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
	FOSTER CITY
9	GUADALUPE
10	HILLSBOROUGH
	INDUSTRY
	LAGUNA NIGUEL
	LEMON GROVE
	MENLO PARK
	MILL VALLEY
	MONTE SERENO
	MONTEREY COUNTY
	ROHNERT PARK
	SAINT HELENA
	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
	SANTA ANA
	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
	SANTA MONICA
	SOLVANG
	SONOMA COUNTY
	UKIAH
	WEST HOLLYWOOD
28	WOODSIDE

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 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 13	ARROYO GRANDE
14	AVALON AVENAL
16	AVENAL AZUSA
17	BAKERSFIELD
	BANNING
	BARSTOW
	BEAUMONT
21	BELL
22	BELL GARDENS
23	BELVEDERE
	BENICIA
25	BIGGS
26	BISHOP
27	BLUE LAKE
28	BLYTHE
29	BRADBURY
	BRAWLEY
	BURBANK
	BUTTE COUNTY
	CALAVERAS COUNTY
	CALEXICO
	CALIFORNIA CITY
	CALIMESA
	CALIPATRIA
	CARMEL
	CARSON
40	CATHEDRAL

	JURISDICTION
	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
50	CORCORAN
57	CORNING
00 50	
59 60	CRESCENT CITY
61	
62	DEL NORTE COUNTY
62 63	DEL REY OAKS DELANO
64	
65	DESERT HOT SPRINGS DINUBA
66	DORRIS
67	DORRIS DOS PALOS
68	DUARTE
	DUNSMUIR
	EAST PALO ALTO
	EL CAJON
	EL CENTRO
	EL MONTE
	EL SEGUNDO
75	ESCALON
	ESCONDIDO
	ETNA
	EUREKA
	EXETER
	FAIRFAX

	JURISDICTION
81	FARMERSVILLE
82	FERNDALE
83	FILLMORE
84	FIREBAUGH
85	FORT JONES
86	FORTUNA
	FOUNTAIN VALLEY
	FOWLER
	FRESNO COUNTY
90 01	
91	GLENN COUNTY GONZALES
94	GRAND TERRACE GRASS VALLEY
95	GREENFIELD
	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
100	HUNTINGTON BEACH
	HURON
	IMPERIAL IMPERIAL COUNTY
	INGLEWOOD
	INGLEWOOD INYO COUNTY
	IRWINDALE
	ISLETON
	JURUPA VALLEY
	KERMAN
	KERN COUNTY
	KINGS COUNTY
120	

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 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	166MONTEBELLO	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 LAWNDALE	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	177NORCO	²¹⁷ ROSS
¹³⁸ LOMA LINDA	178 _{NOVATO}	218 SACRAMENTO
139LOMPOC	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

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 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
241 SANTEE
242 SARATOGA
243 SAUSALITO
244 SEASIDE
245 SEBASTOPOL
246 SELMA 247 SHAFTER
248 SHASTA COUNTY
249 SHASTA LAKE
250 SIERRA COUNTY
251 SIGNAL HILL
252 SISKIYOU COUNTY
253 SOLANA BEACH
254 SONOMA
255 <u>SONORA</u> 256 SOUTH GATE
256 SOUTH GATE
257 SOUTH LAKE TAHOE
258 STOCKTON
259 SUISUN CITY
260 SUSANVILLE
261 SUTTER CREEK
263 <u>TEHACHAPI</u> 264 TEHAMA
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

	JURISDICTION
281	WATERFORD
282	WEED
283	WEST SACRAMENTO
284	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
285	WESTMORLAND
286	WHEATLAND
287	WHITTIER
288	WILLIAMS
289	WILLITS
290	WILLOWS
291	WINDSOR
292	WOODLAKE
293	YOLO COUNTY
294	YREKA
295	YUBA CITY
296	YUBA COUNTY
297	YUCAIPA
298	YUCCA VALLEY

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 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
1	AGOURA HILLS
2	ALAMEDA
3	ALBANY
4	AMADOR COUNTY
5	AMERICAN CANYON
6	ANAHEIM
7	ANDERSON
	ANTIOCH
	ARTESIA
	ATASCADERO
11	ATWATER
12	AUBURN
	BALDWIN PARK
	BELLFLOWER
	BELMONT
	BERKELEY
	BIG BEAR LAKE
	BREA
	BRENTWOOD
	BRISBANE
	BUELLTON
	BUENA PARK
	BURLINGAME
24	CALABASAS
25	CAMARILLO
	CAMPBELL
	CANYON LAKE
	CAPITOLA
	CARLSBAD
	CERRITOS
	СНІСО
32	CHINO
33	CHINO HILLS
34	CHULA VISTA
35	CLAREMONT

