

SB 35 Determination Methodology and Background Data Updated June 2018

SB 35 Reporting Period

SB 35 defines the Reporting Period as the first half of the regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) cycle or the second half of the RHNA cycle. For jurisdictions that have not completed the first half of the current (fifth) RHNA cycle, a proration will apply until the jurisdiction completes the first-half point of the cycle.

Prorated targets will be updated after Annual Progress Reports (APRs) are due each year until the jurisdiction completes the first-half of the fifth RHNA cycle, at which point a jurisdiction's determination will only be updated at the end of the fifth RHNA cycle, and at the midpoint and end point of all cycles going forward.

APRs are on calendar years, while RHNA planning periods¹ may begin and end at various times throughout the year. When a planning period begins after July, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior RHNA cycle. When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following RHNA cycle.

More detail is shown below by regional government or county and applies to all jurisdictions within the regional government or county.

Credit for Permitting during Projection Period

Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period² before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period.

Annual Progress Report (APRs) Due Dates

APRs are due each April and report on the prior calendar year's activities. As of April 2018, 2017 APRs and prior APRs were due.

¹ **Planning Period:** The time-period between the due date for one housing element and the due date for the next housing element. This time-period can be either 8 or 5 years, depending on the jurisdiction.

² **Projection Period:** The time-period for which the regional housing need assessment (RHNA) is calculated.

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and San Benito County Council of Governments (San Benito COG) – includes Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 12/15/2015³ – 12/15/2023

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

³ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG) and Kern Council of Governments (KCOG) – includes Fresno and Kern Counties; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015⁴ – 12/31/2023

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013, 2014, and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁴ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Stanislaus County Council of Governments (Stan COG) and Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) – includes Stanislaus and Tulare Counties; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015⁵ – 12/31/2023

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 09/30/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁵ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

San Joaquin County Council of Governments (SJCOG) – includes San Joaquin County and all cities within the County

5th Cycle Planning Period: 12/31/2015⁶ – 12/31/2023

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁶ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG) and Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC) – includes Kings and Madera Counties; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 01/31/2016 – 01/31/2024⁷

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁷ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) – includes Merced County and all cities within the County

5th Cycle Planning Period: 03/31/2016 – 03/31/2024⁸

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 12/31/2023

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2016 2017 2018 2019
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2020 2021 2022 2023

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014 and 2015. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 2/8ths (25%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2019 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2023 APRs are due	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁸ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 year (2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
FRESNO	CLOVIS	0.0%	2.2%	130.7%	137.0%
FRESNO	COALINGA	0.0%	27.8%	22.0%	26.9%
FRESNO	FRESNO	1.9%	4.9%	46.6%	38.8%
FRESNO	FRESNO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	23.6%
FRESNO	HURON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FRESNO	PARLIER	0.0%	106.1%	3.9%	*
FRESNO	REEDLEY	24.0%	0.0%	9.3%	1.1%
FRESNO	SANGER	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
KERN	ARVIN	0.0%	23.4%	91.8%	0.0%
KERN	BAKERSFIELD	0.0%	1.3%	68.0%	21.8%
KERN	DELANO	3.9%	0.0%	22.6%	4.0%
KERN	KERN COUNTY	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
KERN	MCFARLAND	0.0%	3.8%	5.0%	0.0%
KERN	TAFT	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	21.9%
KERN	WASCO	0.0%	22.2%	1.4%	39.2%
KINGS	AVENAL	2.1%	1.9%	5.2%	0.0%
KINGS	KINGS COUNTY	0.0%	5.8%	0.7%	2.3%
MADERA	MADERA	0.0%	29.3%	16.6%	0.2%
MADERA	MADERA COUNTY	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	*
MERCED	LIVINGSTON	50.0%	2.8%	0.0%	23.7%
MERCED	LOS BANOS	0.0%	4.9%	2.3%	20.7%
MERCED	MERCED	6.8%	0.0%	20.4%	4.4%
MERCED	MERCED COUNTY	1.7%	0.0%	12.5%	13.5%
MONTEREY	KING CITY	0.0%	21.4%	18.2%	113.2%
MONTEREY	MARINA	13.3%	2.9%	61.5%	4.0%
MONTEREY	MONTEREY	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
MONTEREY	MONTEREY COUNTY	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	58.8%
MONTEREY	PACIFIC GROVE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
MONTEREY	SALINAS	0.0%	4.8%	1.0%	15.4%
SAN BENITO	HOLLISTER	0.0%	0.0%	16.9%	29.9%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 year (2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
SAN BENITO	SAN BENITO COUNTY	9.9%	0.0%	25.0%	100.0%
SAN JOAQUIN	LATHROP	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.3%
SAN JOAQUIN	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	0.0%	250.0%	290.6%	1200.0%
SAN JOAQUIN	TRACY	99.1%	0.0%	0.4%	12.2%
SANTA CRUZ	CAPITOLA	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	38.3%
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ	14.0%	29.7%	141.2%	78.9%
SANTA CRUZ	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	10.3%	11.1%	48.5%	18.0%
SANTA CRUZ	WATSONVILLE	14.3%	4.5%	8.6%	44.4%
STANISLAUS	CERES	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%
STANISLAUS	HUGHSON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	51.6%
STANISLAUS	MODESTO	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	8.0%
STANISLAUS	OAKDALE	3.3%	0.0%	38.1%	26.0%
STANISLAUS	RIVERBANK	13.2%	18.4%	0.0%	12.1%
STANISLAUS	STANISLAUS COUNTY	0.0%	2.9%	11.3%	32.8%
STANISLAUS	TURLOCK	0.0%	21.9%	94.3%	3.0%
TULARE	DINUBA	0.0%	39.3%	41.3%	0.0%
TULARE	EXETER	0.0%	1.6%	2.4%	2.2%
TULARE	LINDSAY	10.5%	108.8%	32.9%	2.9%
TULARE	PORTERVILLE	0.2%	0.8%	15.5%	0.5%
TULARE	TULARE	3.4%	1.1%	0.0%	24.4%
TULARE	TULARE COUNTY	0.0%	16.3%	8.4%	2.8%
TULARE	VISALIA	12.4%	15.3%	24.4%	27.7%
Fresno County	FIREBAUGH	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	FOWLER	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	HURON	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	KERMAN	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	KINGSBURG	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	MENDOTA	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	ORANGE COVE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	PARLIER	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Fresno County	SAN JOAQUIN	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 year (2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.***

