

June 21, 2019

**Subject:**                   **Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program:  
FY 2017-2018 Recommended Awards**

**Reporting Period:** May – June 2019

**Staff Lead:**               AHSC Program Staff

---

### **Recommended Action:**

Approve staff recommendation of awarding up to \$402,398,806 in cap-and-trade funding for the FY2017-18 Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program to 25 projects supporting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions and related co-benefits.

### **Summary:**

The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program provides grants and loans for programs and capital development projects, including affordable housing development and transportation improvements that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use resulting in fewer passenger vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Reduction of VMT in these projects will achieve GHG reductions and benefit Disadvantaged and Low-Income Communities. In its fourth round of funding, \$402,398,806 is available to fund such projects. This staff report provides an overview of the AHSC Program, application process for the FY2017-18 funding round, and summary of applications recommended for award.

### **Background:**

The AHSC Program provides competitive grants and loans to projects that will achieve GHG reductions through the development of affordable housing and related infrastructure, active transportation infrastructure, capital transit improvements, and related programming, the majority of which directly benefits Disadvantaged and Low-Income Communities. The AHSC Program encourages partnerships between local municipalities, transit agencies and housing developers in order to achieve integration of affordable housing and transportation projects.

Upon approval of this round of awards, the AHSC program will have invested over \$1 billion in communities across California. AHSC awarded over \$700 million to support 77 projects in the first three rounds of the program. These awards support over 6400 units, over 90 percent of which are affordable, over 85 miles of new or improved bike lanes, and over 650 new or improved crosswalks. Beyond housing and transportation, projects improve climate resiliency through water conservation features, infrastructure hardening, low-impact development, and community programming. Most projects also incorporate local workforce development strategies, often by partnering with job training programs or Workforce Investment Boards. In all, the projects are estimated to reduce 1.6 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> and about 195,000 pounds of criteria air pollutants.

Originating as the first original Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund program, the AHSC Program has set a model for combined planning and implementation of transportation and housing projects. Projects are rooted in collaborative planning efforts between local municipalities, transit agencies, and housing developers and driven by community engagement. They focus on community scale improvement to increase connectivity between everyday resources and job centers while anchoring the investments with affordable housing to ensure all residents can continue to benefit from these neighborhood improvements. AHSC projects increase community livability, particularly in historically under-resourced areas, while reducing VMT by enhancing accessibility to transportation and affordable housing in destination rich areas.

### ***Investment Targets***

A set of statutory and programmatic targets guide AHSC investments. These target investments toward specific infrastructure types, communities, and project types.

Infrastructure Type: Per statute, a minimum of 50 percent of the total AHSC Program dollars must be dedicated to affordable housing<sup>1</sup>, and 50 percent of AHSC funding must also be invested to benefit Disadvantaged Communities<sup>2</sup>, as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool. These set-asides are not mutually exclusive.

Communities: The California Air Resources Board (CARB) set investment targets for the AHSC Program to benefit priority populations, aligned with statutory requirements set by Assembly Bill (AB) 1550 (Gomez, Chapter 369, Statutes of 2016) for the entire suite of Climate Change Investments (CCI) administered by ARB. These target are to 55 percent in Disadvantaged Communities as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool, 10 percent in Low-Income Communities or Households and an additional 5 percent to Low-Income Communities or Households located within a half mile of a Disadvantaged Community.

Project Types: The AHSC Program Guidelines for the Fiscal Year 2017-18, adopted by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) in October 2018, established three project types: Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects, Integrated Connectivity Projects (ICP), and Rural Innovations Project Area (RIPA) projects (Figure 1). The Guidelines also establish funding targets for these project types, which indicate that at least 35 percent of funds to be invested in each of the TOD and ICP project types, and 10 percent be invested within the RIPA category. The project area type investment targets result in 20 percent of funding being available for discretionary awards.

---

<sup>1</sup> Health & Saf Code § 39719 (b)(1)(C).

<sup>2</sup> Pub Resources Code § 75214.

