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Background
On September 9, 2014, a combined Sphere of Influence Plan and Municipal Service Review (SOI/MSR) for the San Joaquin Irrigation District (District) was prepared and publicly released by the San Joaquin County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo), in compliance with the 2000 Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act (CKH Act). On December 11, 2014, LAFCo adopted the District SOI/SMR, along with an addendum to the document.

The District has since received annexation requests from several property owners who wish to obtain irrigation water and drainage services from the District. One property annexation request lies outside the District SOI (Area G), and the other lies within Area B (Area F), which is presently under a 30-year timeframe for irrigation and drainage service. The remaining properties are in Area D. The property owners within Area D have either discussed but not formally requested annexation, or their properties are split by the current District boundary. Given the number of properties in Area D potentially affected by an SOI amendment and the likelihood of additional property owners expressing interest in annexation in the future due to the anticipated increased demand for surface water due to an anticipated decrease in use of groundwater in the area, the District wishes to amend the SOI/MSR to change the entire Area D from the 30-year SOI timeframe to the 10-year SOI timeframe for irrigation water and drainage service. Retail electric service, however, would remain on the 30-year timeframe in Area D. These changes are summarized in Table 2-1 (see page 10 for changes to Table 2-1), and the areas discussed are shown in Figure 2-3, both extracted from the amended SOI/MSR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOI Area</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Sphere Horizon</th>
<th>Planned Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E1</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes areas within the Manteca city limits currently outside SSJID’s SOI, but planned for inclusion in the SOI.

Source: SSJID, 2019; Mintier Harnish, 2019.
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Figure 2-3 (Revised August 2019)
10- and 30-year Timeframes and Anticipated Services
This document outlines, by page, the updates necessary to facilitate approval of an amendment to the District SOI/MSR, to modify the 10-year SOI for irrigation water and drainage service.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of LAFCo, the SOI, District boundary, MSR Determinations, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. Minor changes were made to reflect the proposed SOI expansions and annexation of the 80-acre island (Area A).

Chapter 2 provides the SOI Plan, as required by the CKH Act. This chapter has been updated to provide current status of contracts (for example, SSJID’s contract with PG&E has expired since the last SOI amendment). Sources have been updated to reflect the current location of information and outdated sources have been removed. Population projections have been updated to reflect a 2018 baseline population, extrapolated using data from the California Department of Finance (DOF). This chapter also includes description of the changes to service timeframes in Area D, based on several annexation requests in this area received by the District. Areas F and G have been added to the discussion to accommodate annexation requests outside of Area D.

Chapter 3 is the beginning of the MSR and addresses growth and population projections for the affected area. Population projections have been updated to reflect a 2018 baseline population, extrapolated using data from the DOF. District population in 2040 is estimated to be 187,604.

Chapter 4 addresses present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies. Metrics, such as irrigation water demand, land area served, water diversion, groundwater levels, and groundwater recharge have been updated. Sources have been updated to reflect the current location of information. Outdated sources have been removed. References to the Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan have been updated, such as project funding. The description of Senate Bill (SB) X7-7, which requires all California irrigation districts to take actions to measure, report, and bill their customers for the delivery of actual volumes of water, has been updated to reflect District actions to implement SBX7-7.

Chapter 5 describes the financial ability of the District to provide services. Except for an updated description of SB X7-7 (Water Conservation Act of 2009), no other changes were made to this chapter.

Chapter 6 describes the status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities. Except for updated metrics for amount of untreated water sold, no other changes were made to this chapter.

Chapter 7 discusses accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operation efficiencies. The number of District employees and the District organizational chart were updated. No other changes were made to this chapter.
Chapter 8 evaluates the provision of infrastructure and services to disadvantaged unincorporated communities within and adjacent to the District’s SOI. The household income threshold for a disadvantaged unincorporated community was updated to reflect more current income data. Within the District, only French Camp CDP qualifies as a disadvantaged unincorporated community. The number of households and median household income were updated to reflect more current data.

All appendices remain unchanged, with the exception of Appendix B. Appendix B provides information on population history and projections and was updated to reflect more current sources.
Executive Summary
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- **Updated verb tense:**
  SSJID is separately petitioning San Joaquin LAFCo for a change of organization…
  Since the District is petitioning San Joaquin LAFCo to annex an 80-acre island and for a change in organization…

- **Updated project setting:**
  The District has requested San Joaquin LAFCo to bring Areas D, F, and G into the 10-year SOI for irrigation water service. All the subject properties either currently have or will install their own irrigation and drainage infrastructure (pipes or ditches) so the District’s current irrigation and drainage infrastructure would not require upgrading or expansion. The District has sufficient water and drainage infrastructure capacity to provide the requested irrigation water and drainage service to the proposed annexation areas.
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- **Updated demographic information:**
  It is anticipated population within SSJID’s territory increase to 204,657 through 2040.
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- **Updated water demand information:**
  As of 2017, irrigation water demand in the district currently (2013) averages approximately 230,214,000 AF of water, serves approximately 476,500 acres of agricultural land, and accounts for about 80 to 90 percent of the total water supplied by the District.

