

SB 35 Determination Methodology and Background Data Updated December 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 | 24.0% | 27.8% | 22.0% | 26.9% |
| FRESNO | FIREBAUGH | 11.7% | 8.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FRESNO | FRESNO | 3.9% | 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 | KERMAN | 0.0% | 2.4% | 16.8% | 3.5% |
| FRESNO | PARLIER | 99.1% | 106.1% | 3.9% | * |
| FRESNO | REEDLEY | 14.0% | 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 | 1.9% | 1.3% | 68.0% | 21.8% |
| KERN | DELANO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 22.6% | 4.0% |
| KERN | KERN COUNTY | 2.1% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| KERN | MCFARLAND | 3.2% | 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 | 0.0% | 1.9% | 5.2% | 0.0% |
| KINGS | KINGS COUNTY | 0.0% | 5.8% | 0.7% | 2.3% |
| MADERA | MADERA | 1.7% | 29.3% | 16.6% | 0.2% |
| MADERA | MADERA COUNTY | 0.0% | 3.2% | 0.0% | 6.2% |
| MERCED | ATWATER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 49.2% |
| MERCED | LIVINGSTON | 0.0% | 2.8% | 0.0% | 23.7% |
| MERCED | LOS BANOS | 6.8% | 4.9% | 2.3% | 20.7% |
| MERCED | MERCED | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.4% | 4.4% |
| MERCED | MERCED COUNTY | 0.0% | 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 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.5% |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY COUNTY | 9.9% | 2.5% | 3.2% | 108.3% |
| MONTEREY | PACIFIC GROVE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.4% |
| MONTEREY | SALINAS | 14.3% | 4.8% | 1.0% | 15.4% |
| SAN BENITO | HOLLISTER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.9% | 29.9% |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 100.0% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | LATHROP | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 19.3% |

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 JOAQUIN | LODI | 10.5% | 8.2% | 0.0% | 27.4% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY | 0.4% | 15.1% | 16.2% | 14.1% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | STOCKTON | 5.2% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 3.8% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | TRACY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 52.9% |
| SANTA CRUZ | CAPITOLA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.8% | 38.3% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | 3.3% | 29.7% | 141.2% | 78.9% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ COUNTY | 13.2% | 11.1% | 48.5% | 18.0% |
| SANTA CRUZ | WATSONVILLE | 12.4% | 4.5% | 8.6% | 44.4% |
| STANISLAUS | CERES | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% |
| STANISLAUS | HUGHSON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 67.7% |
| STANISLAUS | MODESTO | 0.0% | 2.8% | 2.8% | 8.0% |
| STANISLAUS | OAKDALE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 38.1% | 26.0% |
| STANISLAUS | RIVERBANK | 10.3% | 18.4% | 0.0% | 12.1% |
| STANISLAUS | STANISLAUS COUNTY | 0.0% | 2.9% | 11.3% | 32.8% |
| STANISLAUS | TURLOCK | 0.2% | 21.9% | 94.3% | 3.0% |
| TULARE | DINUBA | 20.4% | 56.4% | 89.3% | 2.3% |
| TULARE | EXETER | 0.0% | 1.6% | 2.4% | 2.2% |
| TULARE | FARMERSVILLE | 8.1% | 10.8% | 7.4% | 1.9% |
| TULARE | LINDSAY | 50.0% | 108.8% | 32.9% | 2.9% |
| TULARE | PORTERVILLE | 0.0% | 0.8% | 15.5% | 0.5% |
| TULARE | TULARE | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 24.4% |
| TULARE | TULARE COUNTY | 10.5% | 16.3% | 8.4% | 2.8% |
| TULARE | VISALIA | 3.4% | 15.3% | 24.4% | 27.7% |
| FRESNO | FOWLER | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | HURON | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | KINGSBURG | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | MENDOTA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | ORANGE COVE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | PARLIER | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | SAN JOAQUIN | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | SANGER | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| FRESNO | SELMA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| KERN | CALIFORNIA CITY | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| KERN | MARICOPA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| KERN | MCFARLAND | 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 |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| KERN | RIDGECREST | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| KERN | SHAFTER | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| KERN | TEHACHAPI | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| KINGS | CORCORAN | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| KINGS | HANFORD | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| KINGS | LEMOORE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MADERA | CHOWCHILLA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MERCED | DOS PALOS | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MERCED | GUSTINE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | CARMEL | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | DEL REY OAKS | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | GONZALES | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | GREENFIELD | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | SAND CITY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | SEASIDE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MONTEREY | SOLEDAD | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BENITO | SAN JUAN BAUTISTA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN JOAQUIN | ESCALON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN JOAQUIN | MANTECA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN JOAQUIN | RIPON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SANTA CRUZ | SCOTTS VALLEY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| STANISLAUS | NEWMAN | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| STANISLAUS | PATTERSON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| STANISLAUS | WATERFORD | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| TULARE | 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% | 5.2% | 76.3% |
| 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% | 22.6% |
| 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 | 18.0% | 25.9% | 0.0% | 17.7% |
| CONTRA COSTA | SAN PABLO | 0.0% | 5.7% | 12.0% | 10.9% |
| CONTRA COSTA | SAN RAMON | 3.9% | 29.4% | 59.9% | 414.1% |
| CONTRA COSTA | WALNUT CREEK | 7.0% | 4.5% | 4.7% | 57.1% |
| MARIN | BELVEDERE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 75.0% | 20.0% |

