CaliforniaCommunityColleges.cccco.edu
# Table of Contents

**Executive Summary** .......................................................... 5

**Chapter 1** ........................................................................ 6  
  Introduction ........................................................................ 6  
  Plan Objectives .................................................................. 8  
  Planning Process ................................................................ 8  
  Planning Assumptions and Conditions ............................... 8  
  External Planning Requirements ......................................... 10

**Chapter 2** ........................................................................ 12  
  Long-Range Planning ........................................................ 12  
  Planning Criteria ............................................................... 13

**Chapter 3** ........................................................................ 18  
  Enrollment Projections and Methodology ........................... 18

**Chapter 4** ........................................................................ 24  
  California Community Colleges at a Glance ....................... 24

**Chapter 5** ........................................................................ 30  
  Community College Regions at a Glance ............................ 30  
  Central Coast Region ....................................................... 32  
  Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Region ......................... 34  
  Desert Area Region ........................................................ 36  
  Los Angeles and Ventura Counties Region ......................... 38  
  Northern California Region ............................................. 40  
  San Francisco Bay Area Region ........................................ 42  
  Orange and San Diego Counties Region ............................. 44

**Chapter 6** ........................................................................ 46  
  Evaluating System Needs .................................................. 46  
  Planning Highlights ......................................................... 46  
  Future Demand ............................................................... 47  
  Access ............................................................................ 47  
  Capacity of Existing Campuses ......................................... 48  
  Local and Future Planning Efforts ................................. 48

**Chapter 7** ........................................................................ 49  
  Capital Outlay Funding .................................................... 49

**Appendices** .................................................................... 52  
  Appendix A: California Community Colleges Selected Regional Planning Estimates ............... 53  
  Appendix B: California Community Colleges Selected District Planning Estimates ............... 54  
  Appendix C: California Community Colleges District Planning Conditions ........................ 56  
  Appendix D: California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Needs 2016-25 ....................... 64  
  Appendix E: Proposed College and Center Applications in Process .................................... 64
Tables

Table 1: Access Planning Criteria........................................................................................................... 14
Table 2: 2013 Regional Enrollments, Population, and Participation Rate ........................................... 31
Table 3: 2013 Regional On-site WSCH per Acre .................................................................................. 48
Table 4: State Bond Propositions............................................................................................................ 49
Table 5: 10-Year Capital Outlay Need, 2016-2025 .............................................................................. 50

Figures

Figure 1: California Population Estimates, 2008-2023........................................................................ 20
Figure 2: Community College Fall Enrollment and WSCH Forecast, 2000-2023............................... 22
Figure 3: High School Students and Graduates Grades 9-12 ................................................................. 25
Figure 4: Annual Student Headcounts and Full-Time Equivalent Students ......................................... 25
Figure 5: Course Sections Offered By Academic Year ......................................................................... 25
Figure 6: System Participation Rate by Race/Ethnicity per 1,000 Population ...................................... 25
Figure 7: California Community College Funding 2009-2016 ............................................................ 26
Figure 8: California Community College Funding per Student 2009-2016 .......................................... 26
Figure 9: Annual Number of Community Colleges Transfers to CSU and UC .................................... 27
Figure 10: Annual Distance Education FTES 2007-2014 .................................................................... 27
Figure 11: Student Ethnicity, Fall 2014 ................................................................................................. 28
Figure 12: Student Age Distribution, Fall 2014 .................................................................................... 28
Figure 13: California Community Colleges Student Characteristics, Fall 2014 ................................. 28
Figure 14: California Community Colleges Facilities, 2001-2014 ...................................................... 29
Figure 15: Facilities Square Footage by Region .................................................................................. 31

Maps

Map 1: California Community College System ..................................................................................... 7
Map 2: Drive Time Radius & Population Density .................................................................................. 15
Map 3: District Average WSCH per Acre, 2013 .................................................................................. 17
Map 4: Diversity Index by Zip Code, 2014 ........................................................................................... 19
Map 5: Projected Enrollment Growth by District ................................................................................ 21
Map 6: Central Coast Region ................................................................................................................ 32
Map 7: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ................................................................. 33
Map 8: Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Region ............................................................................... 34
Map 9: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ................................................................. 35
Map 10: Desert Area Region ................................................................................................................. 36
Map 11: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ............................................................... 37
Map 12: Los Angeles and Ventura Counties Region ............................................................................. 38
Map 13: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ............................................................... 39
Map 14: Northern California Region ..................................................................................................... 40
Map 15: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ............................................................... 41
Map 16: San Francisco Bay Area Region ............................................................................................... 42
Map 17: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ............................................................... 43
Map 18: Orange and San Diego Counties Region .................................................................................. 44
Map 19: Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density ............................................................... 45
In January of 1991, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors approved the Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan for the California Community Colleges (1991 Long-Range Plan). This plan was developed to address the continual enrollment growth at colleges throughout the state as it pertains to the need for additional educational facilities in the California community college system. The 1991 Long-Range Plan, however, has not been updated since it was first adopted. This was largely due to the oversight of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), which helped to coordinate student progress in postsecondary education and to make projections and recommendations for capital outlay planning. However, in the 2011-12 California state budget, the commission was defunded, which eliminated an important aspect of the planning process. To revitalize and revise planning criteria an update to the 1991 Long-Range Plan is necessary in order to support appropriate evaluation of proposed colleges and education centers.

The Facilities Planning Unit of the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, in consultation with the Association of Chief Business Officials’ Facilities Task Force, has revised the 1991 Long-Range Plan and has renamed it the “Long-Range Master Plan.” Generally, the criteria have been updated to coincide with California statutes, the California Code of Regulations and current community college practices. The Long-Range Master Plan provides a framework for evaluating and coordinating inter- and intra-district expansion and facility utilization as community college districts work toward improving access and retention, thereby furthering the efforts of the Student Success Initiative.

The planning criteria used to develop the framework are classified into four categories: future demand, access, capacity of existing campuses and local intent. All four of these planning criteria are consistent with the 1991 Long-Range Plan. Updates include revised population data, enrollment trends, demographic characteristics, calculated planning assumptions based on the newly available data and various spatial analyses. This Long-Range Master Plan proposes that an additional 355,000 students will be enrolled in a community college by the year 2023. In order to meet the projected enrollment growth, an additional $13.4 billion is estimated to accommodate these students over the next 10 years.
Chapter 1

Introduction

The California Community Colleges form the largest post-secondary educational system in the world. The system consists of 72 semi-autonomous districts encompassing 113 colleges, 77 off-campus centers and 23 district offices serving approximately 2.1 million students annually. As the most local of post-secondary educational institutions, California community colleges provide an affordable and quality education that often serves as a vehicle that strengthens both the local economy and the capacity of individuals. The ability of these educational institutions to successfully serve their localities requires effective and responsive planning at both the local and system level that recognizes the need for careful utilization of scarce resources while accommodating future demand.

In the 1990-91 basic agenda, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors recognized the need for the California Community Colleges to “accommodate future growth,” noting that “the increased demand for facilities and operating funds… calls for prudent management of limited resources,” and that “plans for growth should be coordinated with the other segments of higher education.” In response, the Board of Governors approved the Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan for the California Community Colleges in 1991. The board adopted this plan with a 2005 planning horizon and the stipulation that it be a “living document,” to be updated periodically as changes occur in (a) California’s demographics, (b) the state’s finances and (c) community colleges’ operations.

Over the last 25 years, California’s dynamic environment has demonstrated the need to update the Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan to reflect the many changes that have affected the community colleges.
Plan Objectives
The 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan for the California Community Colleges originally strived to develop a plan to accommodate projected enrollment growth while managing limited resources. It is apparent that the state's changing economic and demographic landscape presents both challenges and opportunities in delivering an affordable education to the adult population of California. The objective of this revision to the existing plan remains consistent with the original plan to accommodate future enrollment growth. In addition, this plan seeks to provide a framework for evaluating and coordinating inter- and intra-district expansion and facility utilization as districts work toward improving student access and retention.

It is understood that community college growth will be stimulated not only by the state's future demography, but also by the board's desire to improve the access and retention of historically underrepresented students and to play a more significant role in strengthening the economic development of California. California's community colleges have a significant role to play in preparing the state's workforce by developing programs to train individuals in those skills needed by employers. Community colleges not only provide individuals with transfer and vocational education for most of the new and emerging jobs, they also enroll more individuals from the groups that will comprise most of the new workers than do other postsecondary institutions. Consequently, the planning of college facilities must take into consideration improved access for these historically underrepresented groups. Achieving these objectives is essential if the community colleges are to help prepare Californians to participate in an increasingly complex and multicultural society.

Planning Process
In today's dynamic environment community colleges face a collection of challenges. In such an environment it is crucial to recognize the importance of planning effectively for the utilization of available resources to serve enrollment demand. Part of this process of planning for California's 113 community colleges (see Map 1) is based on the annual submission of five-year capital outlay plans and project proposals by each of the 72 districts. These planning efforts are an outcome of two California code sections. Government Code §§ 13100-13102 require the governor to annually submit a five-year capital infrastructure plan to the California Legislature in conjunction with the governor's budget. In addition, Education Code §§ 67501 and 67503 require the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office to prepare a five-year capital outlay plan identifying the statewide needs and priorities of the California Community Colleges.

The five-year plans submitted by community college districts are reviewed by the Chancellor's Office based on enrollment projections, space utilization standards and project priorities set by the Board of Governors. Based on these reviews, a plan for the California Community Colleges is developed and presented to the Board of Governors annually for review and approval. Once the annual Capital Outlay Spending Plan is approved by the Board of Governors, the plan is then submitted to the Department of Finance for consideration of funding in the next budget cycle. Annual funding of these projects is contingent upon their ability to meet the governor's priorities and the availability of funds to meet continuing needs.

However, while current capital outlay planning procedures capture facilities needs at the five- and ten-year planning horizons, they do not provide a picture of long-term needs or system inter- and intra-district coordination. Additionally, the current procedures are not conducive toward the changing enrollment patterns and/or policy changes. To address these challenges, the revisions found in this plan incorporate new data and while evaluating the original planning assumptions to determine the changes needed. Furthermore, the planning criteria developed originally through an engaged stakeholder process that included public hearings, detailed interactions with other state agencies, individual districts, and extensive discussions with facilities planning and research staff, continues to provide the foundation of this update. Moving forward, this update will provide a framework for continual updates as new academic delivery techniques are identified and as conditions of the planning document continue to change.

Planning Assumptions and Conditions
Currently the existing plan is 25 years old and is in need of an update to continue to provide a foundation for future planning efforts. Increased student access to higher education is a critical goal for the state of California. The benefits of higher education extend well beyond the direct payoff for students and include substantial gains to the state. For every $1 California invests in students who graduate from college, it
will receive a net return on investment of $4.50.\(^1\) Protecting the state’s investment in higher education continues to be a high priority because widely accessible high quality education drives the innovation that fuels California’s ever evolving, dynamic economy. If 2 percent more of Californians earned associate’s degrees and 1 percent more earned bachelor’s degrees, the state’s economy would grow by $20 billion, tax revenue would increase by $1.2 billion a year, and 174,000 new jobs would be created.\(^2\)

The revisions that are included in this update to the existing plan continue to be based on a number of general assumptions regarding the delivery of community college education. One assumption is that community college education will continue to be delivered primarily by current methods of instruction. The current proportion of instruction or weekly student contact hours that is taught off-site through outreach locations, distance education or independent study varies by district but on average is 12 percent of total instruction. Therefore the assumption for the current planning effort is that one in ten weekly student contact hours will continue to be delivered through off-site means. The implications for fast growing districts where existing campuses are overcrowded, but which are not scheduled for expansion, must either make greater use of existing campus facilities (if possible); take more instruction off-campus; or use other innovative instructional delivery techniques.

