

Dorothy Menasco

280214-EJ

From: Stright, Lisa [Lisa.Stright@pgnmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2008 4:30 PM
To: Filings@psc.state.fl.us
Cc: Burnett, John; John_Butler@fpl.com; Jim Beasley
Subject: Joint Petition for Deviation of CCA Pole Inspections - To be docketed
Attachments: Document.pdf

This electronic filing is made by:

John T. Burnett
P.O. Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733
(727) 820-5184
john.burnett@pgnmail.com

To Be Docketed

**On behalf of Progress Energy Florida, Florida
Power & Light and Tampa Electric Company**

Consisting of 7 pages.

**Please find attached the Joint Petition for Deviation
Of CCA Pole Inspections Pursuant to Order No. PSC-
06-0144-PAA-EI.**

<<Document.pdf>>

Lisa Stright

Regulatory Analyst - Legal Dept.
Progress Energy
106 E. College Ave., Suite 800
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 521-1425 direct line
VN 230-5095
Email: lisa.stright@pgnmail.com

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02968 APR 15 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Joint Petition for deviation of CCA Pole Inspections pursuant to Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI, by Progress Energy Florida, Inc., Florida Power & Light Company and Tampa Electric Company.

Docket No.:

Date Filed: April 15, 2008

PETITION FOR AUTHORITY TO DEVIATE FROM REQUIREMENTS OF ORDER NO. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI REGARDING CCA WOOD POLE INSPECTIONS

For the reasons stated herein, Joint Petitioners, Progress Energy Florida, Inc. ("PEF"), Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL") and Tampa Electric Company ("TECO") hereby file this request for authority to deviate from the requirements of Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI regarding CCA wood pole inspections. In support of this petition, the Joint Petitioners state the following:

1. PEF, FPL and TECO are investor-owned utilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission under Chapter 366, Florida Statutes. PEF's general offices are located at 299 First Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701. FPL's general offices are located at 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408. TECO's general offices are located at 702 North Franklin Street, Tampa, Florida 33602.

2. All notices, pleadings and other communications required to be served on Joint Petitioners should be directed to:

John T. Burnett, Esquire
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
Post Office Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042
Telephone: (727) 820-5184
Facsimile: (727) 820-5249

John T. Butler, Esq.
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408
Telephone: (561) 304-5639

Lee L. Willis, Esq.
James D. Beasley, Esq.
Ausley & McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
Telephone: (850) 224-9115
Facsimile: (850) 222-7952

For express deliveries by private courier, the addresses are as stated in paragraph 1.

DOCUMENT NUMBER: DAT

02968 APR 15 2008

FPSC-COMMISSION CLEF

3. In this joint petition, PEF, FPL and TECO are seeking authorization to deviate from one of the pole inspection requirements for chromated copper arsenate (“CCA”) poles as set forth in Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI.

4. In Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI, page 9, the Commission ordered investor-owned utilities (“IOUs”) to inspect all of their wooden poles, including CCA poles, on an eight year cycle:

“We find it appropriate to require the wood pole inspections to be based on the sound and bore for all poles.The sound and bore technique shall include excavation for all Southern pine poles and other pole types as appropriate....”

In reviewing the wood pole inspection plans that the IOUs filed to comply with Order No. PSC-06-0144-PAA-EI, the Commission found that some of the IOUs’ wood pole inspection plans contained certain deviations from the recommended excavation process. Specific to CCA poles, the Commission found that Gulf Power Company (“Gulf”) proposed to perform no excavation in its inspections of CCA poles that are under 15 years old.

5. In Order No. PSC-07-0078-PAA-EU, pages 5 and 6, the Commission reviewed and approved Gulf’s proposed deviation:

“In Order No. PSC-06-0778-PAA-EU, we found that Gulf’s plan ‘deviates from the Order in that it does not include excavation of CCA poles under 15 years old.’ Subsequently, Gulf provided additional data and has augmented its inspection program to include excavation for a sample of an estimated 330 CCA poles under 15 years of age.”