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Fresno County	SANGER				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Fresno County	SELMA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	CALIFORNIA CITY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	MARICOPA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	MCFARLAND				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	RIDGECREST				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	SHAFTER				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kern County	TEHACHAPI				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kings County	CORCORAN				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kings County	HANFORD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Kings County	LEMOORE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Madera County	CHOWCHILLA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Merced County	ATWATER				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Merced County	DOS PALOS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Merced County	GUSTINE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	CARMEL				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	DEL REY OAKS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	GONZALES				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	GREENFIELD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	MONTEREY COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	SAND CITY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	SEASIDE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Monterey County	SOLEDAD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Benito County	SAN BENITO COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Benito County	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Joaquin County	ESCALON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Joaquin County	LODI				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Joaquin County	MANTECA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Joaquin County	RIPON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Joaquin County	STOCKTON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 2 year (2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 25% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.***

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Santa Cruz County	SCOTTS VALLEY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Stanislaus County	NEWMAN				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Stanislaus County	PATTERSON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Stanislaus County	WATERFORD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Tulare County	DINUBA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Tulare County	FARMERSVILLE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Tulare County	WOODLAKE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Now Bay Area Metro – includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 01/31/2015 – 01/31/2023⁹

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 10/31/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2015 2016 2017 2018
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2019 2020 2021 2022

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For Bay Area Metro jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2022 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

⁹ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG) – includes Santa Barbara County and all cities within the County

5th Cycle Planning Period: 02/15/2015 – 02/15/2023¹⁰

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 09/30/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2015 2016 2017 2018
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2019 2020 2021 2022