Another planning assumption is the continuation of space and utilization standards that were most recently approved by the Board of Governors in September 2010. These standards are budgetary planning tools that can measure existing and future need for academic spaces such as classrooms, laboratories, library and technology space, and faculty offices. These measurements help determine the amount of physical space to be allocated from state funding for capital outlay on a per-student or per-faculty member basis in buildings, specific to program need. The current utilization and space standards date back to 1966 and were updated in 1971, 1973, 1975, 1991 and 2010. Any proposed changes to the standards would need to be first reviewed and approved by the Department of Finance since revisions to existing standards would impact the amount of needed facilities.

In addition, while improved site and facilities utilization result from the criteria and standards used to formulate this plan, the plan itself does not anticipate significant breakthroughs in the use of technology-based or other alternative educational delivery systems. However, it is evident that the need for community college education in California during the next 10 years is likely to exceed the state’s anticipated financial capability. Therefore, the community colleges must identify and implement more cost-effective ways of delivering education without losing the quality of that education. Changing demographics and economic conditions require community colleges to employ flexible and forward-looking ways of delivering education. This means that the assumption about continuing existing methods will need to be modified as conditions in California change.

This update provides a framework for the submission and review of new campuses and centers throughout the system within an actionable and reasonable timeframe. The main components of this plan include the identification of analytical criteria for selecting new centers and colleges, enrollment projections, the planning, review and approval process for new educational locations and potential funding implications.
EXTERNAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Since the development and implementation of the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan, several landmark pieces of higher education legislation have passed in California that contribute to the mission of California's community colleges. The planning criteria put forth in this document align with California statutes and recommendations from these higher education initiatives.

Smaller Classes, Safer Schools and Financial Accountability Act
(Proposition 39)
In November 2000, California voters approved Proposition 39 which reduced the vote school districts and community colleges need to authorize local general obligation bonds for school construction from two-thirds to a 55 percent "supermajority." It authorizes bonds for repair, construction or replacement of school facilities, classrooms operated by schools, community college districts and county education offices for safety, class size and information technology needs. From June 1998 through November 2000, when bond measures required two-thirds voter approval, only 10 community college districts passed local bonds, providing $875.5 million for community college facilities. Since passage of the Proposition 39, voters have approved 104 of 122 (85 percent) local bond measures, authorizing $28.8 billion in bonds for 67 community college districts.

Community College Funding System - SB 361
Senate Bill 361 (Ch. 631, Stats. 2006) established a new community college funding system. This bill replaced the program-based funding requirements for the California Community Colleges with new methodologies for allocating general apportionments. The bill requires that, commencing with the 2006-07 fiscal year, the marginal amount of credit revenue allocated per credit full-time equivalent student (FTES) would be not less than $4,367, as adjusted by subsequent cost-of-living adjustments funded through the annual Budget Act. The bill further specifies funding noncredit instruction at a uniform rate of $2,626 per FTES, adjusted for the change in cost-of-living provided in the annual Budget Act for subsequent fiscal years. Any educational center that is approved by the Board of Governors on or after May 1, 2008 and serves a minimum of 1,000 FTES will be eligible for basic allocation revenue, per title 5, section 58771(i). In addition educational centers shall not be eligible for state capital outlay funding for a construction project unless and until the Chancellor determines that the educational center reported at least 500 FTES on the district's most recent final attendance report (California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 57017). As for grandfathered centers, each center was certified by the college as of the final 2005-06 recalculation through a one-time certification form. The districts certified that the center served at least 100 FTES as reported on the final attendance report for fiscal year 2005-06 or had an average annual FTES for the three prior fiscal years (2003-04 to 2005-06) of at least 100 FTES (California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55180(b)).

Student Success Initiative - SB 1143
Senate Bill 1143 (Ch. 409, Stats 2010) required the Board of Governors to adopt a plan for promoting and improving student success within the California Community Colleges and establish a taskforce to examine best practices and models for accomplishing student success. The taskforce, known as the Student Success Task Force, assembled an independent group of academic and administrative experts, researchers, and educational policy leaders involved in a 12-month study of best practices in higher education systems throughout the nation and then produced a report on their findings. The Student Success Initiative is based on a set of 22 recommendations put forth in the Student Success Task Force report. In January 2012, the California Community Colleges Board of Governors endorsed the recommendations of the Student Success Task Force final report. Once implemented, the 22 recommendations contained in the plan will impact nearly every aspect of how the community colleges operate and will serve as a guiding policy for the system. These recommendations focus on increasing college and career readiness for students; strengthening support for entering students; incentivizing successful student behaviors; aligning course offerings to meet the needs of students; improving the education of basic skills students; revitalizing professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators; enabling efficient statewide leadership and increasing coordination among the colleges; and aligning resources with the student success recommendations.

Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act - SB 1440
Senate Bill 1440, known as the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (Ch. 428, Stats. 2010) was
signed into legislation on September 29, 2010. It enables the California Community Colleges and California State University (CSU) to collaborate on the creation of associate in arts degree (AA) and associate in science degree (AS) transfer programs. This law requires community colleges to grant an associate degree for transfer to a student once a student has met specified general education and major requirements for the degree. Upon completion of the associate degree, the student is eligible for transfer with junior standing into the California State University system. The primary objective of this legislation is to reduce the need for students to take unnecessary courses, thereby shortening their time to degree completion and reducing costs for students, community colleges and the California State University. The accompanying bill, Assembly Bill 2302 (Ch. 427, Stats. 2010) requests the University of California to consider and implement other specified actions to increase transfer between the university and the California Community Colleges.

Baccalaureate Degree Pilot Program - SB 850
California’s demand for more than one million bachelor degree holders in the coming decade sparked renewed interest in the addition of baccalaureate degrees to the California community college mission. Senate Bill 850 (Ch. 747, Stats. 2014) authorizes the board of governors, in consultation with the California State University and the University of California (UC), to establish a baccalaureate degree pilot program. The pilot program would allow up to 15 participating community college districts to offer one baccalaureate degree program each to meet local workforce needs as long as it does not duplicate a baccalaureate degree program already offered by the California State University or the University of California. The establishment of affordable, accessible and quality baccalaureate degree programs at community colleges is important for two primary reasons: 1) it will help the state meet its need for individuals in high demand technical disciplines which are increasingly requiring baccalaureate degrees; and 2) it will increase college participation rates and improve workforce training opportunities for local residents who are unable to relocate because of family or work commitments. In 2015 the Board of Governors approved the 15 colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees in fields such as respiratory therapy, dental hygiene and aerospace manufacturing technology.

Awards for Innovation in Higher Education
The 2014-15 state budget allocated $50 million in one-time resources from the general fund for the Awards for Innovation in Higher Education. This program recognizes California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California campuses that change existing policies, practices, or systems to achieve the following priorities: significantly increase the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded; allow students to complete bachelor’s degrees within four years after beginning higher education; and ease transfer through the state’s education system by better recognizing learning that occurs across the state’s education segments and elsewhere. Awards were made to individual campuses and teams of campuses which included 14 community colleges.
Chapter 2

Long-Range Planning
The planning process began with an initial review of the Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan for the California Community Colleges completed in 1991. The 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan was initially developed through a process that took place over a year. The original process included consulting with other segments of higher education as well as consultation with individual districts to gather data and input. Following the completion of the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan, the Chancellor’s Office and community college districts worked towards implementing the proposed sites originally identified. However, the recommended ongoing updates to the plan were not completed as originally intended. As part of this update the Chancellor’s Office seeks to accomplish the original intention of the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan to be a living document periodically updated as needed while continuing to increase an understanding of the student needs and how best to serve them through this planning exercise.

This update included a review and assessment of prior planning documents: 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan for the California Community Colleges, 2016-2017 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, 2014 State of the System Report, and the 2002 California Postsecondary Education Commission Guidelines for Review of Proposed University Campuses, Community Colleges, and Educational and Joint-Use Centers. The utilization of existing planning documents meant that this report did not create all new data but instead combined existing information with new available data in an attempt to better inform the decision-making process.
Planning Criteria

The plan describes how California’s Community Colleges will serve the changing needs and address the projected enrollment of California. The purpose of this plan is to provide the framework that will guide the identification and review of future campuses and educational centers. In this context campus refers to a new location that may start as an educational center, but which ultimately is expected to become a full-service site, accredited as a college, and which should have sufficient acreage – generally 100 or more acres – and facilities to support that level of operation. For planning purposes, centers are defined as off-campus operations that enroll 500 full-time equivalent students (FTES) and have been approved by the Board of Governors. All other off-campus operations are considered to be outreach locations.

California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 51014 states that districts must obtain approval for the formation of a new college or educational center from the Board of Governors before classes begin at the new college or educational center. California Code of Regulations, title 5, sections 55180 et. seq. govern the process of approval for establishing new colleges and centers. California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55180 allows for state approval of a proposed educational center if it has generated at least 500 FTES annually. In addition, the process for center establishment is meant to be actionable within a reasonable timeframe.

Districts plan new centers and campuses for several reasons. Population growth may be taking place in a part of the district outside commuting range of existing campuses. Or, an existing campus may not be physically capable of accommodating additional students. In some cases, lack of parking may constrain the expansion of an existing campus. The planning criteria used to develop the framework can be classified in four categories: future demand, access, capacity of existing campuses, and local intent.

All four of these planning criteria were originally consistent with directions set forth in the Board of Governors’ 1990-91 Basic Agenda and with the guidelines developed by the former California Postsecondary Education Commission for reviewing proposed campuses and centers. From 1974 to 2010, proposed colleges and education centers for community college districts were first reviewed and approved by CPEC. CPEC would determine how a new educational site and its educational programs would benefit the already established community college sites within its service area. Based on an initial review, the existing criteria continue to provide a solid foundation for evaluating the future needs of community colleges. Updates include revised population data, enrollment trends, demographic characteristics, and calculated planning assumptions based on the newly available data. In addition to the updates, revisions to the existing framework incorporated various spatial analyses such as; unemployment rates, population density, and participation rate calculations by district to ensure equitable access is provided across the system.

1. Future Demand

This criterion is used to evaluate the number of future students, their location, and their characteristics. To understand the future student demand enrollment forecasts have been developed for each district and demographic characteristics were gathered for the system. Enrollment forecasts developed by the Chancellor’s Office for each district are based on the enrollment projection methodology detailed later in this document. The methodology assumes that population and potential enrollment change takes place evenly throughout a district; it does not distinguish pockets of growth (the more typical phenomenon) or growth at the border of two or more districts. Therefore, discussion of new campuses and centers must include additional analysis and consideration for those instances where enrollment growth and facilities needs are expected at or near the borders of two or more districts. To engage the utilization standards necessary for planning, headcount enrollment is converted into weekly student contact hours (WSCH), day credit enrollment, and full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty, which is calculated through the development of annual five-year construction plans prepared by each district.

The 22 percent enrollment increase anticipated between 2013 and 2023 throughout California’s community colleges outpaces the growth in adult population which is only expected to increase by 3 percent during the same time period. The fastest enrollment growth is expected in districts located within the San Francisco Bay Area region and the Central Coast region. (See Planning Estimates in Appendix A and Appendix C.) While the location of future enrollment will be tied to population patterns and housing and business development, proposed developments must be examined carefully since fluctuations in the economy could result in changes to current plans.
In addition, the demographic characteristics and program preferences of future students are a key component to facilities planning. Districts in which large increases in historically underrepresented populations will be challenged to provide these potential students access to the education and training they seek in ways that are cost-effective.

