COPY OF TRANSCRIPT

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., a Pennsylvania corporation,

Docket No. 03 035 28

Claimant,

VS.

PACIFICORP, dba UTAH POWER, an Oregon corporation,

Respondent.

DEPOSITION OF JIM COPPEDGE

CONFIDENTIAL

TAKEN AT:

Ballard, Spahr, Andrews & Ingersoll

201 S. Main Street, Suite 600

Salt Lake City, Utah

DATE:

May 14, 2004

TIME:

9:30 a.m.

REPORTER:

DAWN M. DAVIS, RPR



Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters

Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

Washington, DC

New York

Los Angeles

Corporate Offices: 50 West Broadway, Suite 900, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

801-983-2180

Salt Lake City

Toll Free: 877-441-2180

Fax: 801-983-2181

```
APPEARANCES
 1
 2
      For the Claimant:
 3
 4
      JOHN DAVIDSON THOMAS
 5
      COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN
          1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
 6
 7
          Second Floor
 8
          Washington, D.C. 20006
 9
      and
      GENEVIEVE D. SAPIR
10
      COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN
11
          2381 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 110
12
13
          El Segundo, California
                                   90245
14
      and
      JEROLD G. OLDROYD
15
      ANGELA W. ADAMS
16
17
      BALLARD, SPAHR, ANDREWS & INGERSOLL
18
          One Utah Center, Suite 600
19
          Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-2221
20
      and
21
     MICHAEL D. WOODS
22
      COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
23
          183 Inverness Drive West, Suite 200
          Englewood, Colorado 80112
24
25
```



Thacker + Co LLC



Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters

Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

Deposition of Jim Coppedge

1

2 May 14, 2004 3 PROCEEDINGS 4 JIM COPPEDGE, called as a witness for and on behalf of the Claimant, being first duly 5 6 sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 7 EXAMINATION 8 BY-MR. THOMAS: Good morning, Mr. Coppedge. My name 9 10 is, is Dave Thomas, and I'll be taking your 11 deposition today. I represent Comcast. 12 I wonder if you could please state your 13 full name, job title, and business address for the 14 record. 15 Full name is James Edwin Coppedge, Α. 16 Junior. My title is Field Services and Inventory 17 Manager for PacifiCorp. Our address--our new 18 address--19 MS. FITZ GERALD: 650. 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 21 650 Northeast Holiday, Portland, 22 Oregon, 97203, I believe. 23 BY MR. THOMAS: 24 Before we get into the questioning, 25 Counsel, same, same arrangement that we reached



Thacker + Co llc

yesterday with respect to reviewing and marking 1 the deposition and treating it as subject to the 2 protective order during the interim? 3 MR. SACKETT: Yes, that's fine. 4 MR. THOMAS: Fourteen days from 5 receipt. 6 MR. SACKETT: Yes, that will work fine 7 for us. 8 MR. THOMAS: Okay, thank you. 9 Mr. Coppedge, have you ever had your Q. 10 deposition taken before? 11 Yes. Α. 12 Could you please explain to me the 0. 13 circumstances of that deposition? 14 When I was working for a company called 15 RCN--that stands for Residential Communications 16 Network--there was some arbitration going on 17 regarding a contractor that presumably felt that 18 he was entitled to some compensation for work that 19 was not performed. 20 Okay. Just a few reminders and then if 21 I'm, if I'm repeating myself or telling you things 22 you already know, feel free to stop me. 23 It's important that when I ask you a



24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

question that you speak audibly so that the court

A. Okay.

Q. A nodding of the head, for example, would not be picked up by, by the transcript. My intention today is to ask you clear questions that you understand. That's my intention; that's not necessarily how it's going to come out, so if you don't understand a question, please ask me to restate it.

A. Okay.

Q. We want you to be comfortable here today insofar as possible, and if you need to take a break at any time, just ask to do so. If I've asked a question, all I would ask is that you answer the question before taking the break or before conferring with counsel.

We have coffee and juice and water, you know, feel free to get up at any time when you are thinking about a question or whatever to, you know, help yourself if a drink. Again, we want you to be, to be comfortable.