- **Updated water supply information:**
  Pursuant to its Agricultural Water Management Plan, adopted December 16, 2015, the District continues to develop and implement strategies for water delivery monitoring and efficiency. As recommended by the SSJID Water Balance Study (Davids Engineering, 2009), SSJID should take steps to improve its monitoring and operations practices to ensure water supplies are delivered to customers as efficiently as possible.
• **Updated water supply information:**
  Water well testing in the district in 2010-2017 showed a -0.22.0 foot net change in groundwater levels. While monitoring showed an overall decrease, ground water levels increased generally show a very gradual but steady decline in the western parts of the district overall.
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• **Updated water facilities information:**
  SSJID is commencing the study phase in developing a “Water Master Plan,” which, among other things, will identify significant, long-term capital improvement projects for a 20-year horizon. SSJID’s Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan identifies ongoing system improvements to maintain and enhance its irrigation water and water treatment facilities. In addition, in the near term, SSJID has several major capital improvement projects planned or currently underway to improve system efficiencies, conserve water, and deliver water to new customers. These include, including, the Phase II of the South County Water Supply Project; expansion of the pressurized agricultural water delivery system; treated water delivery of treated water to the City of Ripon; irrigation water delivery to the 80-acre annexation area; and the SB X7-7 Water Measurement Program. While SSJID’s Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan may change to reflect findings from its Water Master Plan its pressurized irrigation system study, it is reasonable to assume that the District’s improvements will ensure it continues providing adequate irrigation water and treated water service to its customers.
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• **Updated Plan title and date:**
  SSJID should conduct a financial analysis of the Agricultural Water Management Plan (Davids Engineering, Inc. 2015), Water Balance Report (Davids Engineering, Inc. 2009) and Urban Water Management Plan (2011-2016)…

• **Fixed grammar:**
  …the users would be responsible for paying to upgrade facilities.

• **Added information on recent SSJID efforts:**
  SSJID and the City of Manteca are commencing a Master Plan Study for SSJID's primary drainage facility, the French Camp Outlet Canal (“FCOC”) to analyze its hydrology and capacity and identify future improvements to enhance the operation of the FCOC.
Updated date:
SSJID, MID, and PG&E currently (2019) provide for electricity generation, supply, or distribution within SSJID’s SOI. SSJID...

Fixed grammar:
As a retail electric service provider, it is expected that SSJID would improve accountability, transparency, and public involvement...

Fixed grammar:
Irrigation water and drainage service has been improved could be improved by approving SSJID’s annexation application for the 80-acre island. Irrigation water and drainage service could be improved by amending SSJID’s SOI to include the City of Manteca; amending SSJID’s 10-year SOI to include Area-D, Area-F, and Area-G; maintaining SSJID as the planned service provider in Area-B (Figure 2-3); and detaching Area-C from CSJWCD’s existing boundary and maintaining SSJID as the planned service provider (Figure 2-3). SSJID could also provide more efficient and cost-effective service to Area-B and Area-C compared to another agency...

Fixed grammar:
Reorganization of SSJID to include retail electric service, as well as approval of SSJID’s application to annex the 80-acre island, could provide more efficient and cost-effective retail electric service without impacting SSJID’s existing services or customers.

Added description of new figures:
Figure 1-2 shows the SSJID’s service area boundary, existing SOI, and proposed SOI. Figure 1-3a and 1-3b shows a-close-ups of the SOI expansion areas to the west and to the south.

Added Figure 1-3b: SOI Expansion Area Close-up-South
Figure 1-3b
Proposed SOI Expansion Area-South

Legend
- District Boundary
- Existing Sphere of Influence
- Sphere of Influence Expansion
- City Limits

Source: South San Joaquin Irrigation District, January 2010; City of Manteca, January 2010
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- **Updated information on LAFCo application approval:**
  In 2014, LAFCo approved SSJID’s request and is also requesting that LAFCo approve its application to annex an 80-acre island within the District service area boundary.

- **Updated information on SOI expansion:**
  The proposed 2014 SOI expanded the District SOI to the west by about 2,220 acres, so it is coterminous with the Manteca city limits. SSJID is now requesting the SOI be further expanded, and south by about 80 acres. The proposed SOI would total about 88,760-840 acres (138.87 square miles) and result in about 16,460-540 acres (25.87 square miles) remaining outside the District service area boundary.
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- **Updated date:**
  SSJID currently (2014-2019) delivers irrigation water and provides associated drainage, sells treated drinking water and raw water wholesale, and provides recreation through agreement with Stanislaus County.

- **Updated needs analysis:**
  In 2016, when SSJID’s contract with PG&E expired, and the District now sells all electricity to the City of Santa Clara under a contract that expires at the end of 2023.