2. Access
This component of the planning criteria assumes that California’s community colleges are commuter institutions and evaluates campus accessibility to assure that campuses and centers are located so as to maximize access in the most cost-effective way possible. As a result, transportation and parking are major factors in campus accessibility. To assure that campuses and centers are located so as to maximize access, Chancellor’s Office planning begins with the rule that a new site may be indicated when the area per site in a district exceeds:

This planning rule is based on a commuting time threshold of 30 minutes to (and from) campus, which includes 25 minutes for travel and 5 minutes to find parking. This rule of thumb is applied against expected commuting speeds in different areas to derive the approximate mile radius and square-mile area to be served by each campus. In addition, the population density per square mile framework was derived from the Census Bureau methodology to define urban and rural areas on the basis of population density from the 2010 decennial census. In some cases, the locations of new community college sites and facilities will be proposed so as to improve access – for certain historically underrepresented groups and for the adult population in general.

At present, the community colleges enroll approximately one in every 15 adult Californians. According to the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan this measure of access is down from the 1:12 ratio that existed in 1980, the 1:14 ratio that existed in 1991, and more recently the 1:13 ratio that existed in 2008. According to the data there is considerable variation in the enrollment of adults among the college districts as well as varying participation rates (enrollment divided by population) between racial and ethnic groups. While the statewide participation rate in 2013 was 6.5 percent, individual district participation varies from 3.0 to 42.8 percent (See Appendix B). Although a number of extenuating factors go into these figures, districts need to assess why the enrollment of the adult population in their service area is relatively high or low and determine if access to educational facilities is a significant contributing factor. Moving forward any proposed new campuses and centers should be developed with these variations in mind.

3. Capacity of Existing Campuses
Also key to long-range planning is the utilization of existing campuses: both the sites and the buildings at those sites. Therefore, in addition to the planning criteria for access, new sites may be indicated with further analysis when the academic load of a district’s existing site exceeds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Access Planning Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanization Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rule is applied against expected commuting speeds in different areas to derive the approximate mile radius and square-mile area to be served by each campus. In addition, the population density per square mile framework was derived from the Census Bureau methodology to define urban and rural areas on the basis of population density from the 2010 decennial census. In some cases, the locations of new community college sites and facilities will be proposed so as to improve access – for certain historically underrepresented groups and for the adult population in general.

At present, the community colleges enroll approximately one in every 15 adult Californians. According to the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan this measure of access is down from the 1:12 ratio that existed in 1980, the 1:14 ratio that existed in 1991, and more recently the 1:13 ratio that existed in 2008. According to the data there is considerable variation in the enrollment of adults among the college districts as well as varying participation rates (enrollment divided by population) between racial and ethnic groups. While the statewide participation rate in 2013 was 6.5 percent, individual district participation varies from 3.0 to 42.8 percent (See Appendix B). Although a number of extenuating factors go into these figures, districts need to assess why the enrollment of the adult population in their service area is relatively high or low and determine if access to educational facilities is a significant contributing factor. Moving forward any proposed new campuses and centers should be developed with these variations in mind.

In the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan, the proposed planning standard of was 750 weekly student contact hours per acre. At the time, this represented a 25 percent increase over current practice, which was 600 weekly student contact hours per acre. In addition, the 750 weekly student contact hours was developed around the concept of a comprehensive community college campus serving 10,000 students or approximately 5,000 full-time equivalent students on 99 acres. While these assumptions were reasonable at the time, the growth patterns and environmental conditions faced by
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colleges throughout the state during the last 25 years have changed the fundamental assumptions. Today colleges are serving 925 weekly student contact hours per acre instead of 600 and serve, on average, more than 9,000 full-time equivalent students, nearly twice the size of the prototype college developed during the 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Growth Plan. Therefore, 925 weekly student contact hours per acre is proposed as a planning rule that is consistent with current practice. Map 3 represents the average system wide weekly student contact hours -per-acre as of 2013.

4. Local Intent
Critical to system planning are the local planning efforts of the districts. This component of the planning criteria takes into account those plans of the individual districts, including district education master plans, facilities master plans, and other regional plans that identify potential changes to the planning conditions of this plan. It is important to recognize that these plans may contain unique conditions of growth that suggest a particular long-range building strategy; in others, programs with ties to local businesses will suggest the approach for planning new facilities and sites; in still others, local initiatives with nearby California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) campuses will dictate how facilities and sites are to be developed.

The first step in determining the need for a state-approved college or center is for a district to evaluate the area’s potential for enrollment growth and the ability of the district’s existing and planned facilities to absorb that growth. Districts determine, given historical participation rates, whether or not projected enrollment growth can be fully accommodated by expanding existing facilities. This type of evaluation is part of the overall development of educational and facilities master plans that are prepared by each college and would lead into the process for establishing a new college or center as outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55180 et. seq.
Map 3: District Average WSCH per Acre, 2013
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Enrollment Projections and Methodology

Enrollment projections are basic to capital outlay planning. For operating budgets, such projections extend no more than two years into the future. However, longer projections of 10 years are necessary for the orderly planning of new campuses and centers.

Community college enrollments can experience periodic shifts resulting from changes in demographics, especially numbers of high school graduates (see Figure 3), and economic conditions (as reflected in unemployment rate), among other factors. Shifting demographics can be gauged by assimilating the ethnic diversity among the population in California. The Environmental Systems Research Institute (Esri) has developed the Diversity Index, which tracks the racial and ethnic diversity of a geographic location. The Diversity Index is based on census counts and is defined as the probability that two persons, randomly selected from the same area, would belong to a different race or ethnic group. The racial diversity is measured on a scale of 0 to 100, where 0 has no diversity and 100 is completely diverse. As presented in Map 4, California’s Diversity Index is varied across the state; although the majority of the higher Diversity Index is shown in the Central and Southern California regions.

Previously, long-term enrollment projections for capital outlay planning in the California Community Colleges were prepared by the Department of Finance and were developed by applying expected “participation rates” (enrollment divided by population) to projections of future population groups, categorized according to age and gender. The expected participation rates were based on past trends, data from local districts, and a qualitative assessment of each district’s situation by Department of Finance staff. These past trends embodied not only
Map 4: Diversity Index by Zip Code, 2014
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enrollment demand, but also severe budget reductions that impacted the colleges' ability to enroll and educate students.

Since the development of the 1991 plan, the Chancellor’s Office started developing enrollment projections for the system. Initially, these projections were developed through a linear regression model that was based on 30-plus years of data that weighed all the data equally. However, the linear regression model tended to overemphasize negative trends in several of the underlying assumptions of the model such as declining district budgets, fee increases, and for some districts, decreases in adult county population. This resulted in an atypical picture of student enrollment in the community college system at times when those issues were prevalent, as has been the case for the last several years. In response to the limitations of the traditional linear regression model, a new enrollment projection model was developed to replace the original econometric regression enrollment projection model.

The new enrollment projection model was developed by the Chancellor’s Office in cooperation with the Association of Chief Business Officers and the RP Group. The methodology has been implemented annually by the Chancellor’s Office since the 2012 enrollment projections. The new Population Participation Rate (PPR) model forecasts enrollment for each district based on a combination of variables including student participation rates, “in district” and “out of district” enrollment, weekly student contact hours to enrollment ratios, and adult population projections based on Geographic Information Systems zip code data. As a result, the PPR model demonstrates less volatility and will be a more accurate planning tool for community college facilities.

Central to this method of enrollment projections are population estimates, which are used to determine the participation rate for each district and the entire system. According to data collected, California’s population growth is expected to continue. California’s population growth is due to (1) natural increase (birth rate minus death rate), and (2) foreign immigration. This plan is based on an estimated total population of 37.6 million in 2013, growing to a total population of 40.5 million in 2023, an increase of approximately 2.9 million people or 7.6 percent. California’s adult population is estimated at approximately 24.5 million in 2013; increasing to 25.3 million in 2023 or roughly 3 percent during the same period (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: California Population Estimates, 2008-2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>California Population</th>
<th>California Adult Population, 18-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>36.6M</td>
<td>23.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>37.7M</td>
<td>24.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>39.1M</td>
<td>24.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>40.5M</td>
<td>25.3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 5: Projected Enrollment Growth by District
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Today, the California Community Colleges annually serve 2.1 million students, approximately 75 percent of California’s public undergraduate college enrollment, in both vocational and academic program offerings. This number is the actual annual unduplicated enrollment for the system, and represents the total number of students served over all school terms within an academic year. The number is unduplicated because a student enrolled in fall and spring semester would count as one student.

However, the planning for new sites and facilities is based on estimated fall enrollment rather than the annual 2.1 million students because the total number of students served would not all be enrolled in a given semester. Therefore, the need for new facilities, colleges, and/or centers in this report is based on projected fall student enrollment and weekly student contact hours through 2023. As defined in title 5, California Code of Regulations, weekly student contact hours means “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 p.m. during a census week. A class period is not less than 50 minutes and not more than 60 minutes” (title 5, CCR, §57001(e)). The process of using enrollment during the fall term is consistent with the methodology traditionally used by Department of Finance. This plan is based on estimated fall enrollment of 1.6 million students in 2013, growing to an enrollment of 1.9 million in 2023, an increase of approximately 355,000 students or 22 percent. Weekly student contact hours are estimated at approximately 16.5 million in 2013, increasing to 20.6 million in 2023 (see Figure 2). The enrollment projections are calculated by the Chancellor’s Office participation rate model and provided to districts for utilization in their annual five-year capital outlay planning efforts. Map 5 represents the system wide projected enrollment growth through 2023.

It should be noted that the Education Code provides that students have “free flow” access to all community college sites. Students are therefore not restricted to any specific geographic area and can attend college at any campus in the state. While the overall system may appear to have excess facilities capacity, there are many individual campuses within the system that have severe capital facility shortages.

Figure 2: Community College Fall Enrollment and Fall WSCH Forecast, 2000-2023
Figure 3: High School Students and Graduates, Grades 9-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Students Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Projected Total Students Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Projected High School Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1.7M</td>
<td>1.95M</td>
<td>315,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>2M</td>
<td>1.97M</td>
<td>382,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1.97M</td>
<td>1.98M</td>
<td>420,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>417,178</td>
<td>447,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California Community Colleges at a Glance

California Community Colleges are a main point of access to higher education in California. In 2013-14, the California Community Colleges served 2.1 million students — approximately 75 percent of California’s public undergraduate college enrollment — in both vocational and academic program offerings. However, the California Community Colleges continue to recover from the constraints imposed by the Great Recession. As a result of responding to the challenges presented during the Great Recession, the system suffered a 22 percent drop in the number of students served annually between 2008-09 and 2013-14. In addition to experiencing a decline in students served annually, California Community Colleges were also forced to reduce the number of course sections offered in response to the economic recession.

The effects of the recession can also be seen in the drop in the systemwide participation rate. Between the 2009-10 and 2014-15 academic years, the participation rate dropped from 84.3 per 1,000 of adult population to 73.3 by 2014-15.

The decline in funding for California community colleges between 2009 and 2016 has contributed to the limited access for students. However, as the funding levels improve, the speed at which student enrollment patterns recover appears to be much slower. In the 2015-16 academic year, total funding for California community colleges is the highest of all time.

Student transfer to a four-year higher education institution is a large component of the community colleges’ mission. The transfer guarantee pathway has allowed community college students to obtain Associate in Arts...
Figure 4: Annual Student Headcounts* and Annual Full-Time Equivalent Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>2,667,733</td>
<td>2,539,790</td>
<td>2,362,359</td>
<td>2,198,989</td>
<td>2,094,910</td>
<td>2,079,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1M</td>
<td>1,258,719</td>
<td>1,228,349</td>
<td>1,141,298</td>
<td>1,120,913</td>
<td>1,107,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Student Headcounts

Annual Full-Time Equivalent Students

The system headcount is unduplicated and therefore students are only counted once even if they attend multiple colleges. In the past, the Chancellor’s Office measure of headcount counted students if they attended multiple colleges. **Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) is the equivalent of 525 hours of student instruction.