**FIGURE 1: 2017-18 Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program Eligible Project Types**

TOD	ICP	RIPA
Transit Oriented Development	Integrated Connectivity Project	Rural Innovation Project Area
Required: ✓ High Quality Transit ✓ Affordable Housing	Required: ✓ Qualifying Transit ✓ Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure	Required: ✓ Qualifying Transit ✓ Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure
Required: At least one additional components from the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs	Required: At least one additional components from the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs	Required: At least one additional components from the following:  <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs

**Round 4 Application Process:**

As the implementing agency for the AHSC Program, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for this round of funding on November 1, 2018. Applications were considered through a competitive application process.

**Threshold Review**

The AHSC Program staff received 47 proposals by the February 11, 2019 deadline, requesting \$673,741,832 for this highly competitive program. AHSC Program staff reviewed the eligibility of the submitted proposals in accordance with FY 2017-18 AHSC Program Guidelines. Of the 47 proposals received, 38 passed the threshold review. These 30 applications came from 20 counties and totaled \$609,775,634 in requested funds. Final decisions regarding proposal eligibility were proposed by the AHSC Implementation Working Group, consisting of an interagency team from SGC and HCD, and confirmed through the AHSC Steering Committee.

The proposals represent a wide range of VMT reduction strategies and demonstrate strong coordination across housing and transportation investments. Projects are set in large urban centers, medium-sized cities, small towns and rural areas across the state. The composition of the 38 proposals that met the AHSC eligibility requirements, here-in ‘Competitive Proposals’, are detailed in Tables 1, 2 and 3 below.

**TABLE 1: Competitive Proposals by Statutory Set-Aside**

Statutory Set-Aside	AHSC \$ Requested	Number of Proposals	Percent of Total Funding Request
Affordable Housing	\$ 410,658,942	38	67.35%
Disadvantaged Community	\$ 455,457,276	28	74.69%

**TABLE 2: Competitive Proposals by CCI Investment Target**

Target Population	AHSC Funding Requested	Number of Proposals	Percent of Total Funding Request
Low-Income Communities	\$ 581,664,862	36	95.39%
Low-Income Buffer Regions	\$ 91,870,068	5	15.07%

**TABLE 3: Competitive Proposals by Project Area Type**

Project Area Types	AHSC Funding Requested	Number of Proposals	Percent of Total Funding Request
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	\$ 201,439,257	11	33.03%
Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	\$ 376,306,498	24	61.71%
Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	\$ 32,029,879	3	5.25%

### Scoring Review

Following eligibility review, application review consisted of five processes: GHG Quantification Methodology Review, Quantitative Policy Scoring, Interagency Narrative Review, Financial Feasibility Review, and optional MPO ranking. Below is a breakdown of each review process:

- GHG Quantification Methodology (QM) Review
  - CARB staff reviewed and verified the GHG Quantification Methodology (QM) scoring component of each applicant to ensure appropriate application of the adopted QM tools. Proposals were scored on a curve according to (1) total emissions reductions and (2) emissions reductions per Climate Change Investment dollar amount requested. Fifteen points are possible for each of these two GHG scoring categories for a total of thirty points.
- Quantitative Policy Scoring
  - HCD and SGC staff reviewed and verified applicants' self-score of the Program's Quantitative Policy Scoring criteria using supporting documentation provided by the applicant. Scoring categories are focused on the Program's policy objectives. Scored topics include Active Transportation Improvements, Anti-Displacement Strategies, and Housing Affordability. Fifty-five points are possible in this category.

- Interagency Narrative Review
  - The Interagency Narrative Review was conducted by four small teams of subject matter experts with expertise relevant to the section their review section. The teams proposed consensus scores for their qualitative review section of each application based on the publicly posted AHSC Narrative Scoring Rubric. Review teams presented these scores to AHSC Program staff who reviewed all scores to ensure consistent application of the scoring rubric. The participating agencies and departments included: SGC, HCD, Caltrans, California Department of Public Health, California Environmental Protection Agency, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, and CARB. Fifteen points are possible in this category.
- HCD Financial Feasibility Review
  - HCD staff conducted a thorough review of the financial feasibility of each project to ensure the housing components of the application are sustainable over the life of the investment.
- Optional MPO Ranking
  - Each MPO with proposals in its region was offered a chance to rank the proposals based upon regional priorities, such as implementation of their sustainable community strategy. Each MPO that submitted a letter to SGC declined to rank proposals.

