

October 15, 2015

**Subject:** Staff Report: 2015-2016 Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program Public Review Draft Guidelines

**Quarter:** 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2015

**Reporting Period:** July 2015-October 2015

**Staff Lead:** Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program Staff

---

### **Recommended Action:**

For discussion only – no action required.

### **Summary:**

This report summarizes the status of the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program, specifically regarding the proposed draft 2015-16 AHSC programmatic guidelines, opportunities for public comment, and next steps in program roll-out. Also included in this report are options for public discussion related to: (1) coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations, (2) a newly proposed Catalytic Project Type, and (3) geographic distribution of funds.

Issues regarding alignment of the AHSC and Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) programs are discussed in the Staff Report for the SALC Public Review Draft Guidelines (Agenda Item #8). Issues regarding outreach and technical assistance to AHSC applicants are discussed in the Staff Report for the Disadvantaged Communities Technical Assistance Program (Agenda Item #9).

### **Background:**

SB 862, Statutes of 2014 established the AHSC program, to be administered by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC, or Council), "to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through projects that implement land use, housing, transportation, and agricultural land preservation practices to support infill and compact development..."

One of the primary goals of the program is to support and implement sustainable community strategies and efficient land use policies statewide. The broader AHSC program is being implemented in two related components: the housing and infrastructure-focused Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program; and the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Program, which focuses on protection of agricultural lands under threat of conversion to non-agricultural uses.

The AHSC program is funded by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), which is an important part of the State's overall climate investment efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Ultimately, these investments and other transformative drivers lay the foundation for the system-wide changes the State will need to achieve the long-term goals of Assembly Bill 32,

as reflected in the Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

The Budget Act of 2014 appropriated \$130 million from the GGRF to develop and implement the AHSC program for its first funding cycle, in 2014-2015. SB 862 apportioned 20 percent of GGRF annual proceeds to the AHSC program beginning in 2015-2016.

## What is the Purpose of the AHSC Program?

The AHSC Program furthers the purposes of AB 32 (Chapter 488, Statutes 2006) and SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes, 2008) by investing in projects that reduce GHG emissions and support more compact, infill development patterns, encouraging active transportation and transit usage, and protecting agricultural land from sprawl development.

The AHSC Program also supports related and coordinated public policy objectives, including the following:

- Reducing air pollution
- Improving conditions in disadvantaged communities
- Supporting or improving public health and other co-benefits as defined in Section 39712 of the Health and Safety Code
- Improving connectivity and accessibility to jobs, housing, and services
- Increasing options for mobility, including the implementation of the Active Transportation Program established pursuant to Section 2380 of the Streets and Highway Code
- Increasing transit ridership
- Preserving and developing affordable housing for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code
- Protecting agricultural lands to support infill development.

## What's New in the 2015-2016 Public Review Draft Guidelines?

AHSC program staff released the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines for public review on September 17, 2015. The proposed revisions reflect robust feedback received on the first year of the program, and are intended to advance AHSC objectives by strengthening the connection between housing, transportation, and transit investments to further reduce vehicle miles travelled and GHG emissions while creating healthier, transit-oriented environments. Key proposed revisions include:

- **Revised GHG scoring criteria to better balance the quantification of greenhouse gas emission reductions with other supplemental strategies**, including active transportation and urban greening, green building, energy efficiency, and renewable energy. Additional points awarded to these supplemental GHG-reducing strategies are designed to further incentivize walking and bicycling, as well as low-impact design and other water and energy related improvements that exceed current or pending building code standards (pages 33-37).
- **Creation of a new, Rural Innovation Project type**, in consideration of the unique characteristics of rural communities. These projects will compete separately from other project types but must meet the same criteria, with a target goal of 10% of AHSC funds invested in rural innovation project areas (page 8).

