

SB 35 Determination Methodology and Background Data June 2023

SB 35 Reporting Period

SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) defines the Reporting Period as the first half of the regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) cycle or the second half of the RHNA cycle.

Once a jurisdiction completes the first-half of the fifth RHNA cycle, a jurisdiction's determination will be updated next at the end of the fifth RHNA cycle. Thereafter, each jurisdiction's determination will be updated once a jurisdiction has completed the first-half of the 6th cycle planning period and again once the jurisdiction has reached the end point of the 6th planning cycle.

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 may count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period² before the planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 1, 2023, the 2022 APRs and prior APRs were due. While HCD will continue to update APR data as APRs are received, permits from APRs received after June 1, 2023, will not count toward this determination of a jurisdiction's eligibility for the Streamlined Ministerial Approval Process pursuant to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017). The determination includes APRs received as of 6/1/2023.

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

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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”. |

³When 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2016 2017 2018 2019 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2020 2021 2022 2023 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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.” |

⁴When 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2016 2017 2018 2019 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2020 2021 2022 2023 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2016 2017 2018 2019 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2020 2021 2022 2023 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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.” |

⁶When 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; 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2016 2017 2018 2019 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2020 2021 2022 2023 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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.” |

⁷When 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2016 2017 2018 2019 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2020 2021 2022 2023 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2019 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| FRESNO | CLOVIS | 0.0% | 7.6% | 220.9% | 203.2% |
| FRESNO | COALINGA | 24.0% | 27.8% | 33.3% | 75.6% |
| FRESNO | FIREBAUGH | 11.7% | 10.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FRESNO | FOWLER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 36.0% | 63.4% |
| FRESNO | FRESNO | 8.6% | 8.7% | 42.1% | 64.3% |
| FRESNO | FRESNO COUNTY | 10.4% | 9.3% | 43.6% | 28.5% |
| FRESNO | KERMAN | 0.4% | 6.2% | 63.9% | 30.6% |
| FRESNO | KINGSBURG | 10.6% | 55.7% | 36.7% | 47.3% |
| FRESNO | MENDOTA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 233.8% | 1.5% |
| FRESNO | ORANGE COVE | 0.0% | 3.5% | 1.0% | 0.0% |
| FRESNO | PARLIER | 114.5% | 151.2% | 9.1% | 0.0% |
| FRESNO | REEDLEY | 14.0% | 0.5% | 29.8% | 1.3% |
| FRESNO | SAN JOAQUIN | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FRESNO | SANGER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 43.6% | 5.8% |
| FRESNO | SELMA | 39.3% | 33.9% | 69.6% | 1.8% |
| KERN | ARVIN | 0.0% | 23.4% | 208.2% | 0.0% |

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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| KERN | BAKERSFIELD | 1.9% | 1.6% | 68.1% | 41.6% |
| KERN | CALIFORNIA CITY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| KERN | DELANO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 48.6% | 16.5% |
| KERN | KERN COUNTY | 2.1% | 4.3% | 3.7% | 1.3% |
| KERN | MARICOPA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| KERN | MCFARLAND | 6.5% | 8.2% | 48.5% | 8.9% |
| KERN | SHAFTER | 0.0% | 6.8% | 16.1% | 93.1% |
| KERN | TAFT | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 30.8% |
| KERN | TEHACHAPI | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| KERN | WASCO | 0.0% | 31.3% | 4.3% | 67.0% |
| KINGS | AVENAL | 0.0% | 36.1% | 32.2% | 0.0% |
| KINGS | HANFORD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.2% | 42.4% |
| KINGS | KINGS COUNTY | 0.0% | 22.5% | 2.7% | 6.9% |
| KINGS | LEMOORE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.4% | 9.4% |

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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| MADERA | CHOWCHILLA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.8% | 1.1% |
| MADERA | MADERA COUNTY | 0.0% | 4.2% | 0.0% | 38.5% |
| MERCED | ATWATER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 52.5% |
| MERCED | DOS PALOS | 0.0% | 11.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| MERCED | LIVINGSTON | 0.0% | 5.1% | 4.3% | 46.7% |
| MERCED | LOS BANOS | 6.8% | 5.1% | 3.3% | 63.6% |
| MERCED | MERCED | 0.0% | 0.0% | 18.4% | 56.9% |
| MERCED | MERCED COUNTY | 0.0% | 4.6% | 12.9% | 26.9% |
| MONTEREY | CARMEL | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 53.8% |
| MONTEREY | DEL REY OAKS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| MONTEREY | GREENFIELD | 60.9% | 108.8% | 36.4% | 12.4% |
| MONTEREY | KING CITY | 0.0% | 21.4% | 18.2% | 231.6% |
| MONTEREY | MARINA | 13.3% | 2.9% | 61.5% | 64.6% |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY | 12.1% | 0.0% | 1.7% | 27.2% |
| MONTEREY | MONTEREY COUNTY | 58.6% | 18.4% | 12.4% | 185.9% |
| MONTEREY | PACIFIC GROVE | 0.0% | 16.7% | 28.6% | 81.3% |
| MONTEREY | SALINAS | 21.6% | 21.9% | 1.0% | 26.6% |
| MONTEREY | SAND CITY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.4% |
| MONTEREY | SEASIDE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.2% | 4.9% |
| MONTEREY | SOLEDAD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 370.0% |
| SAN BENITO | HOLLISTER | 0.0% | 0.0% | 40.3% | 112.9% |
| SAN BENITO | SAN BENITO COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.8% | 158.9% |
| SAN BENITO | SAN JUAN BAUTISTA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | ESCALON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 8.9% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | LATHROP | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 65.3% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | LODI | 10.5% | 8.2% | 14.4% | 113.1% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | MANTECA | 0.4% | 0.7% | 22.5% | 50.6% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | RIPON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 28.8% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY | 2.6% | 23.5% | 41.6% | 36.8% |

