Committee also met with the Department of Finance (DOF) on the cost models and walked the DOF through this to get their support. The DOF expressed support for the FUSION Steering Committee's actions. The FUSION Steering Committee plans to examine project costs from different regions like Los Rios CCD and conduct a comparative analysis of past and present project costs. From there, the Steering Committee will pick the projects they want to share with the DOF regarding these findings.

B. Chancellor's Office Update – Hoang Nguyen

- For the past year and a half, the Chancellor's Office conducted bond audits. Brian and Druv were assigned to these tasks. As a result of these bond audits, the Chancellor's Office is looking at meeting with the DOF in mid-December on the remaining bond funds within propositions 55, 1D, and potentially Proposition 203. The Chancellor's Office is looking at potentially \$70 million in extra funds from these propositions for use in near-future projects. However, there may be \$100 million in extra funds based on these propositions' unissued bond funds.

For Proposition 203, some funds are pre-FUSION, which could be problematic since the CCCCO Accounting Unit is not back in the office to help audit and determine which of those funds belong to the CCC system. Approximately \$58 million in Proposition 55 funds and approximately \$39 million in Proposition 1D funds could go to the CCC system. However, only \$15 million of Proposition 1D's funds are specifically allocated to CCCs. The Chancellor's Office's mid-December meeting with the DOF could determine if the Chancellor's Office can access the full \$39 million.

The DOF has already talked to the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems regarding the \$24 million remaining Proposition 1D funds. Both the CSU and UC systems stated they are fine with relinquishing those remaining bond funds to CCCs. In light of this, the Chancellor's Office will inform the DOF in the mid-December meeting that those bond funds now belong to them. Hoang believes that with all these bond funds, CCC project funding remains secure until the 2022 education bond.

- Currently, Randy is working on the next budget. The 2022-23 fiscal year currently only has two new projects. Previously, there were 10 projects, but eight of those projects moved to the 2021-22 fiscal year. The bond funds may be used for the 2023-24 fiscal year. The 2023-24 Spending Plan will be prepared and the Chancellor's Office will meet with the DOF to discuss this possibility. The DOF will then determine whether to move projects from the 2023-24 fiscal year to the 2022-23 fiscal year.

C. Climate Action and Sustainability Framework – Hoang Nguyen

- The BOG approved the Climate Action and Sustainability Framework in September. This was the full plan with all of the intended revisions. The plan was also presented to the CCFC and will potentially be presented next week at the NorCal/SoCal Facilities Summit. However, it is unclear if there will be any official emails on this policy from the Chancellor's Office. The framework contains 2025 benchmarks and 2030 and 2035 goals. As part of the BOG's approval, the Climate Action and Sustainability Framework's Phase 2, which encompasses assistance to the system, will begin.

The Climate Action and Sustainability Committee is in the final stages of taking on a fellow for Phase 2. The only thing needed for this is getting the signatures to onboard that fellow in the next couple of weeks. Phase 2 involves building a toolkit, training documents, and potentially videos to help the system start benchmarking. The committee is also looking at getting some volunteer districts to see where they are currently at and if they can beat the current timeframes from where they are at. At the moment, Terrence (San Jose-Evergreen CCD) and Hussain's (Riverside CCD) districts

have volunteered for this. The committee is also looking to see what the system needs in order to get them ready to meet the 2025 benchmark and the 2030 and 2035 goals. This analysis involves a step-by-step approach to help the system move forward. With the aid of the Steering Committee and their documents, the goal is to develop different procedures and guidelines to ease this process for the system.

D. Enrollment Projections – Hoang Nguyen

- Enrollment across the system is going down, but FUSION’s enrollment projections are moderately increasing. This is getting the attention of the BOG. In response to this, the Chancellor’s Office is examining the Maximum Population Participant Rate (MPPR) enrollment to determine how to align that enrollment with this discrepancy.

The Chancellor’s Office is also looking at system modality in online and hybrid systems to better understand those systems’ impacts on enrollment projections. Hoang, Ronnie, and Chay are assigned to this task. The Chancellor’s Office will also examine enrollment in districts with online learning and determine if those districts would like to continue using online learning instead of resuming in-person learning.

