## BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## DOCKET NO. 090172-EI FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

## IN RE: FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S PETITION TO DETERMINE NEED FOR FLORIDA ENERGYSECURE LINE

# REBUTTAL TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF

# **DR. ROSEMARY MORLEY**

FPSC-COMMISSIOU OF FER

60

JUL -2

06727

DOOUMENT NUMBER-CAT

1		<b>BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION</b>
2		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
3		<b>REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DR. ROSEMARY MORLEY</b>
4		DOCKET NO. 090172-EI
5		JULY 2, 2009
6		
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	A.	My name is Dr. Rosemary Morley. My business address is Florida Power &
9		Light Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.
10	Q.	Did you previously submit direct testimony in this proceeding?
11	A.	Yes.
12	Q.	Are you sponsoring any rebuttal exhibits in this case?
13	A.	Yes. I am sponsoring the following rebuttal exhibits:
14		• RM-22 The University of Florida's Population Under-Forecast
15		• RM-23 The University of Florida's Projection Bands
16	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
17	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to comment on the testimony of Florida
18		Gas Transmission Company, LLC ("FGT") witness Michael T. Langston.
19		Specifically, I will address Mr. Langston's contention that the adjustments FPL
20		makes to the University of Florida's population projections are unreasonable and
21		that FPL's population forecast is overstated as a result of the University of
22		Florida's March 2009 population projections. I also address the suggestion that

1		FPL's load forecast filed in this case is inconsistent with other publicly filed
2		forecasts.
3		
4		SUMMARY
5		
6	Q.	Please summarize your rebuttal testimony.
7	Α.	FPL's long-term population projections, which incorporate adjustments to the
8		University of Florida's October 2008 projections, are reasonable. The University
9		of Florida has consistently under-forecasted the state's long-term population
10		growth. FPL's adjustments are smaller than the University of Florida's average
11		long-term under-forecasting error. Likewise, FPL's long-term population
12		projections are within the University of Florida's banded population projections
13		from its recent March 2009 forecast. Finally, the load forecast filed in this case is
14		consistent with the load forecast filed in the 2009 Ten Year Site Plan and other
15		FPL filings.
16		
17		<b>REBUTTAL OF FGT WITNESS LANGSTON</b>
18		
19	Q.	Do you agree with FGT witness Langston's assertion that FPL's population
20		forecast is unreasonable?
21	А.	No, I do not. FPL's population forecast utilized the most recent population
22		projections available from the University of Florida at the time the forecast was
23		developed. Moreover, FPL's population forecast incorporates appropriate

adjustments to the University of Florida's population projections. As explained in my direct testimony, the University of Florida's population projections have consistently under-forecasted the state's long-term population growth based on a ten year forecasting horizon. By contrast, the University of Florida's shorter-term forecasting accuracy has been very good. Accordingly, FPL made no adjustments to the initial years of the University of Florida's October 2008 projections.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 Both FPL's population forecast and the University of Florida's October 2008 9 projections recognize the significantly slower population growth likely to be 10 experienced for the next few years. However, FPL adjusted the later years of the 11 University of Florida's October 2008 population projections based on the rebound 12 in population growth that has historically occurred following recessions.

As a result of these adjustments, FPL's population forecast assumes a level of
long-term growth consistent with the state's historical trends.

#### 15 Q. Why is consistency with the state's historical trends important?

A. The Commission has repeatedly cited consistency with historical trends as a
criterion in approving load forecasts in Need Determination filings. For example,
in Docket No. 040817-EI, Order No. PSC-04-1168-FOF-EI, the Commission
concluded that the utility's forecasts "appear to be a reasonable extension of
historical trends." Similar language was included in Docket No. 080245-EI,
Order No. PSC-08-0591-FOF-EI, and in Docket 080148-EI, Order No. PSC-080518-FOF-EI, among others.

Q. What impact did the adjustments FPL made to the University of Florida's
 October 2008 projections have on the Company's population projections?

A. There was no impact in the first years of the forecast. Beginning in 2012, FPL
assumes a rate of population growth consistent with past levels of rebound
growth. As a result, by 2018, FPL is forecasting a population of 22.2 million
versus a projection of 21.4 million for the same year in the University of Florida's
October 2008 projections. Thus, FPL's adjustments increased the 2018
population level by about 800,000 or a percentage difference of 3.7%.