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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN JOAQUIN | STOCKTON | 8.9% | 0.4% | 27.8% | 9.2% |
| SAN JOAQUIN | TRACY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 129.8% |
| SANTA CRUZ | CAPITOLA | 5.9% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 65.0% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | 31.7% | 132.2% | 153.7% | 116.0% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ COUNTY | 13.6% | 21.3% | 63.2% | 48.1% |
| SANTA CRUZ | SCOTTS VALLEY | 0.0% | 13.6% | 26.9% | 219.0% |
| SANTA CRUZ | WATSONVILLE | 12.4% | 5.5% | 9.4% | 54.3% |
| STANISLAUS | CERES | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 5.3% |
| STANISLAUS | HUGHSON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 97.8% |
| STANISLAUS | MODESTO | 0.0% | 6.2% | 25.1% | 21.4% |
| STANISLAUS | OAKDALE | 4.4% | 21.8% | 40.0% | 55.2% |
| STANISLAUS | RIVERBANK | 10.3% | 18.4% | 0.0% | 22.9% |
| STANISLAUS | STANISLAUS COUNTY | 0.0% | 8.4% | 11.3% | 49.5% |
| STANISLAUS | TURLOCK | 2.1% | 42.5% | 96.5% | 11.3% |
| STANISLAUS | WATERFORD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.4% |
| TULARE | DINUBA | 21.3% | 56.4% | 166.9% | 51.7% |
| TULARE | EXETER | 0.0% | 4.8% | 4.7% | 5.1% |
| TULARE | FARMERSVILLE | 8.1% | 20.0% | 16.2% | 1.9% |
| TULARE | PORTERVILLE | 1.6% | 7.6% | 34.5% | 6.0% |
| TULARE | TULARE | 4.7% | 4.6% | 31.5% | 147.8% |
| TULARE | TULARE COUNTY | 17.5% | 30.6% | 13.2% | 4.5% |
| TULARE | VISALIA | 4.2% | 22.2% | 55.8% | 42.9% |

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 4 years (2019 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 (2016-2024 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| TULARE | WOODLAKE | 7.0% | 161.0% | 34.8% | 0.5% |
| FRESNO | HURON | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| KERN | RIDGECREST | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| KINGS | CORCORAN | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| MADERA | MADERA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| MERCED | GUSTINE | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| MONTEREY | GONZALES | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| STANISLAUS | NEWMAN | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| STANISLAUS | PATTERSON | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| TULARE | LINDSAY | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | - | 2015 2016 2017 2018 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | | 2019 2020 2021 2022 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2018 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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.” |

⁹When 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2015 2016 2017 2018 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2019 2020 2021 2022 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 2018 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines. 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| ALAMEDA | ALAMEDA | 60.1% | 64.9% | 37.1% | 255.9% |
| ALAMEDA | ALAMEDA COUNTY | 33.7% | 102.6% | 20.0% | 39.0% |
| ALAMEDA | ALBANY | 40.0% | 56.6% | 163.2% | 145.5% |
| ALAMEDA | BERKELEY | 74.6% | 42.5% | 18.2% | 281.2% |
| ALAMEDA | DUBLIN | 3.3% | 8.7% | 18.6% | 805.0% |
| ALAMEDA | EMERYVILLE | 41.7% | 23.2% | 23.2% | 139.9% |
| ALAMEDA | FREMONT | 40.7% | 55.8% | 9.2% | 384.1% |
| ALAMEDA | HAYWARD | 24.0% | 42.7% | 38.8% | 179.0% |
| ALAMEDA | LIVERMORE | 23.4% | 12.0% | 133.9% | 162.1% |
| ALAMEDA | NEWARK | 42.1% | 35.3% | 22.8% | 515.8% |
| ALAMEDA | OAKLAND | 71.5% | 42.7% | 4.2% | 209.9% |
| ALAMEDA | PIEDMONT | 87.5% | 242.9% | 160.0% | 628.6% |
| ALAMEDA | PLEASANTON | 37.4% | 19.9% | 17.2% | 300.9% |
| ALAMEDA | SAN LEANDRO | 26.2% | 47.4% | 4.0% | 34.1% |
| ALAMEDA | UNION CITY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 47.4% | 96.9% |
| CONTRA COSTA | ANTIOCH | 59.3% | 155.6% | 43.0% | 232.8% |
| CONTRA COSTA | BRENTWOOD | 1.7% | 11.3% | 56.9% | 1,269.9% |
| CONTRA COSTA | CLAYTON | 0.0% | 40.0% | 12.9% | 70.6% |
| CONTRA COSTA | CONCORD | 9.0% | 2.5% | 1.6% | 37.1% |
| CONTRA COSTA | CONTRA COSTA COUNTY | 26.5% | 99.1% | 111.9% | 390.0% |
| CONTRA COSTA | DANVILLE | 5.1% | 62.2% | 53.2% | 343.7% |
| CONTRA COSTA | EL CERRITO | 118.0% | 38.1% | 37.7% | 408.4% |
| CONTRA COSTA | HERCULES | 0.0% | 13.6% | 217.0% | 211.5% |
| CONTRA COSTA | LAFAYETTE | 6.5% | 7.7% | 165.9% | 537.4% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines. 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| CONTRA COSTA | MARTINEZ | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 84.1% |
| CONTRA COSTA | MORAGA | 0.0% | 6.8% | 20.0% | 206.7% |
| CONTRA COSTA | OAKLEY | 2.5% | 108.0% | 225.7% | 461.6% |
| CONTRA COSTA | ORINDA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 146.3% | 819.0% |
| CONTRA COSTA | PINOLE | 8.8% | 281.3% | 88.4% | 27.0% |
| CONTRA COSTA | PITTSBURG | 8.2% | 135.4% | 142.7% | 104.9% |
| CONTRA COSTA | PLEASANT HILL | 0.0% | 2.9% | 84.5% | 84.2% |
| CONTRA COSTA | RICHMOND | 100.0% | 70.2% | 0.0% | 68.8% |
| CONTRA COSTA | SAN PABLO | 96.4% | 26.4% | 69.3% | 16.6% |
| CONTRA COSTA | SAN RAMON | 11.8% | 68.5% | 125.5% | 664.1% |
| CONTRA COSTA | WALNUT CREEK | 16.4% | 11.5% | 22.6% | 201.9% |
| MARIN | BELVEDERE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 225.0% | 20.0% |
| MARIN | CORTE MADERA | 200.0% | 392.3% | 200.0% | 816.7% |
| MARIN | FAIRFAX | 106.3% | 654.5% | 372.7% | 78.3% |
| MARIN | LARKSPUR | 127.5% | 125.0% | 66.7% | 178.4% |
| MARIN | MARIN COUNTY | 101.8% | 206.3% | 129.7% | 413.1% |
| MARIN | MILL VALLEY | 117.1% | 229.2% | 126.9% | 123.7% |
| MARIN | NOVATO | 64.0% | 104.6% | 73.6% | 204.2% |
| MARIN | ROSS | 100.0% | 100.0% | 125.0% | 25.0% |
| MARIN | SAN ANSELMO | 87.9% | 247.1% | 210.5% | 121.6% |
| MARIN | SAN RAFAEL | 29.2% | 93.9% | 6.1% | 76.0% |
| MARIN | SAUSALITO | 88.5% | 285.7% | 143.8% | 43.5% |
| MARIN | TIBURON | 0.0% | 6.3% | 0.0% | 142.1% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period.

Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines.. 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| NAPA | AMERICAN CANYON | 181.0% | 448.1% | 248.3% | 141.5% |
| NAPA | CALISTOGA | 383.3% | 2050.0% | 1,900.0% | 293.3% |
| NAPA | NAPA | 86.5% | 156.6% | 93.6% | 321.1% |
| NAPA | NAPA COUNTY | 27.5% | 46.7% | 212.5% | 192.5% |
| NAPA | SAINT HELENA | 87.5% | 180.0% | 80.0% | 823.1% |
| NAPA | YOUNTVILLE | 25.0% | 50.0% | 433.3% | 212.5% |
| SAN FRANCISCO | SAN FRANCISCO | 58.9% | 75.2% | 61.4% | 180.3% |
| SAN MATEO | ATHERTON | 245.7% | 292.3% | 79.3% | 5,633.3% |
| SAN MATEO | BELMONT | 19.0% | 173.0% | 116.4% | 243.7% |
| SAN MATEO | BRISBANE | 8.0% | 15.4% | 200.0% | 216.7% |
| SAN MATEO | BURLINGAME | 29.7% | 80.6% | 48.4% | 452.4% |
| SAN MATEO | COLMA | 155.0% | 562.5% | 0.0% | 45.5% |
| SAN MATEO | DALY CITY | 51.5% | 169.1% | 106.3% | 129.6% |
| SAN MATEO | EAST PALO ALTO | 218.8% | 233.3% | 60.2% | 7.1% |
| SAN MATEO | FOSTER CITY | 63.5% | 60.9% | 32.9% | 613.4% |
| SAN MATEO | HALF MOON BAY | 100.0% | 12.9% | 236.1% | 66.1% |
| SAN MATEO | HILLSBOROUGH | 203.1% | 411.8% | 166.7% | 119.0% |
| SAN MATEO | MENLO PARK | 104.7% | 120.2% | 72.0% | 1,238.7% |
| SAN MATEO | MILLBRAE | 21.2% | 69.3% | 32.1% | 122.2% |
| SAN MATEO | PACIFICA | 0.0% | 64.7% | 48.6% | 88.3% |
| SAN MATEO | PORTOLA VALLEY | 71.4% | 26.7% | 80.0% | 253.8% |
| SAN MATEO | REDWOOD CITY | 48.6% | 121.4% | 0.0% | 205.5% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines. 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 (2022) Not Submitted

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN MATEO | SAN BRUNO | 9.5% | 68.3% | 40.0% | 24.6% |
| SAN MATEO | SAN CARLOS | 14.4% | 13.1% | 12.6% | 336.6% |
| SAN MATEO | SAN MATEO | 28.8% | 47.3% | 33.0% | 149.5% |
| SAN MATEO | SAN MATEO COUNTY | 72.5% | 162.1% | 122.5% | 105.8% |
| SAN MATEO | SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO | 26.0% | 25.3% | 48.9% | 162.0% |
| SAN MATEO | WOODSIDE | 191.3% | 315.4% | 133.3% | 581.8% |
| SANTA BARBARA | BUELLTON | 7.6% | 9.1% | 161.0% | 114.5% |
| SANTA BARBARA | CARPINTERIA | 169.2% | 184.6% | 5.9% | 221.9% |
| SANTA BARBARA | GOLETA | 33.2% | 73.2% | 9.8% | 291.0% |
| SANTA BARBARA | GUADALUPE | 775.0% | 1762.5% | 492.3% | 1,400.0% |
| SANTA BARBARA | LOMPOC | 0.0% | 0.0% | 51.6% | 8.1% |
| SANTA BARBARA | SANTA BARBARA | 12.5% | 16.4% | 2.0% | 97.8% |
| SANTA BARBARA | SANTA BARBARA COUNTY | 45.9% | 250.9% | 368.8% | 461.6% |
| SANTA BARBARA | SANTA MARIA | 19.6% | 270.7% | 107.4% | 64.4% |
| SANTA BARBARA | SOLVANG | 85.7% | 50.0% | 3.3% | 122.7% |
| SANTA CLARA | CAMPBELL | 5.1% | 2.9% | 10.6% | 153.5% |
| SANTA CLARA | CUPERTINO | 13.5% | 9.2% | 68.4% | 118.9% |
| SANTA CLARA | GILROY | 91.9% | 455.6% | 46.1% | 328.0% |
| SANTA CLARA | LOS ALTOS | 4.1% | 77.8% | 56.3% | 552.6% |
| SANTA CLARA | LOS ALTOS HILLS | 126.1% | 175.0% | 106.3% | 746.7% |
| SANTA CLARA | LOS GATOS | 24.4% | 2.7% | 118.2% | 278.2% |
| SANTA CLARA | MILPITAS | 27.1% | 15.8% | 12.0% | 322.6% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period.

Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines. 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SANTA CLARA | MONTE SERENO | 282.6% | 430.8% | 46.2% | 666.7% |
| SANTA CLARA | MORGAN HILL | 113.9% | 313.6% | 415.7% | 511.7% |
| SANTA CLARA | MOUNTAIN VIEW | 31.2% | 53.0% | 25.8% | 499.4% |
| SANTA CLARA | PALO ALTO | 14.6% | 13.9% | 15.5% | 130.0% |
| SANTA CLARA | SAN JOSE | 22.4% | 7.2% | 41.9% | 105.8% |
| SANTA CLARA | SANTA CLARA | 45.1% | 72.2% | 28.2% | 435.2% |
| SANTA CLARA | SANTA CLARA COUNTY | 450.0% | 592.3% | 1,213.6% | 2,100.0% |
| SANTA CLARA | SARATOGA | 2.0% | 89.5% | 140.4% | 151.6% |
| SANTA CLARA | SUNNYVALE | 15.5% | 13.2% | 47.1% | 235.0% |
| SOLANO | BENICIA | 1.1% | 5.6% | 39.3% | 16.3% |
| SOLANO | DIXON | 54.0% | 291.7% | 483.3% | 1,018.3% |
| SOLANO | FAIRFIELD | 19.5% | 27.0% | 95.2% | 233.0% |
| SOLANO | RIO VISTA | 0.0% | 11.1% | 322.9% | 310.6% |
| SOLANO | SOLANO COUNTY | 26.9% | 893.3% | 284.2% | 402.3% |
| SOLANO | SUISUN CITY | 29.9% | 201.8% | 0.0% | 73.4% |
| SOLANO | VACAVILLE | 26.1% | 121.6% | 334.7% | 522.7% |
| SOLANO | VALLEJO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 41.7% |
| SONOMA | CLOVERDALE | 305.1% | 406.9% | 32.3% | 77.7% |
| SONOMA | COTATI | 37.1% | 105.6% | 138.9% | 130.3% |
| SONOMA | HEALDSBURG | 119.4% | 141.7% | 357.7% | 265.8% |
| SONOMA | PETALUMA | 66.8% | 76.7% | 143.8% | 430.7% |
| SONOMA | ROHNERT PARK | 107.2% | 143.0% | 29.9% | 358.5% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th Cycle RHNA.

*Jurisdictions with insufficient progress toward Above-Moderate RHNA are subject to SB 35 streamlining for developments with 10% affordability or above or the 20 percent moderate income option if the site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area as defined in Section 102(x) of the SB 35 Guidelines. 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SONOMA | SANTA ROSA | 62.7% | 90.2% | 37.4% | 136.9% |
| SONOMA | SEBASTOPOL | 168.2% | 158.8% | 121.1% | 101.6% |
| SONOMA | SONOMA | 100.0% | 152.2% | 192.6% | 130.2% |
| SONOMA | SONOMA COUNTY | 143.7% | 994.6% | 394.4% | 772.4% |
| SONOMA | WINDSOR | 45.0% | 290.8% | 4.5% | 84.6% |

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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2014 2015 2016 2017 |
| APRs that count toward 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. As result, SCAG jurisdictions cannot count units permitted before the start of the 5th Cycle projection period. For more information, please see the link below:

<https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/hcdrhnaclarificationhe052112.pdf?1602185900>

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| After 2017 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5th 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 – 5/14/2021

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| APRs that count toward First Half Reporting Period | 2014 2015 2016 2017 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2018 2019 2020 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 5th 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 7/7ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5th 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.” |

¹²When 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: 06/15/2014¹³ – 06/29/2022

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

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

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 5th 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 5th 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2014 2015 2016 2017 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2018 2019 2020 2021 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 5th 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 5th 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.” |

