

# 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 1, 2018. The following 22 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 (2017). These jurisdictions are not currently subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining, but the jurisdictions are still encouraged to promote streamlining. **All other cities and counties beyond these 22 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	AMERICAN CANYON
2	BELL
3	BEVERLY HILLS
4	CALISTOGA
5	CARPINTERIA
6	EL CERRITO
7	FOSTER CITY
8	HEALDSBURG
9	HILLSBOROUGH
10	LAGUNA NIGUEL
11	LEMON GROVE
12	MENLO PARK
13	MILL VALLEY
14	MONTE SERENO
15	PASO ROBLES
16	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
17	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
18	SANTA MONICA
19	SONOMA COUNTY
20	UKIAH
21	WEST HOLLYWOOD
22	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 (2017), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 338 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
1 ADELANTO	41 CALIPATRIA	81 ESCALON
2 ALAMEDA COUNTY	42 CANYON LAKE	82 ESCONDIDO
3 ALHAMBRA	43 CARMEL	83 ETNA
4 ALISO VIEJO	44 CARSON	84 EUREKA
5 ALTURAS	45 CATHEDRAL	85 EXETER
6 AMADOR	46 CERES	86 FARMERSVILLE
7 AMADOR COUNTY	47 CHOWCHILLA	87 FERNDALE
8 ANDERSON	48 CITRUS HEIGHTS	88 FILLMORE
9 ANGELS CAMP	49 CLAYTON	89 FIREBAUGH
10 APPLE VALLEY	50 CLEARLAKE	90 FORT BRAGG
11 ARCADIA	51 CLOVERDALE	91 FORT JONES
12 ARCATA	52 COLFAX	92 FORTUNA
13 ARROYO GRANDE	53 COLMA	93 FOUNTAIN VALLEY
14 ARVIN	54 COLTON	94 FOWLER
15 ATASCADERO	55 COLUSA	95 FRESNO COUNTY
16 ATHERTON	56 COLUSA COUNTY	96 GARDEN GROVE
17 ATWATER	57 COMMERCE	97 GLENN COUNTY
18 AVALON	58 COMPTON	98 GONZALES
19 AVENAL	59 CONCORD	99 GRAND TERRACE
20 AZUSA	60 CORCORAN	100 GRASS VALLEY
21 BAKERSFIELD	61 CORNING	101 GREENFIELD
22 BANNING	62 COVINA	102 GRIDLEY
23 BARSTOW	63 CRESCENT CITY	103 GUADALUPE
24 BEAUMONT	64 CUDAHY	104 GUSTINE
25 BELVEDERE	65 CULVER CITY	105 HALF MOON BAY
26 BENICIA	66 DEL NORTE COUNTY	106 HANFORD
27 BIG BEAR LAKE	67 DEL REY OAKS	107 HAWAIIAN GARDENS
28 BIGGS	68 DELANO	108 HAYWARD
29 BISHOP	69 DESERT HOT SPRINGS	109 HEMET
30 BLUE LAKE	70 DINUBA	110 HERMOSA BEACH
31 BLYTHE	71 DORRIS	111 HIDDEN HILLS
32 BRADBURY	72 DOS PALOS	112 HIGHLAND
33 BRAWLEY	73 DOWNEY	113 HOLTVILLE
34 BUENA PARK	74 DUARTE	114 HUMBOLDT COUNTY
35 BURBANK	75 DUNSMUIR	115 HUNTINGTON BEACH
36 BUTTE COUNTY	76 EAST PALO ALTO	116 HUNTINGTON PARK
37 CALAVERAS COUNTY	77 EL CAJON	117 HURON
38 CALEXICO	78 EL CENTRO	118 IMPERIAL
39 CALIFORNIA CITY	79 EL MONTE	119 IMPERIAL COUNTY
40 CALIMESA	80 EL SEGUNDO	120 INDIAN WELLS

