

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 18, 2021. The following 29 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 (2020).

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 29 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		JURISDICTION
1	ATHERTON	16	MODOC COUNTY
2	BELL	17	MONTE SERENO
3	BEVERLY HILLS	18	NEWPORT BEACH
4	CALISTOGA	19	ROHNERT PARK
5	CARPINTERIA	20	SAINT HELENA
6	CORTE MADERA	21	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
7	EL CERRITO	22	SANTA ANA
8	FOSTER CITY	23	SANTA CLARA COUNTY
9	GUADALUPE	24	SANTA MONICA
10	HILLSBOROUGH	25	SOLVANG
11	INDUSTRY	26	SONOMA COUNTY
12	LAGUNA NIGUEL	27	UKIAH
13	MENDOCINO COUNTY	28	WEST HOLLYWOOD
14	MENLO PARK	29	WOODSIDE
15	MILL VALLEY		

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary
Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions

When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability

These 285 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) (2020) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

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

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary
Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions
When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability

These 285 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2020) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION
109	INGLEWOOD	144	MADERA COUNTY	179	PALMDALE
110	INYO COUNTY	145	MARICOPA	180	PALOS VERDES ESTATES
111	IRWINDALE	146	MARIPOSA COUNTY	181	PARADISE
112	ISLETON	147	MARTINEZ	182	PARAMOUNT
113	JURUPA VALLEY	148	MARYSVILLE	183	PARLIER
114	KERMAN	149	MAYWOOD	184	PASO ROBLES
115	KERN COUNTY	150	MCFARLAND	185	PATTERSON
116	KINGS COUNTY	151	MENDOTA	186	PICO RIVERA
117	KINGSBURG	152	MENIFEE	187	PINOLE
118	LA HABRA HEIGHTS	153	MERCED COUNTY	188	PLEASANT HILL
119	LA MIRADA	154	MILLBRAE	189	POMONA
120	LA PUENTE	155	MODESTO	190	PORTERVILLE
121	LA VERNE	156	MONTAGUE	191	PORTOLA
122	LAKE COUNTY	157	MONTCLAIR	192	POWAY
123	LAKE ELSINORE	158	MONTEBELLO	193	RED BLUFF
124	LAKEPORT	159	MONTEREY	194	REDLANDS
125	LANCASTER	160	MONTEREY PARK	195	REDONDO BEACH
126	LASSEN COUNTY	161	MORENO VALLEY	196	REEDLEY
127	LAWNDALE	162	MORRO BAY	197	RIALTO
128	LEMON GROVE	163	MOUNT SHASTA	198	RICHMOND
129	LEMOORE	164	NATIONAL CITY	199	RIDGECREST
130	LINDSAY	165	NEEDLES	200	RIO DELL
131	LIVE OAK	166	NEVADA CITY	201	RIPON
132	LIVINGSTON	167	NEVADA COUNTY	202	RIVERBANK
133	LODI	168	NEWMAN	203	RIVERSIDE
134	LOMA LINDA	169	NORCO	204	RIVERSIDE COUNTY
135	LOMPOC	170	NOVATO	205	ROLLING HILLS
136	LONG BEACH	171	OCEANSIDE	206	ROSEMEAD
137	LOOMIS	172	OJAI	207	ROSS
138	LOS ALAMITOS	173	ONTARIO	208	SACRAMENTO
139	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	174	ORANGE COVE	209	SACRAMENTO COUNTY
140	LOS GATOS	175	ORLAND	210	SALINAS
141	LOYALTON	176	OROVILLE	211	SAN BERNARDINO
142	LYNWOOD	177	OXNARD	212	SAN BRUNO
143	MADERA	178	PACIFICA	213	SAN DIEGO COUNTY

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary
Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions
When Proposed Developments Include ≥10% Affordability

These 285 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Above Moderate income RHNA and/or have not submitted the latest APR (2020) and therefore are subject to the streamlined ministerial approval process (SB 35 (Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017) streamlining) for proposed developments with at least 10% affordability.

	JURISDICTION		JURISDICTION
214	SAN DIMAS	250	SUISUN CITY
215	SAN FERNANDO	251	SUSANVILLE
216	SAN JACINTO	252	TAFT
217	SAN JOAQUIN	253	TEHACHAPI
218	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	254	TEHAMA
219	SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	255	TEHAMA COUNTY
220	SAN LEANDRO	256	TIBURON
221	SAN MATEO COUNTY	257	TORRANCE
222	SAN PABLO	258	TULARE COUNTY
223	SAN RAFAEL	259	TULELAKE
224	SAND CITY	260	TUOLUMNE COUNTY
225	SANGER	261	TURLOCK
226	SANTA CLARITA	262	TWENTYNINE PALMS
227	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	263	UPLAND
228	SANTA MARIA	264	VALLEJO
229	SANTA PAULA	265	VENTURA COUNTY
230	SANTA ROSA	266	VICTORVILLE
231	SANTEE	267	VILLA PARK
232	SARATOGA	268	VISALIA
233	SAUSALITO	269	WATERFORD
234	SEASIDE	270	WEST SACRAMENTO
235	SEBASTOPOL	271	WESTLAKE VILLAGE
236	SELMA	272	WESTMORLAND
237	SHAFTER	273	WHEATLAND
238	SHASTA COUNTY	274	WHITTIER
239	SHASTA LAKE	275	WILLIAMS
240	SIERRA COUNTY	276	WILLITS
241	SIGNAL HILL	277	WILLOWS
242	SISKIYOU COUNTY	278	WINDSOR
243	SOLANA BEACH	279	WOODLAKE
244	SOLEDAD	280	YOLO COUNTY
245	SONOMA	281	YREKA
246	SONORA	282	YUBA CITY
247	SOUTH GATE	283	YUBA COUNTY
248	STANISLAUS COUNTY	284	YUCAIPA
249	STOCKTON	285	YUCCA VALLEY

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary
Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions
When Proposed Developments Include ≥ 50% Affordability

These 225 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore 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.

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

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary
Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions
When Proposed Developments Include \geq 50% Affordability

These 225 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very Low and Low income) and are therefore 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.

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

SB 35 Statewide Determination Summary

Cities and Counties Subject to SB 35 Streamlining Provisions When Proposed Developments Include \geq 50% Affordability

These 225 jurisdictions have insufficient progress toward their Lower income RHNA (Very-Low and Low income) and are therefore 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.

	JURISDICTION
208	TULARE
209	TUSTIN
210	UNION CITY
211	VACAVILLE
212	VERNON
213	VISTA
214	WALNUT
215	WALNUT CREEK
216	WASCO
217	WATSONVILLE
218	WEED
219	WEST COVINA
220	WESTMINSTER
221	WILDOMAR
222	WINTERS
223	WOODLAND
224	YORBA LINDA
225	YOUNTVILLE