If at some point you remember an answer that you had given earlier in the deposition that you want to modify because you are not comfortable with it, please feel free to do so.



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And at the end of our time together today, I will again intend to ask you if you would like to do that. If I, if I forget, you should feel free to do so anyway.
 - Okay. Α.
- Remind me. I have just a couple of Q. questions that I need to ask you just sort of a matter of form, just to ensure the integrity of the deposition and the testimony that we going to receive today.

Are you currently on any medication or drugs that would make it difficult for you to answer the questions completely and truthfully today?

- No, I'm not. Α.
- Have you had an alcoholic drink within the last eight hours that might make it difficult for you to answer questions?
 - I have not. Α.
- Are you under a doctor's care for any illness that might make it difficult for you to answer the questions today?
 - No. Α.
 - Is there any other reason that you can Q.



Thacker + Co LLC

1	think of why you might not be able to answer the
2	questions completely and truthfully?
3	A. No.
4	Q. Thank you.
5	I would like to start, Mr. Coppedge,
6	with a few questions about your, your, your
7	background. And we have your title and your
8	business address. I would like to ask you first
9	about your, your educational background prior to
10	entering the workplace.
11	A. I have a high school diploma. I have a
12	associate's degree in diesel mechanics, and then
13	from there I went into the workplace.
14	Q. Okay. Tet's work backwards from your
15	current position with, with PacifiCorp. How long
16	have you been with PacifiCorp?
17	A. Two years and a few weeks.
18	Q. Two years, so you started in roughly
19	2002?
20,	A. Correct.
21	Q. And what was your position when you
22	started with PacifiCorp?
23	A. I was hired as project manager for the
24	inventory.



Q.

25

Thacker + Co LLC

For the inventory. When you say the

1	inventory, do you mean the multistate inventory
2	that has been conducted by Osmose in the
3	PacifiCorp service area?
4	A. That's correct.
5	Q. And before you came to PacifiCorp,
6	could you tell me wherewhat you were doing in
7	terms of employment?
8	A. I worked for RCN, Residential
9	Communications Network. I started working for
10	them in the San Francisco Bay area.
11	From there I went to Portland, Oregon,
12	to buildstart to build their plant in the
13	Portland metropolitan area. That project was
14	dissolved due to funding, and I went and spent
15	the next year commuting back and forth to L.A.
16	working on their projects down there.
17	And then went to work for PacifiCorp.
18	Q. In twoin the spring of 2002?
19	A. Yeah.
20	Q. When did you start with RCN?
21	A. I want to say 1998.
22	Q. Approximately 1998.
23	How long were you in the San Francisco
24	Bay area project for RCN?



25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

A little over a year.

1	Q. So until approximately 1999?
2	A. Right.
3	Q. Do you remember a month, by any chance?
4	It's okay if you don't. I am just trying to get
5	a time line.
6	A. I don't. I spent a year and a half in
7	the in the bay area, and then I spent a little
8	over a year in Portland and then spent about a
9	year, a year and a half in L.A.
10	Q. So in 1998 you moved to Portland to
11	assist in the construction of RCN's network in
12	Portland?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. And you were there, you said, for a
15	year and a half in Portland?
16	A. Thereabouts.
17	Q. And I believe you stated that the
18	project was cancelled due to funding?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. That would have been 2000, 2001 time
21	period?
22	A. 2000.
23	Q. 2000.
24	Had you established residency within



Thacker + Co LLC

in the Portland area? And I don't mean as a

- Ο.
- So all of that time I worked at RCN, I Α. really--my home and residence was in Portland.
 - I understand. Thank you. 0. What was your title at RCN?
 - I was project manager. Α.
- Project manager. Were you project Q. manager for the bay area project?
 - Yes. Α.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And the Portland project? Q.
- Yes. Α.



Thacker + Co LLC



25

Thacker + Co LLC

power and electrical construction-related work

So you did both power and -- you did both

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's right. Λ.

with Pauley Construction?