Page 18
- **Updated date:**
  The area currently (2014-2019) receives water through individual wells. CSJWCD does not have plans to provide water service to this area.
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- Updated existing services information:
  SSJID has conducted several analyses to determine potential impacts to its water supplies and identify necessary improvements to its water system, including the Agricultural Water Management Plan (2012), the Water Balance Report (2009), and the Urban Water Management Plan (2016), and the On-Farm Water Conservation Program (2011). The District is also currently (2019) undertaking a Water Master Planning development process to, among other things, assess the feasibility of improving and modernizing the Division 9 pressurized irrigation system. The District’s infrastructure to meet future demands, increase the flexibility and availability of water, and potentially expanding the pressurized irrigation system concept in other divisions within the district.
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- Updated date:
  As described in Chapter 5 of the MSR, SSJID has committed to paying franchise fees and property taxes to local government agencies within San Joaquin County that are estimated to exceed those currently (2019) paid by PG&E.
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- Updated demographic information:
  Chapter 3 of the MSR provides a detailed description of SSJID’s existing and projected population. In summary, the estimated 2018 population within the SOI was 100,468 (California DOF, 2018; U.S. Census 2010). Within the District, there has been some growth in the cities and limited growth in the unincorporated areas. SSJID is expected to continue to grow at a 2.4 percent average annual growth rate, with little growth occurring in the unincorporated areas. There has been limited growth in the district since 2010. The cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon are expected to continue to grow at a historical growth rate of 2.4 percent per year, with little growth occurring in the unincorporated areas, resulting in a 2040 population of about 204,657 or 187,604 new residents (California DOF, 2018; Census 2010; California DOF; San Joaquin Council of Governments, 2008).

- Updated map area reference numbering:
  The District has identified Areas “A” and “GE” for inclusion in the 10-year Sphere Horizon (shown in yellow on Figure 2-3).
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- Updated annexation area information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2-1</th>
<th>FUTURE DISTRICT ANNEXATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOI Area</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E²</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Would require San Joaquin LAFCo approval of SSJID’s retail electric service application.*
*Includes areas within the Manteca city limits currently outside SSJID’s SOI, but planned for inclusion in the SOI.

Source: SSJID, 2019; Mintier Harnish, 2019.

- Updated annexation area information:

The information contained in this section of the MSR reflects SSJID’s currently (2014-2019) anticipated services. Generally, the District’s current (2014-2019) decision to not expand a service into an area of its SOI is based on expected customer demand and the cost to extend facilities or service. For example, SSJID does not plan to extend electricity service to Areas “B”, “C”, “F” or “G”.
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- Updated Figure 2-3: 10- and 30-year Timeframes and Anticipated Services
This page is intentionally left blank.
Area A (Annexed) - Irrigation - Drainage - Retail Electric

Area B - Irrigation - Drainage

Area C - Irrigation - Drainage

Area D - Retail Electric (30-year) - Irrigation (10-year) - Drainage (10-year)

Area E - Drainage - Retail Electric

Area G (Circle JM Dairy) - Irrigation - Drainage

Legend:
- County Boundary
- City Limits
- Sphere of Influence
- District Boundary
- 10-year Sphere Horizon
- 30-year Sphere Horizon
- Combined 10- and 30-year Sphere Horizon

Source: South San Joaquin Irrigation District, April 2011

Figure 2-3 (Revised August 2019)
10- and 30-year Timeframes and Anticipated Services
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• Updated acreage:
  Area B - 7,800,760-acre Area to the Northwest
  Area B is a 7,800,760-acre area on the northwest edge of the District. Area-B is within the 30-year Sphere Horizon.

• Updated date:
  CSJWCD does not currently (2014-2019) provide any services to the area and it does not have any plans to extend services to the area.
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• Updated Area “D” information:
  This area includes the southern edge of the City of Ripon and the City of Escalon wastewater treatment plant. Area “D” is within the 30-year Sphere Horizon. The District anticipates that it will ultimately provide irrigation and drainage within the next 10 years and retail electricity service to this area within the next 30 years… The District has identified several properties in Area D where either the property owners have discussed but not formally requested annexation, or the properties are split by the District boundary. Given the number of properties in Area D potentially affected by an SOI amendment, and the likelihood of additional property owners in the future also expressing interest in annexation due to the decreasing water availability and suitability in the area, the District has expressed interest in moving the entire Area D into the 10-year SOI for irrigation water service/drainage.

• Fixed formatting:
  Area E - 2,200-acre Area to the West
• **Added information on Area “F”:**
  
  **Area F - 40-acre Area to the North**

  Area-F is a 40-acre area located at the northern edge of the District Boundary, encompassed by Area-B and located on the Robert L. Miller property. Area-F is within the 4030-year SOI. The District anticipates that it will provide irrigation and drainage service to this area within the next 10 years. The District expects that this area would remain in agricultural production. The area currently (2019) receives water through individual wells and through natural streambeds that carry unused pass-through water from both SSJID and CSJWCD that ultimately drains to the San Joaquin River. In order to serve Area-F, the District would need to extend or construct irrigation and drainage lines and canals and impose conditions to allocate water supplies (e.g., extension of District facilities are the owner’s expense, the owner must follow District rules for water delivery and pay District fees, the District makes no assurances of water supply, and new customers are subject to reductions in the event of shortages in supply).

• **Added information on Area “G”:**
  
  **Area G – 80-acre Area to the Southwest**

  Area G is approximately 80 acres and located at the southwest edge of the District Boundary, on the existing Circle JM Dairy property. It is within the 10-year SOI, outside the Sphere of Influence. This property currently (2019) receives irrigation water service from the District through out-of-area service agreements. Annexation of this property would reduce their property owner’s service costs and enable them to participate in District elections. These property owners would install their own irrigation and drainage infrastructure (e.g., pipes, ditches); meaning the District’s current irrigation and drainage infrastructure would not require an upgrade or expansion.
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• **Updated date:**

  The District’s current (2014-2019) water supplies are adequate to serve the area identified for annexation without affecting its current irrigation and domestic water customers.