“Gulf states that its criterion for not excavating around CCA poles under 15 years old is based on an inspection matrix that was developed with the close cooperation of Gulf’s pole inspection contractor, Osmose, Inc. Gulf submitted data from its contractor to support the inspection matrix used at Gulf, specifically for CCA poles.”

“According to Gulf, Osmose’s study of the data revealed that rejection of CCA poles began with poles in the 16-20 year age group, hence Gulf established the age criterion (15 years old) for excavation.”

"We find that Gulf has reasonably addressed this deviation cited in Order No. PSC-06 0778-PAA-EU that its inspection program does not include full excavation around CCA wood poles under 15 years of age. This criterion appears to be based on Osmose's study of the data compiled from the inspection of poles inspected from 2002 – 2005 in Southeastern states. As part of our annual review, we will analyze data from Gulf and other utilities to assess whether a lower age criterion for full excavation is warranted."

As a result, Gulf does not have to excavate around CCA poles under 15 years of age as part of its wood pole inspection process.

6. Based on recent data, PEF, FPL and TECO are seeking similar approval by the Commission to exclude excavation from their inspection process for CCA poles that are less than 16 years of age (i.e., up to and including 15 years of age). The data shows that, as was the case with Gulf, there is a significantly lower rejection rate for CCA poles that are less than 16 years of age, compared to the rejection rates for older CCA poles. Accordingly, excavating CCA poles under the age of 16 is not significantly beneficial to the purpose of the pole inspection programs yet contributes substantially to the costs of those programs. Therefore, the Joint Petitioners propose to discontinue excavation and sound and bore inspections on all CCA poles under the age of 16.¹ Visual inspections and overload analyses will still be performed on all CCA poles regardless of age. By visually inspecting and analyzing the load on all CCA poles, as well as performing the required excavation and sound and bore inspections on all CCA poles over the age of 15, the Joint Petitioners will still maintain a high standard for CCA poles in their respective service territories. The following exhibits to this petition support the Joint Petitioners' request:


¹ PEF's data could be interpreted to support discontinuing excavation for poles under the age of 21. However, PEF has decided conservatively to seek authority to discontinue excavation only for poles that are under the age of 16.


- Exhibit A *PEF's 2007 CCA Inspection Results*
- Exhibit B *FPL's Summary of Findings*
- Exhibit C *TECO's 2007 CCA Inspection Results*


In summary, these exhibits all show that there is well less than a one percent rejection rate on PEF, FPL and TECO's CCA poles under 16 years of age, whereas the rejection rate increases significantly for older poles.

WHEREFORE, the Joint Petitioners respectfully request the Commission to enter an order granting this petition and authorizing PEF, FPL and TECO each to exclude excavation from their inspections of CCA poles that are less than 16 years of age.

Respectfully submitted,


John T. Burnett, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Progress Energy Service Company, I.L.C.
Post Office Box 14042
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042
Telephone: (727) 820-5184
Facsimile: (727) 820-5519
Attorney for Progress Energy Florida, Inc.


John T. Butler, Esq.
Senior Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408
Telephone: (561) 304-5639
Facsimile: (561) 691-7135
Attorney for Florida Power & Light Co.


Lee L. Willis, Esq.
James D. Beasley, Esq.
Ausley & McMullen
Post Office Box 391
Tallahassee, FL 32302
Telephone: (850) 224-9115
Facsimile: (850) 222-7952
Attorneys for Tampa Electric Company

PROGRESS ENERGY FLORIDA
Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA) Pole Inspections

PEF annually conducts wood pole inspections as outlined and approved by the FPSC in PEF's Wood Pole Inspection Plan. As stated in our plan, each wood pole inspection includes a visual, sound and bore and excavation process regardless of the age or type of wood pole. In 2007, Osmose gathered inspection results and data from approximately 52,000 CCA poles located throughout PEF's service territory.

The table below contains PEF's 2007 CCA pole inspection results. Analyzing the data provided by Osmose, it can be seen that the reject rate of CCA poles increases with age.