Figure 5: Course Sections Offered by Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Noncredit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>352,516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>329,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>341,923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>366,794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>388,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>425,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Participation Rate by Race/Ethnicity per 1,000 Population*

* California residents 18 years through 70 years of age

2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>System-Wide</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>African-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>139.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>System-Wide</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Multi-Race</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>African-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73.3
Figure 7: California Community Colleges Funding 2009 to 2016
Source: 2015 State of the System Report, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

- **Total Funding (including general fund, property taxes, and student fees)**
  - 2009-10: $6.3 Billion
  - 2010-11: $6.8 Billion
  - 2011-12: $6.2 Billion
  - 2012-13: $5.9 Billion
  - 2013-14: $5.9 Billion
  - 2014-15: $3.5 Billion
  - 2015-16: $3.5 Billion

- **State General Fund Contribution**
  - 2009-10: $3.8 Billion
  - 2010-11: $3.5 Billion
  - 2011-12: $3.3 Billion
  - 2012-13: $3.5 Billion
  - 2013-14: $4.0 Billion
  - 2014-15: $4.7 Billion
  - 2015-16: $7.7 Billion

Source: 2015 State of the System Report, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

Figure 8: California Community Colleges Funding per Student 2009 to 2016
Source: 2015 State of the System Report, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

- **Funding per Full-Time Equivalent Student from all sources, including general fund, property taxes, and student fees.**
  - 2009-10: $5,282
  - 2010-11: $5,230
  - 2011-12: $5,236
  - 2012-13: $5,411
  - 2013-14: $5,640
  - 2014-15: $5,886
  - 2015-16: $6,650

- **Funding per Full-Time Equivalent Student from state general fund contributions.**
  - 2009-10: $3,283
  - 2010-11: $3,315
  - 2011-12: $3,147
  - 2012-13: $2,964
  - 2013-14: $3,175
  - 2014-15: $3,456
  - 2015-16: $4,040
or Associate in Science for Transfer degrees and makes them eligible for transfer with junior standing into the California State University (CSU) system. In 2012-13, the first full year the transfer degrees became available, 5,366 students attained this degree. This helped to increase the number of transferees to California State University by 28 percent from 2012-13 to 2013-14. In addition, the University of California system introduced a transfer pathway program from the community colleges; the expected outcome as this program is implemented is an increase in the number of transfers to the University of California system.

As online education becomes more prevalent in course offerings, distance education enrollment has experienced a steady increase. In 2007-08, the percentage of distance education FTES was 7.8 percent. The percentage has continued to increase and in 2013-14 the percentage grew to 10.3 percent FTES, with the greatest increase between 2012-13 and 2013-14. With additional classes being offered online, distance education FTES is expected to escalate.

As the most local of postsecondary educational institutions, California community colleges serve students with diverse backgrounds and education goals. In 2014, Hispanic students constituted the largest percentage of students in the system at 42.7 percent. White (non-Hispanic) students followed with 28.1 percent of the student population. Other reported ethnicities included Asian (10.9 percent), African American (6.6 percent), Filipino (2.9 percent), American Indian/Alaskan Native (1.4 percent), Pacific Islanders (0.4 percent), and multi-ethnicities (3.8 percent). The students who reported "unknown" ethnicity made up 4.2 percent.

Three out of every 10 Californians ages 18 to 24 are currently enrolled in a community college. In fall of 2014, students between 20 to 24 years of age made up the largest age group in the system with 34 percent of the student population. The 19 or younger age range comprised 25 percent, followed by 13.2 percent in the 25 to 29 age range, 8.6 percent in the 50 years and above age range, 7.4 percent in the 30 to 34 age range, 4.8 percent in the 40 to 49 age range, and 4.8 percent in the 35 to 39 age range.

The California Community Colleges cater to a broad spectrum of students with varying schedules and responsibilities outside of the school environment. In fall 2014, females represented 8 percent more of the student population than did males. A majority of the students (60.7 percent) are enrolled part-time, 30 per-

---

**Figure 9: Annual Number of Community College Transfers to California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) Systems**

Source: 2015 State of the System Report, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10: Annual Distance Education FTES, 2007-2014**

Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Data Mart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On Campus FTES</th>
<th>Distance Ed FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 11: Student Ethnicity, Fall 2014**
Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Data Mart

- African-American: 6.6%
- American Indian: 0.4%
- Asian: 10.9%
- Filipino: 2.9%
- Hispanic: 42.7%
- Multi-Race: 3.8%
- Pacific Islander: 0.4%
- White: 28.1%
- Unknown: 4.2%

**Figure 12: Student Age Distribution, Fall 2014**
Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Data Mart

- 19 or Younger: 25%
- 20-24: 34%
- 25-29: 13.2%
- 30-34: 7.4%
- 35-39: 4.8%
- 40-49: 6.8%
- 50 and Above: 8.6%

**Figure 13: California Community Colleges Student Characteristics, Fall 2014**
Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, Data Mart

- Gender:
  - Male: 45.5%
  - Female: 53.5%
  - Unknown: 1.0%

- Full-Time/Part-Time Status:
  - Full-Time: 30.0%
  - Part-Time: 60.7%
  - Unknown: 7.0%

- Time of Day Attended:
  - Evening Only: 17.8%
  - Day Only: 75.3%
  - Unknown: 7.0%
cent are enrolled full-time and 9.3 percent are enrolled in noncredit courses, such as enrichment classes. Students have the option to take classes during the day or evening to accommodate their schedules. Day-only enrollment provides the largest percentage of enrollment at 75.3 percent, while evening-only courses are taken by 17.8 percent of the students. Seven percent of students did not report which time of day they are enrolled in classes.

In order to accommodate enrollment growth, colleges have expanded their campuses quite significantly over the last 13 years. The system's facilities have grown by 30,145,895 in total outside gross square footage (OGSF), which equates to a 60 percent increase from 2001 to 2014. The total assignable square feet (ASF) has increased by 13,145,744 assignable square feet or 35 percent between 2001 and 2014. However, 63 percent of the colleges' facilities are 25 years or older; this includes 2,549 buildings of which 1,967 buildings, roughly half the statewide inventory, are over 40 years old.

As economic and demographic conditions shift, the communities surrounding higher education institutions adapt as well. California Community Colleges have proven that they are dedicated to addressing such challenges proactively through ongoing planning and implementation efforts. As a result, the system is uniquely positioned with the ability to respond effectively to the dynamic needs of each district.

**Figure 14: California Community Colleges Facilities, 2001-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Outside Gross Square Footage</th>
<th>Total Assignable Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>37.6M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53.9M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>84.1M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office, FUSION
Chapter 5

Community College Regions at a Glance

There are 72 semi-autonomous districts that compose the California community colleges. Within these districts there are a total of 113 colleges, 77 off-campus centers, and 23 district offices. For planning purposes, the system has been divided into seven regions to better navigate the data from a regional perspective. Each region consists of geographically contiguous districts. Selected planning estimates used in the planning process are located in the appendices (see Appendix A, B & C).

An overview of the regional data highlights the variation that exists within different geographic areas of the community college system (see Appendix A). This regional variation is seen in the number of districts assigned to each region which ranges between 6 districts in the Central Coast Region to the 14 districts assigned to both the San Francisco Bay Area Region and the Los Angeles/Ventura Counties Region. The regions also differ in geographic size where the square miles within each region varies between 5,000 square miles to slightly more than 52,000 square miles. In addition, each region also serves different levels of enrollment and adult populations resulting in participation rates as seen in Table 2.

Each region has accommodated enrollment through expansion and renovation of facilities. In Figure 15, the total square footage of facilities in each region is presented. It is clear from the data that those regions with the largest adult populations that serve a greater number of students have developed the most square footage on their campuses.
Table 2: 2013 Regional Enrollments, Population, and Participation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013 Fall Enrollment</th>
<th>2013 Adult Population</th>
<th>2013 Adult Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>76,782</td>
<td>916,932</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley and Sierra Foothills</td>
<td>235,334</td>
<td>4,199,216</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>126,492</td>
<td>2,827,317</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/Ventura Counties</td>
<td>444,401</td>
<td>7,119,764</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>36,534</td>
<td>562,066</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>306,686</td>
<td>4,747,546</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange and San Diego Counties</td>
<td>356,212</td>
<td>4,108,347</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Facilities Square Footage by Region

- **Total Gross Sq. Feet**: 26.3M
- **Total Assignable Sq. Feet**: 14M

**Los Angeles and Ventura Counties**

- **16.7M**
- **10.5M**

**San Francisco Bay Area**

- **14.1M**
- **8.7M**

**Orange and San Diego Counties**

- **13.5M**
- **9M**

**Central Valley and Sierra Foothills**

- **6.2M**
- **3.9M**

**Desert Areas**

- **4.4M**
- **2.6M**

**Central Coast**

- **2.9M**
- **2M**

**Northern California**
The Central Coast Region consists of six community college districts along the central coast of California covering an area of 9,850 square miles. Facilities within the region total 4,370,648 outside gross square footage and 2,615,648 assignable square feet. Regional enrollment in 2013 was 76,782 and was projected to be 102,956 by 2023. This is a 34 percent increase in enrollment. In 2013 the total regional weekly student contact hours were 814,706 with 13 percent of this weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The 2013 adult population for this region was 916,932 and projected to be 926,604 by 2023, a 1 percent increase. The following districts are located in this region:

- Allan Hancock CCD
- Cabrillo CCD
- Hartnell CCD
- Monterey Peninsula CCD
- San Luis Obispo CCD
- Santa Barbara CCD
Map 7: Central Coast Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density

Legend

- Approved Centers
- California Community Colleges
- 25 Minute Drive Time Radius
- District Legal Boundaries

2014 Population Density

- 250 or less
- 251 - 500
- 501 - 750
- 751 - 1,000
- 1,251 or greater
Map 8: Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Region

This region consists of 12 districts located in California's central valley and sierra foothills and covers an area of 52,281 square miles. It is comprised of 13,452,021 outside gross square footage and 9,009,671 assignable square feet. In 2013, enrollment for the region was 235,334 and was projected to increase by 25 percent to 293,077 by 2023. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 2,536,138 with 11 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 is 4,199,216 and projected to be 4,336,612 in 2023, a 3 percent increase. This region consists of the following districts:

- Kern CCD
- Lake Tahoe CCD
- Los Rios CCD
- Merced CCD
- San Joaquin Delta CCD
- Sequoias CCD
- Sierra Joint CCD
- State Center CCD
- West Hills CCD
- West Kern CCD
- Yosemite CCD
- Yuba CCD
Map 9: Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density
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Map 10: Desert Area Region

This region consists of 10 districts east of the Los Angeles Basin and is the third largest region geographically with 30,691 square miles. It is comprised of 6,240,846 outside gross square footage and 3,906,461 assignable square feet of facilities. Regional enrollment in 2013 was 126,492 and was projected to be 161,785 by 2023. This is a 28 percent increase in enrollment. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 1,375,234 with 11 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 is 2,827,317 and projected to be 3,003,805 in 2023, which is a 6 percent increase. This region consists of the following districts:

- Barstow CCD
- Chaffey CCD
- Copper Mountain CCD
- Desert CCD
- Imperial Valley CCD
- Mt. San Jacinto CCD
- Palo Verde CCD
- Riverside CCD
- San Bernardino CCD
- Victor Valley CCD

Legend
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Map 12: Los Angeles and Ventura Counties Region

