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Just 3 years into its forecast, DRU already overestimated California's population by over 1.4 million by 2023.

DRU California population forecast vs. actual over 2020-2023

|  |  |  |  | DRU overstated |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Period | Year | DRU Forecast | Actual | in numbers |  |
| in \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| Period 0 | 2020 | $39,782,419$ | $39,782,419$ |  |  |
| Period 1 | 2021 | $39,953,269$ | $39,430,547$ | 522,723 |  |
| Period 2 | 2022 | $40,146,003$ | $39,078,674$ | $1,3 \%$ |  |
| Period 3 | 2023 | $40,354,217$ | $38,940,231$ | $1,413,986$ |  |

The actual 2021 population figure was extrapolated as being half way between the 2020 and 2022 actual ones. This estimation has no impact on the finding that DRU's estimate is over 1.4 million too high or $3.6 \%$ above the actual figure in 2023. This is a gigantic error just 3 years into the forecast.

DRU ignored the impact of COVID and Work From Home. That's even though DRU published its forecast in July of 2021, already 16 months into the COVID and WFH era.



|  | 2023 |  | DRU overestimate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Actual | DRU forecast | in number | in \% |
| California | 38,940,231 | 40,354,217 | 1,413,986 | 3.6\% |
| 1 Los Angeles County | 9,761,210 | 10,222,748 | 461,538 | 4.7\% |
| 2 San Diego County | 3,269,755 | 3,369,636 | 99,881 | 3.1\% |
| 3 Orange County | 3,137,164 | 3,227,671 | 90,507 | 2.9\% |
| 4 Riverside County | 2,439,234 | 2,535,310 | 96,076 | 3.9\% |
| 5 San Bernardino County | 2,182,056 | 2,234,540 | 52,484 | 2.4\% |
| 6 Santa Clara County | 1,886,079 | 2,001,338 | 115,259 | 6.1\% |
| 7 Alameda County | 1,636,194 | 1,701,203 | 65,009 | 4.0\% |
| 8 Sacramento County | 1,572,453 | 1,586,033 | 13,580 | 0.9\% |
| 9 Contra Costa County | 1,147,653 | 1,177,674 | 30,021 | 2.6\% |
| 10 Fresno County | 1,011,499 | 1,036,949 | 25,450 | 2.5\% |
| 11 Kern County | 907,476 | 939,622 | 32,146 | 3.5\% |
| 12 San Francisco County | 831,703 | 902,614 | 70,911 | 8.5\% |
| 13 Ventura County | 825,653 | 853,937 | 28,284 | 3.4\% |
| 14 San Joaquin County | 786,145 | 792,428 | 6,283 | 0.8\% |
| 15 San Mateo County | 737,644 | 780,650 | 43,006 | 5.8\% |
| 16 Marin County | 252,959 | 257,610 | 4,651 | 1.8\% |
| Sum of counties | 32,384,877 | 33,619,963 | 1,235,086 | 3.8\% |

This 2023 data discloses figures for the State and the 15 largest counties. We also added Marin County.

DRU's overestimation at the County level is volatile ranging from 0.9\% for Sacramento County to 8.5\% for San Francisco County.

This table discloses information on the change over the 2020 - 2023 period.