- **Increased award amount of up to \$20 million** for all Project Area types (page 17).
- **Elimination of the jurisdictional cap for localities**, which put larger cities at a disadvantage in the last funding cycle (page 17).
- **Greater emphasis on transportation investments that support mode shift**, by requiring Integrated Connectivity Project Areas to include transportation and transit capital costs which directly result in mode shift from passenger vehicles (page 10).
- **Refinement of Transit Oriented Development Project (TOD) areas to encourage a stronger balance of housing, transportation and transit investments.** Transportation infrastructure is no longer required, but is an eligible cost, recognizing that many TOD areas have already made substantial investments in transportation infrastructure (page 9).
- **Greater emphasis on housing and transportation collaboration and partnerships** by encouraging partnerships between transportation and transit projects and housing development through scored criteria, and not requiring housing and transportation infrastructure in a TOD per Round One (page 39).
- **Focus on Financial Readiness as a Concept to Full Application filter.** Feedback from Round One noted that using Funds Leveraged as the mechanism to limit Concepts invited to Full Application might exclude some of the most GHG-reducing projects and disadvantage projects in areas with less resources. The 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines proposes to use Financial Readiness to limit invitations of Concepts to Full Application, if needed. This means applicants who have all their funding committed to complete their project will rank the highest--even if AHSC money is 100% of the money needed to complete the project (page 21).
- Additional changes include new scoring criteria and point values for community benefit and engagement, access to destinations, depth and level of housing affordability, and anti-displacement strategies (pages 37-46).

The 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines will undergo public review, including workshops later in October, as well as further staff revision prior to consideration for Council adoption on December 17, 2015.

### Who is Eligible for AHSC Funds?

Similar to year one, the following entities are eligible to apply for AHSC Program funds, as a sole or joint applicant:

• Local Governments (City, County, City/County)	• Local Transportation Agencies	• Public Housing Authority
• Transit Agency or Operator	• Regional Transportation Planning Agency	• Congestion Management Agency
• Joint Powers Authority	• School District	• Facilities District

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University or Community College District</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer: Public, Private, or Nonprofit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Operator: Public, Private, or Nonprofit</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## What does AHSC Fund?

Proposed 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines support the following types of capital projects that reduce passenger vehicle miles travelled and support transportation mode shifts:

- Affordable housing development in close proximity to transit
- Capital projects, including:
  - Active transportation capital projects, including pedestrian, bicycle infrastructure, crosswalks, and other capital projects which increase connectivity to and from key destinations (housing, jobs, school, retail, services, etc) or to transit.
  - Infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, etc.) that directly serves affordable housing development in proximity to transit.
  - Infrastructure associated with affordable housing, active transportation, or transit capital projects that meet or exceed current requirements for energy efficiency, green building, water efficient uses, low impact development, or renewable energy.
  - Infrastructure associated with affordable housing, active transportation, or transit capital projects that include urban greening components (e.g. tree canopy along walkable and bikeable corridors, parks and open space adjacent to housing, etc)
  - Capital costs associated with increasing the capacity of a transit system. This includes increased fleet (e.g. vanpool, car share, shuttles), expansion of service (e.g. extension of service to underserved areas)
  - Capital costs supporting improvement or addition of infrastructure to expand public transit access and increase connectivity between the transit stop or station and active transportation infrastructure
- Programs supporting shifts in transportation mode, including:
  - Active transportation outreach (e.g. safety)
  - Transit ridership programs (e.g. transit passes, outreach programs)

## 2015-2016 Proposed Draft Guideline Revisions

### Revised Scoring Criteria

The proposed scoring criteria for the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines is provided below in **Table 1**.

**Table 1**  
**Proposed Scoring Criteria and Points**

Scoring Element	Points
<b>GHG Reduction</b>	
GHG Quantification Methodology	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated GHG Emissions Reductions (CalEEMod and TAC):</li> </ul>	
Total Project GHG Reductions	15
Cost Efficiency of Reductions (Total Project GHG Reductions/AHSC \$ Request)	15
Supplemental Strategies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active Transportation Improvements</li> <li>• Water, Energy, and Greening</li> </ul>	10 10
<b>GHG Reduction Category Subtotal</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Policy Objectives</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depth and Level of Housing Affordability</li> <li>• Housing and Transportation Collaboration</li> <li>• Community Benefit and Engagement</li> <li>• Access to Destinations</li> <li>• Funds Leveraged</li> <li>• Anti-Displacement Strategies</li> <li>• Program Need and Readiness</li> <li>• Implementation of Planning Efforts</li> </ul>	10 10 8 8 5 4 3 2
<b>Policy Objectives Category Subtotal</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>100</b>