Applicants received notification of initial scores from HCD prior to final score issuance; this provided an opportunity to clarify information submitted prior to the application deadline and appeal GHG Quantification Methodology and Quantitative Policy Scoring determinations. Final verified scores for these two categories were then issued to applicants.

## Recommended Round 4 Awards

**Attachment A** provides the staff recommendation for the FY 2017-18 AHSC Program awards, with \$402,398,806 available. The recommended list reflects the top scoring projects within each project area type, which meet the project area type investment targets (Section 108(d)(3)). Scores based on the GHG Quantification Methodology, Quantitative Policy and Narrative Review scoring criteria in the 2017-18 AHSC Guidelines.

Following eligibility review, only three RIPA applications remained in contention for an award. These three projects comprise 7.97 percent of the total funding available, less than the 10 percent RIPA project area type target. While these targets are not mandatory set-asides, AHSC program staff recommend the Council follows the guidance around project area type targets published in the Program guidelines and award all three RIPA applications. This maintains the staff's recommendation from the October 2018 Council Meeting that all AHSC applications that pass eligibility review are of a high quality.



Awarding up to the project area type targets resulted in \$48,717,907 remaining for discretionary awards. Staff recommends allocating these funds to the remaining top scoring projects in the ICP project type category, which is the most over-subscribed project type category. Allocating discretionary funds to these projects will help to achieve similar proportions of funds awarded relative to funding requested across project area types and recognizes applications based on merit. This allocation also achieves broader geographic distribution of investments. ICP projects comprise over 61 percent of the funding requested by competitive proposals. By awarding the remaining funds according to ICP projects, they will comprise over 56 percent of the awards.

The 25 projects recommended for award amount to \$402,117,497 which is \$281,309 less than the total funding available this round. In previous rounds, the Council has partially fulfilled the funding request of the final project awarded. However, due to the relatively small amount of funding available relative to each application's funding request, staff recommend that the Council approves rolling these funds over into the Round 5 funding available. AHSC only awards projects that are "shovel ready", including demonstrating 90 percent of funding secured by the time of award. Fulfilling \$281,309 of an application's funding request would provide less than 10 percent of the funds requested, and the project would not meet this "shovel ready" criteria.

Staff also recommends identifying one project as an alternate award should one of the awarded projects be unable to proceed.

Staff recommends the conditional approval of awarding this \$281,309 remainder of available funds in the event that a substitute project is awarded. If one of the 25 projects recommended for award declines its funding prior to the posting of the Round 5 AHSC Notice of Funding Availability, a substitute project would then be awarded as long as there are enough funds to substantially fulfill the requested award amount. This substitute would receive the funds of the originally awarded project plus the \$281,309 up to the full amount of funding requested by this substitute project.

The recommended awards meet all statutory and programmatic set-asides as outlined in Table 4 below.

**TABLE 4:** Summary of AHSC Funding Recommended by Statutory Set-Asides

	Number of Awards	Proposed Awards	Percent of Total Funding Requested
<b>Total Funding Recommended</b>	25	\$402,117,497	99.93%
Affordable Housing*	25	\$262,522,109	65.28%
Disadvantaged Community	19	\$312,963,910	77.83%
<b>Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</b>			
<b>Project Areas</b>	8	\$143,020,457	35.57%
Affordable Housing*	8	\$97,129,013	
Disadvantaged Community	8	\$66,477,570	
<b>Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)</b>			
<b>Areas</b>	14	\$227,067,161	56.47%
Affordable Housing*	14	\$141,148,096	
Disadvantaged Community	13	\$218,917,161	
<b>Rural Innovation Project Areas (RIPA)</b>			
<b>Project Areas</b>	3	\$32,029,879	7.97%
Affordable Housing*	3	\$24,245,000	
Disadvantaged Community	2	\$27,569,179	