2007 CCA Inspection Results

| Age Span | CCA Poles Inspected | % Rejected |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 0 - 5 years | 7,292 | 0.0% |
| 6 - 10 years | 8,914 | 0.0% |
| 11 - 15 years | 11,807 | 0.1% |
| 16 - 20 years | 12,098 | 0.1% |
| 21 - 25 years | 9,949 | 0.3% |
| > 25 years | 1,130 | 2.28% |

Based on this data, PEF believes the sound and bore excavation inspections applied to CCA poles younger than 16 years of age is unnecessary. PEF will continue to conduct visual inspections and load calculations on all CCA poles regardless of age and will continue to use the sound and bore technique on only CCA poles over the age of 16 years. By taking this action, PEF will continue to maintain a very high standard throughout its territory.

**Florida Power & Light Company
Chromated Copper Arsenate (CCA) Pole Inspections**

Consistent with FPL's approved pole inspection plan, each wood pole inspection includes a visual, sound and bore and excavation inspection regardless of age or type of wood pole. The pole inspection results and other data is gathered by Osmose through its field inspections and includes results on approximately 110,000 CCA poles throughout FPL's service territory.

Overall, CCA poles have performed very well. On average, the failure rate for CCA poles was 0.35%. Through data analysis, FPL has determined that age plays a large role in the rejects rates found for CCA poles. As illustrated below, the reject rate of CCA poles increases with age.

| Age of Pole | Reject Rate |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 0 - 5 years | 0.06% |
| 6 - 10 years | 0.13% |
| 11 - 15 years | 0.18% |
| 16 - 20 years | 0.31% |
| 21 - 25 years | 0.45% |
| >25 years | 0.89% |

In order to minimize risk, but still realize annual inspection cost savings, FPL proposes to discontinue excavation and sound and bore inspections on all CCA poles under 16 years of age. Visual inspections, as well as load calculations, will still be performed at all CCA poles, regardless of age.

By continuing to visually inspect all CCA poles as well as perform an excavation and sound and bore inspection on all CCA poles over 15 years of age, FPL will continue to maintain a very high standard in the field.

**Tampa Electric Company
Chromated Copper Arsenate Pole Inspections**

There is a wide belief within the utility sector, pole manufacturing industries and their respective trade associations that the longevity of Chromated Copper Arsenate (“CCA”) poles is much greater than other wooden pole types. Tampa Electric’s past and current practice has required a full pole inspection, including visual, sound and bore and excavation for CCA poles. A review of the results from Tampa Electric’s Groundline Inspection Program for 2007 concluded CCA poles that are younger than 16 years of age had a failure rate of less than 0.5 percent. However, under the current Wood Pole Groundline Inspection Program, Tampa Electric has continued to perform a full inspection, including excavation of all CCA poles, with the inspection results being an integral part of the annual report filed with the Commission each year.

The table below contains Tampa Electric’s 2007 CCA pole inspection results. During that time period, the company inspected 22,596 CCA poles by visual, sound and bore, and excavation techniques. A total of 109 poles failed over the two-year inspection period, which is less than a 0.5 percent failure rate.

2007 CCA Pole Inspection Results

| Poles Age (years) | CCA Inspected | Failures | Percent Failed |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 0 – 5 | 2,235 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 – 10 | 3,982 | 7 | 0.18 |
| 11 – 15 | 4,666 | 9 | 0.19 |
| 16 – 20 | 4,500 | 23 | 0.51 |
| 21 – 25 | 4,954 | 18 | 0.36 |
| > 26 | 2,259 | 52 | 2.30 |
| Total | 22,596 | 109 | 0.48 |

Based on this data, Tampa Electric has determined that age has a direct impact on the failure rate for CCA poles. The company believes that sound and bore and excavation techniques applied to CCA poles younger than 16 years of age is unnecessary. Therefore, Tampa Electric is proposing to conduct visual inspections and load calculations, if necessary, on all CCA poles; however, sound and bore and excavation techniques will continue to be conducted on only those CCA poles that are 16 years of age and older.