- When did you start with Pauley Q. Construction? Approximately.
 - Well, I worked for them for two years, so I guess I would say sometime in 1996, and I would guess March time frame, so March of '96 through into '98 before I went to work for RCN.
 - Okay. And prior to working for Pauley Construction, what did you do?
 - Initially the company was AT&T Construction Services and then became Lucent Construction Services in the separation of AT&T and Lucent. And I was project manager for all of outside plant construction doing a fiber broadband communications jointly with Pac Bell in California. Originally started in the L.A. marketplace and then finally in the San Diego marketplace.
 - And when did you start at AT&T? Ο. Approximately.
 - I'll say sometime in 1990, so I worked for AT&T for about six years.
 - And the work that you did for AT&T was specific to California?



Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

Α.

Washington and in Oregon, some underground

projects, before I accepted the position in L.A.

4 I also resided all of that period of time in 5 Portland.

- Q. In Portland. Are you from Portland originally?
 - Α. Yes. Well--
 - Q. Originally.
- Α. Originally I was born in Texas, in Corpus Christi, and when my parents as a teenager--when I was a teenager, my parents moved to Oregon, and so from that time I graduated the last two years of college in, in Portland--or Eugene in Oregon so --
- So you are an Oregonian by, by nature and default?
 - Α. By default.
- Okay, fine. Fine. Well, we have other 0. Oregonians in the room.

MR. WOODS: My wife is from Portland.

MR. THOMAS: Let the record reflect that Michael Woods' wife is from Portland, Oregon.

In terms of the work that you did for AT&T, you had mentioned that you had in the early



Thacker + Co llc

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

- stages done some work in Washington state. Is that correct?
 - Yes. Α.
- Could you describe for me what you did for AT&T in Washington state?
- Sometime in 1989, 1990, AT&T developed Α. this construction services, and they would bid jobs to telecommunications companies, GTE at that time, now Verizon. I think that's pretty much who--initially they had the contract in the northwest, and they were doing various aerial, underground jobs for GTE at the time.
- So it's essentially a construction contractor that was owned by AT&T that would do communications construction for communications companies?
 - Correct. Α.
- Primarily the incumbent local exchange carriers like Pac Bell?
 - Like Pac Bell and Verizon. Α.
 - And Verizon and U.S. West at the time? 0.
- I don't recall us doing any work for U.S. West, but that doesn't mean that there weren't other entities that were doing.
 - Did you do work for other Okay. Q.



Thacker + Co LLC

25

- there was some contact and work being done with, with the pole owner at the time.
- When, when you say more on the conduit side, is it because most of the work that you



Thacker + Co llc

1	Γ
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

were	involved	in	for	AT&T	and	AT&T	customers	you
were	building	for	was	unde	ergro	ound?		

- Primarily. Α.
- Primarily. 0.

And was the conduit already in place or did you--were you involved in actually trenching and installing conduits as well?

- The majority of the work was actual underground construction, digging trenches, putting conduits in, pulling cables in, splicing it, activating it, turning it on.
- Because we are talking about construction in developing suburban areas, for example?
- Correct. And most of the--I mean, we Α. did use conduit to get to certain breakout points. We also used aerial plant to get to those--the L.A. market and the San Diego market. Most of those areas that we were building were in the suburbs, and a lot of the infrastructure conduit system was already in place to gct us back to COs for Pac Bell.
- So I just kind of have an understanding of how much work you did when you were with AT&T, by state, how much would you estimate in terms of



Thacker + Co llc

	Deposition of Jim Coppedge CONFIDENTIAL 05/14/04
1	time and in terms of plant construction did you
2	do in Washington state of the total
3	A. Comparative to the time spent in
4	California?
5	Q. Correct.
6	A. Most of my work with AT&T was in
7	California, so I would say less than two percent
8	certainly was in Washington or outside California
9	Q. So 98 percentokay. An overwhelming
10	majority of the work you did was in California?
11	A. (Witness nods head.)
12	Q. And I guess focusing at this point on

- specifically the California piece, do you know how many miles, which seems to be as good an indicator as any, of, of plant you installed or were involved in the construction of for AT&T and its customers?
- It's been a long time since I had to Α. dig back that far.
 - If you can recall.
- I would easily say that over that period of time we built well in excess of 400 miles of underground.
 - Four hundred miles of underground? Q.
 - (Witness nods head.) Α.