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For these jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 3/8ths (37.5%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2022 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹⁰ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2015-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA	12.2%	16.1%	9.2%	42.6%
ALAMEDA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	27.9%	34.8%	11.9%	8.6%
ALAMEDA	ALBANY	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	133.8%
ALAMEDA	BERKELEY	16.0%	3.8%	22.6%	57.1%
ALAMEDA	DUBLIN	3.3%	8.7%	3.3%	426.9%
ALAMEDA	EMERYVILLE	31.2%	7.6%	8.1%	50.5%
ALAMEDA	FREMONT	16.5%	26.9%	0.0%	140.1%
ALAMEDA	HAYWARD	4.7%	4.0%	0.0%	36.7%
ALAMEDA	LIVERMORE	6.2%	9.1%	88.5%	89.8%
ALAMEDA	NEWARK	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%	12.8%
ALAMEDA	OAKLAND	18.0%	5.3%	0.4%	86.3%
ALAMEDA	PIEDMONT	12.5%	14.3%	20.0%	57.1%
ALAMEDA	PLEASANTON	30.7%	11.3%	3.7%	259.0%
ALAMEDA	SAN LEANDRO	21.6%	32.6%	0.0%	1.4%
ALAMEDA	UNION CITY	0.0%	0.0%	131.8%	18.0%
CONTRA COSTA	ANTIOCH	24.9%	0.0%	36.0%	44.7%
CONTRA COSTA	BRENTWOOD	1.3%	8.1%	4.9%	683.5%
CONTRA COSTA	CLAYTON	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	23.5%
CONTRA COSTA	CONCORD	2.4%	0.7%	0.7%	9.3%
CONTRA COSTA	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	0.0%	5.0%	51.0%	135.5%
CONTRA COSTA	DANVILLE	0.0%	7.2%	19.4%	137.3%
CONTRA COSTA	HERCULES	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	107.0%
CONTRA COSTA	LAFAYETTE	1.4%	3.8%	50.6%	350.5%
CONTRA COSTA	MARTINEZ	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	20.5%
CONTRA COSTA	MORAGA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.3%
CONTRA COSTA	OAKLEY	2.7%	40.5%	147.2%	109.6%
CONTRA COSTA	ORINDA	0.0%	0.0%	46.9%	150.9%
CONTRA COSTA	PINOLE	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	3.2%
CONTRA COSTA	PITTSBURG	5.9%	85.4%	115.8%	53.6%
CONTRA COSTA	PLEASANT HILL	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	11.9%
CONTRA COSTA	RICHMOND	0.0%	25.9%	0.0%	13.1%
CONTRA COSTA	SAN PABLO	0.0%	3.1%	9.7%	29.0%
CONTRA COSTA	SAN RAMON	3.9%	29.4%	59.9%	414.1%
CONTRA COSTA	WALNUT CREEK	7.0%	4.5%	4.7%	57.1%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2015-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
MARIN	BELVEDERE	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	20.0%
MARIN	CORTE MADERA	31.8%	100.0%	38.5%	745.8%
MARIN	FAIRFAX	6.3%	9.1%	9.1%	43.5%
MARIN	LARKSPUR	7.5%	50.0%	42.9%	168.6%
MARIN	MARIN COUNTY	20.0%	59.4%	43.2%	162.3%
MARIN	NOVATO	18.0%	20.0%	2.8%	26.9%
MARIN	ROSS	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%
MARIN	SAN ANSELMO	33.3%	105.9%	36.8%	27.0%
MARIN	SAN RAFAEL	1.3%	18.2%	5.5%	34.5%
MARIN	SAUSALITO	38.5%	121.4%	25.0%	21.7%
MARIN	TIBURON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.9%
NAPA	NAPA	0.0%	6.6%	2.8%	42.7%
NAPA	NAPA COUNTY	0.0%	3.3%	143.8%	83.6%
NAPA	SAINT HELENA	0.0%	160.0%	80.0%	307.7%
NAPA	YOUNTVILLE	25.0%	50.0%	300.0%	175.0%
SAN FRANCISCO	SAN FRANCISCO	20.5%	31.5%	10.0%	78.2%
SAN MATEO	ATHERTON	48.6%	26.9%	6.9%	166.7%
SAN MATEO	BELMONT	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	63.5%
SAN MATEO	BRISBANE	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%	160.0%
SAN MATEO	BURLINGAME	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	97.4%
SAN MATEO	COLMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%
SAN MATEO	DALY CITY	14.8%	118.1%	26.7%	47.3%
SAN MATEO	EAST PALO ALTO	0.0%	14.8%	39.8%	1.9%
SAN MATEO	HALF MOON BAY	100.0%	112.9%	25.0%	28.9%
SAN MATEO	MILLBRAE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
SAN MATEO	PACIFICA	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%	15.6%
SAN MATEO	PORTOLA VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	169.2%
SAN MATEO	REDWOOD CITY	1.0%	12.6%	0.0%	119.3%
SAN MATEO	SAN BRUNO	0.0%	11.2%	20.5%	12.3%
SAN MATEO	SAN CARLOS	1.5%	11.2%	8.1%	153.0%
SAN MATEO	SAN MATEO	5.7%	5.5%	17.7%	86.6%
SAN MATEO	SAN MATEO COUNTY	0.7%	11.7%	16.7%	26.5%
SAN MATEO	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	14.2%	1.4%	8.9%	57.2%
SANTA BARBARA	BUELLTON	7.6%	9.1%	148.8%	71.8%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2015-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
SANTA BARBARA	GOLETA	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	136.6%
SANTA BARBARA	LOMPOC	0.0%	0.0%	46.3%	1.8%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA	6.3%	5.1%	0.0%	21.0%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	35.8%	46.2%	151.8%	123.2%
SANTA BARBARA	SANTA MARIA	2.7%	9.0%	133.6%	35.6%
SANTA CLARA	CAMPBELL	3.6%	1.4%	4.0%	73.1%
SANTA CLARA	CUPERTINO	0.0%	0.0%	16.5%	69.6%
SANTA CLARA	GILROY	22.0%	280.6%	6.5%	204.2%
SANTA CLARA	LOS ALTOS	1.2%	18.2%	0.9%	328.9%
SANTA CLARA	LOS ALTOS HILLS	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
SANTA CLARA	LOS GATOS	0.0%	1.8%	6.8%	39.7%
SANTA CLARA	MILPITAS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	113.3%
SANTA CLARA	MORGAN HILL	15.0%	116.9%	13.5%	366.5%
SANTA CLARA	MOUNTAIN VIEW	17.3%	32.5%	0.0%	244.3%
SANTA CLARA	PALO ALTO	6.2%	13.4%	15.1%	42.6%
SANTA CLARA	SAN JOSE	9.2%	4.3%	4.6%	72.3%
SANTA CLARA	SANTA CLARA	0.2%	0.2%	5.9%	294.0%
SANTA CLARA	SARATOGA	0.0%	33.7%	5.8%	20.4%
SANTA CLARA	SUNNYVALE	5.4%	2.3%	8.5%	69.7%
SOLANO	BENICIA	1.1%	5.6%	0.0%	12.2%
SOLANO	DIXON	0.0%	225.0%	196.7%	158.1%
SOLANO	FAIRFIELD	0.0%	0.0%	78.9%	96.0%
SOLANO	SOLANO COUNTY	15.4%	253.3%	100.0%	107.0%
SOLANO	SUISUN CITY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.8%
SOLANO	VACAVILLE	4.9%	19.4%	307.5%	92.2%
SOLANO	VALLEJO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.2%
SONOMA	CLOVERDALE	64.1%	58.6%	16.1%	28.7%
SONOMA	COTATI	11.4%	72.2%	61.1%	57.6%
SONOMA	PETALUMA	4.5%	13.6%	19.8%	183.5%
SONOMA	ROHNERT PARK	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	78.3%
SONOMA	SANTA ROSA	10.1%	20.7%	6.6%	28.0%
SONOMA	SEBASTOPOL	0.0%	10.7%	51.7%	21.8%
SONOMA	SONOMA	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	33.3%
SONOMA	WINDSOR	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	38.3%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2015-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 37.5% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.***