\* Includes costs related to Affordable Housing Development and Housing-Related Infrastructure

**Note:** Affordable Housing and Disadvantaged Community dollars are not mutually exclusive

### Affordable Housing

Every project being recommended for an AHSC award will fund affordable housing development and related infrastructure. Over 65 percent of the total funds recommended for award will support affordable housing and related infrastructure, exceeding statutory requirements to allocate at least 50 percent of the total AHSC Program for affordable housing. When completed, the recommended projects will provide more than 3,046 units of housing and 2,571 of these units will be affordable across a range of incomes.

**TABLE 5: Summary of Affordable Housing Units Funded by AHSC**

<b>Recommended AHSC Awards with Affordable Housing</b>	<b>25 awards</b>
<b>Total Units Funded</b>	<b>3,046 units</b>
<b>Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% Area Median Income)</b>	
Units Funded	946 units
<b>Very Low Income (Between 30-50% Area Median Income)</b>	
Units Funded	988 units
<b>Low Income (Between 50-80% Area Median Income)</b>	
Units Funded	637 units
<b>Supportive Housing</b>	
Units Funded	705 units

**Disadvantaged Communities**

Of the AHSC Program funds recommended for award this year, 77.8 percent, or more than \$312 million will benefit Disadvantaged Communities. This amount well exceeds AHSC’s statutory requirements to invest at least 50 percent of AHSC funding to benefit Disadvantaged Communities, as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool. The recommended projects reflect critical needs for affordable, compact development in close proximity to transit in some of California’s most impacted and Disadvantaged communities. Over \$119 million of these AHSC funds will benefit a disadvantaged community ranked in the top 5 percentile of CalEnviroScreen 3.0.



**TABLE 6:** Recommended AHSC Funding Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities

	<b>Number of Projects</b>	<b>Total Dollars Funded</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Funding</b>
<b>Total Projects</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>\$402,117,497</b>	
<b>Projects Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>\$312,963,910</b>	<b>77.8%</b>
<b>Located Within</b>			
CalEnviroscreen 3.0 Score			
95-100	7	\$119,851,816	
90-95	2	\$28,739,300	
85-90	4	\$65,166,708	
80-85	-	-	
75-80	6	\$99,206,086	
<b>Not Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>\$89,153,587</b>	<b>22.2%</b>

**Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure and Transit Improvements**

All projects recommended for funding also connect affordable housing and key destinations to transit – including bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, and vanpool services – through walking and/or bicycling infrastructure. More than \$134 million in AHSC funding, or 33 percent of the total funding available, is being allocated for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, transit station area improvements, transit service, transportation demand management, and other transportation improvements supporting critical connectivity between housing, key destinations, and transit. Additional funding will be provided for three years of discounted or free transit passes to all affordable housing development residents. All the projects being recommended for award include transportation related investments.

Of the transportation investments, approximately 83 percent will be in Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure (STI), which are capital improvements that increase public transit access, expand, expand pedestrian networks, or expand bicycle networks. The other 17 percent fund Transportation Related Amenities (TRA), which are capital improvements that provide supportive amenities to cyclists, pedestrians, or transit riders, such as bike parking, bus shelter, benches, and street trees. AHSC also funds ridership programs as well as active transportation education and outreach programs necessary to achieve transportation mode shift.

### Geographic Distribution of Awards

Round 4 AHSC award recommendations reach a diverse set of locations across the State, with projects reflecting regional priorities for both affordable housing development and transportation investments. Four of six applications from the San Joaquin Valley are proposed for funding, representing over 14% of the total funding. Projects in Coachella, Madera, Orange Cove, Arcata, Riverside, Merced, Brawley, and Napa are all examples of AHSC’s ability to serve projects in cities without long histories of transit oriented development. Of the 26 city or county jurisdictions that are applicants or partner to an application, 19 are proposed to receive an award.