|  | Actual |  | DRU 2023 | 2020-2023 change |  | 2020-2023 \% change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2020 | 2023 | forecast | Actual | DRU | Actual | DRU |
| California | 39,782,419 | 38,940,231 | 40,354,217 | -842,188 | 571,798 | -2.1\% | 1.4\% |
| 1 Los Angeles County | 10,171,593 | 9,761,210 | 10,222,748 | -410,383 | 51,155 | -4.0\% | 0.5\% |
| 2 San Diego County | 3,352,145 | 3,269,755 | 3,369,636 | -82,390 | 17,491 | -2.5\% | 0.5\% |
| 3 Orange County | 3,190,832 | 3,137,164 | 3,227,671 | -53,668 | 36,839 | -1.7\% | 1.2\% |
| 4 Riverside County | 2,449,299 | 2,439,234 | 2,535,310 | -10,065 | 86,011 | -0.4\% | 3.5\% |
| 5 San Bernardino County | 2,184,112 | 2,182,056 | 2,234,540 | -2,056 | 50,428 | -0.1\% | 2.3\% |
| 6 Santa Clara County | 1,962,251 | 1,886,079 | 2,001,338 | -76,172 | 39,087 | -3.9\% | 2.0\% |
| 7 Alameda County | 1,671,855 | 1,636,194 | 1,701,203 | -35,661 | 29,348 | -2.1\% | 1.8\% |
| 8 Sacramento County | 1,562,242 | 1,572,453 | 1,586,033 | 10,211 | 23,791 | 0.7\% | 1.5\% |
| 9 Contra Costa County | 1,149,800 | 1,147,653 | 1,177,674 | -2,147 | 27,874 | -0.2\% | 2.4\% |
| 10 Fresno County | 1,026,358 | 1,011,499 | 1,036,949 | -14,859 | 10,591 | -1.4\% | 1.0\% |
| 11 Kern County | 912,975 | 907,476 | 939,622 | -5,499 | 26,647 | -0.6\% | 2.9\% |
| 12 San Francisco County | 899,891 | 831,703 | 902,614 | -68,188 | 2,723 | -7.6\% | 0.3\% |
| 13 Ventura County | 841,439 | 825,653 | 853,937 | -15,786 | 12,498 | -1.9\% | 1.5\% |
| 14 San Joaquin County | 776,068 | 786,145 | 792,428 | 10,077 | 16,360 | 1.3\% | 2.1\% |
| 15 San Mateo County | 775,132 | 737,644 | 780,650 | -37,488 | 5,518 | -4.8\% | 0.7\% |
| 16 Marin County | 258,956 | 252,959 | 257,610 | -5,997 | -1,346 | -2.3\% | -0.5\% |
| Sum of counties | 33,184,948 | 32,384,877 | 33,619,963 | -800,071 | 435,015 | -2.4\% | 1.3\% |

# Why is DRU's forecast way off? <br> It way overestimated migration 

## Migration rate per year

|  | Actual est. | DRU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2021 | $-1.25 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ |
| 2022 | $-1.23 \%$ | $0.18 \%$ |
| 2023 | $-0.67 \%$ | $0.23 \%$ |

The actual estimates were derived by using the population figures, DRU's own natural growth forecast (that is very reasonable), and calculating the resulting migration rates that would reconcile with the mentioned population figures. As a result, these migration rates are not exact; but, they are directionally most representative. Whether, the yearly migration rates are off by 10 or 20 basis points, does not matter. We know for sure that they had to reach down into record negative levels for California's population to decrease as rapidly as it did between 2020 and 2023.

## The migration forecast is highly unrealistic relative to California's own history

(California Natural Growth vs. Migration p.a.

The DRU migration rate forecast is highly unrealistic (red line). Instead, of record negative migration rates over the 2020 2023 period, it shows a rapid rebound after 2019. Migration reaches near historical record level at $0.28 \%$ by 2024 (record in data going back to 2009 is $0.29 \%$ in 2011). The migration forecast then keeps on rising to $0.31 \%$ much above actual figures in the historical data. And, it remains close to that level till 2060.

The DRU natural growth rate forecast is very reasonable (blue line). It reflects California ongoing population aging. It turns negative in 2037; and, it becomes increasingly negative out to 2060.

The migration forecast is highly unrealistic relative to California's own history

Distribution of Migration rate per year

|  |  | History | DRU | DRU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $2009-2023$ | $2020-2030$ | $2020-2060$ |
|  | Max | $0.29 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ |
| Percentiles | $95 \%$ | $0.24 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ | $0.31 \%$ |
|  | $75 \%$ | $0.14 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ | $0.30 \%$ |
|  | $50 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ |
|  | $25 \%$ | $-0.51 \%$ | $0.20 \%$ | $0.27 \%$ |
|  | $5 \%$ | $-1.24 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ |
|  | Min | $-1.25 \%$ | $0.05 \%$ | $0.05 \%$ |

This is just a statistical approach to convey how unrealistic the DRU migration rates are.

The DRU (2020-2030) migration rate bottom $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile at $0.08 \%$ is 2 x higher than the Median ( $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile) during the history (2009-2023).

The DRU (2020 - 2060) migration rate bottom $5^{\text {th }}$ percentile at $0.17 \%$ is much higher than the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile of $0.14 \%$ during the history (2009-2023).

The migration forecast is highly unrealistic relative to the US


The DRU migration forecast suggests it will bounce right back up and track the US medium level scenario from the UN Population Division. But, during the history (2009 - 2019), California's migration rate is far lower than the US.

Remember WFH affects California. But, it does not affect the US.

Over the long term DRU's overstating California's population growth is likely to grow much above the current level of 1.4 million.

## Exploring California population scenarios using specified percentiles migration rates levels

We used 2020-2023 actual population figures, DRU's natural growth forecast, and migration rates at different migration percentile levels. Remember, the migration rate Median or $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile is $0.04 \%$; and the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile is at $0.20 \%$. We also assumed that the migration rates increase from deep into negative territory in 2023 to $0 \%$ by 2026; and they reach their constant level at a specified percentile by 2028.

