## Cities and Counties Not Currently Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

This determination represents Annual Progress Report (APR) data received as of February 25, 2018, and will be updated at least quarterly to incorporate new or corrected data provided by jurisdictions. The following 13 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 (2016). 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 12 are subject to at least some form of SB 35 streamlining, as indicated on the following page.

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

	JURISDICTION
1	BEVERLY HILLS
2	CARPINTERIA
3	CORTE MADERA
4	FOSTER CITY
5	HILLSBOROUGH
6	LEMON GROVE
7	SAN ANSELMO
8	SAN FERNANDO
9	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
10	SANTA MONICA
11	SONOMA COUNTY
12	WEST HOLLYWOOD

February 25, 2018 Page 1 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), 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 377 jurisdictions:

	JURISDICTION
1	ADELANTO
2	ALAMEDA COUNTY
3	ALISO VIEJO
4	ALPINE COUNTY
5	ALTURAS
-	AMADOR
7	AMADOR COUNTY
8	ANDERSON
	ANGELS CAMP
	APPLE VALLEY
	ARCADIA
	ARCATA
	ARROYO GRANDE
	ARTESIA
	ARVIN
	ATWATER
	AUBURN
	AVALON
	AVENAL
	AZUSA
	BAKERSFIELD
	BALDWIN PARK
	BANNING
	BARSTOW
	BEAUMONT
	BELL GARDENS
	BELMONT
	BELVEDERE
	BENICIA
30	BIG BEAR LAKE

JURISDICTION	
31 BIGGS	
32 BISHOP	
33 BLUE LAKE	
34 BLYTHE	
35 BRADBURY	
36 BRAWLEY	
37 BREA	
38 BUENA PARK	
39 BURBANK	
40 BUTTE COUNTY	
41 CALABASAS	
42 CALAVERAS COUNTY	
43 CALEXICO	
44 CALIFORNIA CITY	
45 CALIMESA	
46 CALIPATRIA	
47 CAMARILLO	
48 CANYON LAKE	
49 CAPITOLA	
50 CARMEL	
51 CARSON	
52 CATHEDRAL	
53 CERES	
54 CERRITOS	
55 CHINO	
56 CHOWCHILLA	
57 CITRUS HEIGHTS	
58 CLAREMONT	
59 CLAYTON	
60 CLEARLAKE	

	JURISDICTION
61	CLOVERDALE
62	CLOVIS
	COACHELLA
64	COALINGA
65	COLFAX
	COLMA
67	COLTON
68	COLUSA
	COLUSA COUNTY
70	COMMERCE
71	COMPTON
	CONCORD
73	CORCORAN
	CORNING
	COTATI
76	COVINA
	CRESCENT CITY
	CUDAHY
79	CULVER CITY
80	CYPRESS
	DEL NORTE COUNTY
82	DEL REY OAKS
83	DELANO
84	DESERT HOT SPRINGS
85	DIAMOND BAR
86	DINUBA
87	DIXON
	DORRIS
89	DOS PALOS
90	DOWNEY