9 Q. How does this adjustment compare with the University of Florida's average
10 long-term forecasting error?

FPL's adjustments are well within the University of Florida's average long-term 11 Α. 12 forecasting error. As shown in Exhibit RM-22, the University of Florida's 13 population forecast has consistently under-estimated Florida's long-term population growth based on a ten-year forecasting horizon. Since 1994, the 14 University of Florida has under-estimated the state's long-term population 15 growth, on average, by almost 1.3 million residents based on a ten-year 16 17 forecasting horizon. By comparison, FPL's adjustments increased the University of Florida's October 2008 population forecast by about 800,000 in 2018, a ten-18 19 year forecasting horizon. Thus, FPL's adjustments are reasonable in light of the 20 University of Florida's average long-term forecasting tendency to under-estimate population growth. 21

- 1Q.Has the University of Florida subsequently revised its population2projections?
- 3 A. Yes. As Mr. Langston observes, the University of Florida revised its population
  4 projections in March 2009.
- 5 Q. How do the University of Florida's March 2009 population projections
   6 compare with October 2008 projections?
- 7 A. The University of Florida's most recent projections are even lower than the prior 8 The level of population growth for the 2008 to 2010 period is estimates. 9 projected to fall to record levels. The University of Florida notes that its 2008 to 10 2010 projections reflect the smallest population growth in Florida since the mid-11 1940s when large numbers of military personnel relocated out of the state after 12 World War II ended. Specifically, the University of Florida is projecting no 13 increase in population in 2009 and only a 74,226 increase in 2010. By contrast, 14 the October 2008 projections indicated a 75,000 population increase in 2009 15 followed by a 98,000 increase in 2010. After 2010, the University of Florida's 16 March 2009 projections show that both the rate and level of population growth 17 will remain below their historical averages.
- 18 Q. Is FPL's long-term population forecast overstated as a result of the
   19 University of Florida's March 2009 projections, as Mr. Langston claims?
- A. No. While there may be an impact in the short term, FPL's long-term population
  forecast, specifically the forecast based on a ten-year forecasting horizon or
  longer, is not overstated as a result of the University of Florida's March 2009
  projections.

- Q. Why is it appropriate here to focus on a long-term forecasting horizon of ten
   years or more?
- A. As described in FPL witness Enjamio's rebuttal testimony, the Florida Energy
  Security Line will have a multi-decade service life; therefore, the project should
  be assessed using a long-term planning horizon.
- Q. Why is FPL's long-term population forecast still reasonable in light of the
   7 University of Florida's March 2009 projections?
- 8 Α. First, the differences between FPL's population forecast and the University of 9 Florida's March 2009 forecast are still within the University of Florida's average 10 error over a ten-year forecasting horizon. As shown in Exhibit RM-22, the 11 difference between FPL's population forecast for 2018 and the University of 12 Florida's March 2009 forecast for the same year closely approximates the 13 University of Florida's average error over a ten-year forecasting horizon. The 14 March 2009 University of Florida projections show a population of about 20.9 15 million by 2018, 1.3 million lower than FPL's population forecast for the same 16 year. Since 1993 the University of Florida has on average under-estimated the state's population by 1.3 million based on a ten-year forecasting horizon, thus 17 18 indicating that FPL's population projection remains appropriate given the 19 University of Florida's past track record.
- 20
- Second, acknowledging the uncertainty associated with population forecasts, the
   University of Florida presented three sets of forecasting bands in its March 2009
   projections; a medium case, a high case, and a low case. The University of

Florida recognizes that the low and high case projections "provide reasonable alternative scenarios." FPL's population forecast is well within the forecasting bands incorporated in the University of Florida's March 2009 projections.

1

2

3

4

5

# Q. How does FPL's population forecast compare with the University of Florida's March 2009 projections?

A. As shown on Exhibit RM-23, FPL's population forecast falls within the
University of Florida's high, medium, and low case projections from its March
2009 forecast. Specifically, FPL's population forecast is consistently between the
medium and high band projections, a relationship that is maintained throughout
the forecasting horizon provided by the University of Florida.

- Q. Why is the fact that FPL's population forecast falls within the University of
  Florida's forecasting bands significant?
- 13 First, FPL's population forecast falls within the reasonable range of expected Α. population growth indicated by the University of Florida's population bands. 14 Second, the University of Florida's tendency to under-estimate long-run 15 population growth suggests that it may be prudent to consider its high case 16 projections when reviewing forecasts over a ten-year horizon or longer. Thus, the 17 fact that FPL's population forecast falls between the medium and high case 18 projections further supports the reasonableness of the forecast. It is important to 19 keep in mind that the University of Florida's high case projections do not 20 21 represent an upper limit of the state's population growth. Rather, the high case projections, to a large extent, represent an extension of the state's historical 22 growth rates. For example, the high case projections assume that net migration 23

will average 270,000 to 290,000 over the forecasting horizon. By comparison, net
 migration actually averaged between 260,000 and 280,000 in the 1970s, 1980s
 and 1990s, periods when the absolute level of the Florida and U.S. population
 were considerably lower

# 5 Q. Is FPL's load forecast in this filing consistent with the 2009 Ten-Year Site 6 Plan?

- 7 A. Yes. FPL's load forecast in this filing is consistent with the 2009 Ten-Year Site
  8 Plan and other publicly available filings, including FPL's petition for a rate
  9 increase, Docket No. 080677-EI and FPL's petition for approval of numeric
  10 conservation goals, Docket No. 080407-EG.
- 11 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
- 12 A. Yes.



Vintage of Forecast

ł

I

1

L

1

ł

}

Ł

ł

1

t

1

ł

ł

1

Docket No. 090172-EI The University of Florida's Population Under-Forecast Exhibit RM-22, Page 1 of 1

I





Docket No. 090172-El