# 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 (2017), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 338 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION	
121	INDUSTRY	161	LOYALTON	201	ORANGE
122	INGLEWOOD	162	LYNWOOD	202	ORANGE COVE
123	INYO COUNTY	163	MADERA	203	ORLAND
124	IONE	164	MANHATTAN BEACH	204	OROVILLE
125	IRWINDALE	165	MANTECA	205	OXNARD
126	ISLETON	166	MARICOPA	206	PACIFIC GROVE
127	JACKSON	167	MARINA	207	PACIFICA
128	JURUPA VALLEY	168	MARIPOSA COUNTY	208	PALM DESERT
129	KERMAN	169	MARTINEZ	209	PALMDALE
130	KERN COUNTY	170	MARYSVILLE	210	PALOS VERDES ESTATES
131	KINGS COUNTY	171	MAYWOOD	211	PARADISE
132	KINGSBURG	172	MCFARLAND	212	PARAMOUNT
133	LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	173	MENDOCINO COUNTY	213	PARLIER
134	LA HABRA	174	MENDOTA	214	PATTERSON
135	LA HABRA HEIGHTS	175	MENIFEE	215	PICO RIVERA
136	LA MIRADA	176	MERCED	216	PINOLE
137	LA PALMA	177	MERCED COUNTY	217	PISMO BEACH
138	LA PUENTE	178	MILLBRAE	218	PLEASANT HILL
139	LA QUINTA	179	MODESTO	219	PLYMOUTH
140	LA VERNE	180	MODOC COUNTY	220	POINT ARENA
141	LAKE COUNTY	181	MONTAGUE	221	POMONA
142	LAKEPORT	182	MONTCLAIR	222	PORTERVILLE
143	LANCASTER	183	MONTEBELLO	223	PORTOLA
144	LASSEN COUNTY	184	MONTEREY	224	POWAY
145	LATHROP	185	MONTEREY COUNTY	225	RED BLUFF
146	LAWNDALE	186	MONTEREY PARK	226	REDDING
147	LEMOORE	187	MORENO VALLEY	227	REDLANDS
148	LINDSAY	188	MORRO BAY	228	REDONDO BEACH
149	LIVE OAK	189	MOUNT SHASTA	229	REEDLEY
150	LIVINGSTON	190	MURRIETA	230	RIALTO
151	LODI	191	NATIONAL CITY	231	RICHMOND
152	LOMA LINDA	192	NEEDLES	232	RIDGECREST
153	LOMPOC	193	NEVADA CITY	233	RIO DELL
154	LONG BEACH	194	NEWARK	234	RIO VISTA
155	LOOMIS	195	NEWMAN	235	RIPON
156	LOS ALAMITOS	196	NORCO	236	RIVERBANK
157	LOS ALTOS	197	NOVATO	237	RIVERSIDE
158	LOS ALTOS HILLS	198	OCEANSIDE	238	RIVERSIDE COUNTY
159	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	199	OJAI	239	ROLLING HILLS
160	LOS BANOS	200	ONTARIO	240	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES

# 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 (2017), these jurisdictions are subject to SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

These conditions currently apply to the following 338 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION	
241	ROSEMEAD	281	SIERRA COUNTY	321	WEST SACRAMENTO
242	ROSS	282	SIGNAL HILL	322	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
243	SACRAMENTO	283	SIMI VALLEY	323	WESTMINSTER
244	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	284	SISKIYOU COUNTY	324	WESTMORLAND
245	SALINAS	285	SOLANA BEACH	325	WHEATLAND
246	SAN ANSELMO	286	SOLEDAD	326	WHITTIER
247	SAN BENITO COUNTY	287	SOLVANG	327	WILLIAMS
248	SAN BERNARDINO	288	SONOMA	328	WILLITS
249	SAN BRUNO	289	SONORA	329	WILLOWS
250	SAN DIEGO COUNTY	290	SOUTH EL MONTE	330	WOODLAKE
251	SAN DIMAS	291	SOUTH GATE	331	WOODLAND
252	SAN FERNANDO	292	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	332	YOLO COUNTY
253	SAN GABRIEL	293	STOCKTON	333	YORBA LINDA
254	SAN JACINTO	294	SUISUN CITY	334	YREKA
255	SAN JOAQUIN	295	SUSANVILLE	335	YUBA CITY
256	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	296	SUTTER COUNTY	336	YUBA COUNTY
257	SAN LEANDRO	297	TAFT	337	YUCAIPA
258	SAN LUIS OBISPO	298	TEHACHAPI	338	YUCCA VALLEY
259	SAN MATEO COUNTY	299	TEHAMA		
260	SAN PABLO	300	TEHAMA COUNTY		
261	SAN RAFAEL	301	TEMPLE CITY		
262	SAND CITY	302	TORRANCE		
263	SANGER	303	TRACY		
264	SANTA BARBARA	304	TRINIDAD		
265	SANTA CLARITA	305	TRINITY COUNTY		
266	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	306	TULARE		
267	SANTA MARIA	307	TULARE COUNTY		
268	SANTA PAULA	308	TULELAKE		
269	SANTA ROSA	309	TUOLUMNE COUNTY		
270	SANTEE	310	TURLOCK		
271	SARATOGA	311	TWENTYNINE PALMS		
272	SAUSALITO	312	UNION CITY		
273	SCOTTS VALLEY	313	UPLAND		
274	SEAL BEACH	314	VALLEJO		
275	SEASIDE	315	VENTURA COUNTY		
276	SEBASTOPOL	316	VERNON		
277	SELMA	317	VICTORVILLE		
278	SHAFTER	318	VILLA PARK		
279	SHASTA COUNTY	319	WATERFORD		
280	SHASTA LAKE	320	WEED		

