

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Not Currently Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

This determination represents Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) data received as of June 25, 2019. The following 28 jurisdictions have met their prorated Lower (Very-Low and Low) and Above-Moderate Income Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the Reporting Period and submitted their latest APR (2018). These jurisdictions are not currently subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining), but the jurisdictions are still encouraged to promote streamlining. **All other cities and counties beyond these 28 are subject to at least some form of SB 35 streamlining, as indicated on the following pages.**

For more detail on the proration methodology or background data see the SB 35 Determination Methodology.

	JURISDICTION
1	ATHERTON
2	BEVERLY HILLS
3	CALISTOGA
4	CARPINTERIA
5	CORONADO
6	CORTE MADERA
7	EL CERRITO
8	FOSTER CITY
9	GUADALUPE
10	HILLSBOROUGH
11	INDUSTRY
12	LAGUNA NIGUEL
13	LEMON GROVE
14	MENLO PARK
15	MILL VALLEY
16	MONTE SERENO
17	MONTEREY COUNTY
18	ROHNERT PARK
19	SAINT HELENA
20	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
21	SANTA ANA
22	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
23	SANTA MONICA
24	SOLVANG
25	SONOMA COUNTY
26	UKIAH
27	WEST HOLLYWOOD
28	WOODSIDE

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include $\geq 10\%$ Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (2018), these jurisdictions are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 298 jurisdictions:

	JURISDICTION
1	ADELANTO
2	ALAMEDA COUNTY
3	ALHAMBRA
4	ALISO VIEJO
5	ALPINE COUNTY
6	ALTURAS
7	AMADOR CITY
8	ANGELS CAMP
9	APPLE VALLEY
10	ARCADIA
11	ARCATA
12	ARROYO GRANDE
13	ARVIN
14	AVALON
15	AVENAL
16	AZUSA
17	BAKERSFIELD
18	BANNING
19	BARSTOW
20	BEAUMONT
21	BELL
22	BELL GARDENS
23	BELVEDERE
24	BENICIA
25	BIGGS
26	BISHOP
27	BLUE LAKE
28	BLYTHE
29	BRADBURY
30	BRAWLEY
31	BURBANK
32	BUTTE COUNTY
33	CALAVERAS COUNTY
34	CALEXICO
35	CALIFORNIA CITY
36	CALIMESA
37	CALIPATRIA
38	CARMEL
39	CARSON
40	CATHEDRAL

	JURISDICTION
41	CERES
42	CHOWCHILLA
43	CITRUS HEIGHTS
44	CLAYTON
45	CLEARLAKE
46	CLOVERDALE
47	COACHELLA
48	COLFAX
49	COLMA
50	COLTON
51	COLUSA
52	COLUSA COUNTY
53	COMMERCE
54	COMPTON
55	CONCORD
56	CORCORAN
57	CORNING
58	COVINA
59	CRESCENT CITY
60	CUDAHY
61	DEL NORTE COUNTY
62	DEL REY OAKS
63	DELANO
64	DESERT HOT SPRINGS
65	DINUBA
66	DORRIS
67	DOS PALOS
68	DUARTE
69	DUNSMUIR
70	EAST PALO ALTO
71	EL CAJON
72	EL CENTRO
73	EL MONTE
74	EL SEGUNDO
75	ESCALON
76	ESCONDIDO
77	ETNA
78	EUREKA
79	EXETER
80	FAIRFAX

	JURISDICTION
81	FARMERSVILLE
82	FERNDALE
83	FILLMORE
84	FIREBAUGH
85	FORT JONES
86	FORTUNA
87	FOUNTAIN VALLEY
88	FOWLER
89	FRESNO COUNTY
90	GARDEN GROVE
91	GLENN COUNTY
92	GONZALES
93	GRAND TERRACE
94	GRASS VALLEY
95	GREENFIELD
96	GRIDLEY
97	GUSTINE
98	HALF MOON BAY
99	HANFORD
100	HAWAIIAN GARDENS
101	HAYWARD
102	HEMET
103	HESPERIA
104	HIDDEN HILLS
105	HIGHLAND
106	HOLTVILLE
107	HUMBOLDT COUNTY
108	HUNTINGTON BEACH
109	HUNTINGTON PARK
110	HURON
111	IMPERIAL
112	IMPERIAL COUNTY
113	INGLEWOOD
114	INYO COUNTY
115	IRWINDALE
116	ISLETON
117	JURUPA VALLEY
118	KERMAN
119	KERN COUNTY
120	KINGS COUNTY