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Alameda County	NEWARK				
Contra Costa County	MARTINEZ				
Contra Costa County	RICHMOND				
San Mateo County	ATHERTON				
Santa Barbara County	GUADALUPE				
Santa Barbara County	SANTA BARBARA				
Santa Barbara County	SOLVANG				
Santa Clara County	LOS ALTOS				
Solano County	RIO VISTA				

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) – includes Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties, and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 10/15/2013¹¹ – 10/15/2021

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Due to an anomaly in setting the SCAG planning and projection period for the 5th housing element cycle, the SCAG projection period begins after the planning period. To account for this, SCAG jurisdictions can count permits from the last two months of 2013 on their 2014 APRs. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹¹ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) – includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 10/31/2013¹² – 10/31/2021

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period. For SACOG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹² When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) – includes the City of South Lake Tahoe

5th Cycle Planning Period: 10/31/2013¹³ – 10/31/2021

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2013 – 10/31/2021

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For TRPA jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2013. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹³ When the planning period begins after July 1, the APR for that year is attributed to the prior cycle.

Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) – includes Butte County and all cities within the County

5th Cycle Planning Period: 06/15/2014 – 06/15/2022¹⁴

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 06/15/2022

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016 2017
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2018 2019 2020 2021

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For BCAG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2014, which will already be included on their 2014 APR.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