The 14 districts located within the Los Angeles basin and its periphery cover a geographic area of 6,075 square miles. The region is the second smallest in terms of land area but is the largest in facilities, enrollment and adult population. The region consists of 26,317,334 outside gross square footage and 14,004,051 assignable square feet of facilities. Regional enrollment in 2013 was 444,401 and was projected to increase by 15 percent to 510,313 by 2023. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 4,907,621 with 9 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 was 7,119,764 and projected to be 7,186,511 in 2023, which is a 1 percent increase. This region consists of the following districts:

- Antelope Valley CCD
- Cerritos CCD
- Citrus CCD
- Compton CCD
- El Camino CCD
- Glendale CCD
- Long Beach
- Los Angeles CCD
- Mt. San Antonio CCD
- Pasadena CCD
- Rio Hondo CCD
- Santa Clarita CCD
- Santa Monica CCD
- Ventura CCD

Legend
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Map 14: Northern California Region

Community college districts in the northern part of the state form a region that consists of seven districts that cover a geographic area of 34,933 square miles. Regional facilities consist of a total of 2,922,997 outside gross square footage and 2,043,472 assignable square feet. Regional enrollment in 2013 was 36,534 and was projected to be 45,574 by 2023. This is a 25 percent increase in enrollment. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 432,835 with 12 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 was 562,066 and projected to be 531,049 in 2023, which is a 6 percent decrease. This region consists of the following districts:

- Butte-Glenn CCD
- Feather River CCD
- Lassen CCD
- Mendocino-Lake CCD
- Redwoods CCD
- Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint CCD
- Siskiyou Joint CCD
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Map 15: Northern California Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density
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Map 16: San Francisco Bay Area Region

The 14 community college districts surrounding the San Francisco Bay encompass an area that totals 7,946 square miles. The facilities from these districts total 16,706,354 outside gross square footage and 10,510,031 assignable square feet. In 2013, enrollment in the region was 306,686 and was projected to increase by 29 percent to 394,558 by 2023. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 3,096,707 with 16 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 was 4,108,347 and projected to be 4,286,439 in 2023, which is a 4 percent increase. This region consists of the following districts:

- Chabot-Las Positas CCD
- Contra Costa CCD
- Foothill-DeAnza CCD
- Gavilan CCD
- Marin CCD
- Napa Valley CCD
- Ohlone CCD
- Peralta CCD
- San Francisco CCD
- San Jose-Evergreen CCD
- San Mateo CCD
- Solano CCD
- Sonoma CCD
- West Valley CCD

Legend

- Approved Centers
- Approved District Offices
- California Community Colleges
- District Legal Boundaries

0 10 20 40 60 80 Miles
Map 17: San Francisco Bay Area Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density
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Map 18: Orange and San Diego Counties Region
The Orange and San Diego Counties region includes nine community college districts covering a 5,044 square mile area. The combined facilities within this region comprise a total of 14,119,213 outside gross square footage and 8,669,537 assignable square feet. In 2013, regional enrollment was 356,212 and was projected to increase by 20 percent to 428,724 by 2023. The total 2013 weekly student contact hours were 3,323,549 with 13 percent of these weekly student contact hours generated through off-site methods. The adult population for this region in 2013 was 4,108,347 and projected to be 4,286,439 in 2023, which is a 4 percent increase. This region consists of the following districts:

- Coast CCD
- Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD
- Mira Costa CCD
- North Orange County CCD
- Palomar CCD
- Rancho Santiago CCD
- San Diego CCD
- South Orange County CCD
- Southwestern CCD
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Map 19: Orange and San Diego Counties Regional Drive Time Radius & Population Density
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Chapter 6

Evaluating System Needs
Among California’s 72 community college districts, there are currently 113 college campuses and 77 centers. In addition, there are currently 10 proposed new centers that have submitted documentation prior to the development of this plan and are in various stages of the review process (see Appendix E). Since the development of the original 1991 Long-Range Capital Outlay Plan, the community college system has experienced growth in areas of enrollment, facilities, and funding. At the time of the original planning effort, the system consisted of 71 districts, 107 colleges and more than 50 centers (exact number was not stated). Since the development of the original plan, the system has experienced significant growth in the number of educational institutions located throughout the state of California, including the establishment of a new community college district. Currently there are 190 approved community colleges and educational centers combined. The selected estimates used in the planning process are listed in both Appendix A and Appendix B. The following discussion covers the plan from a regional perspective drawing on data and maps presented throughout the document.

Planning Highlights
• Four Regions with projected enrollment growth in excess of 50,000 students;
• One Region with a projected 6 percent increase in adult population;
• One District with a projected 12.81 percent increase in adult population;
• Two Regions exceeded 925 on-site weekly student contact hours per acre;
• 16 Districts exceeded 1,200 on-site weekly student contact hours per acre;
• One District exceeded 6,000 on-site weekly student contact hours per acre.

**Future Demand**

Enrollment projections are a fundamental criterion districts should evaluate when considering the number of future students and their location. The California Community Colleges are expected to grow in enrollment by approximately 22 percent from 2013 to 2023. However, this growth should be considered with caution since the growth in adult population is only expected to increase by 3 percent during the same time period and this projection may therefore not materialize. The enrollment projections used in this analysis are part of the projections developed annually by the California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office to address fluctuations in population patterns. An analysis of the data reveals that growth within the system is projected to occur in terms of enrollment and percentage growth. The region with the greatest enrollment growth within the community college system is the San Francisco Bay Area. The San Francisco Bay Area is anticipated to serve approximately an additional 88,000 students by 2023 (see Appendix A); with San Francisco CCD accounting for approximately 17,000 of those students (see Appendix B). In addition, the Central Coast Region is expected to experience the fastest growth regionally, with an estimated 34 percent increase from 2013 to 2023 (see Appendix A). However, the additional 26,000 students are in part anticipated by an increase in regional adult participation rate, which is a metric that requires further evaluation. For example, if the regional participation rate remains constant then the enrollment growth will be reduced to 1 percent instead of 34 percent. Based on the available data, there are four regions with an increase in projected enrollment in excess of 50,000 students. Those regions include the Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Region, Los Angeles/Ventura Counties Region, San Francisco Bay Area Region, and the Orange and San Diego Counties Region. Currently, there are two proposals for new centers within the San Francisco Bay Area Region, one proposal with the Central Valley and Sierra Foothills Region, and two proposals within the Los Angeles/Ventura Counties Region that have been submitted to the Chancellor’s Office and are moving through the application process (see Appendix E).

**Access**

Efficient community college access is an integral planning component for serving students within a district’s service area. As primarily commuter institutions, community colleges should be located to maximize access in a cost-effective manner. An analysis of each region based on population density, degree of urbanization and the average miles per site identified five regions that exceeded the recommended site to square miles ratio based on urbanization category. In addition, minimum threshold for a student’s commuting time to and from a campus is 30 minutes each way; this includes five minutes to locate parking. However, as shown in the “Drive Time Radius & Population Density” map (Map 2), the California Community Colleges are doing an excellent job of accommodating the concentrations of populated service areas across the state. For future planning purposes, however, districts should evaluate the adult population change across the state. In 2013, California’s adult population was an estimated 24,481,189 and is on pace to increase by 3 percent in 2023 to approximately 25,213,688. Regionally, the Desert Areas are expected to see the greatest increase in adult population. The 6 percent increase in adult population from an estimated 2,827,317 in 2013 to 3,003,805 in 2023 is expected to occur within the 10 districts that encompass that region. The area servicing Mt. San Jacinto Community College District within the Desert Area region is anticipating a 12.81 percent increase in their adult population by 2023, which is the highest growth within the state. Currently, there are four proposals for new centers within the Desert Area Region that have been submitted to the Chancellor’s Office and are moving through the application process (see Appendix E).
Capacity of Existing Campuses
Evaluating the districts’ capacity of existing facilities is measured, in part, by calculating the weekly student contact hours per acre as described in Chapter 2. If a district exceeds 925 weekly student contact hours per acre, further analysis may be necessary to determine if a campus has reached capacity and is in need of adding a college or center to accommodate additional students. From a regional perspective, this analysis provides an opportunity to evaluate whether a region may be impacted. As a result of this analysis, two regions are identified as exceeding the 925 weekly student contact hours per acre threshold – the Los Angeles and Ventura Counties Region and the Orange and San Diego Counties Region (see Table 3). In addition as of 2013, 22 districts had exceeded the 925 weekly student contact hours per acre and of those districts, 16 districts exceeded 1,200 on-site weekly student contact hours per acre. A majority of those districts are located in the Los Angeles and Ventura Counties Region. Santa Monica Community College District, which is included in that region, had the most on-site weekly student contact hours per acre in the system with approximately 6,155 per acre (see Appendix B).

Local and Future Planning Efforts
Accompanying the three planning criteria listed above is the local planning conducted by each district. These local planning efforts are uniquely positioned to evaluate and understand the conditions of growth and mobility that are difficult to assess at a system level without local knowledge. It is generally understood that future enrollment will be tied to population, housing and business development patterns that are susceptible to economic fluctuations. Therefore this part of the planning criteria is designed to incorporate local plans when available such as district education master plans, facilities master plans and other regional plans. Moving forward, regions and districts will need to work together to evaluate an area’s project enrollment growth and coordinate the district’s ability to service that growth through a combination of existing and planned facilities as well as alternative instructional methods. It is envisioned that this type of evaluation is part of the overall development of educational and facilities master plans that are prepared by each college and will lead into the process for establishing a new college or center as outlined in California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 55180 et. seq.

Table 3 - 2013 Regional On-site Weekly Student Contact Hours per Acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2013 WSCH On-site</th>
<th>2013 Acreage</th>
<th>2013 On-site WSCH per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>733,235</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley and Sierra Foot-hills</td>
<td>2,282,525</td>
<td>6,401</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>1,237,710</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles and Ventura Counties</td>
<td>4,416,859</td>
<td>3,325</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>389,552</td>
<td>3,336</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>2,787,036</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange and San Diego Counties</td>
<td>2,991,194</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>14,838,111</td>
<td>24,522</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Outlay Funding
Funding for capital outlay in the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California is derived from sales of revenue and general obligation bonds. Since 2000, there have been three statewide bond measures that have allowed the community college districts to fund new and modernization capital outlay projects.

The three statewide bond measures since 2000 for community colleges total $3,172,853,000. These propositions are Proposition 47, Proposition 55, and Proposition 1D. As seen in Table 4, the details can be found on these bond programs.

Thus far, these propositions have funded 325 projects throughout the state in 67 districts on 123 campuses and centers. Currently these bond funds have all been allocated or expended and there is still a need for new and modernization facilities projects at districts statewide. According to the 2016-17 Five-Year Systemwide Capital Outlay Plan, the current need for new educa-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Bond Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6028</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2002</td>
<td>$745,853,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6041</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund of 2004</td>
<td>$920,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>2006 California Community College Capital Outlay Bond Fund</td>
<td>$1,507,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tional space is 10.2 million ASF to meet enrollment growth. The cost for this growth is projected to be $12 billion within five years, projected out to a total cost of $15.3 billion in 2025. The plan also identifies the need to modernize 28.3 million assignable square feet of existing facilities. The cost for modernizing facilities within five years is $14 billion and projected to be $21 billion by 2025. In addition, 63 percent of the colleges’ facilities are 25 years or older, this includes

Table 5: 10-Year Capital Outlay Need, 2016-2025

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5-Year Plan</th>
<th>10-Year Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities</td>
<td>$11,998,000</td>
<td>$15,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Life Safety</td>
<td>$541,000</td>
<td>$1,083,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>$12,244,000</td>
<td>$18,434,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Temporary Buildings</td>
<td>$1,229,000</td>
<td>$1,484,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Centers⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,573,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,012,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,378,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2,549 buildings of which 1,967 buildings are over 40 years old. An estimated $26 billion over the next 10 years will be needed to meet these current capital outlay needs. In addition, this Long-Range Master Plan proposes that an additional 355,000 students will be enrolled in a community college by the year 2023. In order to meet the projected enrollment growth, an estimated additional $13.4 billion is needed to accommodate these students over the next 10 years.
Due to the growth in student enrollment, districts have been building education centers to make district educational programs more accessible to the student population and to handle the projected enrollment growth. It is expected that 10 new centers will be built by 2025 to handle the influx of students. The cost for these centers is projected to be $500 million. The total cost for these new centers is projected to be $39.4 billion by 2025.