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 | 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 | 39.4% | 111.8% | 47.4% | 29.7% |
| 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 | 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% | 1.9% | 52.4% |
| 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 | 25.0% | 59.3% | 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% |
| 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% | 28.2% |

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 | 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% | 17.7% | 69.6% |
| SANTA CLARA | GILROY | 11.0% | 280.6% | 6.5% | 204.2% |
| SANTA CLARA | LOS ALTOS | 1.2% | 18.2% | 0.9% | 379.4% |
| SANTA CLARA | LOS ALTOS HILLS | 10.9% | 7.1% | 6.3% | 26.7% |
| 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% | 93.5% | 54.1% | 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 | 0.1% | 0.1% | 5.4% | 139.4% |
| 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% | 31.3% |
| 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% | 17.6% | 78.9% | 30.6% |
| SONOMA | SONOMA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 33.3% |
| SONOMA | WINDSOR | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.5% | 38.3% |
| SANTA BARBARA | GUADALUPE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| SOLANO | RIO VISTA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |

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 | GRIDLEY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.3% |
| 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 | CALEXICO | 8.1% | 2.0% | 13.1% | 0.0% |
| 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% | 23.3% |
| 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% | 600.0% | * | * |
| 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% |

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 | CUDAHY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | CULVER CITY | 12.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 107.8% |
| LOS ANGELES | DIAMOND BAR | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 58.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | DOWNEY | 0.0% | 4.9% | 51.9% | 59.0% |
| 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 MIRADA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 32.3% |
| 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% |

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 | ROLLING HILLS ESTATES | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 200.0% |
| 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% | 118.8% | 8.6% | 40.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN GABRIEL | 0.4% | 1.4% | 60.4% | 55.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN MARINO | 100.0% | 0.0% | * | * |
| LOS ANGELES | SANTA CLARITA | 0.5% | 8.8% | 0.7% | 34.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | SANTA FE SPRINGS | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 159.0% |
| 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 GATE | 7.0% | 103.8% | 27.3% | 3.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | SOUTH PASADENA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 300.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | TEMPLE CITY | 0.0% | 1.1% | 5.1% | 36.5% |
| 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 | 27.6% | 92.5% | 291.9% | 122.3% |
| 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% | 42000.0% |

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 |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| ORANGE | LA PALMA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 333.3% |
| 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 | 8.4% | 5.1% | 122.7% | 258.1% |
| ORANGE | ORANGE COUNTY | 6.5% | 17.2% | 18.4% | 151.0% |
| ORANGE | PLACENTIA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 34.4% | 53.6% |
| 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 | 69.4% | 46.9% | 12.7% | 212.6% |
| 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% |

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 | CATHEDRAL | 0.0% | 0.0% | 110.9% | 1.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | COACHELLA | 5.0% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 3.0% |
| 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% | 230.6% |
| RIVERSIDE | INDIO | 11.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 91.3% |
| RIVERSIDE | LA QUINTA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 69.9% |
| 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% |
| 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 | 4.0% | 10.3% | 77.7% | 19.7% |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO COUNTY | 2.4% | 5.3% | 34.6% | 25.8% |

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 | APPLE VALLEY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | BARSTOW | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.3% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | BIG BEAR LAKE | 0.0% | 0.0% | * | * |
| SAN BERNARDINO | CHINO | 19.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 111.7% |
| 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 | NEEDLES | 0.0% | 0.0% | 29.4% | 16.3% |
| 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% | 5.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO | 5.8% | 2.6% | 1.5% | 4.7% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | TWENTYNINE PALMS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 27.4% | 0.0% |
| 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 | 44.2% | 51.4% | 3.6% | 2.6% |
| SUTTER | SUTTER COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 27.4% | 52.3% |
| 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 | SANTA PAULA | 0.0% | 5.0% | 2.5% | 0.2% |