### GHG Reductions

The Total GHG Reductions Score, including the GHG Quantifications Methodology (30 points) and Supplemental Strategies (20 points) respond to the Year 1 concerns related to:

- Year 1 increments/bins being “too large” (11 points each). Specifically, In year 1 applications were assigned to one of 5 bins representing 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the total number of applications in ranked order based upon the calculated GHG emissions reduction/GGRF dollar requested with each bin receiving as assigned point score as follows: Bin 1 – 55 points, Bin 2 – 44 points, Bin 3 – 33 points, Bin 4 – 22 points and Bin 5 – 11 points.
- The priority of points on the GHG reductions, based only on cost efficiency weighing too heavily (55 of 100 total points).

The 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines attempt to better balance the GHG Quantifications Methodology with other Supplemental Strategies, including Active Transportation and Water Energy and Greening, and adjust bin score increments, addressing some of the concerns around the potential unevenness of this scoring criterion.

*GHG Quantification Methodology (CalEEMod and Transportation and Connectivity) – 30 points:*

The GHG Quantifications Methodology scoring criteria focus on two components of GHG reductions:

GHG Component	Calculation	Total Points Possible	Increment of Points/Bin
1) Total Reductions	Total GHGs Reduced	15	3
2) Cost Efficiency of Reductions	$\frac{\text{Total Project GHG Reductions}}{\text{AHSC \$ Requested}}$	15	3

Each of these components results in a total maximum score of 15 points. Each component will be ranked from highest to lowest – and be assigned an incremental point value based on reductions associated with the application. These ‘bins’ occur in increments of three points as follows and are designed to award points to projects with similar GHG emissions reductions:

Total GHGs Reduced		Cost Efficiency of Reductions		Total Quantified GHG Reduction Score (Maximum 30 points)
Bin 1 = 15 points	+	Bin 1 = 15 points	=	
Bin 2 = 12 points		Bin 2 = 12 points		
Bin 3 = 9 points		Bin 3 = 9 points		
Bin 4 = 6 points		Bin 4 = 6 points		
Bin 5 = 3 points		Bin 5 = 3 points		

ARB is preparing updates to the quantification methodology to provide increased usability to applicants, incorporate feedback from the Lessons Learned workshops, and provide greater consistency with other quantification methodologies such as incorporating a “Well-to-Wheels” quantification approach (instead of the FY 2014-2015 “Tank-to-Wheels”) to estimate GHG reductions. The quantification methodology will be consistent with the AHSC Program Guidelines for FY 2015-2016. ARB anticipates the draft will be available for public comment at AHSC workshops in October 2015.

SGC and ARB staff are working with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) to identify updates to CalEEMod, and to determine whether the updated model will be available for the FY 15-16 AHSC Program. CAPCOA, which owns and maintains CalEEMod, is currently updating the model to include model and data refinements, some of which are supportive of comments received through the AHSC program over the past year.

Peer review is pending on new research regarding depth of affordability and GHG reductions. SGC staff plan on putting together an independent blind peer review of the Center for Neighborhood Technology’s recent research on “Income, Location Efficiency, and VMT: Affordable Housing as a Climate Strategy.” Pending the findings of the report’s peer review, findings may be incorporated into future GHG quantification methodologies.

### *Active Transportation – 10 Points:*

The 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines consider the co-benefits achieved from active transportation improvements supporting walking and bicycling, and provide additional points for clearly articulated purpose and need for such investments, as well as how the proposed improvements address the purpose and need.