	JURISDICTION
36	CLOVIS
37	COALINGA
	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
	CORONA
40	COSTA MESA
	COTATI
42	CULVER CITY
43	CUPERTINO
44	CYPRESS
45	DALY CITY
	DANA POINT
	DANVILLE
	DAVIS
49	DEL MAR
	DIAMOND BAR
51	DIXON
	DOWNEY
	DUBLIN
	EASTVALE
55	EL DORADO COUNTY
	ELK GROVE
	EMERYVILLE
	ENCINITAS
59	FAIRFIELD
	FOLSOM
61	FONTANA
	FORT BRAGG
	FREMONT
	FRESNO
	FULLERTON
	GALT
	GARDENA
	GILROY
	GLENDALE
70	GLENDORA

	JURISDICTION
71	GOLETA
	GROVER BEACH
	IAWTHORNE
	IEALDSBURG
	HERCULES
	HERMOSA BEACH
	HOLLISTER
	HUGHSON
	MPERIAL BEACH
	NDIAN WELLS
	NDIO
	ONE
	RVINE
	JACKSON
	KING CITY
	A CANADA FLINTRIDGE
	A HABRA
	A MESA
	A PALMA
	A QUINTA
	AFAYETTE
	AGUNA BEACH
	AGUNA HILLS
	AGUNA WOODS
95	AKE FOREST
90	AKEWOOD ARKSPUR
	IVERMORE
	LIVERMORE
	LODI
	LOMITA LOS ALTOS
	LOS ALTOS HILLS
103	LOS ANGELES
104	LOS BANOS
105	MALIBU

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 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
106	MAMMOTH LAKES
107	MANHATTAN BEACH
108	MARIN COUNTY
109	MARINA
110	MILPITAS
111	MISSION VIEJO
112	MONO COUNTY
113	MONROVIA
114	MOORPARK
115	MORAGA
116	MORGAN HILL
117	MOUNTAIN VIEW
118	MURRIETA
119	NAPA
120	NAPA COUNTY
121	NEWARK
122	NEWPORT BEACH
123	NORWALK
124	OAKDALE
125	OAKLAND
126	OAKLEY
127	ORANGE
128	ORANGE COUNTY
129	ORINDA
130	PALM DESERT
131	PALM SPRINGS
132	PALO ALTO
133	PASADENA
134	PERRIS
135	PETALUMA
136	PIEDMONT
137	PISMO BEACH
138	PITTSBURG
139	PLACENTIA
140	PLACER COUNTY
141	PLACERVILLE
142	PLEASANTON

	JURISDICTION
143	PLUMAS COUNTY
144	POINT ARENA
145	PORT HUENEME
146	PORTOLA VALLEY
	RANCHO CORDOVA
148	RANCHO CUCAMONGA
149	RANCHO MIRAGE
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES
151	RANCHO ST. MARGARITA
152	REDDING
153	REDWOOD CITY
154	RIO VISTA
155	ROCKLIN
156	ROLLING HILLS ESTATES
157	ROSEVILLE
158	SAN ANSELMO
159	SAN BENITO COUNTY
160	SAN BUENAVENTURA
	SAN CARLOS
	SAN CLEMENTE
	SAN DIEGO
164	SAN FRANCISCO
165	SAN GABRIEL
166	SAN JOSE
167	SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
168	SAN LUIS OBISPO
169	SAN LUIS OBISPO CO.
170	SAN MARCOS
	SAN MATEO
	SAN RAMON
	SANTA BARBARA
	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
176	SANTA CLARA
177	SANTA CRUZ
178	SANTA FE SPRINGS
179	SCOTTS VALLEY

	JURISDICTION
	SEAL BEACH
181	SIERRA MADRE
182	SIMI VALLEY
183	SOLANO COUNTY
184	SOLEDAD
185	SOUTH EL MONTE
186	SOUTH PASADENA
187	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO
188	STANISLAUS COUNTY
189	STANTON
190	SUNNYVALE
191	SUTTER COUNTY
192	TEMECULA
193	THOUSAND OAKS
194	TIBURON
195	TRACY
196	TRUCKEE
197	TULARE
198	TUSTIN
199	UNION CITY
200	VACAVILLE
201	VISALIA
202	VISTA
203	WALNUT
204	WALNUT CREEK
205	WASCO
206	WATSONVILLE
207	WEST COVINA
208	WESTMINSTER
209	WILDOMAR
210	WINTERS
211	WOODLAND
212	YORBA LINDA
213	YOUNTVILLE
	L