The need for new facilities and the modernization of existing facilities is due to the ever-increasing amount of students that are attending community colleges and the changes in programs on campus. The estimated fall enrollment of 1.6 million students in 2013 is projected to grow to 1.9 million in 2023, an increase of approximately 355,000 students or 22 percent.

With this need, the state has a capital outlay funding process that allows districts to compete for facilities funding to build or modernize facilities on their campuses. Obtaining this funding is not as simple as sending in an application. Districts must go through several planning phases before receiving state capital outlay funds. Districts create a five-year plan, which includes an educational master plan, energy plan and facility plan summary. This five-year plan is comprised of a list of projects in the district’s order of priority. The plan also shows how impacted districts are for space in five space categories (lecture, lab, office, library, AV/TV). The comparison of space available versus enrollment provided by the five-year plan assists districts in planning capital outlay projects which are eligible for state funding. With this information, districts are then able to create project proposals that are submitted to the Chancellor’s Office for consideration for state funding.

After the district completes the educational master plan, facilities master plan and five-year construction plan (5YCP), the district then develops an initial project proposal (IPP). An initial project proposal is the first step towards obtaining state capital outlay funding for a singular construction project. It is a concept paper introducing the project to the state. It is a summary of a construction project and provides information needed to determine eligibility for funding. The project should be listed in the educational master plan, the facility master plan, and the five-year construction plan. Initial project proposals are submitted with the five-year construction plan annually in July. Initial project proposals are submitted three years prior to the first potential funding appropriation, and more than one IPP may be submitted for a single funding year.

The second step for obtaining state capital outlay funding is for the district to submit the final project proposal (FPP). Final project proposals are submitted annually in July. A final project proposal is an evolved initial project proposal. It establishes the project justification, final scope and estimated costs for implementation of all acquisition, infrastructure, facility and systems projects. Final project proposals are submitted two years prior to the first year for a potential funding appropriation. Only one final project proposal may be submitted from each college within the district for a single funding year/two year period. Once a final project proposal is approved, it becomes a contract with between the district and the state regarding scope, schedule and cost of the project.

Given the nature of state funding, there is an uncertainty of the state providing funding for capital outlay projects. Bond funding has been depleted and there is no guarantee of state funds for facilities in the near future. Districts must decide on whether or not to participate in the capital outlay process or use local bond funding to construct their educational facilities. There are districts that have the capability to do both in maximizing their bond funding by sharing the facilities construction costs with the state. Districts take on a certain risk when providing these project proposals. These proposals take time, effort, and funding from the district which doesn’t necessarily guarantee a funded facility. However, when a facility is funded, it is deemed a good investment by the district.

Footnotes
3. 2016-17 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.
4. 2016-17 Five-Year Capital Outlay Plan, California Community Colleges Chancellor’s Office.
5. The assumption is that 10 centers at $50,000,000 each will be built by 2025
6. Please see the Facilities Planning Manual for an in-depth look at the details on the capital outlay requirements and needs.
Appendices
## Appendix A

### California Community Colleges Selected Regional Planning Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Coast</th>
<th>Central Valley and Sierra Foothills</th>
<th>Desert Areas</th>
<th>Los Angeles/ Ventura Counties</th>
<th>Northern California</th>
<th>San Francisco Bay Area</th>
<th>Orange and San Diego Counties</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sq Miles</td>
<td>9,850</td>
<td>52,281</td>
<td>30,691</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>34,933</td>
<td>7,946</td>
<td>5,044</td>
<td>146,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>2,615,648</td>
<td>9,009,671</td>
<td>3,906,461</td>
<td>14,004,051</td>
<td>2,043,472</td>
<td>10,510,031</td>
<td>8,669,537</td>
<td>50,758,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Enrollment</td>
<td>76,782</td>
<td>235,334</td>
<td>126,492</td>
<td>444,401</td>
<td>36,534</td>
<td>306,686</td>
<td>356,212</td>
<td>1,582,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Enrollment</td>
<td>102,956</td>
<td>293,077</td>
<td>161,785</td>
<td>510,313</td>
<td>45,574</td>
<td>394,558</td>
<td>428,724</td>
<td>1,936,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Total WSCH</td>
<td>814,706</td>
<td>2,536,138</td>
<td>1,375,234</td>
<td>4,907,621</td>
<td>432,835</td>
<td>3,096,707</td>
<td>3,323,549</td>
<td>16,486,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCH Off-site %</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 Adult Pop</td>
<td>926,604</td>
<td>4,336,612</td>
<td>3,003,805</td>
<td>7,186,511</td>
<td>531,049</td>
<td>4,942,669</td>
<td>4,286,439</td>
<td>25,213,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Pop % Change</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### California Community Colleges Selected District Planning Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2013 Enrollment</th>
<th>2023 Enrollment</th>
<th>Chg.</th>
<th>% Chg.</th>
<th>Onsite WSCH Per Acre</th>
<th>Sq. Mi. Per Coll.</th>
<th>Sq. Mi. Per Site.</th>
<th>Part. Rate</th>
<th>WSCH Off-Campus</th>
<th>Adult Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allan Hancock CCD</td>
<td>12,965</td>
<td>19,494</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>174,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley CCD</td>
<td>14,269</td>
<td>17,351</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>282,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow CCD</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>4,371</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9,157</td>
<td>9,157</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte-Glenn CCD</td>
<td>12,669</td>
<td>14,509</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>152,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo CCD</td>
<td>13,365</td>
<td>16,072</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>187,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos CCD</td>
<td>23,572</td>
<td>25,467</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>289,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffey CCD</td>
<td>19,945</td>
<td>23,479</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>564,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus CCD</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td>14,476</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>156,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast CCD</td>
<td>43,144</td>
<td>52,999</td>
<td>9,855</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>419,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton CCD</td>
<td>7,756</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>190,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa CCD</td>
<td>35,726</td>
<td>44,721</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>678,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Mountain CCD</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert CCD</td>
<td>10,408</td>
<td>13,485</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>238,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino CCD</td>
<td>23,992</td>
<td>27,562</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>371,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather River CCD</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill-DeAnza CCD</td>
<td>37,748</td>
<td>46,807</td>
<td>9,059</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>265,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavilan CCD</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>4,128</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>126,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale CCD</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>23,537</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>143,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD</td>
<td>27,036</td>
<td>35,825</td>
<td>8,789</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>293,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartnell Joint CCD</td>
<td>9,238</td>
<td>11,082</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>182,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Valley CCD</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>9,988</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>4,291</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>117,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern CCD</td>
<td>24,940</td>
<td>31,332</td>
<td>6,392</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>7,097</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>583,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe CCD</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen CCD</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach CCD</td>
<td>24,282</td>
<td>29,224</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>325,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles CCD</td>
<td>154,078</td>
<td>172,209</td>
<td>18,131</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3,507,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Rios CCD</td>
<td>73,274</td>
<td>90,514</td>
<td>17,240</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,052,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin CCD</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>8,560</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>169,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino-Lake CCD</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>4,721</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>58,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced CCD</td>
<td>11,153</td>
<td>14,607</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>170,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira Costa CCD</td>
<td>16,125</td>
<td>19,075</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>236,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula CCD</td>
<td>10,339</td>
<td>13,533</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Antonio CCD</td>
<td>34,365</td>
<td>37,961</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>492,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. San Jacinto CCD</td>
<td>15,558</td>
<td>22,738</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>517,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Chg. %</td>
<td>Onsite WSCH Per Acre</td>
<td>Sq. Mi. Per Coll.</td>
<td>Sq. Mi. Per Site.</td>
<td>Part. Rate</td>
<td>WSCH Off-Campus</td>
<td>Adult Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa Valley CCD</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>9,343</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>80,942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Orange County CCD</td>
<td>55,779</td>
<td>62,397</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>603,423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde CCD</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>4,253</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6,519</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar CCD</td>
<td>25,939</td>
<td>34,528</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>537,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena CCD</td>
<td>26,270</td>
<td>30,365</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5,248</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>277,062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta CCD</td>
<td>30,578</td>
<td>38,458</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>431,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santiago CCD</td>
<td>57,332</td>
<td>67,637</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>124,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwoods CCD</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>412,147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo CCD</td>
<td>17,567</td>
<td>22,871</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>272,763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside CCD</td>
<td>35,374</td>
<td>43,840</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>623,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino CCD</td>
<td>17,704</td>
<td>22,124</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>407,944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego CCD</td>
<td>71,377</td>
<td>83,869</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>718,517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CCD</td>
<td>50,955</td>
<td>67,879</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>600,874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Delta CCD</td>
<td>17,087</td>
<td>22,735</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>474,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose-Evergreen CCD</td>
<td>18,393</td>
<td>24,593</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>554,836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo County CCD</td>
<td>9,448</td>
<td>13,145</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>189,557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County CCD</td>
<td>25,646</td>
<td>30,435</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>426,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara CCD</td>
<td>21,427</td>
<td>29,630</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>105,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita CCD</td>
<td>19,356</td>
<td>25,443</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>182,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica CCD</td>
<td>31,993</td>
<td>35,486</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5,539</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>74,792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoias CCD</td>
<td>10,872</td>
<td>14,916</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>244,545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Jt. CCD</td>
<td>8,598</td>
<td>10,676</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10,132</td>
<td>10,132</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>161,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Jt. CCD</td>
<td>18,533</td>
<td>19,618</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>307,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou Jt. CCD</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>3,801</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27,373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano CCD</td>
<td>9,411</td>
<td>12,716</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>270,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Junior CCD</td>
<td>25,812</td>
<td>31,271</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>305,879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Orange County CCD</td>
<td>39,822</td>
<td>46,883</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>571,131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern CCD</td>
<td>19,658</td>
<td>25,511</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>316,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Center CCD</td>
<td>35,141</td>
<td>43,099</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>639,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County CCD</td>
<td>33,317</td>
<td>39,361</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>554,249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Valley CCD</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>254,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills CCD</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>78,426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kern CCD</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>8,068</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley CCD</td>
<td>20,356</td>
<td>28,880</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>288,449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite CCD</td>
<td>20,481</td>
<td>24,841</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>406,457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba CCD</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>11,977</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>198,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

California Community Colleges District Planning Conditions

Allan Hancock Joint
This district is 2,442 square miles and is comprised of 706,550 outside gross square footage and 445,058 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 12,965 and is projected to be 19,494 by 2023. This is a 50 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 128,022 with 15 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 174,240 and projected to be 179,618 in 2023, which is a 3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.4 percent and 10.9 percent for 2023.

Antelope Valley
This district is 1,963 square miles and is comprised of 682,950 outside gross square footage and 431,470 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 14,269 and projected to be 17,351 by 2023. This is a 22 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 296,619 in 2023, which is a 3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5.1 percent and 5.8 percent for 2023.

Barstow
This district is 9,157 square miles and is comprised of 177,265 outside gross square footage and 121,290 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 2,996 and is projected to be 582,238 in 2023, which is a .5 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.5 percent and 4 percent for 2023.