In an attempt to address concerns about geographic distribution in previous rounds, Round 4 outreach and technical assistance (TA) directed assistance towards jurisdictions that had historically submitted fewer applications or were unsuccessful in previous rounds of AHSC. Recommended projects include 10 of 11 re-applicants, several of which received TA.

Since the conclusion of Round 3, AHSC Program staff and TA providers have held or participated in many AHSC-related workshops, presentations, and events. Targeted outreach efforts included one-on-one site visits and capacity building workshops in local jurisdictions throughout the State to help prepare applicants for Round 4. The combination of targeted outreach and TA in key areas across the state is demonstrated in the broad geographic spread of awards recommended for Round 4.

**TABLE 7: Geographic Breakdown of Applications and Awards**

Region	Dollars Requested	Applications submitted	Total Awards	Award Amount	Percentage of Request Awarded	Percentage of AHSC Funding Awarded
SCAG	\$237,915,443	14	9	\$148,360,647	62.36%	36.89%
MTC	\$217,936,864	13	8	\$137,330,657	63.01%	34.15%
San Joaquin Valley	\$76,946,634	6	4	\$57,960,780	75.33%	14.41%
SANDAG	\$38,511,280	2	1	\$20,000,000	51.93%	4.97%
SACOG	\$34,004,713	2	2	\$34,004,713	100%	8.46%
North State	\$4,460,700	1	1	\$4,460,700	100%	1.11%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$609,775,634</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>\$402,117,497</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Technical Assistance

In Round 2, an AHSC pilot technical assistance program provided TA to applicants located in disadvantaged communities that were unsuccessful in securing funding in Round 1. SGC contracted researchers at UC Davis to conduct an evaluation of the AHSC TA Pilot, who were able to provide recommendations on the TA program design for future rounds.

Building off of the lessons of the Round 2 pilot, the first phase of the Round 3 technical assistance effort focused on providing TA to AHSC applicants based on a variety of criteria, including whether projects would meet Threshold criteria, scope of TA needs, geographic diversity, location in disadvantaged, low-income, and/or tribal communities, and capacity of the applicant.

After the selection of Round 3 awards, the AHSC TA providers embarked on capacity building efforts in jurisdictions across the State that had seen less success or put forward fewer applications to the Program. This model included roundtable workshops that sought to bring together developers, local governments, and transit agencies to collaborate on AHSC Projects for Round 4, as well as to set up a pipeline of possible projects for future rounds of the Program. Providers also worked with select jurisdictions to help develop RFP's for publicly owned land that would prepare the housing site for a more competitive AHSC application.

In order to support the continuation and expansion of the broader CCI TA program, including AHSC, the Council made the decision in June 2018 to allocate \$5 million from the SGC's continuous appropriation of AHSC to the CCI TA Program. Approximately \$500,000 of these funds were set aside to provide TA for Round 4 of the AHSC Program.

Once TA recipients were selected, the SGC-contracted TA providers for Round 4 built upon the partnership development and project scope development conducted over the preceding months to help Applicants prepare and submit final applications. The comprehensive TA provided over the year period resulted in 14 of 19 TA recipients receiving awards. This represents a success rate of approximately 74% compared to 53% overall, and represents 56% of the total AHSC awards recommended for Round 4.

## **Next Steps and Timeline**

Approximately five years after its inception, the AHSC Program has completed four rounds of funding and invested over \$1 billion dollars. AHSC has established itself as a key source of income-restricted housing funding in California. The Program is continuously funded through 2030 and will continue its role as a catalyst for sustainable development in California. Updates to the Program's Guidelines will support the State's policy objectives while keeping eligibility consistent and furthering the Program's reach to all of California.