California population scenarios using different migration percentile levels

|  |  | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Migration Percentile | 95\% | 39,608,622 | 40,664,326 | 41,066,062 | 41,072,308 |
|  | 90\% | 39,547,827 | 40,423,866 | 40,643,918 | 40,471,378 |
|  | 80\% | 39,476,212 | 40,141,959 | 40,151,375 | 39,773,591 |
|  | 70\% | 39,454,235 | 40,055,735 | 40,001,237 | 39,561,613 |
|  | 60\% | 39,384,905 | 39,784,635 | 39,530,744 | 38,899,527 |
|  | 50\% | 39,336,298 | 39,595,373 | 39,203,685 | 38,441,257 |
|  | DRU | 41,860,549 | 43,353,414 | 44,049,015 | 44,228,057 |

The DRU forecast with unrealistic migration rates comes in way higher than any of the scenarios using migration rate percentile levels.

## Resulting DRU population forecast in excess of migration percentiles scenarios

## DRU forecast in excess of migration percentiles scenarios

|  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Migration | $95 \%$ | $2,251,927$ | $2,689,088$ | $2,982,953$ | $3,155,749$ |
|  | Percentile | $90 \%$ | $2,312,722$ | $2,929,548$ | $3,405,097$ |
|  | $80 \%$ | $2,384,337$ | $3,211,455$ | $3,897,640$ | $4,454,466$ |
|  | $70 \%$ | $2,406,314$ | $3,297,679$ | $4,047,778$ | $4,666,444$ |
|  |  | $60 \%$ | $2,475,644$ | $3,568,779$ | $4,518,271$ |

DRU's overestimation of California's population could increase from 1.4 million in 2023 to about 2.4 million by 2030 and $3.2-5.8$ million by 2060.

DRU forecast in excess of migration percentiles scenarios in \%

|  |  | 2030 | 2040 | 2050 | 2060 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Migration Percentile | 95\% | 5.7\% | 6.6\% | 7.3\% | 7.7\% |
|  | 90\% | 5.8\% | 7.2\% | 8.4\% | 9.3\% |
|  | 80\% | 6.0\% | 8.0\% | 9.7\% | 11.2\% |
|  | 70\% | 6.1\% | 8.2\% | 10.1\% | 11.8\% |
|  | 60\% | 6.3\% | 9.0\% | 11.4\% | 13.7\% |
|  | 50\% | 6.4\% | 9.5\% | 12.4\% | 15.1\% |

DRU's overestimation of California's population could increase from 3.6\% in 2023 to about $6.0 \%$ by 2030 and $7.7 \%$ to 15.1\% by 2060.

If a forecast is already off by $3.6 \%$ by the third year, it is not a stretch of the imagination that this forecast would be off by $6 \%$ by the $10^{\text {th }}$ year (2030) and by $7.7 \%$ to $15.1 \%$ by the $40^{\text {th }}$ year (2060).

Appendix I:
California demographics history before COVID \& WFH

## California's demographic history is distinguished by 3 very different periods

The Boom years (1950-1989). During this period California grew a lot faster than the US. Convergence (1990-2004). California's growth slowed down and converged towards US level. Down (2005-2020). California's population slowed down further and is now much lower than the US.

|  |  |  | Growth over period |  | Growth per year |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Period | \# Years | California | US | California | US |
| Boom | $1950-1989$ | 39 | $173.8 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ | $2.62 \%$ | $1.30 \%$ |
| Convergence | $1990-2004$ | 14 | $19.9 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $1.30 \%$ | $1.22 \%$ |
| Down | $2005-2020$ | 15 | $10.5 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $0.67 \%$ | $0.83 \%$ |

When we will get updated data till 2023, there is little doubt that California's population will show a far more rapid decline over recent years than the US due to the impact of WFH.

## Visual data on the 3 periods



Graph 1: Total. This graph is interesting because it hides the relative slow down in California's population growth vs. the US. It is only when you split the time series into the 3 distinct periods that you see what is going on.

In summary, till 1989 California grew a lot faster than the US. Since 2005, it has grown much slower than the US.

And, after 2020 (beyond this data set) California's population has most probably shrunk a lot faster than the US (WFH impact).

## Data source:

For California:
California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit https://dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/

For the US:
Our World in Data
https://ourworldindata.org/explorers/population-and-
demography?facet=none\&Metric=Population\&Sex=Both+sexes\&Age+group=Total\&Proje ction+Scenario=None\&country=~USA