February 25, 2018 Page 2 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), 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 377 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
91 DUARTE	131 HESPERIA	171 LAKEPORT
92 DUNSMUIR	132 HIDDEN HILLS	172 LANCASTER
93 EAST PALO ALTO	133 HIGHLAND	173 LASSEN COUNTY
94 EASTVALE	134 HOLLISTER	174 LATHROP
95 EL CAJON	135 HOLTVILLE	175 LAWNDALE
96 EL CENTRO	136 HUGHSON	176 LEMOORE
97 EL MONTE	137 HUMBOLDT COUNTY	177 LINCOLN
98 EL SEGUNDO	138 HUNTINGTON BEACH	178 LINDSAY
99 EMERYVILLE	139 HUNTINGTON PARK	179 LIVE OAK
100 ENCINITAS	140 HURON	180 LIVINGSTON
101 ESCALON	141 IMPERIAL	181 LODI
102 ESCONDIDO	142 IMPERIAL BEACH	182 LOMA LINDA
103 ETNA	143 IMPERIAL COUNTY	183 LOMITA
104 EUREKA	144 INDUSTRY	184 LOMPOC
105 EXETER	145 INGLEWOOD	185 LONG BEACH
106 FAIRFAX	146 INYO COUNTY	186 LOOMIS
107 FARMERSVILLE	147 IONE	187 LOS ALAMITOS
108 FERNDALE	148 IRWINDALE	188 LOS ALTOS HILLS
109 FILLMORE	149 ISLETON	189 LOS ANGELES COUNTY
110 FIREBAUGH	150 JACKSON	190 LOS BANOS
111 FORT BRAGG	151 JURUPA VALLEY	191 LOYALTON
112 FORT JONES	152 KERMAN	192 LYNWOOD
113 FORTUNA	153 KERN COUNTY	193 MADERA
114 FOUNTAIN VALLEY	154 KING CITY	194 MALIBU
115 FOWLER	155 KINGS COUNTY	195 MANHATTAN BEACH
116 FRESNO	156 KINGSBURG	196 MANTECA
117 GARDENA	157 LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	197 MARICOPA
118 GLENN COUNTY	158 LA HABRA	198 MARINA
119 GONZALES	159 LA HABRA HEIGHTS	199 MARIPOSA COUNTY
120 GRAND TERRACE	160 LA MESA	200 MARTINEZ
121 GRASS VALLEY	161 LA MIRADA	201 MARYSVILLE
122 GREENFIELD	162 LA PALMA	202 MAYWOOD
123 GRIDLEY	163 LA PUENTE	203 MCFARLAND
124 GUADALUPE	164 LA QUINTA	204 MENDOCINO COUNTY
125 GUSTINE	165 LA VERNE	205 MENDOTA
126 HALF MOON BAY	166 LAGUNA BEACH	206 MENIFEE
127 HANFORD	167 LAGUNA NIGUEL	207 MENLO PARK
128 HAWAIIAN GARDENS	168 LAGUNA WOODS	208 MERCED
129 HAYWARD	169 LAKE COUNTY	209 MERCED COUNTY
130 HERMOSA BEACH	170 LAKE ELSINORE	210 MILL VALLEY

February 25, 2018 Page 3 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), 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 377 jurisdictions:

JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION	JURISDICTION
211 MILLBRAE	251 PINOLE	291 SAN DIMAS
212 MODESTO	252 PISMO BEACH	292 SAN GABRIEL
213 MODOC COUNTY	253 PLEASANT HILL	293 SAN JACINTO
214 MONTAGUE	254 PLYMOUTH	294 SAN JOAQUIN
215 MONTCLAIR	255 POINT ARENA	295 SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
216 MONTEBELLO	256 POMONA	296 SAN JUAN BAUTISTA
217 MONTEREY	257 PORT HUENEME	297 SAN LEANDRO
218 MONTEREY PARK	258 PORTERVILLE	298 SAN LUIS OBISPO
219 MORAGA	259 PORTOLA	299 SAN MATEO COUNTY
220 MORENO VALLEY	260 POWAY	300 SAND CITY
221 MORRO BAY	261 RANCHO CORDOVA	301 SANGER
222 MOUNT SHASTA	262 RANCHO MIRAGE	302 SANTA BARBARA
223 MURRIETA	263 RED BLUFF	303 SANTA CLARITA
224 NAPA COUNTY	264 REDDING	304 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
225 NATIONAL CITY	265 REDLANDS	305 SANTA PAULA
226 NEEDLES	266 REDONDO BEACH	306 SANTA ROSA
227 NEVADA CITY	267 REEDLEY	307 SANTEE
228 NEWARK	268 RIALTO	308 SARATOGA
229 NEWMAN	269 RICHMOND	309 SAUSALITO
230 NORCO	270 RIDGECREST	310 SCOTTS VALLEY
231 NORWALK	271 RIO DELL	311 SEAL BEACH
232 NOVATO	272 RIO VISTA	312 SEASIDE
233 OCEANSIDE	273 RIPON	313 SEBASTOPOL
234 OJAI	274 RIVERBANK	314 SELMA
235 ONTARIO	275 RIVERSIDE	315 SHAFTER
236 ORANGE	276 RIVERSIDE COUNTY	316 SHASTA COUNTY
237 ORANGE COVE	277 ROHNERT PARK	317 SHASTA LAKE
238 ORLAND	278 ROLLING HILLS	318 SIERRA COUNTY
239 OROVILLE	279 ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	319 SIERRA MADRE
240 OXNARD	280 ROSEMEAD	320 SIGNAL HILL
241 PACIFIC GROVE	281 SACRAMENTO	321 SISKIYOU COUNTY
242 PACIFICA	282 SACRAMENTO COUNTY	322 SOLANA BEACH
243 PALM DESERT	283 SALINAS	323 SOLEDAD
244 PALM SPRINGS	284 SAN BENITO COUNTY	324 SOLVANG
245 PALMDALE	285 SAN BERNARDINO	325 SONOMA
246 PALOS VERDES ESTATES	286 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	326 SONORA
247 PARADISE	287 SAN BRUNO	327 SOUTH EL MONTE
248 PARAMOUNT	288 SAN BUENAVENTURA	328 SOUTH GATE
249 PATTERSON	289 SAN CLEMENTE	329 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
250 PICO RIVERA	290 SAN DIEGO COUNTY	330 SOUTH PASADENA

