

1 **Q. (Reference CA-NP-117, Table 1) Please provide a comparison of the Wood Pole**
 2 **Management Program shown in Table 1 to NP's current practice.**

3
 4 A. Table 1 provides a comparison of the Wood Pole Management Program to Newfoundland
 5 Power's current Inspection practices.

Table 1 Comparison of Wood Pole Management Practices		
Utility A		NL Power
Inspections		
Type	Frequency	Frequency
Aerial	1-2 years	As required
Ground	1-3 years	Annually
Climbing	N/A ¹	As required ²
Methods Used	Conventional (Visual, Sounding, Boring)	Conventional (Visual, Sounding, Boring)
Replacement Criteria		
Condition	Physical Damage, internal decay, insect damage, woodpecker holes	Pole top/groundline rot, external decay, rotting, cracks, breaks, burns, woodpecker damage, insect infestation
Age	35-55 years	58 years ³
Other Work	Nearby Projects ⁴	Not considered
Laboratory Testing	N/A ⁵	N/A ⁵
Chemical Treatment		
Type	Boron Rod	N/A ⁶
First Treatment	15 years	N/A
Subsequent Retreatments	10 years	N/A
Expected life - Not treated	35 years	58 years
Expected life - Treated	55 years	N/A

¹ Climbing inspections are only used in specific instances to gather further information regarding previously identified issues.

² Climbing inspections are generally only completed to more thoroughly assess issues identified during ground inspections or to ensure newly constructed lines meet construction standards.

³ Newfoundland Power estimates the typical useful service life of a transmission wood pole is 58 years. See Newfoundland Power's *2024 Capital Budget Application, 2024-2028 Capital Plan*, page 10.

⁴ The presence of nearby projects or planned work could play a factor in replacement decisions depending on the accessibility to the pole's location or other environmental factors.

⁵ Laboratory or destructive testing of a pole after it has been removed from service is not standard practice.

⁶ Newfoundland Power does not currently chemically retreat wood poles to attempt to extend their useful service life.