Butte-Glenn
This district is 2,477 square miles and is comprised of 785,717 outside gross square footage and 551,409 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 12,669 and is projected to be 14,476 by 2023. This is a 9 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 232,279 with 15.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 424,956 and projected to be 449,319 in 2023, which is a 5.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.2 percent and 8.8 percent for 2023.

Cerritos
This district is 52 square miles and is comprised of 900,770 outside gross square footage and 604,482 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 23,572 and is projected to be 25,467 by 2023. This is an 8 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 242,567 with 9.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 289,074 and projected to be 290,365 in 2023, which is a .4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.2 percent and 8.8 percent for 2023.

Chabot-Las Positas
This district is 567 square miles and is comprised of 1,280,956 outside gross square footage and 873,373 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 21,924 and is projected to be 27,117 by 2023. This is a 24 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 449,319 in 2023, which is a .7 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.6 percent and 0.3 percent for 2023.

Chaffey
This district is 319 square miles and is comprised of 238,956 outside gross square footage and 521,603 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 19,945 and is projected to be 23,479 by 2023. This is an 8 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 521,603 and projected to be 604,482 in 2023, which is a 10.6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 10.6 percent for 2023.

Citrus
This district is 272 square miles and is comprised of 722,783 outside gross square footage and 478,309 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 13,245 and is projected to be 16,072 by 2023. This is a 20 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 582,238 in 2023, which is a 3.1 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.5 percent and 4.2 percent for 2023.

Cabrillo
This district is 453 square miles and is comprised of 775,661 outside gross square footage and 555,232 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 13,365 and is projected to be 16,072 by 2023. This is a 20 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 155,178 with 14.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 187,498 and projected to be 186,129 in 2023, which is a .7 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.1 percent and 8.6 percent for 2023.
The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.5 percent and 9.2 percent for 2023.

**Coast**
This district is 105 square miles and is comprised of 1,926,044 outside gross square footage and 1,413,097 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 43,144 and is projected to be 52,999 by 2023. This is a 23 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 509,352 with 19.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 190,522 and projected to be 21,666 with 7.6 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.1 percent and 4.7 percent for 2023.

**Compton**
This district is 29 square miles and is comprised of 485,691 outside gross square footage and 258,808 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 7,756 and is projected to be 9,000 by 2023. This is a 16 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 79,760 with 8.8 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 190,522 and projected to be 193,419 in 2023, which is a 1.5 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.1 percent and 12.4 percent for 2023.

**Contra Costa**
This district is 730 square miles and is comprised of 1,532,126 outside gross square footage and 1,092,389 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 35,726 and is projected to be 44,721 by 2023. This is a 25 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 403,406 with 11.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 190,522 and projected to be 218,000 in 2023, which is a 4.6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5.3 percent and 6.3 percent for 2023.

**Copper Mountain**
This district is 1,342 square miles and is comprised of 142,923 outside gross square footage and 101,399 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 1,991 and is projected to be 2,253 by 2023. This is a 13 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 21,666 with 7.6 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 10,408 and projected to be 13,485 in 2023. This is a 30 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 116,364 with 8.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 238,719 and projected to be 258,432 in 2023, which is a 7.6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.4 percent and 5.2 percent for 2023.

**Desert**
This district is 4,229 square miles and is comprised of 640,712 outside gross square footage and 368,244 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 10,408 and is projected to be 13,485 by 2023. This is a 30 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 284,553 with 3.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 371,281 and projected to be 372,574 in 2023, which is a .3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.5 percent and 7.4 percent for 2023.

**El Camino**
This district is 59 square miles and is comprised of 1,381,969 outside gross square footage and 890,353 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 2,217,656 outside gross square footage and 1,166,738 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 23,392 and is projected to be 27,562 by 2023. This is a 15 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 284,553 with 3.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 371,281 and projected to be 372,574 in 2023, which is a .3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.5 percent and 7.4 percent for 2023.

**Foothill-DeAnza**
This district is 116 square miles and is comprised of 1,381,969 outside gross square footage and 1,166,738 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 14,280 and projected to be 12,221 in 2023, which is a 16.8 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.8 percent and 18.2 percent for 2023.

**Feather River**
This district is 1,692 square miles and is comprised of 1,381,969 outside gross square footage and 1,166,738 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 1,342 and is projected to be 1,869 by 2023. This is a 30 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 21,542 with 19.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 265,418 and projected to be 293,067 in 2023, which is a 6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.7 percent and 5.2 percent for 2023.

**Gavilan**
This district is 1,342 square miles and is comprised of 1,381,969 outside gross square footage and 1,166,738 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 268,462 outside gross square footage and 216,625 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 23,392 and is projected to be 27,562 by 2023. This is a 15 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 243,859 with 30.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 265,418 and projected to be 287,297 in 2023, which is a 7.6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 14.2 percent and 16.3 percent for 2023.

**Glendale**
This district is 38 square miles and is comprised of 971,405 outside gross square footage and 433,916 assignable square feet.
feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 20,339 and is projected to be 23,537 by 2023. This is a 16 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 236,876 with 3.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 143,124 and projected to be 141,716 in 2023, which is a 1 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 14.2 percent and 16.6 percent for 2023.

**Grossmont-Cuyamaca**
This district is 1,137 square miles and is comprised of 1,370,094 outside gross square footage and 780,041 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 27,036 and is projected to be 35,825 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 271,396 with 11.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 293,483 and projected to be 299,993 in 2023, which is a 2.2 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.2 percent and 11.9 percent for 2023.

**Hartnell**
This district is 2,553 square miles and is comprised of 851,762 outside gross square footage and 325,134 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 9,238 and is projected to be 11,082 by 2023. This is a 20 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 93,268 with 10.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 182,444 and projected to be 186,992 in 2023, which is a 2.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5.1 percent and 5.9 percent for 2023.

**Imperial**
This district is 4,291 square miles and is comprised of 365,970 outside gross square footage and 269,545 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 7,944 and is projected to be 9,988 by 2023. This is a 26 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 97,286 with 2.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 117,179 and projected to be 123,039 in 2023, which is a 4.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.8 percent and 8.1 percent for 2023.

**Kern**
This district is 21,290 square miles and is comprised of 1,338,065 outside gross square footage and 892,523 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 24,940 and is projected to be 31,332 by 2023. This is a 26 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 278,739 with 12.3 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 583,769 and projected to be 615,928 in 2023, which is a 5.2 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.3 percent and 5.1 percent for 2023.

**Lake Tahoe**
This district is 210 square miles and is comprised of 164,989 outside gross square footage and 110,864 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 2,509 and is projected to be 3,370 by 2023. This is a 34 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 23,779 with 30.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 19,382 and projected to be 19,938 in 2023, which is a 2.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 12.9 percent and 16.9 percent for 2023.

**Lassen**
This district is 4,584 square miles and is comprised of 252,021 outside gross square footage and 174,598 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 2,308 and is projected to be 2,637 by 2023. This is a 14 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 22,326 with 31.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 24,191 and projected to be 22,306 in 2023, which is an 8.4 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.5 percent and 11.8 percent for 2023.

**Long Beach**
This district is 59 square miles and is comprised of 1,221,617 outside gross square footage and 779,509 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 24,282 and is projected to be 29,224 by 2023. This is a 20 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 236,876 with 11.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 22,306 and is projected to be 23,537 by 2023. This is a 16 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 271,396 with 11.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 186,992 in 2023, which is a 2.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.2 percent and 11.9 percent for 2023.

**Los Angeles**
This district is 822 square miles and is comprised of 1,140,170 outside gross square footage and 521,158 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 154,078 and is projected to be 172,209 by 2023. This is a 12 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 1,561,478 with 8.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 3,507,260 and projected to be 3,553,473 in 2023, which is a 1 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.5 percent and 9 percent for 2023.

**Los Rios**
This district is 2,423 square miles and is comprised of 4,480,765 outside gross square footage and 2,747,557 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 73,274 and is projected to be 90,514 by 2023. This is a 24 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 726,739 with 12.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 1,052,136 and projected to be 1,072,853 in 2023, which is
a 1.9 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7 percent and 8.4 percent for 2023.

**Marin**
This district is 537 square miles and is comprised of 637,165 outside gross square footage and 412,406 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 6,892 and is projected to be 8,560 by 2023. This is a 24 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 166,514 in 2023, which is a 1.5 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.1 percent and 5.1 percent for 2023.

**Mendocino-Lake**
This district is 3,268 square miles and is comprised of 296,116 outside gross square footage and 209,062 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 3,784 and is projected to be 4,721 by 2023. This is a 25 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 36,520 with 19.6 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 169,029 and projected to be 177,855 in 2023, which is a 4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.5 percent and 8.8 percent for 2023.

**Merced**
This district is 2,184 square miles and is comprised of 581,628 outside gross square footage and 418,383 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 11,153 and is projected to be 14,607 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 132,502 with 5.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 236,703 and projected to be 247,976 in 2023, which is a 4.5 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.5 percent and 7.7 percent for 2023.

**MiraCosta**
This district is 179 square miles and is comprised of 522,085 outside gross square footage and 376,293 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 16,125 and is projected to be 19,075 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 157,179 with 22.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 169,029 and projected to be 177,855 in 2023, which is a 4.5 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.5 percent and 7.7 percent for 2023.

**Monterey Peninsula**
This district is 665 square miles and is comprised of 523,128 outside gross square footage and 344,349 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 10,339 and is projected to be 13,533 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 90,888 with 7.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 77,428 and projected to be 78,315 in 2023, which is a 1.1 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 13.4 percent and 17.3 percent for 2023.

**Mt. San Antonio**
This district is 179 square miles and is comprised of 1,544,390 outside gross square footage and 1,078,707 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 34,365 and is projected to be 37,961 by 2023. This is a 10 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 428,334 with 5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 492,426 and projected to be 487,653 in 2023, which is a 1 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7 percent and 7.8 percent for 2023.

**Mt. San Jacinto**
This district is 1,756 square miles and is comprised of 527,293 outside gross square footage and 368,631 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 15,558 and is projected to be 22,738 by 2023. This is a 46 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 153,458 with .1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 517,593 and projected to be 583,912 in 2023, which is a 11.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3 percent and 3.9 percent for 2023.

**Napa Valley**
This district is 789 square miles and is comprised of 521,612 outside gross square footage and 363,310 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 80,942 and projected to be 82,389 in 2023, which is a 1.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.2 percent and 11.3 percent for 2023.

**North Orange County**
This district is 157 square miles and is comprised of 1,948,618 outside gross square footage and 1,252,142 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 55,779 and is projected to be 62,397 by 2023. This is a 12 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 532,639 with 8 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 1,252,142 and projected to be 1,252,142 in 2023, which is a 4.9 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.2 percent and 9.8 percent for 2023.

**Ohlone**
This district is 67 square miles and is comprised of 601,889 outside gross square footage and 386,129 assignable square
feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 10,052 and is projected to be 13,099 by 2023. This is a 30 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 120,872 with 29.5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 124,277 and projected to be 62,277 with 8.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 32,210 and projected to be 32,659 in 2023, which is a 1.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.1 percent and 8.5 percent for 2023.

**Palo Verde**
This district is 6,519 square miles and is comprised of 215,797 outside gross square footage and 145,280 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 3,135 and is projected to be 4,253 by 2023. This is a 36 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 19,878 with 42.6 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 537,401 and projected to be 562,323 in 2023, which is a 4.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.7 percent and 13 percent for 2023.

**Palomar**
This district is 2,554 square miles and is comprised of 932,364 outside gross square footage and 639,876 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 25,939 and is projected to be 34,528 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 265,462 with 19.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 415,252 with 5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 124,277 and projected to be 130,798 in 2023, which is a 5.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 13.9 percent and 15.8 percent for 2023.