# 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 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 179 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	CORTE MADERA	71	HOLLISTER
2	ALAMEDA	37	COSTA MESA	72	HUGHSON
3	ALBANY	38	COTATI	73	IMPERIAL BEACH
4	ALPINE COUNTY	39	CUPERTINO	74	INDIO
5	ANAHEIM	40	CYPRESS	75	IRVINE
6	ANTIOCH	41	DALY CITY	76	KING CITY
7	ARTESIA	42	DANA POINT	77	LA MESA
8	AUBURN	43	DANVILLE	78	LAFAYETTE
9	BALDWIN PARK	44	DAVIS	79	LAGUNA BEACH
10	BELL GARDENS	45	DEL MAR	80	LAGUNA HILLS
11	BELLFLOWER	46	DIAMOND BAR	81	LAGUNA WOODS
12	BELMONT	47	DIXON	82	LAKE ELSINORE
13	BERKELEY	48	DUBLIN	83	LAKE FOREST
14	BREA	49	EASTVALE	84	LAKEWOOD
15	BRENTWOOD	50	EL DORADO COUNTY	85	LARKSPUR
16	BRISBANE	51	ELK GROVE	86	LINCOLN
17	BUELLTON	52	EMERYVILLE	87	LIVERMORE
18	BURLINGAME	53	ENCINITAS	88	LOMITA
19	CALABASAS	54	FAIRFAX	89	LOS ANGELES
20	CAMARILLO	55	FAIRFIELD	90	LOS GATOS
21	CAMPBELL	56	FOLSOM	91	MADERA COUNTY
22	CAPITOLA	57	FONTANA	92	MALIBU
23	CARLSBAD	58	FREMONT	93	MAMMOTH LAKES
24	CERRITOS	59	FRESNO	94	MARIN COUNTY
25	CHICO	60	FULLERTON	95	MILPITAS
26	CHINO	61	GALT	96	MISSION VIEJO
27	CHINO HILLS	62	GARDENA	97	MONO COUNTY
28	CHULA VISTA	63	GILROY	98	MONROVIA
29	CLAREMONT	64	GLENDALE	99	MOORPARK
30	CLOVIS	65	GLENDORA	100	MORAGA
31	COACHELLA	66	GOLETA	101	MORGAN HILL
32	COALINGA	67	GROVER BEACH	102	MOUNTAIN VIEW
33	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	68	HAWTHORNE	103	NAPA
34	CORONA	69	HERCULES	104	NAPA COUNTY
35	CORONADO	70	HESPERIA	105	NEVADA COUNTY

# 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 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 178 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	
106	NEWPORT BEACH	143	SAN JOSE
107	NORWALK	144	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
108	OAKDALE	145	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO.
109	OAKLAND	146	SAN MARCOS
110	OAKLEY	147	SAN MARINO
111	ORANGE COUNTY	148	SAN MATEO
112	ORINDA	149	SAN RAMON
113	PALM SPRINGS	150	SANTA ANA
114	PALO ALTO	151	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
115	PASADENA	152	SANTA CLARA
116	PERRIS	153	SANTA CRUZ
117	PETALUMA	154	SANTA FE SPRINGS
118	PIEDMONT	155	SIERRA MADRE
119	PITTSBURG	156	SOLANO COUNTY
120	PLACENTIA	157	SOUTH PASADENA
121	PLACER COUNTY	158	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
122	PLACERVILLE	159	STANISLAUS COUNTY
123	PLEASANTON	160	STANTON
124	PLUMAS COUNTY	161	SUNNYVALE
125	PORT HUENEME	162	SUTTER CREEK
126	PORTOLA VALLEY	163	TEMECULA
127	RANCHO CORDOVA	164	THOUSAND OAKS
128	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	165	TIBURON
129	RANCHO MIRAGE	166	TRUCKEE
130	RANCHO PALOS VERDES	167	TUSTIN
131	RANCHO ST. MARGARITA	168	VACAVILLE
132	REDWOOD CITY	169	VISALIA
133	ROCKLIN	170	VISTA
134	ROHNERT PARK	171	WALNUT
135	ROSEVILLE	172	WALNUT CREEK
136	SAINT HELENA	173	WASCO
137	SAN BUENAVENTURA	174	WATSONVILLE
138	SAN CARLOS	175	WEST COVINA
139	SAN CLEMENTE	176	WILDOMAR
140	SAN DIEGO	177	WINDSOR
141	SAN FRANCISCO	178	WINTERS
142	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	179	YOUNTVILLE