After 2017 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2021 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹⁴ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
BUTTE	BIGGS	54.2%	106.7%	0.0%	0.0%
BUTTE	BUTTE COUNTY	0.0%	1.5%	6.9%	16.3%
BUTTE	CHICO	1.5%	0.8%	45.8%	81.4%
BUTTE	OROVILLE	2.4%	23.6%	0.0%	3.7%
BUTTE	PARADISE	0.0%	10.0%	8.6%	13.9%
EL DORADO	EL DORADO COUNTY	5.4%	33.2%	5.7%	164.7%
EL DORADO	PLACERVILLE	0.0%	0.0%	73.9%	71.8%
EL DORADO	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	19.3%
IMPERIAL	BRAWLEY	5.2%	10.4%	19.0%	0.7%
IMPERIAL	CALIPATRIA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IMPERIAL	EL CENTRO	0.0%	27.0%	30.6%	6.9%
IMPERIAL	HOLTVILLE	0.0%	3.2%	3.1%	1.1%
IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL	16.0%	4.9%	210.9%	20.1%
IMPERIAL	IMPERIAL COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	102.8%	0.0%
IMPERIAL	WESTMORLAND	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	AGOURA HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	91.1%
LOS ANGELES	ALHAMBRA	0.0%	3.6%	1.2%	22.0%
LOS ANGELES	ARCADIA	0.0%	0.0%	21.5%	23.8%
LOS ANGELES	ARTESIA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	107.8%
LOS ANGELES	AVALON	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%
LOS ANGELES	BALDWIN PARK	33.1%	20.5%	1.1%	52.5%
LOS ANGELES	BELL GARDENS	0.0%	0.0%	125.0%	85.0%
LOS ANGELES	BELLFLOWER	0.0%	3.7%	3.4%	52.4%
LOS ANGELES	BURBANK	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	28.7%
LOS ANGELES	CALABASAS	9.1%	0.0%	12.3%	69.5%
LOS ANGELES	CARSON	8.7%	21.3%	46.4%	11.7%
LOS ANGELES	CERRITOS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1014.3%
LOS ANGELES	CLAREMONT	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	207.9%
LOS ANGELES	CUDAHY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	DIAMOND BAR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.2%
LOS ANGELES	DOWNEY	0.0%	4.9%	51.9%	19.9%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
LOS ANGELES	DUARTE	48.3%	1.9%	5.5%	0.7%
LOS ANGELES	EL MONTE	45.6%	11.4%	0.6%	26.8%
LOS ANGELES	GARDENA	0.0%	0.0%	81.8%	104.6%
LOS ANGELES	GLENDALE	17.3%	31.3%	0.3%	360.2%
LOS ANGELES	GLENDORA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	157.3%
LOS ANGELES	HAWTHORNE	0.0%	125.7%	34.8%	120.3%
LOS ANGELES	INGLEWOOD	15.6%	0.7%	0.0%	7.4%
LOS ANGELES	IRWINDALE	75.0%	150.0%	200.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.8%
LOS ANGELES	LA VERNE	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.6%
LOS ANGELES	LAKEWOOD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	71.7%
LOS ANGELES	LAWNDALE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
LOS ANGELES	LOMITA	0.0%	85.7%	425.0%	85.0%
LOS ANGELES	LONG BEACH	16.6%	2.4%	0.0%	43.7%
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES	15.5%	18.2%	1.9%	152.9%
LOS ANGELES	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	7.4%	2.3%	0.0%	28.2%
LOS ANGELES	MALIBU	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
LOS ANGELES	MONROVIA	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	211.6%
LOS ANGELES	MONTEREY PARK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
LOS ANGELES	NORWALK	1.9%	0.0%	45.5%	70.6%
LOS ANGELES	PALMDALE	6.5%	8.5%	9.6%	5.9%
LOS ANGELES	PARAMOUNT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.9%
LOS ANGELES	PASADENA	42.4%	18.4%	20.1%	279.0%
LOS ANGELES	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	62.5%	20.0%	0.0%	630.8%
LOS ANGELES	REDONDO BEACH	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.0%
LOS ANGELES	ROSEMEAD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	SAN DIMAS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.1%
LOS ANGELES	SAN FERNANDO	50.9%	43.8%	0.0%	37.9%
LOS ANGELES	SAN GABRIEL	0.4%	0.0%	39.0%	20.4%
LOS ANGELES	SAN MARINO	14.3%	0.0%	80.0%	*
LOS ANGELES	SANTA FE SPRINGS	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	159.0%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
LOS ANGELES	SIERRA MADRE	14.3%	77.8%	33.3%	356.5%
LOS ANGELES	SIGNAL HILL	100.0%	181.5%	67.9%	40.0%
LOS ANGELES	SOUTH PASADENA	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	300.0%
LOS ANGELES	TORRANCE	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	15.2%
LOS ANGELES	WALNUT	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	116.8%
LOS ANGELES	WEST COVINA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	190.2%
LOS ANGELES	WESTLAKE VILLAGE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOS ANGELES	WHITTIER	0.0%	0.0%	146.6%	11.1%
ORANGE	ALISO VIEJO	39.5%	418.8%	11985.7%	0.0%
ORANGE	ANAHEIM	5.7%	2.4%	4.2%	211.5%
ORANGE	BREA	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	109.8%
ORANGE	BUENA PARK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%
ORANGE	COSTA MESA	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
ORANGE	CYPRESS	12.7%	16.0%	10.7%	244.3%
ORANGE	DANA POINT	0.0%	0.0%	27.9%	103.6%
ORANGE	FOUNTAIN VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%	19.9%
ORANGE	FULLERTON	42.8%	28.4%	3.3%	98.4%
ORANGE	GARDEN GROVE	7.9%	39.2%	58.5%	31.1%
ORANGE	IRVINE	32.2%	0.1%	579.4%	171.6%
ORANGE	LA HABRA	0.0%	3.9%	1100.0%	2200.0%
ORANGE	LA PALMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ORANGE	LAGUNA BEACH	0.0%	100.0%	*	*
ORANGE	LAGUNA HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
ORANGE	LAGUNA WOODS	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
ORANGE	LAKE FOREST	0.0%	0.0%	40.4%	210.7%
ORANGE	LOS ALAMITOS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%
ORANGE	MISSION VIEJO	31.0%	96.6%	48.5%	1102.7%
ORANGE	NEWPORT BEACH	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60700.0%
ORANGE	ORANGE	0.0%	1.7%	12.1%	4.5%
ORANGE	ORANGE COUNTY	6.5%	17.2%	18.4%	151.0%
ORANGE	PLACENTIA	0.0%	0.0%	34.4%	53.6%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
ORANGE	RANCHO ST. MARGARITA	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
ORANGE	SAN CLEMENTE	48.5%	29.5%	6.5%	170.5%
ORANGE	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	0.0%	1.9%	1.7%	131.5%
ORANGE	SANTA ANA	44.2%	42.6%	64.9%	854.4%
ORANGE	STANTON	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	67.1%
ORANGE	TUSTIN	31.8%	37.4%	45.1%	172.6%
ORANGE	VILLA PARK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
ORANGE	WESTMINSTER	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
ORANGE	YORBA LINDA	33.8%	12.4%	0.0%	46.7%
PLACER	AUBURN	0.0%	0.0%	57.9%	50.4%
PLACER	COLFAX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
PLACER	LINCOLN	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	82.4%
PLACER	LOOMIS	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	18.6%
PLACER	PLACER COUNTY	2.6%	8.9%	7.2%	82.7%
PLACER	ROCKLIN	0.0%	0.0%	111.0%	124.9%
PLACER	ROSEVILLE	4.1%	1.8%	137.9%	81.8%
RIVERSIDE	BANNING	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RIVERSIDE	BEAUMONT	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	19.6%