### *Urban Greening, Green Building, Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy – 10 Points:*

Identified in the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines as the “Water, Energy, and Greening” section, this encourages projects that incorporate urban greening, low-impact design, site development and energy efficiency standards, and on-site renewable energy generation, in most cases to exceed current or pending building code standards.

## Policy Objectives

### *Depth and Level of Housing Affordability – 10 Points:*

Points for this criterion have been increased to 10 points in the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines. The 2014-2015 Program Guidelines awarded up to 6.5 points for this criterion.

### *Housing and Transportation Collaboration – 10 Points:*

To allow for greater flexibility and reward more meaningful coordination, the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines do not require a combination of both housing and transportation Capital Projects in any project prototype. However, coordination between housing and transportation infrastructure continues to be a priority policy goal of the Program. This category encourages collaboration between housing, transportation, and transit partners by incentivizing joint applications and coordinated investments in both housing and transportation Capital Projects.

### *Community Benefit and Engagement – 8 points:*

This category refines and captures the objectives of meaningful public engagement and direct implementation Projects that reflect community needs and interests. Co-benefits will continue to be tracked and measured, per ARB Guidance.

### *Access to Destinations – 8 Points:*

This category replaces the Accessibility to Employment and some components of the 2014-2015 Guidelines’ Walking and Biking Criteria, using Walkscore and Bikescore to estimate accessibility and proximity of services and key destinations, as well as bike infrastructure to address location efficiency with regard to the Project.

### *Funds Leveraged – 5 Points:*

Criterion was revised to include both Capital Project and Program activities leveraged by other enforceable funding commitments.

### *Anti-Displacement – 4 Points:*

The proposed 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines provide additional points for demonstration of policies, strategies, or programs designed to avoid both physical and economic displacement of low-income residents and businesses of the Project Area.

*Program Need and Readiness – 3 Points:*

Criterion provides points for demonstration of need and benefit of proposed Program activities as well as readiness and sustainability of Program beyond the term of the AHSC standard agreement and funds.

*Implementation of Planning Efforts – 2 Points:*

Revised to include stronger tie to SCS implementation and climate adaptation efforts as reflected in a current region of local planning document

**New Project Type: Rural Innovation Project Area**

In consideration of the unique characteristics of rural communities and the roles they play in greenhouse gas emissions reduction, a new project area has been created to support innovative housing and transportation projects: Rural Innovation Project Areas (RIPAs). These projects will compete separately from other TOD and ICP projects, but must meet the same criteria as those required in an ICP Area.

- A rural community is defined based on Health & Safety Code § 50199.21 by demonstrating at least one of the following:
  1. Location within a non-metropolitan area;
  2. Location within a Rural Housing Service (RHS) Section 515 eligible area; or
  3. Where neither 1 or 2 above result in a rural determination, location within or adjoining a small city, defined by an incorporated city of 40,000 or less where the projects census tract is NOT designated as an “urbanized area” or “part of an urbanized area”
- Additional detail on determining rural status is available at <http://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/2015/methodology.pdf>
- A target goal of 10 percent of AHSC funds would be invested in Rural Innovation Project Areas, but if insufficient eligible applications are received, funds would roll over to fund additional applications in other Project Area types. (pages 8 and 10)

**Transportation Investments that Support Mode Shift**

To ensure more meaningful transportation investments, the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines distinguishes what was formerly considered “Transportation-Related Infrastructure” in two categories: Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure (STI) and Transportation-Related Amenities (TRAs). The STI category was created to support capital projects that result in mode shifts from passenger vehicles to low-carbon transportation options such as transit, walking, and bicycling, which the TRAs support by providing amenities for transit riders, pedestrians and cyclists (page 14-15)

**Refinement of Project Area Types***Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Project Areas*

The 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines acknowledge that some TOD areas have already (and recently) made significant investments in transportation and transit infrastructure. Recognizing

this investment the Draft Guidelines propose transportation infrastructure is no longer required in TOD Project Areas, but is an eligible cost. (page 8)

### *Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP) Areas*

All ICP projects are required to include a Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure (STI) Capital Project, defined as transportation and transit capital costs which directly result in mode shift from passenger vehicles. (page 10)