Since the enrollment projections do not distinguish between online and in-person learning, Ann-Marie believes this could be a factor that needs to be added in. Hoang also believes it is necessary to look into hiring a consultant for additional assistance in this area. The original consultant that created MPPR was the RP Group, which created the MPPR in 2011 with the help of a sub-committee that included the Chancellor’s Office. With the consultant’s help, Hoang believes that it is necessary to consider rebuilding the system’s enrollment projections. Similar to what occurred in 2011 with the RP Group, Hoang is also looking at creating a sub-committee to gain greater input, including from districts, on this subject. Hoang, Ronnie, and Chay will work on this topic next week and will also discuss this topic.

E. Division of State Architects

- **Ida Clair, AIA – State Architect**
 - i. On October 18, a new Headquarters Principal Architect, which was the position Ida previously held, named Eric Driever began his role. Eric Driever comes from DGS’s Real Estate Services division and is a Certified Access Specialist (CAsp). At this point, Eric Driever worked for the DSA for approximately six weeks and according to Ida, has been doing a great job. Due to retirements or existing Sacramento supervisors advancing, new Sacramento supervisors in Field Services (Steven Ito), Fire & Life Safety (Dan DeLoach), and Project Services (Erik Edgmon) started their roles. Steven Ito’s role as a Field Services Supervisor means that he will be working with DSA’s structural engineers. Prior to becoming Fire & Life Safety Supervisor, Dan DeLoach was previously Project Services Supervisor. Erik Edgmon, the current Project Services Supervisor, then assumed Dan DeLoach’s previous position. All other supervisors in the other offices remain the same.
 - ii. DSA’s December 2021 plan reviews and submittals are expected to be high. While DSA did experience a high number of plan reviews and submittals in November 2021, the total estimated project cost was \$750 million. The amount of postponements and deferrals to December 2021 requested by the client on

the initial submittal date encompass 221 projects. However, a high amount of planned projects is also expected to occur for December 2021. To aid in this, the DSA opened 24 new positions, 14 of which are temporary (but will be made permanent) and 10 of which the DSA is in the position of actively hiring.

- iii. The 2022 Energy Code's approved regulations will be heard in the December 14-16 Building Standards Commission (BSC) Adoption Meeting. This meeting is the public's final opportunity to comment on these regulations. The regulations were passed by the Energy Commission in June, but the BSC helps ensure the public participation process for these regulations occurred by the Energy Commission. These regulations involve basing Prescriptive Method and Performance Method energy budgets on head pump technology for water heating and HVAC systems. These regulations also specify Performance Method improvements to envelopes are needed to meet energy budgets if fossil fuels are used. Under these regulations, Zones 1 and 16 can meet requirements with dual fuel. While these regulations require using photovoltaics and battery storage, they do not address cooking or other gas end uses.
- iv. The 2022 CalGreen Rulemaking will be heard in the December 14-16 BSC Adoption Meeting. This meeting is the public's final opportunity to comment on this rulemaking. If approved by the BSC, these regulatory requirements become effective 1/1/23. The rulemaking provides clarification on shade tree requirements and includes a requirement for EVCS infrastructure based on 20% of parking spaces or additions to new parking spaces. However, this does not cover existing facilities. The EVCS infrastructure installation requirements under this rulemaking also requires charger installation at the time of construction for 25% of EV capable spaces. This charger installation is present from within the 20% of parking spaces or additions to new parking spaces containing EVCS infrastructure. VOC limits for thermal insulation and acoustical tile ceilings also occur under the rulemaking.
- v. The 2022 California Building Code (CBC) Access Rulemaking will be heard in the January 18-20 BSC Adoption Meeting. This meeting is the public's final opportunity to comment on this rulemaking. The rulemaking will occur within Chapter 11B of the 2022 CBC, but, according to Ida, will not involve any new regulations or significant changes. The rulemaking provides clarification on the definition of an "access aisle" as well as clarification on the requirements for the "maintenance of accessible features". The rulemaking also separates scoping for "entrances" and moves exceptions for "exterior ground floor exists" to 11B-207 Accessible Means of Egress. Clarification for housing requirements within places of education also occurs under this rulemaking.
- vi. The 2022 Code Structural Safety Rulemaking will be heard in the January 18-20 BSC Adoption Meeting. This meeting is the public's final opportunity to comment on this rulemaking. The rulemaking concerns the 2022 Administrative Code and the 2022 CBC. For the 2022 Administrative Code, the rulemaking states that construction shall commence within 4 years of approval with no extensions or any need to make repeated requests for extension. Within the 2022 CBC, the rulemaking repeals the "early adoption" of mass timber and instead adopts the 2021 International Building Commission (IBC) requirements

for mass timber. The rulemaking will also provide edits to technical requirements in the 2022 CBC for clarity and consistency, but otherwise does not propose any significant changes in practice.