¹⁴When 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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| BUTTE | BIGGS | 54.2% | 100.0% | 4.2% | 0.0% |
| BUTTE | BUTTE COUNTY | 1.0% | 13.6% | 86.9% | 57.5% |
| BUTTE | CHICO | 34.4% | 17.7% | 97.3% | 203.7% |
| BUTTE | GRIDLEY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 24.3% |
| BUTTE | OROVILLE | 89.7% | 72.2% | 0.0% | 31.9% |
| BUTTE | PARADISE | 68.1% | 429.0% | 428.0% | 400.7% |
| EL DORADO | EL DORADO COUNTY | 5.4% | 33.3% | 18.3% | 263.0% |
| EL DORADO | PLACERVILLE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 91.3% | 86.5% |
| EL DORADO | SOUTH LAKE TAHOE | 0.0% | 2.6% | 22.2% | 98.9% |
| IMPERIAL | BRAWLEY | 21.1% | 44.0% | 50.0% | 11.7% |
| IMPERIAL | CALIPATRIA | 0.0% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| IMPERIAL | EL CENTRO | 52.4% | 78.3% | 94.9% | 11.7% |
| IMPERIAL | HOLTVILLE | 81.5% | 32.3% | 3.1% | 1.1% |
| IMPERIAL | IMPERIAL COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.2% | 1.9% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| IMPERIAL | WESTMORLAND | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.6% | 0.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | AGOURA HILLS | 12.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 128.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | ALHAMBRA | 0.3% | 1.3% | 1.6% | 108.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | ARCADIA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 21.5% | 106.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | ARTESIA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 217.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | BALDWIN PARK | 33.1% | 20.5% | 2.2% | 133.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | BELL | 590.9% | 771.4% | 75.0% | 400.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | BELL GARDENS | 36.4% | 0.0% | 150.0% | 745.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | BELLFLOWER | 100.0% | 1600.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | BEVERLY HILLS | 2,900.0% | 3100.0% | 200.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | BRADBURY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | BURBANK | 0.4% | 64.2% | 13.8% | 66.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | CALABASAS | 13.6% | 0.0% | 35.1% | 141.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | CARSON | 8.7% | 21.7% | 46.4% | 60.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | CERRITOS | 17.4% | 7.1% | 7.1% | 1,014.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | CLAREMONT | 19.4% | 23.7% | 71.9% | 296.1% |
| LOS ANGELES | COMMERCE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 180.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | COMPTON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | COVINA | 28.3% | 45.7% | 71.1% | 122.7% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | CULVER CITY | 14.6% | 13.8% | 12.9% | 789.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | DIAMOND BAR | 2.6% | 11.5% | 0.5% | 67.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | DOWNEY | 0.0% | 4.9% | 51.9% | 147.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | DUARTE | 48.3% | 69.8% | 5.5% | 388.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | EL MONTE | 56.5% | 32.7% | 4.3% | 91.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | EL SEGUNDO | 22.2% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 839.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | GARDENA | 1.0% | 0.0% | 81.8% | 453.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | GLENDALE | 19.5% | 51.6% | 3.0% | 437.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | GLENDORA | 0.0% | 0.9% | 2.6% | 222.5% |
| LOS ANGELES | HAWAIIAN GARDENS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | HAWTHORNE | 5.3% | 126.7% | 49.1% | 232.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | HERMOSA BEACH | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | HIDDEN HILLS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 285.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | HUNTINGTON PARK | 0.0% | 67.2% | 9.4% | 0.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | INDUSTRY | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | INGLEWOOD | 32.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 18.8% |
| LOS ANGELES | IRWINDALE | 225.0% | 600.0% | 200.0% | 0.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 213.6% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | LA HABRA HEIGHTS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | LA MIRADA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 32.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | LA PUENTE | 16.3% | 32.2% | 0.0% | 42.1% |
| LOS ANGELES | LA VERNE | 32.7% | 19.3% | 31.9% | 139.1% |
| LOS ANGELES | LAKESWOOD | 58.9% | 19.0% | 1.5% | 97.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | LANCASTER | 35.1% | 108.6% | 47.9% | 59.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | LAWNDALE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 71.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | LOMITA | 8.3% | 128.6% | 437.5% | 1,535.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | LONG BEACH | 26.8% | 20.0% | 2.4% | 147.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES | 48.2% | 41.7% | 6.7% | 362.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | LOS ANGELES COUNTY | 11.9% | 15.3% | 0.6% | 71.1% |
| LOS ANGELES | LYNWOOD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | MALIBU | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | MANHATTAN BEACH | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2,940.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | MAYWOOD | 7.7% | 50.0% | 233.3% | 43.5% |
| LOS ANGELES | MONROVIA | 12.9% | 0.0% | 7.7% | 517.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | MONTEBELLO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.8% |
| LOS ANGELES | MONTEREY PARK | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 29.7% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | NORWALK | 236.5% | 341.9% | 139.4% | 222.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | PALMDALE | 8.7% | 8.5% | 63.6% | 5.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | PALOS VERDES ESTATES | 50.0% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 750.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | PARAMOUNT | 53.8% | 75.0% | 94.1% | 215.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | PASADENA | 73.2% | 34.8% | 189.3% | 476.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | PICO RIVERA | 0.0% | 16.0% | 1.4% | 31.5% |
| LOS ANGELES | RANCHO PALOS VERDES | 62.5% | 0.0% | 180.0% | 946.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | REDONDO BEACH | 2.7% | 24.7% | 1.7% | 97.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | ROLLING HILLS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | ROLLING HILLS ESTATES | 100.0% | 100.0% | 200.0% | 21,950.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | ROSEMEAD | 0.0% | 10.2% | 51.5% | 136.3% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN DIMAS | 0.8% | 5.6% | 10.4% | 46.6% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN FERNANDO | 50.9% | 800.0% | 168.6% | 73.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN GABRIEL | 1.3% | 61.3% | 68.8% | 81.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | SAN MARINO | 300.0% | 1100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | SANTA MONICA | 91.4% | 58.6% | 18.0% | 250.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | SIERRA MADRE | 14.3% | 500.0% | 33.3% | 230.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | SIGNAL HILL | 100.0% | 100.0% | 75.0% | 78.6% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| LOS ANGELES | SOUTH EL MONTE | 0.0% | 104.0% | 3.6% | 261.8% |
| LOS ANGELES | SOUTH GATE | 23.9% | 124.3% | 281.0% | 15.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | SOUTH PASADENA | 5.9% | 30.0% | 9.1% | 520.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | TEMPLE CITY | 87.4% | 10.8% | 6.1% | 228.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | TORRANCE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.1% | 65.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | VERNON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| LOS ANGELES | WALNUT | 0.0% | 4.2% | 3.2% | 128.9% |
| LOS ANGELES | WEST COVINA | 4.1% | 16.3% | 2.2% | 218.4% |
| LOS ANGELES | WEST HOLLYWOOD | 505.3% | 1500.0% | 592.3% | 5,621.2% |
| LOS ANGELES | WESTLAKE VILLAGE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% |
| LOS ANGELES | WHITTIER | 0.0% | 80.7% | 146.6% | 275.1% |
| ORANGE | ALISO VIEJO | 922.2% | 5842.9% | 6,057.1% | 0.0% |
| ORANGE | ANAHEIM | 23.7% | 7.8% | 8.1% | 332.3% |
| ORANGE | BREA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.2% | 314.9% |
| ORANGE | BUENA PARK | 163.2% | 260.4% | 291.9% | 193.2% |
| ORANGE | CYPRESS | 25.4% | 16.0% | 21.4% | 480.9% |
| ORANGE | DANA POINT | 5.3% | 50.9% | 49.2% | 355.5% |
| ORANGE | FOUNTAIN VALLEY | 153.0% | 133.9% | 18.5% | 141.1% |
| ORANGE | FULLERTON | 64.5% | 48.5% | 3.9% | 163.9% |
| ORANGE | GARDEN GROVE | 7.9% | 39.2% | 60.7% | 326.5% |
| ORANGE | HUNTINGTON BEACH | 7.0% | 17.7% | 23.0% | 49.1% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|--------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| ORANGE | IRVINE | 41.3% | 1.8% | 583.7% | 377.7% |
| ORANGE | LA HABRA | 2,100.0% | 6700.0% | 1,600.0% | 50,400.0% |
| ORANGE | LA PALMA | 0.0% | 150.0% | 0.0% | 333.3% |
| ORANGE | LAGUNA BEACH | 0.0% | 200.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | LAGUNA HILLS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | LAGUNA NIGUEL | 130.2% | 170.0% | 14.7% | 2,164.0% |
| ORANGE | LAGUNA WOODS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | LAKE FOREST | 8.0% | 44.2% | 46.7% | 336.9% |
| ORANGE | LOS ALAMITOS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 311.5% |
| ORANGE | MISSION VIEJO | 45.2% | 124.1% | 51.5% | 1,279.5% |
| ORANGE | NEWPORT BEACH | 10,900.0% | 13400.0% | 1,200.0% | 89,000.0% |
| ORANGE | ORANGE | 12.0% | 122.0% | 2,195.5% | 356.1% |
| ORANGE | ORANGE COUNTY | 24.8% | 26.5% | 18.4% | 254.2% |
| ORANGE | PLACENTIA | 43.8% | 2.5% | 52.2% | 392.3% |
| ORANGE | RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | SAN CLEMENTE | 50.7% | 33.7% | 51.9% | 296.3% |
| ORANGE | SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO | 15.0% | 57.7% | 32.5% | 263.7% |
| ORANGE | SANTA ANA | 1,148.9% | 5393.8% | 167.6% | 4,031.1% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| ORANGE | SEAL BEACH | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | STANTON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 333.6% |
| ORANGE | TUSTIN | 33.9% | 39.0% | 50.9% | 244.4% |
| ORANGE | VILLA PARK | 266.7% | 650.0% | 400.0% | 350.0% |
| ORANGE | WESTMINSTER | 8,700.0% | 11700.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| ORANGE | YORBA LINDA | 91.3% | 63.7% | 20.6% | 304.4% |
| PLACER | AUBURN | 0.0% | 1.9% | 80.7% | 92.0% |
| PLACER | COLFAX | 0.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 120.8% |
| PLACER | LINCOLN | 0.0% | 0.0% | 86.5% | 84.6% |
| PLACER | LOOMIS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 24.1% | 20.3% |
| PLACER | PLACER COUNTY | 9.0% | 14.7% | 21.6% | 139.9% |
| PLACER | ROCKLIN | 0.4% | 0.5% | 173.5% | 216.0% |
| PLACER | ROSEVILLE | 8.1% | 4.2% | 202.9% | 158.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | BLYTHE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 30.7% | 0.6% |
| RIVERSIDE | CALIMESA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 110.0% |
| RIVERSIDE | CANYON LAKE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 62.5% | 100.0% |
| RIVERSIDE | CATHEDRAL | 0.0% | 87.4% | 117.3% | 248.8% |
| RIVERSIDE | COACHELLA | 11.7% | 5.7% | 21.7% | 5.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | CORONA | 33.3% | 71.1% | 47.2% | 870.8% |
| RIVERSIDE | DESERT HOT SPRINGS | 5.6% | 0.3% | 18.1% | 0.0% |
| RIVERSIDE | EASTVALE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 332.0% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| RIVERSIDE | HEMET | 0.0% | 69.8% | 418.8% | 185.5% |
| RIVERSIDE | INDIAN WELLS | 2.5% | 7.4% | 3.2% | 495.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | INDIO | 51.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 191.3% |
| RIVERSIDE | JURUPA VALLEY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 142.4% |
| RIVERSIDE | LA QUINTA | 114.3% | 247.5% | 18.2% | 561.6% |
| RIVERSIDE | LAKE ELSINORE | 3.8% | 23.1% | 151.5% | 57.1% |
| RIVERSIDE | MENIFEE | 0.7% | 3.1% | 112.1% | 203.4% |
| RIVERSIDE | MORENO VALLEY | 2.7% | 4.1% | 71.2% | 71.1% |
| RIVERSIDE | MURRIETA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 282.0% |
| RIVERSIDE | NORCO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.4% |
| RIVERSIDE | PALM DESERT | 38.8% | 53.7% | 0.0% | 352.9% |
| RIVERSIDE | PALM SPRINGS | 71.4% | 114.0% | 72.0% | 1,199.1% |
| RIVERSIDE | PERRIS | 35.0% | 0.0% | 29.2% | 75.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | RANCHO MIRAGE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.1% | 1,959.0% |
| RIVERSIDE | RIVERSIDE COUNTY | 3.1% | 1.7% | 25.2% | 71.2% |
| RIVERSIDE | SAN JACINTO | 0.0% | 0.5% | 141.0% | 48.7% |
| RIVERSIDE | TEMECULA | 4.0% | 0.0% | 5.5% | 360.9% |
| RIVERSIDE | WILDOMAR | 0.0% | 3.9% | 13.9% | 67.4% |
| SACRAMENTO | CITRUS HEIGHTS | 7.5% | 4.9% | 20.8% | 36.2% |
| SACRAMENTO | ELK GROVE | 7.2% | 7.6% | 19.7% | 186.1% |
| SACRAMENTO | FOLSOM | 5.3% | 14.5% | 94.3% | 153.5% |
| SACRAMENTO | GALT | 0.8% | 29.7% | 0.0% | 127.8% |
| SACRAMENTO | ISLETON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SACRAMENTO | RANCHO CORDOVA | 6.5% | 0.0% | 57.1% | 73.6% |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO | 16.5% | 33.9% | 160.2% | 56.1% |
| SACRAMENTO | SACRAMENTO COUNTY | 4.3% | 7.1% | 71.4% | 42.8% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | ADELANTO | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.3% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | APPLE VALLEY | 0.1% | 1.3% | 81.5% | 8.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | BARSTOW | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 1.9% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | BIG BEAR LAKE | 0.0% | 500.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | CHINO | 37.9% | 42.5% | 0.9% | 399.9% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | CHINO HILLS | 2.3% | 4.7% | 810.4% | 272.7% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | COLTON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 38.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | FONTANA | 4.4% | 21.3% | 0.0% | 156.8% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | GRAND TERRACE | 3.6% | 5.3% | 77.3% | 120.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | HESPERIA | 0.0% | 7.3% | 50.0% | 89.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | HIGHLAND | 6.6% | 84.1% | 10.7% | 21.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | LOMA LINDA | 15.0% | 30.5% | 8.9% | 82.3% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | MONTCLAIR | 11.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 242.5% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | NEEDLES | 5.3% | 0.0% | 58.8% | 21.3% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN BERNARDINO | ONTARIO | 4.2% | 3.8% | 72.5% | 166.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | RANCHO CUCAMONGA | 8.6% | 7.8% | 108.2% | 850.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | REDLANDS | 2.1% | 8.1% | 4.2% | 86.1% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | RIALTO | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 51.5% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY | 3,588.9% | 19566.7% | 13,928.6% | 9,482.4% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | TWENTYNINE PALMS | 0.0% | 13.9% | 94.0% | 0.0% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | UPLAND | 0.0% | 0.4% | 37.1% | 148.2% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | VICTORVILLE | 0.4% | 0.0% | 18.5% | 26.8% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | YUCAIPA | 16.2% | 98.5% | 14.4% | 56.7% |
| SAN BERNARDINO | YUCCA VALLEY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 68.8% |
| SUTTER | LIVE OAK | 44.2% | 51.4% | 3.6% | 100.0% |
| SUTTER | SUTTER COUNTY | 3.5% | 1.7% | 32.3% | 69.5% |
| SUTTER | YUBA CITY | 0.5% | 11.7% | 27.1% | 13.7% |
| VENTURA | CAMARILLO | 23.6% | 29.2% | 214.6% | 119.3% |
| VENTURA | FILLMORE | 67.5% | 39.3% | 14.8% | 96.6% |
| VENTURA | MOORPARK | 9.0% | 18.8% | 7.4% | 124.2% |
| VENTURA | OJAI | 0.0% | 0.0% | 108.6% | 11.0% |
| VENTURA | OXNARD | 11.3% | 65.4% | 39.9% | 43.3% |
| VENTURA | PORT HUENEME | 0.0% | 1000.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| VENTURA | SIMI VALLEY | 11.3% | 1.4% | 38.9% | 128.9% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|---------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| VENTURA | THOUSAND OAKS | 66.0% | 6.3% | 741.7% | 614.3% |
| VENTURA | VENTURA | 25.3% | 20.1% | 12.2% | 169.3% |
| VENTURA | VENTURA COUNTY | 48.0% | 132.1% | 89.9% | 78.4% |
| YOLO | DAVIS | 59.3% | 86.8% | 208.1% | 148.2% |
| YOLO | WEST SACRAMENTO | 16.1% | 2.7% | 117.6% | 20.6% |
| YOLO | WINTERS | 61.8% | 27.8% | 16.9% | 163.1% |
| YOLO | WOODLAND | 37.4% | 34.3% | 83.1% | 125.1% |
| YOLO | YOLO COUNTY | 13.8% | 7.7% | 8.5% | 3.8% |
| YUBA | MARYSVILLE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17.9% |
| YUBA | WHEATLAND | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| IMPERIAL | CALEXICO | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| IMPERIAL | IMPERIAL | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | AVALON | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | AZUSA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | CUDAHY | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | POMONA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | SANTA CLARITA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| LOS ANGELES | SANTA FE SPRINGS | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| ORANGE | COSTA MESA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | BANNING | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | BEAUMONT | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| RIVERSIDE | RIVERSIDE | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| SAN BERNARDINO | SAN BERNARDINO | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| VENTURA | SANTA PAULA | No 2022 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2013 |
| | 2014 |
| | 2015 |
| | 2016 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2017 |
| | 2018 |
| | 2019 |
| | 2020 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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 5th 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 5th 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.” |