**Pasadena Area**
This district is 244 square miles and is comprised of 2,339,777 outside gross square footage and 853,558 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 26,270 and is projected to be 30,365 by 2023. This is a 16 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 332,380 with 7.8 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 277,062 and projected to be 275,040 in 2023, which is a .7 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.5 percent and 11 percent for 2023.

**Peralta**
This district is 83 square miles and is comprised of 1,488,307 outside gross square footage and 987,497 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 30,578 and is projected to be 38,458 by 2023. This is a 26 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 264,620 with 8.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 431,564 and projected to be 449,975 in 2023, which is a 4.1 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.1 percent and 8.5 percent for 2023.

**Rancho Santiago**
This district is 183 square miles and is comprised of 1,291,885 outside gross square footage and 917,281 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 57,332 and is projected to be 67,637 by 2023. This is an 18 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 415,252 with 5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 412,147 and projected to be 429,094 in 2023, which is a 3.9 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 13.9 percent and 15.8 percent for 2023.

**Redwoods**
This district is 5,474 square miles and is comprised of 583,008 outside gross square footage and 405,756 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 4,813 and is projected to be 7,007 by 2023. This is a 46 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 62,277 with 8.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 124,277 and projected to be 114,706 in 2023, which is an 8.3 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.9 percent and 6.1 percent for 2023.

**Riverside**
This district is 451 square miles and is comprised of 1,816,149 outside gross square footage and 911,356 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 57,332 and is projected to be 60,201 by 2023. This is a 26 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 30,365 with 13.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 417,406 in 2023, which is a .5 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.1 percent for 2023.

**San Bernardino**
This district is 828 square miles and is comprised of 1,048,721 outside gross square footage and 673,355 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 17,704 and is projected to be 22,124 by 2023. This is a 25 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 583,008 with 10.6 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 407,944 and projected to be 417,406 in 2023, which is a 2.3
percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.3 percent and 5.3 percent for 2023.

**San Diego**
This district is 204 square miles and is comprised of 4,199,572 outside gross square footage and 1,945,148 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 71,377 and is projected to be 83,869 by 2023. This is an 18 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 593,119 with 10.8 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 718,517 and projected to be 747,311 in 2023, which is a 3.9 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 9.9 percent and 11.2 percent for 2023.

**San Francisco**
This district is 47 square miles and is comprised of 1,909,569 outside gross square footage and 1,236,386 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 50,955 and is projected to be 67,879 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 411,118 with 19.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 746,517 and projected to be 974,630 in 2023, which is a 33 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.5 percent and 10.9 percent for 2023.

**San Joaquin Delta**
This district is 2,534 square miles and is comprised of 1,026,632 outside gross square footage and 670,616 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 17,087 and is projected to be 22,735 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 213,879 with 19.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 401,049 and projected to be 254,589 in 2023, which is a 22.1 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.6 percent and 4.5 percent for 2023.

**San Jose-Evergreen**
This district is 295 square miles and is comprised of 1,433,985 outside gross square footage and 785,666 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 18,393 and is projected to be 24,593 by 2023. This is a 34 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 254,801 and projected to be 354,836 in 2023, which is a 31 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.3 percent and 4.2 percent for 2023.

**San Luis Obispo**
This district is 3,557 square miles and is comprised of 642,405 outside gross square footage and 445,911 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 9,448 and is projected to be 13,145 by 2023. This is a 39 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 197,137 with 5.5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 1,433,985 outside gross square footage and 750,925 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 189,557 and projected to be 188,351 in 2023, which is a 6.6 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5 percent and 7 percent for 2023.

**San Mateo**
This district is 437 square miles and is comprised of 1,626,054 outside gross square footage and 1,096,206 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 25,646 and is projected to be 30,435 by 2023. This is a 19 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 254,589 with 11 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 426,536 and projected to be 437,723 in 2023, which is a 2.6 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6 percent and 7 percent for 2023.

**Santa Barbara**
This district is 179 square miles and is comprised of 871,372 outside gross square footage and 499,964 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 105,764 and is projected to be 189,585 in 2023, which is a 3.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 20.3 percent and 27.6 percent for 2023.

**Santa Clarita**
This district is 354 square miles and is comprised of 885,714 outside gross square footage and 621,704 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 182,342 and is projected to be 256,446 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 1,129,918 with 11 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 189,585 and projected to be 256,446 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 214,464 with 11 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 189,585 and projected to be 256,446 by 2023. This is a 31 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 237,064 with 15.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 105,764 and projected to be 189,585 in 2023, which is a 3.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 10.6 percent and 13.4 percent for 2023.

**Santa Monica**
This district is 110,285 with 9.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 182,342 and projected to be 189,585 in 2023, which is a 3.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 42.8 percent and 46.6 percent for 2023.

**Sequoias**
This district is 2,893 square miles and is comprised of 705,525 outside gross square footage and 505,152 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 31,993 and is projected to be 67,879 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 3.3 percent and 4.2 percent for 2023.
able square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 10,872 and is projected to be 14,916 by 2023. This is a 37 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 132,150 with 7.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 27,373 and projected to be 31,969 with 19.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.4 percent and 5.9 percent for 2023.

**Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint**
This district is 10,132 square miles and is comprised of 574,854 outside gross square footage and 377,575 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 8,598 and is projected to be 10,676 by 2023. This is a 24 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 98,250 with 15.1 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 13.9 percent and 16.4 percent for 2023.

**Sierra Joint**
This district is 2,469 square miles and is comprised of 764,500 outside gross square footage and 555,629 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 18,533 and is projected to be 19,618 by 2023. This is a 6 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 211,739 with 10.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5.3 percent and 6.9 percent for 2023.

**Siskiyou Joint**
This district is 6,386 square miles and is comprised of 277,802 outside gross square footage and 203,612 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 2,957 and is projected to be 3,801 by 2023. This is a 29 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 31,969 with 19.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 27,373 and projected to be 24,734 in 2023, which is a 37 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7 percent and 8 percent for 2023.

**Sonoma**
This district is 1,588 square miles and is comprised of 1,651,562 outside gross square footage and 819,487 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 25,812 and is projected to be 31,271 by 2023. This is a 21 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 258,038 with 9.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 305,879 and projected to be 303,800 in 2023, which is a 0.7 percent decrease. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.4 percent and 10.3 percent for 2023.

**South Orange County**
This district is 363 square miles and is comprised of 1,107,309 outside gross square footage and 739,125 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 39,822 and is projected to be 46,883 by 2023. This is an 18 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 365,916 with 14.3 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 571,131 and projected to be 599,996 in 2023, which is a 4.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7 percent and 7.8 percent for 2023.

**Southwestern**
This district is 161 square miles and is comprised of 821,242 outside gross square footage and 606,534 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 19,658 and is projected to be 25,511 by 2023. This is a 30 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 213,235 with 16.4 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 316,277 and projected to be 337,629 in 2023, which is a 6.3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6.2 percent and 7.6 percent for 2023.

**State Center**
This district is 5,743 square miles and is comprised of 1,608,403 outside gross square footage and 1,156,726 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 639,864 and projected to be 661,593 in 2023, which is a 3.3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5.5 percent and 6.5 percent for 2023.

**Ventura County**
This district is 1,857 square miles and is comprised of 1,914,575 outside gross square footage and 1,152,601 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 33,317 and is projected to be 39,361 by 2023. This is an 18 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 356,397 with 10.5 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 554,249 and projected to be 555,457 in 2023, which is a .2
percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 6 percent and 7.1 percent for 2023.

**Victor Valley**
This district is 1,800 square miles and is comprised of 548,764 outside gross square footage and 425,758 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 11,437 and is projected to be 15,254 by 2023. This is a 33 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 132,766 with 18.2 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 254,652 and projected to be 270,228 in 2023, which is a 5.8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.5 percent and 5.6 percent for 2023.

**West Hills**
This district is 2,923 square miles and is comprised of 447,897 outside gross square footage and 346,238 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 6,720 and is projected to be 8,000 by 2023. This is a 19 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 72,314 with 23.9 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 78,426 and projected to be 79,120 in 2023, which is a .9 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 8.6 percent and 10.1 percent for 2023.

**West Kern**
This district is 767 square miles and is comprised of 259,391 outside gross square footage and 189,206 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 5,254 and is projected to be 8,068 by 2023. This is a 54 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 35,572 with 33.8 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 22,719 and projected to be 23,265 in 2023, which is a 2.3 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 23.1 percent and 34.7 percent for 2023.

**West Valley-Mission**
This district is 204 square miles and is comprised of 985,375 outside gross square footage and 640,371 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 20,356 and is projected to be 28,880 by 2023. This is a 42 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 213,335 with 15.7 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 288,449 and projected to be 304,926 in 2023, which is a 5.4 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 7.1 percent and 9.5 percent for 2023.

**Yosemite**
This district is 4,707 square miles and is comprised of 1,383,220 outside gross square footage and 953,521 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 20,481 and is projected to be 24,841 by 2023. This is a 21 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 235,285 with .3 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 406,457 and projected to be 409,804 in 2023, which is a .8 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 5 percent and 6.1 percent for 2023.

**Yuba**
This district is 4,139 square miles and is comprised of 691,006 outside gross square footage and 463,256 assignable square feet. District enrollment in 2013 was 9,370 and is projected to be 11,977 by 2023. This is a 28 percent increase in enrollment. The 2013 weekly student contact hours are 98,958 with 10 percent of them generated through off-site methods. The adult population for 2013 was 198,844 and projected to be 199,888 in 2023, which is a .5 percent increase. The adult participation rate for 2013 was 4.7 percent and 6 percent for 2023.
Appendix D

California Community Colleges Capital Outlay Needs 2016-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Campuses</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment (WSCH)</td>
<td>18,947,000</td>
<td>22,370,000</td>
<td>3,423,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ASF</td>
<td>50,800,000</td>
<td>63,099,000</td>
<td>12,299,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Year Projected System Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Facilities</td>
<td>$12,000,000,000</td>
<td>$15,300,000,000</td>
<td>$3,300,000,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>$14,000,000,000</td>
<td>$21,000,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Centers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (for years 6 – 10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,600,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$26,000,000,000</td>
<td>$39,400,000,000</td>
<td>$13,400,000,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E

Proposed College and Center Applications in Process

There are currently 113 community colleges and 77 approved centers that are located within the 72 community college districts in California. Prior to the development of this master plan, 10 educational centers have been proposed and have submitted a letter of intent to the Chancellor’s Office. Those 10 proposals that are currently moving through the approval process are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Campus Name</th>
<th>Status of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>Desert CCD</td>
<td>College of the Desert</td>
<td>Eastern Valley Center</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>Desert CCD</td>
<td>College of the Desert</td>
<td>Western Valley Center</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>Riverside CCD</td>
<td>Moreno Valley College</td>
<td>Ben Clark Training Center</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Areas</td>
<td>Victor Valley CCD</td>
<td>Victor Valley College</td>
<td>Regional Public Safety Training Center</td>
<td>Needs Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley and Sierra Foothills</td>
<td>Los Rios CCD</td>
<td>Folsom Lake College</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>Needs Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>Gavilan CCD</td>
<td>Gavilan College</td>
<td>Coyote Valley</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>Gavilan CCD</td>
<td>Gavilan College</td>
<td>San Benito Center</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles and Ventura Counties</td>
<td>Los Angeles CCD</td>
<td>East Los Angeles College</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles and Ventura Counties</td>
<td>Rio Hondo CCD</td>
<td>Rio Hondo College</td>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>Letter of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California</td>
<td>Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint CCD</td>
<td>Shasta College</td>
<td>Tehama Campus</td>
<td>Needs Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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