RIVERSIDE	CALIMESA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%
RIVERSIDE	CATHEDRAL	0.0%	0.0%	110.9%	1.2%
RIVERSIDE	COACHELLA	10.2%	9.1%	0.0%	*
RIVERSIDE	CORONA	27.6%	14.1%	46.5%	453.2%
RIVERSIDE	DESERT HOT SPRINGS	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RIVERSIDE	EASTVALE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	262.5%
RIVERSIDE	HEMET	0.0%	47.9%	193.8%	26.3%
RIVERSIDE	INDIAN WELLS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	191.9%
RIVERSIDE	INDIO	11.8%	0.0%	0.2%	91.3%
RIVERSIDE	LAKE ELSINORE	0.2%	0.0%	81.2%	52.8%
RIVERSIDE	MENIFEE	0.7%	1.2%	61.7%	48.2%
RIVERSIDE	MORENO VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	20.9%
RIVERSIDE	MURRIETA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
RIVERSIDE	NORCO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
RIVERSIDE	PALM DESERT	3.4%	4.7%	0.0%	21.1%
RIVERSIDE	PALM SPRINGS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.0%
RIVERSIDE	PERRIS	35.0%	0.0%	29.2%	50.9%
RIVERSIDE	RANCHO MIRAGE	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	92.3%
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.0%
RIVERSIDE	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	2.3%	1.7%	18.7%	15.7%
RIVERSIDE	SAN JACINTO	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	30.7%
RIVERSIDE	TEMECULA	4.0%	0.0%	5.5%	115.8%
RIVERSIDE	WILDOMAR	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	54.9%
SACRAMENTO	CITRUS HEIGHTS	0.7%	3.9%	18.5%	19.2%
SACRAMENTO	ELK GROVE	4.1%	5.3%	19.7%	86.0%
SACRAMENTO	FOLSOM	0.5%	0.0%	67.5%	54.4%
SACRAMENTO	GALT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.7%
SACRAMENTO	RANCHO CORDOVA	6.5%	0.0%	8.4%	52.6%
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO	6.3%	16.1%	67.1%	18.3%
SACRAMENTO	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	14.6%	11.7%
SAN BERNARDINO	APPLE VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	BARSTOW	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%
SAN BERNARDINO	CHINO	18.3%	0.0%	0.0%	157.7%
SAN BERNARDINO	CHINO HILLS	0.0%	0.0%	806.1%	176.6%
SAN BERNARDINO	COLTON	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	7.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	FONTANA	4.4%	15.1%	0.0%	60.9%
SAN BERNARDINO	GRAND TERRACE	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	42.9%
SAN BERNARDINO	HESPERIA	0.0%	7.3%	50.0%	68.6%
SAN BERNARDINO	HIGHLAND	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	10.9%
SAN BERNARDINO	ONTARIO	0.0%	0.0%	68.9%	44.1%
SAN BERNARDINO	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	8.6%	7.8%	19.6%	376.5%
SAN BERNARDINO	REDLANDS	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	26.3%
SAN BERNARDINO	RIALTO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%
SAN BERNARDINO	SAN BERNARDINO	5.8%	2.6%	1.5%	4.7%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
SAN BERNARDINO	UPLAND	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%
SAN BERNARDINO	YUCAIPA	5.4%	20.8%	6.3%	29.8%
SAN BERNARDINO	YUCCA VALLEY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.3%
SUTTER	LIVE OAK	88.5%	79.2%	3.6%	2.6%
SUTTER	YUBA CITY	1.0%	2.5%	27.1%	8.9%
VENTURA	CAMARILLO	25.8%	33.3%	100.7%	91.2%
VENTURA	MOORPARK	1.7%	9.1%	8.3%	134.8%
VENTURA	OJAI	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%	6.5%
VENTURA	OXNARD	15.2%	43.8%	27.8%	8.4%
VENTURA	PORT HUENEME	0.0%	0.0%	*	*
VENTURA	SAN BUENAVENTURA	13.1%	7.8%	9.2%	66.3%
VENTURA	SIMI VALLEY	0.0%	0.5%	6.6%	48.5%
VENTURA	THOUSAND OAKS	20.2%	3.4%	247.2%	285.7%
VENTURA	VENTURA COUNTY	10.6%	23.2%	24.9%	28.4%
YOLO	DAVIS	17.3%	28.7%	26.3%	114.1%
YOLO	WEST SACRAMENTO	9.7%	2.0%	65.6%	5.6%
YOLO	WINTERS	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%	53.1%
YOLO	WOODLAND	11.8%	6.6%	39.3%	58.6%
YOLO	YOLO COUNTY	11.5%	4.0%	4.6%	2.6%
YUBA	YUBA COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	4.2%
San Bernardino County	ADELANTO	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	AZUSA	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
San Bernardino County	BIG BEAR LAKE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Butte County	BIGGS	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	BLYTHE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	BRADBURY	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Orange County	BUENA PARK	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Imperial County	CALEXICO	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Riverside County	CANYON LAKE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Placer County	COLFAX	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Los Angeles County	COMMERCE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Los Angeles County	COMPTON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	COVINA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	CUDAHY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	CULVER CITY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	DOWNEY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	EL SEGUNDO				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Ventura County	FILLMORE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Butte County	GRIDLEY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	HAWAIIAN GARDENS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	HERMOSA BEACH				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	HIDDEN HILLS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Orange County	HUNTINGTON BEACH				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	HUNTINGTON PARK				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Riverside County	INDIAN WELLS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	INDUSTRY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Sacramento County	ISLETON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Riverside County	JURUPA VALLEY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Orange County	LA HABRA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	LA HABRA HEIGHTS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	LA MIRADA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Orange County	LA PALMA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	LA PUENTE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Riverside County	LA QUINTA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	LANCASTER				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Bernardino County	LOMA LINDA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	LYNWOOD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	MANHATTAN BEACH				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Yuba County	MARYSVILLE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	MAYWOOD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Bernardino County	MONTCLAIR				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Los Angeles County	MONTEBELLO				No 2017 Annual Progress Report