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

1	Q. And how much-of the total amount
2	let's just limit it to California because we'll
3	treat Washington as a footnote since it seems to
4	represent such a small part of the totalof the
5	total amount of plant that you built in
6	California, how much of that do you think was
7	underground and how much of that was aerial,
8	percentage or mileage basis, whatever comes
9	easiest to you?
10	A. First, let me clarify that that 400
11	miles consists of pulling cable in existing duct
12	as opposed to trenching.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. I mean, there was a portion of that. So
15	aerial plant construction in that project probably
16	was less than 5 percent, just as a wild ball
17	park.
18	Q. When you say that project, do you mean
19	all the work in
20	A. All the work in California.
21	Q. And that was in Los Angeles?
22	A. Los Angeles.
23	Q. Was it in San Francisco?
24	A. San Diego.
25	Q. San Diego, okay.



Q.

25

Thacker + Co LLC



Α.

Q.

23

24

25

Thacker + Co llc

Would the name ACSI help?

It was a company called Espire.

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

think prior to that name they were--



Okay.

Q.

24

25

surrounding communities, Las Cruces.

Thacker + Co LLC

Now, was this primarily



25

Thacker + Co LLC

the telephone and electric utility poles?

responsibility for interacting with the owners of

Court Reporters

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Okay. You, you then dealt with those
3	individuals who are commonly referred to as the
4	joint use administrators?
5	A. For getting permit applications for
6	those routes, yes.
7	Q. Right. And so youwould you do the
8	engineering?
9	A. No. The engincer was done by Espire or
10	othersome other company.
11	Q. Espire itself would do the engineering
12	or they would have another contractor do the
13	engineering. Correct?
14	A. Depending on the city and, and who was
15	responsible for that area for Espire. It could
16	go both ways.
17	Q. But you guys did construction?
18	A. Right.
19	Q. Okay. You would be presented with a
20	engineering drawing which would tell you where on
21	the pole you could attach the facilities and
22	that's what would you do?
23	A. Correct.
24	Q. Attach strand. Correct?



Correct.

Α.

25

Thacker + Co LLC

1	Q. Lash fiber to the strand. Correct?
2	A. Correct.
3	Q. Splicing?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Okay. Just trying to get a picture in
6	my mind of how this, how this works.
7	Would you like to take a break? Are
8	you
9	A. No, I'm fine.
10	Q. Okay. Do you haveyou have mentioned
11	three cities that you worked in for RCN: San
12	Francisco, Portland, and Los Angeles.
13	A. Correct.
14	O. I hesitated myself a second. I
15	couldn't remember.
16	A. You want to restate those?
17	Q. Yes. I believe, Mr. Coppedge, earlier
18	you stated that you worked in San Francisco and
19	Portland and Los Angeles for RCN. Is that correct?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	Do you have an estimate of how many
23	miles of plant for RCN that you were involved in
24	building for RCN in those three cities in total?
25	Your best estimate.
- 1	



Thacker + Co llc

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

14 15

13

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Α.	I want	to guess	in a com	bination	in
those two	cities	somewhere	between	200, 250	o miles.

- And can you estimate what--and I think Ο. you are going to be able to guess my question-what, what percentage was aerial and what percentage was underground?
- Ninety-eight percent of it was aerial Α. and the balance was underground.
- Okay. Did--you were an employee of Q. RCN, I believe you said. Correct?
 - Correct. Α.
- Did you, in your position as project manager, actually do the construction of the plant in the same or a similar way that you had done for Pauley Construction and before that for AT&T's construction?
- I would say yes, with the exception that RCN had its own engineering group that went out and did the fielding, drew the prints, did all of the, the cable assignments, splicing assignments. And that group, the engineering group, with the work combined with construction, would process those applications to Southwest Bell, to Pacific Gas and Electric, Southern Cal Edison, and then after those permits were



Thacker + Co llc

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

approved, go start construction.