¹⁵When 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 Last Half Reporting Period, including all APRs for the planning period. **Less than 100% 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN DIEGO | CARLSBAD | 9.9% | 42.9% | 32.2% | 132.1% |
| SAN DIEGO | CHULA VISTA | 3.6% | 23.2% | 14.5% | 190.0% |
| SAN DIEGO | CORONADO | 92.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1,968.4% |
| SAN DIEGO | DEL MAR | 0.0% | 20.0% | 120.0% | 100.0% |
| SAN DIEGO | EL CAJON | 3.3% | 15.3% | 3.3% | 21.0% |
| SAN DIEGO | ENCINITAS | 14.1% | 9.0% | 18.4% | 130.9% |
| SAN DIEGO | ESCONDIDO | 10.1% | 11.9% | 10.6% | 98.8% |
| SAN DIEGO | IMPERIAL BEACH | 4.8% | 66.7% | 11.1% | 345.9% |
| SAN DIEGO | LA MESA | 4.2% | 6.7% | 92.4% | 150.5% |
| SAN DIEGO | LEMON GROVE | 116.9% | 200.0% | 129.6% | 97.5% |
| SAN DIEGO | NATIONAL CITY | 23.7% | 53.5% | 49.8% | 91.5% |
| SAN DIEGO | OCEANSIDE | 20.0% | 15.9% | 22.5% | 50.8% |
| SAN DIEGO | POWAY | 36.3% | 77.0% | 13.1% | 31.7% |
| SAN DIEGO | SAN DIEGO | 15.1% | 20.3% | 0.2% | 111.3% |
| SAN DIEGO | SAN DIEGO COUNTY | 6.0% | 42.6% | 21.1% | 35.6% |
| SAN DIEGO | SAN MARCOS | 24.6% | 18.8% | 8.7% | 227.8% |
| SAN DIEGO | SANTEE | 1.1% | 6.2% | 15.6% | 86.6% |
| SAN DIEGO | SOLANA BEACH | 0.0% | 9.2% | 39.0% | 41.2% |
| SAN DIEGO | VISTA | 45.5% | 55.4% | 0.4% | 526.0% |