### **Transportation and Housing Collaboration**

Recognizing that planning and development of housing and transportation capital projects do not necessarily align to similar timeframes or processes, the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines provide greater flexibility with regard to coordination of capital costs. However, in order to encourage development of integrated projects, the draft guidelines encourage meaningful partnerships between transportation and transit projects and housing development through scored criteria. (page 39)

### **Other Proposed Program Changes**

- Increase in total award amount to \$20 million for all Project Area types, with a minimum award of \$1 million.
- Planning Costs are no longer standalone Eligible Costs, and has been incorporated into costs associated with Affordable Housing Development, Housing-Related Infrastructure, Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure, and Transportation-Related Amenities.
- All AHSC-funded Affordable Housing Developments must provide at least one secure overnight bicycle parking for every two units. This required bicycle parking may be funded by AHSC funds, but does not count toward required Project Area components.
- Clarification that Acquisition and Substantial Rehabilitation projects are exempt from minimum density requirements.
- Limits the amount of AHSC funds allowed for parking, with the intent to phase out parking as an allowable cost altogether in future funding rounds.

## Application Process

### **Threshold Requirements**

All projects must meet the following statutory thresholds:

- Achieve a reduction in GHG emissions through fewer vehicle miles travelled, pursuant to the AHSC Program Quantification Methodology
- Support the implementation of the applicable SCS or similar sustainable planning document in non-MPO regions
- Be consistent with the State planning priorities established pursuant to Section 65041.1 of the Government Code

In addition, similar to Year 1, other key thresholds for Projects include:

- Addressing environmental clearances by application
- Secured entitlements and permits (with the exception of design review and building permits)
- Cleared any outstanding legal challenges to Project

- Must have not started construction
- Address issues related to Climate Adaptation (i.e. sea level rise, heat island effect concerns)
- No conversion of working or natural resource lands

### Screening of Applicants at Concept

To the extent that the number of applications received exceed 200% of the total amount available in the Notice of Funding Availability, applicants meeting all threshold requirements will be invited to submit a full application based on the following filter:

Demonstration of the level of Enforceable Funding Commitments (EFCs) calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{AHSC Funds Requested} + \text{EFCs} - \text{Deferred Costs}}{\text{Total Development Cost}}$$

In contrast to Year 1 where invitations to full applications were based on demonstration of financial leverage, the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines propose to use the above calculation of Financial Readiness to limit invitations of Concepts to Full Application, if needed. This means applicants who have all their funding committed to complete their project will rank the highest--even if AHSC money is 100% of the money needed to complete the project.

- Invites to Full Application will include up to 200% of the respective targets within each Project Area category and statutory set-aside (affordable housing and disadvantaged communities), based on the total amount available designated in the Notice of Funding Availability.
- At least one concept proposal from each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) jurisdiction will be invited to submit a full application provided it meets all threshold requirements.

### Coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations

In its first year, the AHSC Program collaborated with the state's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to disseminate information about the program, convene workshops, and provide initial technical assistance to applicants. As appropriate, MPO staff also served as reviewers of AHSC applications at concept and full application, providing insight into applicant implementation of applicable Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and in some cases, provided recommendations based on criteria adopted by the respective region.

In this second year of the AHSC Program, we look forward to ongoing coordination between the State and MPOs to continue to inform the updated AHSC Program Guidelines and provide closer alignment of state and regional objectives. We envision this occurring in four categories, to be developed with consideration for each region's unique needs and capacity. The following provides examples of potential partnerships, which may leverage other public, private, or nonprofit partners.