• **Updated date:**

  SSJID does not currently (2014-2019) plan to provide all its services (i.e., irrigation water, agricultural drainage, and, if approved by San Joaquin LAFCo, retail electric) to all areas of its SOI.
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- **Updated population and demographics information:**
  Table 3-1 summarizes the 2018 SSJID District and SOI population. As the table shows, 98.8 percent (99,268,109.890) of the population resides within the District service area. Areas outside the District, but within the District’s SOI, are lightly populated, accounting for only 1.2 percent (about 1,328,200) of the population. Most of the population in the SOI (88.1 percent or 88,525,977) resides in the cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon.
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- **Updated population and demographics information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>20180 Population</th>
<th>Percent of SOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>7,132,895</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca¹</td>
<td>67,096,275</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>14,297,158,277</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated²</td>
<td>40,743,11,893</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Boundary Subtotal</td>
<td>99,268,109,890</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining SOI³</td>
<td>4,291,328</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20180 Total SOI</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,468,111,218</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes areas within the Manteca city limits currently outside SSJID’s SOI, but planned for inclusion in the SOI.
² 2010 estimates based on estimated Census 2000 Block-Level population data. At the writing of this report 2010 Census Block-Level data is not available. Assumes little growth occurred in unincorporated areas of the District and SOI between 2000 and 2010. 2018 estimates are extrapolated by multiplying the 2010 estimates by 10.7% (the population growth in San Joaquin County between 2010 and 2018 using DOF estimates).
³ Source: Census 2000 and Census 2010, United States Census Bureau, California Department of Finance, 2018; Mintier Harnish, 2019.
• *Updated growth projections:*  
  Appendix B: Historic and Projected Population and Employment provides a detailed description of San Joaquin County’s historic and projected population and employment growth developed as part of the San Joaquin County General Plan Update (2008). Historically (i.e., 19902000 through 20052015), the county had an average annual population growth rate of about 21.8 percent. During the same period from 2000 through 2005, the cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon (within the SSJID service area) had a combined historic average annual growth rate of about 2.82.5 percent (1.52.4 percent, 3.1 percent, and 2.83.0 percent, respectively). According to the Although growth projections used by San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), show that population growth for the cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon are expected to grow at an average annual growth rate of about 1.32.4 percent through the year 2030, each of the local jurisdictions predict a higher future growth rate for themselves. Based on the 2011 Escalon SOI/MSR, Escalon expects a 2.01-2.33 percent compounded growth rate between 2018 and 2025. According to the Manteca Growth Management Ordinance, the City assumes a maximum 3.9 percent annual growth rate. Based on the 2010 Ripon SOI/MSR, Ripon expects an average annual growth rate of 3.2 percent. The higher expected growth rates of the cities within the SSJID service area combined little growth expected in the unincorporated areas, leads LAFCo to conclude that the 2.4 percent average annual growth rate used in the adopted 2014 SSJID SOI/MSR Report is still appropriate for this update. While the current recession has slowed growth throughout the State and nation, June 2011 California Department of Finance population projections show that in the near term San Joaquin County’s population will experience a slow-down, but then recover in the long term consistent with projections used in this MSR.
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- Updated population and demographics information:
  Table 3-2 shows projected population from 2018 through 2040 in two and five-year increments. Projected population is based on an historic expected future (i.e., 1990 through 2005) average annual growth rate of 2.4 percent. As the table shows, by 2020 the District’s SOI population is expected to grow to 127,358. By 2040 the District’s SOI population is expected to grow to 204,657.

  TABLE 3-2 EXISTING AND PROJECTED POPULATION (SSJID SOI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Population (2.4 Percent Annual Growth Rate)</th>
<th>Five-Year Increment of Net New Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100,468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>111,218</td>
<td>11,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>119,226</td>
<td>8,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>113,533</td>
<td>14,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>149,557</td>
<td>16,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>167,504</td>
<td>17,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>187,604</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, 2018; LAFCo, 2019; Mintier Harnish, 2019 Census 2000 and Census 2010, United States Census Bureau; California DOF, June 2011; San Joaquin Council of Governments, 2008; Mintier Harnish, 2011.

- Updated MSR Finding 1:
  The estimated 2018 population within the SOI was 100,468. For the purposes of this report, we assume that the cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon will continue to grow at their historical projected growth rate of 2.4 percent per year, with little growth occurring in the unincorporated areas of the district, resulting in a 2040 population of about 204,657.
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- Updated irrigation water statistics:
  As of 2017, irrigation water demand in the district currently (20173) averages approximately 230214.000 AF of water and serves approximately 5647.500-900 acres of agricultural land.
- **Updated MSR Finding 2:**
  
  As of 2017, irrigation water demand in the district currently (2013) averages approximately 230,214,000 AF of water, serves approximately 4,756,500 acres of agricultural land, and accounts for about 80 to 90 percent of the total water supplied by the District.
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- **Updated Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) information:**
  
  The District adopted an Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) in June 2016 on September 13, 2011, for its domestic water service in accordance with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act. The UWMP evaluates SSJID’s urban water supplies for the period of 2011 to 2030. This UWMP reports on activities from 2011 to 2015 and provides projections for future activities through 2040. This is the first UWMP prepared by SSJID.
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- **Updated Table 4-1 source:**
  
  Source: SSJID UWMP, Table 5-63-1, Davids Engineering, Inc. December-June 2012-16.