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Butte, El Dorado, Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2014-2017 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2014-2021 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
San Bernardino County	NEEDLES				
Orange County	ORANGE				
Los Angeles County	PALOS VERDES ESTATES				
Los Angeles County	PICO RIVERA				
Los Angeles County	POMONA				
San Bernardino County	RIALTO				
Los Angeles County	ROLLING HILLS				
Los Angeles County	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES				
Sacramento County	SACRAMENTO				
Los Angeles County	SAN FERNANDO				
Los Angeles County	SAN GABRIEL				
Los Angeles County	SANTA CLARITA				
Ventura County	SANTA PAULA				
Orange County	SEAL BEACH				
Ventura County	SIMI VALLEY				
Los Angeles County	SOUTH EL MONTE				
Los Angeles County	SOUTH GATE				
Sutter County	SUTTER COUNTY				
Los Angeles County	TEMPLE CITY				
San Bernardino County	TWENTYNINE PALMS				
Los Angeles County	VERNON				
San Bernardino County	VICTORVILLE				
Orange County	WESTMINSTER				
Yuba County	WHEATLAND				
Yolo County	WOODLAND				
Orange County	YORBA LINDA				
Yuba County	YUBA COUNTY				

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)-includes San Diego County and all cities within the County

5th Cycle Planning Period: 04/30/2013 – 04/30/2021¹⁵

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2010 – 12/31/2020

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2013 2014 2015 2016
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2017 2018 2019 2020

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For SANDAG jurisdictions, this includes permits from 2010, 2011, and 2012, which can be counted on 2013 APRs. For assistance in counting these units contact APR@hcd.ca.gov.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

By January 2018, after 2016 APRs are due:	Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2020 APRs are due:	Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹⁵ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of San Diego; and all cities within the County

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2013-2016 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. **Less than 50% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 8 years (2013-2020 APRs) of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.**

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.**

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER % COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
SAN DIEGO	CARLSBAD	4.6%	30.0%	19.9%	86.2%
SAN DIEGO	CHULA VISTA	3.6%	23.2%	14.0%	96.7%
SAN DIEGO	CORONADO	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1400.0%
SAN DIEGO	DEL MAR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.5%
SAN DIEGO	EL CAJON	3.3%	0.8%	3.3%	6.1%
SAN DIEGO	ENCINITAS	5.6%	5.2%	1.0%	74.4%
SAN DIEGO	ESCONDIDO	4.4%	7.0%	1.1%	44.9%
SAN DIEGO	IMPERIAL BEACH	4.8%	54.2%	11.1%	69.4%
SAN DIEGO	LA MESA	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	77.1%
SAN DIEGO	NATIONAL CITY	9.7%	32.9%	14.4%	33.1%
SAN DIEGO	OCEANSIDE	17.2%	4.8%	13.7%	22.0%
SAN DIEGO	POWAY	12.9%	17.1%	0.0%	16.7%
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO	5.5%	10.8%	0.0%	61.6%
SAN DIEGO	SAN DIEGO COUNTY	1.2%	13.9%	12.3%	21.7%
SAN DIEGO	SAN MARCOS	17.9%	13.1%	8.7%	161.0%
SAN DIEGO	SANTEE	1.1%	6.2%	12.5%	42.4%
SAN DIEGO	SOLANA BEACH	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	18.3%
SAN DIEGO	VISTA	28.0%	20.8%	0.4%	262.8%

Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, and Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

5th Cycle Planning Period: 06/30/2014 – 06/30/2019¹⁶

5th Cycle Projection Period: 01/01/2014 – 06/30/2019

APRs that count towards First Half Reporting Period	2014 2015 2016
APRs that count towards Last Half Reporting Period	2017 2018

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the projection period before the planning period began on the first APR of the planning period. For the jurisdictions noted above, this includes permits from 2014, which will already be included on their 2014 APR.

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

By January 2018, after 2016 APRs are due:	Less than 3/5ths (60%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”
After 2018 APRs are due:	Less than 5/5ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5 th Cycle regional housing needs assessment for an income category, qualifies as “fewer units of [an income category of] housing approved than were required for the regional housing needs assessment cycle for that reporting period.”

¹⁶ When the planning period ends before July 1, the APR for that year will be attributed to the following cycle.