AHSC Program staff has been gathering both informal and official feedback throughout the year on potential improvements and changes to the AHSC Program, including both the Guidelines and application process. Building on this feedback, staff is conducting research to update the Program's Guidelines and associated materials ahead of its fifth round. A few topics that staff is researching include:

- Alignment with other State funding sources
- Project Area Type equity
- Quantification Methodology point allocation
- Active transportation scoring criteria
- Tribal eligibility

### ***Quantification Methodology***

As part of each round of AHSC program implementation, CARB staff work with SGC staff to review the AHSC Quantification Methodology and identify additional improvements that can be made to the methodology. For Round 5, CARB staff plan to update the AHSC Quantification Methodology to make it more user-friendly and enhance the analysis. Drawing on feedback received during the Round 4 process and discussions with stakeholders, CARB intends to work with both SGC staff and the AHSC program stakeholders to clarify frequently asked questions, provide additional guidance on aligning inputs and documentation across AHSC application materials, and update the underlying data and equations in the Quantification Methodology where appropriate.

### ***Program Continuity***

The extension of Cap-and-Trade through 2030 combined with the AHSC Program's continuous 20 percent appropriation of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund monies creates certainty about the future of the AHSC Program and its source of funding. Round 4 signifies the first instance of the AHSC annual cycle in alignment with the fiscal year cycle; AHSC Program staff intend to bring Guidelines to Council for adoption in the fall, set application due dates near the beginning of the calendar year, and recommend awards in the summer. This predictable cycle combined with the programmatic objective of consistent eligibility criteria aids AHSC Program staff's ability to conduct outreach to local jurisdictions, encouraging them to develop potential AHSC projects and create "pipelines" for future application cycles. With a recurring AHSC schedule and consistent eligibility criteria, it is the hope that projects will be able to better plan for applying in future rounds.

### ***Housing Funding Accessibility***

The passage of Senate Bill (SB) 2 (Atkins, Chapter 364, Statutes of 2017) in Fall of 2018 provides a new funding to HCD legacy housing programs, which may also be significantly supplemented in California's next budget. AHSC applicants now have several other funding sources available. To help increase the accessibility of these funds, SGC and HCD staff will investigate how to align the AHSC Program Guidelines with other HCD programs such as the Infill Infrastructure Grant, Transit Oriented Development, and Multifamily Housing Programs. The goal of this alignment is to minimize the work of applicants who will apply to multiple programs. AHSC Program staff will also inform unsuccessful applicants of these other sources of housing funding, their timelines, and ability to combine with the AHSC Program.

**FIGURE 2: Tentative Schedule for AHSC Round 5**

<b>Round 5 Schedule</b>	
<i>Quarterly Cap &amp; Trade Auction</i>	<i>August 2019</i>
<i>TCAC Applications Due</i>	<i>July 2019</i>
<b>Release of Round 4 Draft Program Guidelines</b>	August 2019
<b>Stakeholder Meetings/Comments on Draft Guidelines</b>	September 2019
<b>Release of Round 3 Application</b>	October 2019
<i>Quarterly Cap &amp; Trade Auction</i>	<i>November 2019</i>
<b>Application Due Date</b>	February 2020
<i>Quarterly Cap &amp; Trade Auction</i>	<i>February 2020</i>
<i>Quarterly Cap &amp; Trade Auction</i>	<i>May 2020</i>
<b>Awards Adoption</b>	June 2020

**Council Recommendations**

Staff recommends the Council approve the staff recommendation, as reflected in Appendix A of this staff report. This recommended list identifies a total of 25 projects and one substitute project, representing at least \$402,117,497 in GGRF funding, and would reduce approximately 550,000 metric tons of GHG emissions. In the event that an awarded project does not satisfy conditions for receiving its award or an awarded project foregoes an award prior to the publishing of the Round 5 AHSC NOFA, staff will award the substitute project identified in Appendix A if there are enough funds available to substantially fulfill its funding request.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

**Appendix A (Tables 1-3)**

- **FY2017-18 AHSC Funding Recommendations**
- **AHSC Applications Not Recommended for Award**
- **AHSC Applications Eliminated at Threshold Review**

**Appendix B: Summary of FY2017-18 AHSC Recommended Awards**

**Appendix C: Map of FY2017-18 AHSC Recommended Awards**