- **Updated date in MSR Finding 4:**
  
  SSJID’s Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) (September 13, 2011-June 2016) covers treated water delivered by the district as part of the SCWSP.
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- **Updated water supply study information:**
  
  According to the 2015 SSJID Water Balance Study, Agricultural Water Management Plan (Davids Engineering, 2015), an estimated 19,000 to 45,000 acre-feet of the demand per water year between 1994 and 2014 was supplied by rainfall stored in the root zone. Total rainfall on agricultural land within the district boundaries varied from 30,000 to 123,000 acre-feet annually between 1994 and 2008.

- **Updated study reference:**
  
  Detailed analysis and information on SSJID’s irrigation water supply and demand can be found in the District’s Agricultural Water Management Plan (Davids Engineering, Inc., 2015) and the SSJID Water Balance Study (Davids Engineering, Inc., 2009). Domestic water supply and demand analysis and information can be found in the District’s Urban Water Management Plan (2014, Provost & Prichard Consulting Group).
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- Updated Figure 4-1:

According to the 2015 SSJID Water Balance Study Agricultural Water Management Plan (Davids Engineering, 2015), the District’s supply has varied from about 205,000 to 268,000 acre-feet between 1994 and 2014, with a wet year average of 220,000 af and a dry year average of 237,000 af. The overall average for the 21-year period was 230 af. As the dashed trend line shows, average water diversions have increased slightly from just under 230,000 acre-feet/year to about 240,000 acre-feet/year. The difference between these measurements in Figure 4-1 and the Water Balance Study is due to the location used to take the measurements.
Updated the Goodwin Dam Water Diversions to SSJID figure:

Source: AWMP, 2015.

Source: Tri-Dam, 2013
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- **Updated water source information:**
  According to the 2015 SSJID Water Balance Study Agricultural Water Management Plan (by David’s Engineering, 2009-2015), the reported results of the water balance for each flow path imply a greater degree of accuracy than is justified. While potential error in the data has not been assessed, uncertainty for each flow path has been estimated, which is approximately equivalent to a 95 percent confidence interval. There is appreciable uncertainty in SSJID’s outflow measurements, and the overall level of confidence in the water balance is lower than desired, although adequate for making initial performance assessments. Water balance is the amount of water delivered to SSJID customers after accounting for various factors, such as evaporation, leakage, and seepage. Davids Engineering recommended that certainty be increased by improving outflow measurements and conducting regular, independent validation of inflow measurements. Specifically, the Study made four recommendations to improve water balance:
  - Further enhance ongoing efforts to expand and improve flow measurement;
  - Differentiate between District lateral and farm performance and conduct on-farm efficiency assessments with cooperating landowners;
  - Work toward providing real time flow measurements to system operators; and
  - Continue to enhance centralized data storage and management.

- **Updated MSR Finding 6**
  As recommended by the SSJID Water Balance Study (Davids Engineering, 2009), SSJID should take steps to improve its monitoring and operations practices to ensure water supplies are delivered to customers as efficiently as possible.
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- **Updated water supply information:**
  According to SSJID’s AWMP, agricultural irrigation is the dominant water use in SSJID. Total water required to meet the evapotranspiration need of the crops grown varied from 147,000 to 178,000 acre-feet per water year between 1994 and 2014. Between 1994 and 2008 SSJID and growers within the SSJID service area pumped an average of 39,652 acre-feet of groundwater, most of which was pumped by growers with their own wells. In wet years groundwater pumping averaged 30,025 acre-feet; in dry years pumping increased to an average of 48,075 acre-feet, most by growers with their own wells.
Page 59

• *Updated groundwater information:*
  Decreases have averaged over 1.75 feet per year, and groundwater levels have dropped over 100 feet in some areas during the 40-year period.

• *Updated groundwater information:*
  Groundwater is relatively shallow (i.e., less than 20 feet below ground level) in the central portion of San Joaquin County, and as shallow as two feet within SSJID’s SOI and on the western side of SSJID.

• *Updated groundwater information:*
  In Spring 2010 Fall 2016, SJCFCCD reported on 44-22 wells, out of a total of 39 wells, within the District showing a -0.2 foot net average -0.77 change in groundwater levels. Of the 44-22 reported wells, 26-12 showed decreases in groundwater levels, 44-nine (9) showed increases in levels, and one (1)4 wells showed no change. Increases in groundwater levels were concentrated in the western portions of the District.