February 25, 2018 Page 4 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 10% Affordability

When jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the most recent Annual Progress Report (2016), 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 377 jurisdictions:

	JURISDICTION
331	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
	STOCKTON
	SUSANVILLE
	SUTTER COUNTY
	TEHACHAPI
336	
337	
338	
	TEMPLE CITY
	TIBURON
	TORRANCE
342	
343	
	TRINITY COUNTY
	TULARE
346	
347	TULELAKE
348	
	TURLOCK
	TWENTYNINE PALMS
	UKIAH
	UNION CITY
	UPLAND
	VALLEJO
	VENTURA COUNTY
356	VERNON
357	VICTORVILLE
	VILLA PARK
	WATERFORD
	WATSONVILLE
	WEST SACRAMENTO
	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
	WESTMORLAND
	WHEATLAND
	WHITTIER
367	WILLIAMS
	WILLITS
369	
370	WINTERS

	JURISDICTION
	WOODLAKE
	YOLO COUNTY
	YREKA
374	YUBA CITY
375	YUBA COUNTY
	YUCAIPA
377	YUCCA VALLEY

February 25, 2018 Page 5 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 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 150 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
	AGOURA HILLS
	ALAMEDA
	ALBANY
	ALHAMBRA
5	
6	
7	ANTIOCH
8	
	ATHERTON
	BELL
	BELLFLOWER
12	BERKELEY
13	BRENTWOOD
14	BRISBANE
	BUELLTON
16	BURLINGAME
17	CALISTOGA
	CAMPBELL
19	CARLSBAD
	CHICO
	CHINO HILLS
	CHULA VISTA
	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
	CORONA
	CORONADO
	COSTA MESA
	CUPERTINO
	DALY CITY
	DANA POINT
	DANVILLE
31	DAVIS
	DEL MAR
	DUBLIN
-	EL CERRITO
35	EL DORADO COUNTY

	JURISDICTION
36	ELK GROVE
	FAIRFIELD
38	FOLSOM
39	FONTANA
	FREMONT
41	FRESNO COUNTY
	FULLERTON
	GALT
	GARDEN GROVE
	GILROY
	GLENDALE
	GLENDORA
	GOLETA
	GROVER BEACH
	HAWTHORNE
	HEALDSBURG
	HEMET
	HERCULES
54	INDIAN WELLS
	INDIO
	IRVINE
	1
	LAGUNA HILLS
	LAKE FOREST
	LAKEWOOD
61	LARKSPUR
62	LIVERMORE
	LOS ALTOS
	LOS ANGELES
	LOS GATOS MADERA COUNTY
	MAMMOTH LAKES
	MARIN COUNTY
	MILPITAS
	MISSION VIEJO
70	INIOSION VIEJO

	JURISDICTION
71	MONO COUNTY
	MONROVIA
	MONTE SERENO
	MONTEREY COUNTY
	MOORPARK
	MORGAN HILL
	MOUNTAIN VIEW
78	NAPA
79	
80	NEWPORT BEACH
	·
82	OAKLAND
83	OAKLEY
84	ORANGE COUNTY
	ORINDA
86	PALO ALTO
87	PARLIER
88	PASADENA
89	PASO ROBLES
90	PERRIS
91	PETALUMA
92	PIEDMONT
93	PITTSBURG
94	PLACENTIA
95	PLACER COUNTY
96	PLACERVILLE
97	PLEASANTON
98	PLUMAS COUNTY
99	PORTOLA VALLEY
100	RANCHO CUCAMONGA
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES
	RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA
	REDWOOD CITY
	ROCKLIN
105	ROSEVILLE

February 25, 2018 Page 6 of 7

## Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

## When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 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 150 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
147	WOODLAND
148	WOODSIDE
149	YORBA LINDA
150	YOUNTVILLE

February 25, 2018 Page 7 of 7