- vii. The 2022 Fire Code Rulemaking will be heard in the January 18-20 BSC Adoption Meeting. This meeting is the public's final opportunity to comment on this rulemaking. The rulemaking involves changes to Chapter 7, Fire and Smoke Protection Features and changes to Chapter 49, Requirements Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Fire Areas. The Chapter 7 rulemaking requires the building owner to maintain an inventory of all required fire-resistance-rated construction and construction installed to resist the passage of smoke. The Chapter 7 rulemaking also requires this construction to be visually inspected annually and properly repaired, restored, or replaced where damaged, breached or penetrated. The Chapter 49 rulemaking requires fire-resistant vegetation for landscaping in areas designated as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones and requires maintaining this landscaping as it matures.
- viii. AB 306, which was chaptered on 7/9/21, requires local jurisdictions instead of the DSA to review employee and teacher housing projects. However, applicants submitting those projects can request the DSA's review. Under the CBC, faculty housing projects are considered public housing and housing at a place of education. The CBC views employee housing projects, even if single-family, as public housing. The DSA may still provide oversight to ensure housing projects on a school campus do not conflict with site accessibility and life safety requirements. The DSA also provided a guidance document called "Guide to Public Housing Regulated by Chapter 11B of the California Building Code" to provide more information on these projects. Chapter 11B information from the "2019 California Access Compliance Advisory Reference Manual" is also helpful in providing further information on these projects.
- ix. SB 169, a student housing bill chaptered on 9/23/21, provides affordable, low-cost housing options for students enrolled in public postsecondary education in California through the creation of the Higher Education Student Grant Program. Under this program, 50% of available funds for this housing shall be available for CCCs, facilitating low-income student access to higher education. Submittal to the DSA is required if it is a dorm located on campus or on district-owned property or if it is a dorm located off campus where it is leased by the district with a purchase option. DSA Access Compliance review and submittal to local jurisdictions is required for dorms off campus, leased, and with district funds used for construction. This housing is considered public housing and housing at a place of education when addressing Access Compliance requirements.
- x. Acceptance Testing for the 2019 Energy Code began on 10/1/21 and ensures the installed equipment in nonresidential buildings operates as designed and complies with the Energy Code. There are three phases of Acceptance Testing. The first phase is documentation inspection, which involves the review of certificates of compliance and certificates of installation. The second phase, construction inspection, compares approved plans to actual installation. The third phase, functional testing, is specific to equipment type and Energy Code requirements. Even though Acceptance Testing has been an Energy Code

requirement since 2005, it was originally performed by the installing contractor. The Acceptance Test Technician Certification Provider (ATTCP) Program will be required for projects submitted on or after 10/1/2021. The Acceptance Testing Technicians (ATTs) under the ATTCP Program are third-party independent entities who verify the project meets the Energy Code requirements for HVAC Systems and Controls as well as Indoor and Outdoor Lighting and Controls.

The use of ATTs is mandatory for these Energy Code requirements. However, envelope and process equipment Acceptance Testing must be performed by the installing contractor, engineer/architect of record, or the owner's agent. Information on third-party Acceptance Testing requirements along with a web link to a list of certified ATTs must be present on the project drawings in the form of a note.

For DSA project closeout for Acceptance Testing, IR A-8: Project Inspector and Assistant Inspector Duties and Performance was updated to indicate that the Project Inspector (PI) should collect these certificates and provide them to the owner. No forms or processes will be changed for DSA project closeout nor is it necessary to submit forms to the DSA. Also, a lack of ATTCP testing and forms will not hold up certification. Nonetheless, Project Inspector Overview (PIO) training and recertification training and testing will address the requirements on ATTCP testing and the collection of Acceptance Testing certificates.

- xi. The DSA has also provided a new way to backcheck. A backcheck is a review of the "final" plans that incorporate the design professionals' responses to DSA plan review. This process was once in-person, but it has moved to the virtual environment. However, once the pandemic ends, the backcheck process will become a hybrid system consisting of two phases.