• *Updated MSR Finding 7:*
  As a result of groundwater pumping by property owners, cities, and water providers within and outside the district, groundwater levels have decreased an average of 1.57 feet per year... Water well testing in the district in 2010 showed a -0.277 foot net change in groundwater levels. While monitoring showed an overall decrease, groundwater levels increased in the western parts of the district.
• **Updated water balance study findings:**
  Results from a water balance study prepared for the District by Davids Engineering, Inc., as reported in SSJID’s 2015 Agricultural Water Management Plan, showed that the District’s irrigation water service facilities and practices, which include seepage, deep percolation of applied water, and deep percolation of precipitation, result in groundwater recharge of about 144,000 acre-feet per year, while District and private groundwater pumping is about 54,000 acre-feet per year. Thus, the net effect of District, landowner operations, and annual precipitation is recharge of nearly 90,000 acre-feet each year. Supply of surface water in canals and reservoirs annually recharges the groundwater in excess of 50,000 acre-feet. When combined with drain seepage and deep percolation, SSJID contributes a total recharge of about 97,000 acre-feet per year. Between 1994 and 2014, net groundwater recharge tended to be greater in wet, full allocation years, and less in net dry years. Total recharge was found to be greater in dry years due to longer irrigation seasons (i.e., increased number of days during which seepage in the distribution and drainage systems occurs) and increased crop irrigation requirements in dry years.

• **Updated MSR Finding 8:**
  SSJID’s irrigation water service facilities and practices, which include seepage, deep percolation of applied water, and deep percolation of precipitation, result in groundwater recharge of about 97,144,000 acre-feet per year while District and private groundwater pumping is about 54,000 acre-feet. Based on average recharge rates compared to average groundwater pumping within SSJID, the AWMP found that SSJID activities result in a net recharge to the groundwater basin of about 57,300 acre-feet per year. Thus, the net effect of District, landowner operations and annual precipitation is recharge of nearly 90,000 acre-feet each year.
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• **Updated timeframe:**
  The City of Ripon is currently (2014) interested in negotiating with SSJID (and the other cities in the SCWSP) to receive treated water in lieu of raw water it receives under its current contract with the District and to accelerate the annual delivery schedule.
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- **Updated water supply data:**
  According to SSJID’s AWMP, it is estimated that SSJID is expected to receive its full supply in 79 out of 100 years and is expected to receive at least 249,267,000 acre-feet in 95-90 out of 100 years. The minimum supply SSJID is expected to receive in any year is approximately 190,225,000 acre-feet.
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- **Updated source references:**
  These strategies include those identified in the California Water Plan and *Safeguarding California: 2018 Update*, 2009 Update (California Department of Water Resources, 2010) as well as strategies identified in the 2009 California Climate Adaptation Strategy.
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- **Updated source reference dates:**
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- **Added source reference date:**
  According to SSJID’s 2015 AWMP, the District monitors electrical conductivity for its 28 production wells using permanently installed sensors.
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- **Updated source references:**
  Detailed information on SSJID’s existing and planned irrigation water distribution system can be found in the Districts’ 2015 Agricultural Water Management Plan (2012, Davids Engineering, Inc.). Domestic water treatment and distribution facilities information can be found in the District’s 2016 Urban Water Management Plan (2011, Provost & Prichard Consulting Group).
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- **Updated source reference date:**
  SSJID has identified, in its Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan (September November 21, 201724, 2013), maintenance projects and system enhancements…
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- **Updated information from the SSJID Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan:**
  In total the Plan identifies project costs of about $33,520.2 million over five years (includes irrigation system, shop, and water treatment plan improvements); however, SSJID is only directly responsible for funding about $14,360.6 million of those costs. The remaining $19,560.6 million cost would be the responsibility of property-owners or developers, cities within the district, partner irrigation districts, or specific rate payer fees (e.g., SBx7-7 rates).

- **Updated source reference date:**
  SSJID’s irrigation system improvement plans are likely to change once the District completes its current (20193) Master Plan on expanding its pressurization irrigation system.
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- **Updated information on SBX7-7 Water Measurement Program:**
  Senate Bill X7-7 (SB X7-7), also known as the Water Conservation Act of 2009, contains provisions requiring all California irrigation districts, including SSJID, to take actions to measure, report, and bill their customers for the delivery of actual volumes of water. SSJID is required to measure the volume of water delivered to its customers and adopt a pricing structure based at least in part on the quantity of water delivered. SSJID’S first tier volumetric charge is $3 per acre-foot of water for the first 48 inches and $10 per acre-foot for water used in excess of 48 inches. Water usage is determined by the flow rate multiplied by the duration of the water run. Flow rate is determined on the basis of the predetermined capacities of gates, laterals, and turnouts throughout the distribution system, together with average head during each irrigation delivery. Electronic flow meters, doppler meters, and magnetic meters will be used to take measurements. SSJID is implementing all technically feasible Efficient Water Management Practices identified by SB X7-7 to achieve water use efficiency improvements in SSJID operations and to encourage on-farm improvements, detailed in the 2015 SSJID Agricultural Water Management Plan. SBX7-7 (Steinberg, 2009) requires water purveyors to develop a water measurement program by 2015. The District is currently (2013) working with an engineering firm to implement a measurement program, which will include 111 Doppler and 282 magnetic meters. To comply with the SBX7-7 volumetric pricing requirements, SSJID adopted a new, $3.00 per acre-foot charge in addition to its existing charges, which will be implemented in 2014 (see Chapter 5).
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• **Updated MSR Finding 19:**
  While SSJID has prepared plans to ensure its water supplies and associated infrastructure are sufficient to meet future demands, SSJID has not conducted detailed financial studies to determine how it will carry out implementation of the Agricultural Water Management Plan (2015), Water Balance Report (2009), and Urban Water Management Plan (2016). For water conservation programs, it appears that SSJID is not planning to provide future funding. SSJID should conduct a financial analysis of the Agricultural Water Management Plan (Davids Engineering, Inc. 2015), Water Balance Report (Davids Engineering, Inc. 2009) and Urban Water Management Plan (2016), and prepare a comprehensive, near- to mid-term Capital Improvement Plan to carry out identified improvements.