**Table 2  
Options for MPO Engagement and Input**

	Examples/Options
Regional/Local Capacity Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identifying pipeline projects, leveraging past regional planning grants, SGC Prop 84 recipients, etc.</li> <li>- Identifying and developing partnership opportunities between housing, transportation, transit partners, and other public, nonprofit, community stakeholders</li> <li>- Determining local capacity needs for future applications</li> </ul>
Outreach and Information Sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional informational workshops</li> <li>- Topic-specific workshops</li> <li>- Presentations to local boards, groups</li> <li>- Development of resource material</li> </ul>
Application Development and Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Grant writing assistance</li> <li>- GHG scenario evaluation and quantification analysis</li> <li>- Partnership development</li> <li>- Data, GIS assistance</li> </ul>
Application Review and Recommendations	<p>At Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review of applications for consistency with SCS</li> </ul> <p>At Full Application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MPO review of Full Applications, using regionally-adopted criteria. Recommendations provided to the State for consideration.</li> <li>▪ MPO staff reviews regional applications along with other interagency State reviewers. Major differences in scores discussed through consensus-based approach to determine final score.</li> </ul>

**Proposed New Project Type: Catalytic Project**

The increase in available AHSC program funds in this cycle gives the Council the flexibility to consider investments that expedite the benefits of the program through projects that could have the effect of catalyzing regional transportation mode shift. These projects would be larger in scale and impact and would have the potential to significantly advance the objectives of the program.

The Council may also wish to consider a separate set of competitive criteria to encourage applicants to implement greater densities and more integrated land use connections, including but not limited to the following:

- Density levels that exceed threshold requirements.
- Include at least 150 housing units and multi-phased.

- Meaningful transportation-related improvements. For example, at least 60% the awarded funds should be used for transportation infrastructure and site work.

The Council may wish to consider dedicating a percentage of the funds available in Year 2 to invest in catalytic projects within TOD and/or ICP Project Areas and allow an investment of AHSC Program funds in excess of the \$20 million per application cap applicable in the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines.

**Geographic Distribution of Funds**

AHSC staff recognizes the considerable comments received regarding the geographic distribution of funds, including striking a balance between geographic diversity and funding projects that best meet AHSC program goals and objectives.

In response, as detailed above, staff is proposing the elimination of the jurisdictional cap that disproportionately affected projects in the SCAG region in the 2014-2015 funding cycle. Staff has also proposed a target of 10% of AHSC funds for Rural Innovation Project Areas in recognition of the unique characteristics of rural communities, which would allow these projects to compete separately from projects in urban or suburban areas of the state. Additionally, as noted above, staff has put forth a newly proposed Catalytic Project type for further discussion. As proposed, these larger scale projects would compete separately from the TOD, ICP and RIPA applications.

AHSC staff also received a number of comments proposing the exploration of methodologies for the geographic apportionment of funds across the State. While the draft guidelines do not include geographic targets at this time, there is recognition that this issue deserves thoughtful and broad public consideration. Below is one geographic apportionment concept for the purpose of discussion during the public review period for the 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines:

**Geographic Distribution Discussion Option: Regional Population-Based Targets (Seven Regions)**

Regions	% target of available funds
Bay Area	20%
Central Coast	4%
North State-Sierra	2%
Sacramento	6%
San Diego	8%
San Joaquin Valley	11%
Southern CA	49%

*Population % Figures Source: US Census Bureau*

- Funds could be apportioned by region for awards determined by SGC; awards would be held over to the next cycle should projects that do not meet AHSC program requirements.
- Funds may be awarded for other projects throughout the state at the discretion of the Council.

- Regarding the proposed 10% of AHSC funds for Rural Innovation Project Types, this is not an additive percentage to the regional targets option, but an overlay of regional targets.

This option is intended to solicit broader stakeholder input and discussion during the public review period of the Draft Guidelines, and do not indicate a staff recommendation to geographically apportion funds.

<b>AHSC Program Timeline</b>
------------------------------

Estimated Year 2 Timeline	
Stakeholder Meetings on 2015-2016 Draft Guidelines	Late October 2015
Comments due on Draft Guidelines	October 30, 2015
Revision of Guidelines	Late Fall/Early Winter 2015
Final Guidelines presented to Council for Approval	December 2015
Release of 2015-2016 Notice of Funding Availability	January 2016
Concept Applications Due	February 2016
Full Applications Due	April 2016
Awards Announced	July/August 2016