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 |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| VENTURA | SIMI VALLEY | 9.7% | 0.5% | 11.8% | 51.9% |
| 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 | 32.1% | 6.6% | 48.4% | 70.0% |
| YOLO | YOLO COUNTY | 11.5% | 4.0% | 4.6% | 2.6% |
| YUBA | WHEATLAND | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| YUBA | YUBA COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 4.2% |
| BUTTE | BIGGS | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | AZUSA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | BRADBURY | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | COMMERCE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | COMPTON | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | COVINA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | CUDAHY | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | EL SEGUNDO | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | HAWAIIAN GARDENS | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | HERMOSA BEACH | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | HIDDEN HILLS | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | HUNTINGTON PARK | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | INDUSTRY | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | LA HABRA HEIGHTS | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | LA PUENTE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | LANCASTER | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | LYNWOOD | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | MANHATTAN BEACH | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | MAYWOOD | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | 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 |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | PALOS VERDES ESTATES | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LOS ANGELES | PICO RIVERA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LOS ANGELES | POMONA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LOS ANGELES | ROLLING HILLS | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LOS ANGELES | SOUTH EL MONTE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LOS ANGELES | VERNON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| ORANGE | HUNTINGTON BEACH | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| ORANGE | SEAL BEACH | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| RIVERSIDE | BLYTHE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| RIVERSIDE | CANYON LAKE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| RIVERSIDE | JURUPA VALLEY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SACRAMENTO | ISLETON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BERNARDINO | ADELANTO | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BERNARDINO | LOMA LINDA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BERNARDINO | MONTCLAIR | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN BERNARDINO | VICTORVILLE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| VENTURA | FILLMORE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| YUBA | MARYSVILLE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| YUBA | YUBA COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |

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 | AMADOR COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| AMADOR | JACKSON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 400.0% | 0.0% |
| AMADOR | PLYMOUTH | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 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 | GLENN COUNTY | 24.0% | 36.8% | 16.0% | 35.4% |
| GLENN | ORLAND | 0.0% | 390.0% | 107.1% | 0.0% |
| GLENN | WILLOWS | 326.7% | 381.8% | 9.1% | 0.0% |
| HUMBOLDT | ARCATA | 50.6% | 8.9% | 87.1% | 10.0% |
| HUMBOLDT | EUREKA | 0.0% | 57.3% | 7.7% | 9.5% |
| HUMBOLDT | FORTUNA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HUMBOLDT | HUMBOLDT COUNTY | 11.4% | 20.6% | 74.7% | 16.7% |
| INYO | BISHOP | 0.0% | 10.0% | 66.7% | 0.0% |
| INYO | INYO COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 19.4% |
| LAKE | CLEARLAKE | 0.9% | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.5% |
| 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% |

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | ARROYO GRANDE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 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 | 19.3% | 10.1% | 6.4% | 88.9% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO CO. | 8.3% | 27.5% | 40.9% | 151.5% |
| SHASTA | ANDERSON | 0.0% | 19.0% | 216.7% | 16.9% |
| SHASTA | REDDING | 2.0% | 4.0% | 6.6% | 13.9% |
| SHASTA | SHASTA COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SHASTA | SHASTA LAKE | 28.1% | 61.9% | 34.8% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | DORRIS | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | ETNA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | MONTAGUE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | MOUNT SHASTA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.3% |
| SISKIYOU | YREKA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.1% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | RED BLUFF | 0.0% | 50.0% | 9.8% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA COUNTY | 14.3% | 39.5% | 15.7% | 24.9% |
| TUOLUMNE | SONORA | 0.0% | 62.5% | 31.6% | 9.5% |
| TUOLUMNE | TUOLUMNE COUNTY | 0.0% | 5.4% | 0.0% | 17.1% |
| AMADOR | AMADOR | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| AMADOR | IONE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| CALAVERAS | ANGELS CAMP | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| COLUSA | COLUSA | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| COLUSA | WILLIAMS | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| DEL NORTE | CRESCENT CITY | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | BLUE LAKE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | FERNDALE | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | RIO DELL | No 2017 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| HUMBOLDT | TRINIDAD | 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 |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| LAKE | LAKE COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LASSEN | LASSEN COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| LASSEN | SUSANVILLE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MENDOCINO | FORT BRAGG | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MENDOCINO | MENDOCINO COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MENDOCINO | WILLITS | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MODOC | ALTURAS | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| MODOC | MODOC COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| NEVADA | NEVADA CITY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| PLUMAS | PORTOLA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | ATASCADERO | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | MORRO BAY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | PISMO BEACH | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SIERRA | LOYALTON | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SIERRA | SIERRA COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | DUNSMUIR | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | FORT JONES | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | MOUNT SHASTA | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | SISKIYOU COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | TULELAKE | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| SISKIYOU | WEED | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| TEHAMA | CORNING | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |
| TRINITY | TRINITY COUNTY | | | | No 2017 Annual Progress Report |