• **Updated date:**
  In 2015 SSJID prepared and adopted its current AWMP.
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• **Added UWMP update information:**
  In 2011 SSJID prepared and adopted its UWMP, and most recently updated it in 2016.

• **Removed outdated finding from previous version of the UWMP:**
  According to SSJID’s Urban Water Management Plan (2011), SSJID began implementing these measures as early as 2005. In most cases SSJID continues to carry out these and other measures that increase domestic water conservation.
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• **Updated date:**
  SSJID has identified, in its Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan (November 21, 2017; September 24, 2013), a specific set of maintenance projects and system enhancements that will ensure SSJID’s water and drainage systems continue to operate and function at an optimal level.
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• **Updated date:**
  SSJID, MID, and PG&E currently (2019) provide for electricity generation, supply, or distribution within SSJID’s SOI.
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- Updated date:
  SSJID does not currently (2019) provide retail electric service.
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- Updated date:
  Currently (2013) SSJID does not provide retail electricity service.
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- Updated date:
  Figure 4-10 shows areas currently (2013) served by PG&E and MID.
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- Updated date:
  SSJID currently (2013) receives retail electric service for its facilities from PG&E and MID.

**Page 119**
- Updated date:
  PG&E currently (2013) offers programs for customers to reduce their peak and base period demands for electricity.

**Page 130**
- Updated information on SBx7-7:
  Pursuant to SBx7-7 (Steinberg, 2009), the District recently (2018) has enacted a new volumetric pricing structure that requires agricultural water to be priced at least in part based on volume. SSJID has added a volumetric rate of $3.00 per acre-foot to the existing fixed charge of $24 per acre. This new volumetric rate is projected to provide enough incremental revenue to amortize the cost of the meters and to cover operating and maintenance costs of the measurement program. This fee structure became effective in 2014.
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- Updated date:
  The District is also currently (2013) reviewing the feasibility of delivering treated water to Ripon.

According to the 2014-2015 UWMP, SSJID charges cities involved in the SCWSP for all operating, maintenance, and capital costs of the water treatment and delivery system.
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- Updated date:
  SSJID could provide services to Area-C, which is currently (2019) within
  CSJWCD’s service area and SSJID’s SOI.

- Added recent water capacity information:
  SSJID also sold 11,500 acre-feet, 42,500 acre feet, and 31,459 acre-feet of untreated
  water in 2015, 2016, and 2017, respectively.

- Fixed typo:
  SSJID, in coordination with the SCWSP members, could work with the City of Ripon
  to provide treated water to Ripon from the Nick C. Groote Water Treatment Plant.
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- Updated employee information:
  SSJID currently (2019) has 89-97 full-time employees who are responsible for
  operations and maintenance, construction, billing and collection for irrigation and
  water utility services, and wholesale power sales.
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- Updated Figure 7-2: Organizational Chart
Figure 7-2 SSJID Organizational Structure
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- **Updated date:**
The current plan was approved by the SSJID Board on November 21, 2017 (Appendix C: SSJID Five-Year Capital Expenditures Plan).
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- **Updated date:**
SSJID is currently (2019) exploring the feasibility of constructing a new District headquarters facility.
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- **Deleted outdated information:**
Currently (2012) the best available data for determining disadvantaged unincorporated communities was prepared by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR).

- **Updated demographic information:**
DWR developed a mapping tool to help determine which communities meet the disadvantaged communities median household income definition. DWR’s maps and geographic information system (GIS) files use the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey and are compiled for the five year period 2006-2010, 2012-2016. DWR included in the maps a calculated field that indicates the DAC status for different census geographies (Census Designated Place, Tract, and Block Group). DWR established a median household income of less than about $48,700 as the disadvantaged unincorporated communities threshold (i.e., 80 percent of the statewide median household income)… The French Camp CDP is located adjacent to the SSJID SOI, it includes 609 households and has been in existence for more than 50 years, and it had a median household income ($39,729,32,383).
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- **Updated reference date:**