Counties of Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Mendocino, Mono, Nevada, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, and Siskiyou; 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 toward First Half Reporting Period | 2014 2015 2016 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2017 2018 |

Note: Jurisdictions can count permits that occurred during the 5th cycle projection period before the 5th cycle planning period began on the first APR of the 5th cycle 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

| | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| After 2018 APRs are due: | Less than 5/5ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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.” |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

¹⁶When 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 Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Mendocino, Mono, Nevada, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, and Siskiyou; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| AMADOR | AMADOR COUNTY | 10.0% | 57.1% | 233.3% | 30.4% |
| AMADOR | IONE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2,200.0% | 1,071.4% |
| AMADOR | JACKSON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 725.0% | 225.0% |
| AMADOR | PLYMOUTH | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3,700.0% |
| AMADOR | SUTTER CREEK | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1,000.0% | 325.0% |
| COLUSA | COLUSA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.0% |
| COLUSA | COLUSA COUNTY | 7.5% | 5.5% | 78.0% | 24.8% |
| COLUSA | WILLIAMS | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 18.5% |
| DEL NORTE | CRESCENT CITY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 90.0% | 11.8% |
| DEL NORTE | DEL NORTE COUNTY | 36.7% | 59.5% | 73.3% | 71.7% |
| GLENN | GLENN COUNTY | 44.0% | 73.7% | 56.0% | 77.1% |
| GLENN | ORLAND | 0.0% | 720.0% | 250.0% | 0.0% |

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Mendocino, Mono, Nevada, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, and Siskiyou; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| GLENN | WILLOWS | 326.7% | 327.3% | 9.1% | 7.7% |
| HUMBOLDT | ARCATA | 50.6% | 8.9% | 416.1% | 35.6% |
| HUMBOLDT | BLUE LAKE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| HUMBOLDT | EUREKA | 26.2% | 69.8% | 7.7% | 26.9% |
| HUMBOLDT | FERNDALE | 0.0% | 33.3% | 75.0% | 50.0% |
| HUMBOLDT | FORTUNA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 74.1% | 35.2% |
| HUMBOLDT | HUMBOLDT COUNTY | 15.6% | 32.6% | 156.8% | 55.2% |
| HUMBOLDT | RIO DELL | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% |
| HUMBOLDT | TRINIDAD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| INYO | BISHOP | 0.0% | 10.0% | 66.7% | 3.6% |
| INYO | INYO COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 29.2% |
| LAKE | CLEARLAKE | 2.8% | 3.0% | 3.4% | 2.9% |
| LAKE | LAKE COUNTY | 2.2% | 7.4% | 8.6% | 2.7% |
| LAKE | LAKEPORT | 29.4% | 277.3% | 0.0% | 10.9% |
| MENDOCINO | FORT BRAGG | 0.0% | 66.7% | 0.0% | 133.3% |
| MENDOCINO | MENDOCINO COUNTY | 137.5% | 166.7% | 474.1% | 320.3% |
| MENDOCINO | POINT ARENA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 200.0% | 800.0% |