Phase 1 involves desk review that is not interactive with the design team, while Phase 2 involves in-person interaction with the design team. If there are no issues in addressing the design team's comments within Phase 1, then the client can skip Phase 2. However, if not all comments are addressed in Phase 1, the client must then proceed to Phase 2. The reason for keeping the virtual environment is not only because it is more environmentally friendly, but also because it reduces the need for the design team to travel. However, there has been somewhat of a delay in establishing this virtual environment and the DSA wants to speed this up so that projects can quickly get in and out of backcheck. This is set for the first quarter of 2022. Further information on this development will be provided in the near-future.

- xii. The DSA wants to evaluate changes to regulations that ensure when significant financial investment is made to modernize an existing school building and address safety standards for that building. However, one issue that is present is that more alterations of existing buildings are reaching the 50% valuation threshold, which requires analysis for rehabilitation. Increasing construction

cost are also making project planning more difficult. This issue is interfering with the DSA's end-goal of achieving a better planning process prioritizing student safety and preserving project modernization goals in a sustainable and resilient manner.

To alleviate this issue, the strategy is to implement an interim plan consisting of hiring a Cost Estimating Consultant, who will establish a fair and reasonable construction costs per square footage value. The DSA also plans to convene a task force of representative stakeholders known as the Modernization of Existing Buildings (EB) Task Force to explore regulatory changes to achieve this outcome. There has been some interest from individuals regarding participating in the EB Task Force and Ida mentioned that it is still possible for individuals to submit their names to her to let her know that they are interested in joining the EB Task Force.

- xiii. Regarding the DSA's hiring of a Cost Estimating Consultant as part of its interim plan, this step is not yet complete since the applicants for this role are being reviewed. From there, the Cost Estimator Consultant will create cost estimating data sets representative of current dollars per square footage. These data sets aim to reflect construction costs of the geographic locations of Oakland, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego, including recommended periodic updates. The Cost Estimator Consultant will also establish templates for use by school districts to demonstrate costs and provide consistency in the evaluation process. The Cost Estimating Consultant will analyze specified projects' project costs to their replacement values as well as inform and advise the DSA during regulatory amendments. The interim plan will be used until the new regulations on existing buildings are implemented, which are anticipated to occur on 8/1/2023. The Cost Estimating RFP may be ready by early 2022.
- xiv. The EB Task Force consists of a representative group of stakeholders who will meet 2 to 4 times over 6 months from January to June of 2022 for the purpose of exploring the regulatory changes previously mentioned. The task force is designed to gather information for the DSA, who will then determine how to move forward. The task force's initial meeting is designed for the DSA to explore the problem by asking questions and soliciting feedback and ideas from stakeholders on how to improve building valuation and the 50% cost threshold. From there, the DSA will review considerations and ideas for proposals. The DSA will then meet with the task force to present and receive feedback on these proposals. This process repeats itself until the DSA determines there is enough information needed to proceed with the established regulatory process. The DSA also determines the regulatory proposals presented for the pre-cycle and formal rulemaking process, which requires public input by all stakeholders.
- xv. Alongside the EB Task Force meetings from January 2022 to June 2022, the 2022 Intervening Code Cycle Rulemaking Schedule also includes pre-cycle work from June 2022 to January 2023. The pre-cycle work consists of different public outreach meetings for the regulatory proposals. From there, these proposals advance later in 2023. If the BSC approves these proposals in its

August 2023 meeting, they become effective on September 2023 (regulations for part 1 of Title 24) and July 2024 (all other parts of Title 24).

- xvi. The DSA Academy's Learning Management System (LMS) is now live, with Project Inspector Recertification offered. Also, the LMS offers, for free and on demand, Accessibility and Sustainability classes, including the All-Electric California Schools Kitchen of the Future Webinar. Later in December, The LMS will contain information on 7/1/2021 EVCS Accessibility regulations. For additional DSA updates, Ida recommends subscribing to the DSA's Listserv.