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
ALPINE	ALPINE COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	63.6%
AMADOR	JACKSON	0.0%	0.0%	400.0%	0.0%
AMADOR	SUTTER CREEK	0.0%	0.0%	150.0%	250.0%
CALAVERAS	CALAVERAS COUNTY	30.7%	36.6%	86.5%	28.7%
COLUSA	COLUSA COUNTY	2.8%	4.4%	75.8%	19.0%
DEL NORTE	DEL NORTE COUNTY	16.7%	13.5%	36.7%	35.8%
GLENN	ORLAND	0.0%	390.0%	107.1%	0.0%
GLENN	WILLOWS	326.7%	381.8%	9.1%	0.0%
HUMBOLDT	EUREKA	0.0%	57.3%	7.7%	9.5%
HUMBOLDT	HUMBOLDT COUNTY	11.4%	20.6%	74.7%	16.7%
HUMBOLDT	ARCATA	50.6%	8.9%	87.1%	10.0%
INYO	INYO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%
INYO	BISHOP	0.0%	10.0%	66.7%	0.0%
LAKE	LAKEPORT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MARIPOSA	MARIPOSA COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	54.4%	12.4%
MENDOCINO	FORT BRAGG	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	33.3%
MENDOCINO	MENDOCINO COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	207.4%	70.3%
MENDOCINO	POINT ARENA	0.0%	0.0%	200.0%	0.0%
MONO	MAMMOTH LAKES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	183.9%
MONO	MONO COUNTY	0.0%	100.0%	344.4%	142.1%
NEVADA	GRASS VALLEY	10.7%	84.1%	1.0%	2.3%
NEVADA	NEVADA COUNTY	23.6%	43.7%	55.3%	63.4%
NEVADA	TRUCKEE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.6%
PLUMAS	PLUMAS COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	136.0%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	ATASCADERO	49.0%	41.9%	236.2%	95.1%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	GROVER BEACH	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	91.3%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO	11.2%	19.6%	7.4%	51.3%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO.	8.3%	27.5%	40.9%	151.5%
SAN LUIS OBISPO	ARROYO GRANDE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.

Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
SHASTA	ANDERSON	0.0%	19.0%	216.7%	16.9%
SHASTA	REDDING	2.0%	4.0%	6.6%	13.9%
SHASTA	SHASTA LAKE	28.1%	61.9%	34.8%	0.0%
SHASTA	SHASTA COUNTY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SISKIYOU	DORRIS	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
SISKIYOU	MOUNT SHASTA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
SISKIYOU	YREKA	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
SISKIYOU	ETNA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SISKIYOU	MONTAGUE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TEHAMA	RED BLUFF	0.0%	50.0%	9.8%	0.0%
TEHAMA	TEHAMA COUNTY	14.3%	39.5%	15.7%	24.9%
TEHAMA	TEHAMA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TUOLUMNE	SONORA	0.0%	62.5%	31.6%	9.5%
TUOLUMNE	TUOLUMNE COUNTY	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	17.1%
Modoc County	ALTURAS	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	AMADOR	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Amador County	AMADOR COUNTY	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Calaveras County	ANGELS CAMP	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
San Luis Obispo County	ATASCADERO	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	BLUE LAKE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Lake County	CLEARLAKE	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Colusa County	COLUSA	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Tehama County	CORNING	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Del Norte County	CRESCENT CITY	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	DUNSMUIR	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	FERNDAL	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Mendocino County	FORT BRAGG	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Siskiyou County	FORT JONES	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			
Humboldt County	FORTUNA	No 2017 Annual Progress Report			

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

*These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2014-2016 APRs) of an 5-year planning period. **Less than 60% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) for an income category is considered insufficient progress. The next SB 35 Determination for these jurisdictions will be conducted at the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward 5th Cycle RHNA.***

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above. Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Lower RHNA (Very Low and Low) are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 50% affordability or above. **As the definition of low-income is inclusive of very-low income, units permitted in excess of the very-low income need can be applied to demonstrate progress towards the Lower-income need.***

(Note: Jurisdictions are automatically subject to SB 35 streamlining provisions when latest Annual Progress Report (2017) Not Submitted)

COUNTY	JURISDICTION	VLI % COMPLETE	LOWER% COMPLETE	MOD % COMPLETE	ABOVE MOD % COMPLETE
Glenn County	GLENN COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Amador County	IONE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Lake County	LAKE COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Lassen County	LASSEN COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Sierra County	LOYALTON				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Mendocino County	MENDOCINO COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Modoc County	MODOC COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Luis Obispo County	MORRO BAY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Siskiyou County	MOUNT SHASTA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Nevada County	NEVADA CITY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
San Luis Obispo County	PISMO BEACH				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Amador County	PLYMOUTH				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Plumas County	PORTOLA				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Humboldt County	RIO DELL				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Sierra County	SIERRA COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Siskiyou County	SISKIYOU COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Lassen County	SUSANVILLE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Humboldt County	TRINIDAD				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Trinity County	TRINITY COUNTY				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Siskiyou County	TULELAKE				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Siskiyou County	WEED				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Colusa County	WILLIAMS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report
Mendocino County	WILLITS				No 2017 Annual Progress Report