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Mendocino, Mono, Nevada, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, and Siskiyou; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| MENDOCINO | UKIAH | 618.2% | 957.1% | 500.0% | 160.0% |
| MENDOCINO | WILLITS | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% |
| MONO | MAMMOTH LAKES | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 351.6% |
| MONO | MONO COUNTY | 0.0% | 314.3% | 611.1% | 231.6% |
| NEVADA | GRASS VALLEY | 12.3% | 89.8% | 2.0% | 22.3% |
| NEVADA | NEVADA CITY | 0.0% | 28.6% | 50.0% | 2.8% |
| NEVADA | NEVADA COUNTY | 30.5% | 67.5% | 75.3% | 85.7% |
| NEVADA | TRUCKEE | 0.0% | 44.0% | 123.1% | 257.8% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | ARROYO GRANDE | 0.0% | 44.7% | 0.0% | 58.4% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | ATASCADERO | 49.0% | 41.9% | 247.8% | 148.8% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | GROVER BEACH | 0.0% | 34.6% | 0.0% | 152.2% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | MORRO BAY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7.4% | 58.5% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | PASO ROBLES | 171.5% | 228.6% | 240.2% | 91.3% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | PISMO BEACH | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 395.3% |

SB 35 Determination for the Counties of Amador, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Mendocino, Mono, Nevada, San Luis Obispo, Shasta, and Siskiyou; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the Last Half Reporting Period, including 5 years (2014-2018 APRs) of a 5-year planning period. Less than 100% 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 First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 50% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) not submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO | 58.2% | 17.3% | 6.5% | 169.2% |
| SAN LUIS OBISPO | SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY | 15.5% | 42.2% | 65.8% | 278.3% |
| SHASTA | ANDERSON | 71.9% | 95.2% | 387.5% | 101.7% |
| SHASTA | REDDING | 12.2% | 71.3% | 55.1% | 125.3% |
| SHASTA | SHASTA COUNTY | 6.3% | 19.7% | 4.7% | 44.9% |
| SHASTA | SHASTA LAKE | 28.1% | 152.4% | 273.9% | 3.4% |
| SISKIYOU | DORRIS | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | DUNSMUIR | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% |
| SISKIYOU | ETNA | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | MONTAGUE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | SISKIYOU COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 59.1% |
| SISKIYOU | TULELAKE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SISKIYOU | WEED | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| SISKIYOU | YREKA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% |
| AMADOR | AMADOR | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| SISKIYOU | FORT JONES | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| SISKIYOU | MOUNT SHASTA | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |

Counties of Alpine, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra, Tehama, Trinity, and Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

6th Cycle Planning Period: 08/31/2019 – 06/30/2024¹⁶

6th Cycle Projection Period: 12/31/2018 – 08/31/2024

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| APRs that count toward First Half Reporting Period | 2019 2020 2021 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2022 2023 |

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| After 2021 APRs are due: | Less than 3/5ths (60%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 5/5ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5th 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.” |

¹⁶When 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, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Plumas, Sierra, Tehama, Trinity, and Tuolumne; and all cities within each county

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 3 years (2019-2021 APRs) of a 5-year planning period. Less than 60% permitting progress toward 6th 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 of a 5-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| LASSEN | LASSEN COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 81.3% |
| LASSEN | SUSANVILLE | 0.0% | 0.0% | 81.8% | 95.8% |
| MARIPOSA | MARIPOSA COUNTY | 0.0% | 3.8% | 0.0% | 160.5% |
| MODOC | ALTURAS | 0.0% | 200.0% | 100.0% | 33.3% |
| MODOC | MODOC COUNTY | 33.3% | 50.0% | 466.7% | 60.0% |
| PLUMAS | PLUMAS COUNTY | 260.0% | 566.7% | 2,550.0% | 1,450.0% |
| PLUMAS | PORTOLA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| SIERRA | LOYALTON | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| TEHAMA | CORNING | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | RED BLUFF | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.1% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| TEHAMA | TEHAMA COUNTY | 5.9% | 66.9% | 43.2% | 19.9% |
| TRINITY | TRINITY COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| TUOLUMNE | SONORA | 0.0% | 10.0% | 15.0% | 20.0% |
| TUOLUMNE | TUOLUMNE COUNTY | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 36.8% |
| ALPINE | ALPINE COUNTY | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |
| SIERRA | SIERRA COUNTY | No 2022 Annual Progress Report | | | |

County of Calaveras; and all cities within the county

6th Cycle Planning Period: 06/15/2019 – 06/15/2027

6th Cycle Projection Period: 12/31/2018 – 06/15/2027

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| APRs that count toward First Half Reporting Period | 2019 2020 2021 2022 |
| APRs that count toward Last Half Reporting Period | 2023 2024 2025 2026 |

SB 35 Eligibility Methodology

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| After 2022 APRs are due: | Less than 4/8ths (50%) permitting progress toward 5th 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 2026 APRs are due: | Less than 8/8ths (100%) permitting progress toward 5th 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.” |

SB 35 Determination for the County of Calaveras; and all cities within the County

These jurisdictions are in the First Half Reporting Period, including 4 years (2019-2022 APRs) of an 8-year planning period. Less than 50% permitting progress toward 6th 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 of an 8-year planning period, at which point they will need to demonstrate 100% permitting progress toward the 6th 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 (2022) Not Submitted)

| COUNTY | JURISDICTION NAME | VLI % Complete | % Lower Complete | MOD % Complete | ABOVE MOD % Complete |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| CALAVERAS | ANGELS CAMP | 0.0% | 2.4% | 10.5% | 5.6% |
| CALAVERAS | CALAVERAS COUNTY | 2.6% | 14.0% | 63.1% | 46.7% |