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include $\geq 10\%$ Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (2018), these jurisdictions are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 298 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
121 KINGSBURG	161 MILLBRAE	201 PORTOLA
122 LA HABRA HEIGHTS	162 MODESTO	202 POWAY
123 LA MIRADA	163 MODOC COUNTY	203 RED BLUFF
124 LA PUENTE	164 MONTAGUE	204 REDLANDS
125 LA VERNE	165 MONTCLAIR	205 REDONDO BEACH
126 LAKE COUNTY	166 MONTEBELLO	206 REEDLEY
127 LAKE ELSINORE	167 MONTEREY	207 RIALTO
128 LAKEPORT	168 MONTEREY PARK	208 RICHMOND
129 LANCASTER	169 MORENO VALLEY	209 RIDGECREST
130 LASSEN COUNTY	170 MORRO BAY	210 RIO DELL
131 LATHROP	171 MOUNT SHASTA	211 RIPON
132 LAWDALE	172 NATIONAL CITY	212 RIVERBANK
133 LEMOORE	173 NEEDLES	213 RIVERSIDE
134 LINCOLN	174 NEVADA CITY	214 RIVERSIDE COUNTY
135 LINDSAY	175 NEVADA COUNTY	215 ROLLING HILLS
136 LIVE OAK	176 NEWMAN	216 ROSEMEAD
137 LIVINGSTON	177 NORCO	217 ROSS
138 LOMA LINDA	178 NOVATO	218 SACRAMENTO
139 LOMPOC	179 OCEANSIDE	219 SACRAMENTO COUNTY
140 LONG BEACH	180 OJAI	220 SALINAS
141 LOOMIS	181 ONTARIO	221 SAN BERNARDINO
142 LOS ALAMITOS	182 ORANGE COVE	222 SAN BRUNO
143 LOS ANGELES COUNTY	183 ORLAND	223 SAN DIEGO COUNTY
144 LOS GATOS	184 OROVILLE	224 SAN DIMAS
145 LOYALTON	185 OXNARD	225 SAN FERNANDO
146 LYNWOOD	186 PACIFIC GROVE	226 SAN JACINTO
147 MADERA	187 PACIFICA	227 SAN JOAQUIN
148 MADERA COUNTY	188 PALMDALE	228 SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
149 MANTECA	189 PALOS VERDES ESTATES	229 SAN JUAN BAUTISTA
150 MARICOPA	190 PARADISE	230 SAN LEANDRO
151 MARIPOSA COUNTY	191 PARAMOUNT	231 SAN MATEO COUNTY
152 MARTINEZ	192 PARLIER	232 SAN PABLO
153 MARYSVILLE	193 PASO ROBLES	233 SAN RAFAEL
154 MAYWOOD	194 PATTERSON	234 SAND CITY
155 MCFARLAND	195 PICO RIVERA	235 SANGER
156 MENDOCINO COUNTY	196 PINOLE	236 SANTA CLARITA
157 MENDOTA	197 PLEASANT HILL	237 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
158 MENIFEE	198 PLYMOUTH	238 SANTA MARIA
159 MERCED	199 POMONA	239 SANTA PAULA
160 MERCED COUNTY	200 PORTERVILLE	240 SANTA ROSA

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include \geq 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (2018), these jurisdictions are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 298 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION	
241	SANTEE	281	WATERFORD
242	SARATOGA	282	WEED
243	SAUSALITO	283	WEST SACRAMENTO
244	SEASIDE	284	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
245	SEBASTOPOL	285	WESTMORLAND
246	SELMA	286	WHEATLAND
247	SHAFTER	287	WHITTIER
248	SHASTA COUNTY	288	WILLIAMS
249	SHASTA LAKE	289	WILLITS
250	SIERRA COUNTY	290	WILLOWS
251	SIGNAL HILL	291	WINDSOR
252	SISKIYOU COUNTY	292	WOODLAKE
253	SOLANA BEACH	293	YOLO COUNTY
254	SONOMA	294	YREKA
255	SONORA	295	YUBA CITY
256	SOUTH GATE	296	YUBA COUNTY
257	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	297	YUCAIPA
258	STOCKTON	298	YUCCA VALLEY
259	SUISUN CITY		
260	SUSANVILLE		
261	SUTTER CREEK		
262	TAFT		
263	TEHACHAPI		
264	TEHAMA		
265	TEHAMA COUNTY		
266	TEMPLE CITY		
267	TORRANCE		
268	TRINIDAD		
269	TRINITY COUNTY		
270	TULARE COUNTY		
271	TULELAKE		
272	TUOLUMNE COUNTY		
273	TURLOCK		
274	TWENTYNINE PALMS		
275	UPLAND		
276	VALLEJO		
277	VENTURA COUNTY		
278	VERNON		
279	VICTORVILLE		
280	VILLA PARK		

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include \geq 50% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income), these jurisdictions are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

The following list includes the 213 jurisdictions that are not subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 10% affordability, but are subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with \geq 50% affordability.

JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION	
1	AGOURA HILLS	36	CLOVIS	71	GOLETA
2	ALAMEDA	37	COALINGA	72	GROVER BEACH
3	ALBANY	38	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	73	HAWTHORNE
4	AMADOR COUNTY	39	CORONA	74	HEALDSBURG
5	AMERICAN CANYON	40	COSTA MESA	75	HERCULES
6	ANAHEIM	41	COTATI	76	HERMOSA BEACH
7	ANDERSON	42	CULVER CITY	77	HOLLISTER
8	ANTIOCH	43	CUPERTINO	78	HUGHSON
9	ARTESIA	44	CYPRESS	79	IMPERIAL BEACH
10	ATASCADERO	45	DALY CITY	80	INDIAN WELLS
11	ATWATER	46	DANA POINT	81	INDIO
12	AUBURN	47	DANVILLE	82	IONE
13	BALDWIN PARK	48	DAVIS	83	IRVINE
14	BELLFLOWER	49	DEL MAR	84	JACKSON
15	BELMONT	50	DIAMOND BAR	85	KING CITY
16	BERKELEY	51	DIXON	86	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE
17	BIG BEAR LAKE	52	DOWNEY	87	LA HABRA
18	BREA	53	DUBLIN	88	LA MESA
19	BRENTWOOD	54	EASTVALE	89	LA PALMA
20	BRISBANE	55	EL DORADO COUNTY	90	LA QUINTA
21	BUELLTON	56	ELK GROVE	91	LAFAYETTE
22	BUENA PARK	57	EMERYVILLE	92	LAGUNA BEACH
23	BURLINGAME	58	ENCINITAS	93	LAGUNA HILLS
24	CALABASAS	59	FAIRFIELD	94	LAGUNA WOODS
25	CAMARILLO	60	FOLSOM	95	LAKE FOREST
26	CAMPBELL	61	FONTANA	96	LAKEWOOD
27	CANYON LAKE	62	FORT BRAGG	97	LARKSPUR
28	CAPITOLA	63	FREMONT	98	LIVERMORE
29	CARLSBAD	64	FRESNO	99	LODI
30	CERRITOS	65	FULLERTON	100	LOMITA
31	CHICO	66	GALT	101	LOS ALTOS
32	CHINO	67	GARDENA	102	LOS ALTOS HILLS
33	CHINO HILLS	68	GILROY	103	LOS ANGELES
34	CHULA VISTA	69	GLENDALE	104	LOS BANOS
35	CLAREMONT	70	GLENDORA	105	MALIBU

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include $\geq 50\%$ Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income), these jurisdictions are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 50% affordability. If the jurisdiction also has insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA, then they are subject to the more inclusive streamlining for developments with at least 10% affordability.

The following list includes the 213 jurisdictions that are not subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with $\geq 10\%$ affordability, but are subject to SB 35 streamlining for proposed developments with $\geq 50\%$ affordability.

JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION	
106	MAMMOTH LAKES	143	PLUMAS COUNTY	180	SEAL BEACH
107	MANHATTAN BEACH	144	POINT ARENA	181	SIERRA MADRE
108	MARIN COUNTY	145	PORT HUENEME	182	SIMI VALLEY
109	MARINA	146	PORTOLA VALLEY	183	SOLANO COUNTY
110	MILPITAS	147	RANCHO CORDOVA	184	SOLEDAD
111	MISSION VIEJO	148	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	185	SOUTH EL MONTE
112	MONO COUNTY	149	RANCHO MIRAGE	186	SOUTH PASADENA
113	MONROVIA	150	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	187	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
114	MOORPARK	151	RANCHO ST. MARGARITA	188	STANISLAUS COUNTY
115	MORAGA	152	REDDING	189	STANTON
116	MORGAN HILL	153	REDWOOD CITY	190	SUNNYVALE
117	MOUNTAIN VIEW	154	RIO VISTA	191	SUTTER COUNTY
118	MURRIETA	155	ROCKLIN	192	TEMECULA
119	NAPA	156	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	193	THOUSAND OAKS
120	NAPA COUNTY	157	ROSEVILLE	194	TIBURON
121	NEWARK	158	SAN ANSELMO	195	TRACY
122	NEWPORT BEACH	159	SAN BENITO COUNTY	196	TRUCKEE
123	NORWALK	160	SAN BUENAVENTURA	197	TULARE
124	OAKDALE	161	SAN CARLOS	198	TUSTIN
125	OAKLAND	162	SAN CLEMENTE	199	UNION CITY
126	OAKLEY	163	SAN DIEGO	200	VACAVILLE
127	ORANGE	164	SAN FRANCISCO	201	VISALIA
128	ORANGE COUNTY	165	SAN GABRIEL	202	VISTA
129	ORINDA	166	SAN JOSE	203	WALNUT
130	PALM DESERT	167	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	204	WALNUT CREEK
131	PALM SPRINGS	168	SAN LUIS OBISPO	205	WASCO
132	PALO ALTO	169	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO.	206	WATSONVILLE
133	PASADENA	170	SAN MARCOS	207	WEST COVINA
134	PERRIS	171	SAN MARINO	208	WESTMINSTER
135	PETALUMA	172	SAN MATEO	209	WILDOMAR
136	PIEDMONT	173	SAN RAMON	210	WINTERS
137	PISMO BEACH	174	SANTA BARBARA	211	WOODLAND
138	PITTSBURG	175	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	212	YORBA LINDA
139	PLACENTIA	176	SANTA CLARA	213	YOUNTVILLE
140	PLACER COUNTY	177	SANTA CRUZ		
141	PLACERVILLE	178	SANTA FE SPRINGS		
142	PLEASANTON	179	SCOTTS VALLEY		