Page 219

- **Updated reference date:**
Appendix B: Population History and Projections

- Deleted outdated information and updated tables:
  - Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., (WPE) provides long-term projections of population, employment, and earnings for all counties in the United States. WPE uses the “Export-Based Approach” to generate employment and earnings projections by industry sector that are based on data from the U.S. Department of Commerce. Compared to the other sources reviewed, WPE projections forecast the most conservative growth rates for both population and employment in the county. WPE projects County population to grow at an average annual growth rate of 1.1 percent to reach 880,100 by 2030, while employment is projected to grow at a faster rate than population—1.3 percent annually from 307,000 jobs in 2010 to 398,700 jobs in 2030 (see Table 3-22).
## TABLE B-1
### POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS
#### SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
1990-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historical Trends</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Projected Trends</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>522,100</td>
<td>569,064</td>
<td>665,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSCE&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>583,586</td>
<td>660,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOF</td>
<td>480,628</td>
<td>517,926</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>652,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>630,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Census</td>
<td>480,628</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>646,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods &amp; Poole</td>
<td>484,131</td>
<td>517,923</td>
<td>568,333</td>
<td>664,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>481,796</td>
<td>519,316</td>
<td>568,629</td>
<td>653,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Employment&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>170,140</td>
<td>196,410</td>
<td>214,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>195,710</td>
<td>207,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>172,433</td>
<td>175,568</td>
<td>204,007</td>
<td>221,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods &amp; Poole</td>
<td>215,763</td>
<td>226,419</td>
<td>259,492</td>
<td>286,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>194,098</td>
<td>190,709</td>
<td>213,905</td>
<td>232,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The time frame for the average annual growth rate may vary based on available data.

<sup>2</sup>Average annual growth rate shown for the 1996-2016 period; population and employment projects extrapolated to 2015 by Economic Planning Systems (EPS).

<sup>3</sup>Defined as number of jobs in the County.

Source: U.S. Census; Caltrans; CCSCE; DOF; EDD; SJCOG; Woods & Poole; and EPS.
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## TABLE B-1
**POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS**
**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY**
**1990-2030**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historical Trends</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate¹</th>
<th>Projected Trends</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth Rate ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>522,100</td>
<td>569,064</td>
<td>665,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOF</td>
<td>480,628</td>
<td>517,926</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>652,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>630,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Census</td>
<td>480,628</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>646,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>480,628</td>
<td>520,013</td>
<td>564,965</td>
<td>648,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Employment²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>170,140</td>
<td>196,410</td>
<td>214,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>195,710</td>
<td>221,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>170,140</td>
<td>196,060</td>
<td>217,619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The time frame for the average annual growth rate may vary based on available data.

² Defined as number of jobs in the County.

California Center for the Study of the Continuing Economy (CCSCE). CCSCE provides high-level statewide and county projections. Short-term projections provide a nearer-term indicator of future growth and appropriateness of other projection sources. Projections are based on the analysis of economic regions, in this case the San Joaquin Valley Region, derived from CCSCE’s regional projections, county-level data provided by regional planning agencies (such as SJCOG), and analysis of historical county shares of regional growth. Employment projections are determined based on analysis of individual industries in each area’s economic base and factor location decisions, such as national growth rates and supply and determinants unique to each industry sector.

California Employment Development Department (EDD). The State EDD provides detailed current employment estimates based on the Current Employment Statistics (CES) survey, which summarizes monthly employment, hours, and earnings data from a sample of California employers. Final revisions to the statewide and local area data, called a “benchmark” are made each March for the current and previous year. Projections are available by industry sector.

To provide a reasonable estimate of projected population and employment in the County, Table B-2 averages these projected demographic trends. This method accounts for the level of variation in projection methodology and provides a foundation for future analysis. Average San Joaquin County population projections estimate a 1.22 percent average annual rate of growth from 2020 through 2030 for a total of nearly 880,000-1 million people, while employment is estimated to average 1.51 percent annually to a total of 344,100 over 290,000 jobs by 2030.

Overall, the County and incorporated cities have experienced significant growth since 2000. Annual average rates of growth of 2 percent or higher represent strong growth and almost all the Cities experienced this level of growth between 2000 and 2005. Countywide growth was at 2 percent; however, the unincorporated County population growth was a bit slower at 1.7 percent annually, possibly related to annexations of unincorporated land to cities.
Projected growth is expected to be absorbed largely by the cities. Between 2010 and 2030, SJCOG data show that of the total projected countywide population, about 88 percent of growth would occur in cities. By 2030 about 81 percent of the population growth would occur in incorporated cities. Average annual growth rates of these cities’ population would also increase at a slightly faster rate than that of the unincorporated county. The county as a whole is expected to increase by a rate of 2.2 percent annually from 2010-2030. More robust growth is expected in Lathrop, Tracy, and Manteca, as those cities have planned capacity for future residential development. Growth in the unincorporated County is relatively slower than that of the cities—an estimated 1.1 percent increase annually over the 20-year time frame, as opposed to 2.4 percent annually in the cities over the same time period.

**TABLE B-2**
**POPULATION FORECAST**
**SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY AND CITIES**
**2000-2030**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/County</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>2000-2005</th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>2010-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>5,963</td>
<td>6,712</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>10,445</td>
<td>12,369</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>57,011</td>
<td>60,913</td>
<td>3,902</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>49,255</td>
<td>57,499</td>
<td>8,244</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>10,158</td>
<td>11,794</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>243,771</td>
<td>268,270</td>
<td>24,499</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>56,929</td>
<td>70,541</td>
<td>13,612</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incorporated</td>
<td>433,532</td>
<td>488,098</td>
<td>54,566</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>130,066</td>
<td>141,278</td>
<td>11,212</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>563,598</td>
<td>629,376</td>
<td>65,778</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the current recession has slowed growth throughout the State and nation, recent (June 2011) California Department of Finance population projections show that in the near-term San Joaquin County’s population will experience a slow-down, but then recover in the long-term consistent with projections used in this MSR.
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