F. Legislative Update

- **Rebekah Cearley – Legislative Advocate**

- i. At the moment, there is no available information on the 2022 bond legislation, but it is believed to be moving forward. Also, there has been little news on student housing regarding the Higher Education Student Housing Grant program. There was an email that was sent focusing on submitting an application to this program. Presumably, these applications are being reviewed for the program and more information on this may be ready in spring 2022. There was more desired money in these applications than there was money available. The Chancellor's Office submitted a \$327,000 grant request for a liaison to work with the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) and College Finance and Facilities Planning (CFFP) divisions for the purpose of providing CCDs with comprehensive and consistent technical assistance and resources. Currently, there is a liaison in the Foundation who provides questions and guidance to CCDs when it comes to submitting grant applications.

G. CCC/IOU

- **CCC/IOU Update – Lisa Hannaman**

- i. Over the last year, the CCC/IOU worked with various focus groups to determine what the needs list would be for California's community college system. The needs list was broken down into three areas: program-focused priorities, communication-focused priorities, and management-focused priorities. Responsibilities to these priorities were assigned to either the CCC, Investor-Owned Utilities (IOU), or both groups. Generally, the IOU would take the lead on program-focused priorities, while the CCC would take the lead on communication-focused priorities.

Priorities within the management-focused priorities area were assigned to either the CCC, IOU, or are a combined effort for both groups. All of the program-focused priorities have been added by the IOU to the CCC/IOU website, either as offerings or, in the case of Fellowship Program expansion, as information. For communication-focused priorities, the CCC assisted districts with training and education forms, partnered with districts as requested for support, provided outreach management support. Also, the CCC spoke with the Foundation team about expanding offerings in the case of leveraging procurement options under CollegeBuys.org. For management-focused priorities, the CCC and IOU added California Energy Commission (CEC) grant information to the CCC/IOU website under the "Resources" tab and shared this information at the CCFC Conference. The CEC grant information pertains to funding resources, audit

assistance, how to apply for grants within the system, and zero-interest loans to assist new energy projects. The “Resources” tab contains current information on all IOU programs and other program offerings. This includes information on Clean Transportation for energy utilities and how to apply for the Climate Corps program. Information on energy savings is also present, including information on utility-offered third party energy efficiency programs. The recent California Energy Design Assistance (CEDA) program is one of those third party energy efficiency programs. The “Resources” tab also contains information on utility-offered training and education programs such as energy education classes and the building operator certification & training class.

The CCC/IOU also released a newsletter to increase awareness of CCC/IOU opportunities. The CCC/IOU aims to get the newsletter’s information out to the districts. The CCC/IOU newsletter also contains information on benchmarking within the ENERGY STAR’s Portfolio Manager. This includes information on access, logging in, starting one’s program, and adding items to the Portfolio Manager. Information is also included on how Portfolio Manager can assist in fulfilling CEC requirements on the reporting of campus benchmarking activities for buildings larger than 50,000 GSF. This is important because districts who do not comply with these requirements will be fined. The CCC/IOU newsletter contains information on how districts can comply with these requirements. The CCC/IOU is also offering support, including an employee who is helping districts across the state, regarding these requirements.

The CCC/IOU developed a District/Campus Opportunity Screening Questionnaire for districts to fill out so the IOU can assist campuses in maximizing schedule maintenance or bond dollars. Once the questionnaire form is filled, the form’s data then populates an excel spreadsheet visible to the IOU. With this spreadsheet, the IOU can view a pipeline of projects where they can provide assistance to districts. This is a useful strategy if the IOU is not directly interacting with districts on this subject.

The CCC/IOU already started this benchmarking assistance for some districts’ campuses. In the case of San Mateo College, PG&E assisted the campus in opening an account in ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager and entering campus information. PG&E also refreshed some of San Mateo College’s meters so that they work automatically in uploading energy data. SCE and SoCalGas assisted Citrus College, Norco College, and Moreno Valley College in connecting with utilities to exchange energy usage data. SCE and SoCalGas also assisted Fullerton College in submitting a benchmarking report, from within Portfolio Manager, of the entire campus to the California Energy Commission. Those utilities also refreshed those campuses’ meters so that they combined old information with new information. Along with fulfilling CEC requirements through reporting, Portfolio Manager can also show meter data over the past few years. At the moment, Riverside, Citrus, and North Orange CCDs have received assistance from the CCC/IOU on using Portfolio Manager. Also

regarding this assistance, the CCC/IOU started reaching out to MiraCosta CCD today and reached out to San Jose-Evergreen CCD yesterday.

Upcoming Meetings:

March 3, 2022

June 2, 2022

September 1, 2022

December 1, 2022