AT&T, did you actually climb poles and run machinery to dig trenches and install conduits? Were you a field person?

Α. No.

How about with, with Pauley Construction, did you climb poles and install strand?

Α. On occasion, but that wasn't my primary function.

Okay. Your primary function at AT&T Q. was what?

Α. Managing the project.

Ο. Managing the project?

Α. Schedules.

Q. Okay. And you were regional project manager for Pauley Construction. Correct?

Correct. Α.

So your--just so I understand your testimony, you, on occasion, were asked to do, you know, real construction work, but primarily you were a project manager and you needed to keep-your job was to keep the trains running on time?

Α. That's correct.

Okay. At RCN did you have -- did you 0.



Thacker + Co llc

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

interact with the joint use administrators of the, the pole and conduit owners in those RCN cities we talked about before?

- Yes, I did interact. That wasn't Α. necessarily my primary function. I mean, RCN had its own engineering group, but we jointly went and looked at alternate routes or alternate solutions that there were problems attaching the poles.
- So as project manager, did you oversee Ο. engineering or pre-engineering functions of RCN?
 - Yes. Α.
- Did you oversee permitting 0. relationships between RCN and the support structure owners?
- Again, just let me state that my primary function was to construct, build, and activate the plant, but there was a percentage of my responsibilities that dealt with a preview of the engineering and the routes or obstacles that we would face and making sure that we had the proper permits with those structure owners.
- Did that interaction require you to deal frequently with the National Electrical Safety Code?
 - In California they run under the guise Α.



Thacker + Co LLC

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

οf	GO-	-95.	Cal	lif	orn	i a	opte	e d	to	put	th€	eir	OW	n	
rul	es	in p	lace	≘,	whic	ch :	mirr	or	sc	omewl	hat	NES	S C	rule	S
but	th	ere	are	ot	her	ru	les	th	at	are	far	mc	re		
str	ing	gent	or c	dif	fere	ent	tha	an	the	NE:	SC.				

- Moving out of the past and coming into, Ο. into the present, how did you, how did you come to be hired by PacifiCorp?
- When RCN made the decision to move into Α. the Portland market, my initial work was with the attorneys, visiting the various cities, working with the franchisees to---the cable commissions in which cities we would built out first and what that schedule might look like. And also running some preliminary numbers based on the size of the city and what the schedule would entail and how fast we could build out, what the aerial portion of the city consisted of, what the underground portions of those cities, where the commercial entities were.

As we worked through some of those analysis, we had hired and, previously in the bay area, worked with a outside engineering plant called--give me a minute--I want to say Northstar Engineering Company. Anyway, we had worked with them in the bay area quite frequently, so when we



Thacker + Co llc

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

came into the Portland market, we used their services to do a lot of our preliminary work and, and design for that marketplace.

So the first part of my challenge or, or responsibilities was to get those prints engineered, walked out. So in that process in building the area in Portland metropolitan, the poles that we were going to attach to was Pacificorp. So it was my first experience taking some of this engineering work and going to PacifiCorp and meeting with Corey Fitz Gerald.

When we, when we walked in the door and made our first presentation, we told Corey that we were going to attach to every single one of her poles, which, which amounted to something like 18,000 poles. And there was a look of disbelief, as you can imagine. And we brought the initial packages in that we wanted to submit to make sure that what we were going to supply them was adequate information. Our, our packages -- the, the requirement with RCN for our own internal database was an, an analysis of every pole that we were going to attach to, what the heights was, whether there was make-ready work, whether there were violations that existed on the pole already.



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't recall the first submission of poles that we gave her, but we handed her tabloid stacks of data that were inches thick. And after approval for those poles, we started construction. And in Portland I think we built somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 miles or better, at least, of strand, maybe not all co-ax fiber, but when it shut down due to the telecommunications downturn and kind of RCN rethinking where they wanted to put their money given the environment, we put everything kind of on hold and let it stay in place for about a year trying to see whether the market was going to turn around and continue building or whether we were going to withdrawal and that's--that time frame is when I went back to, to L.A. to assist them in that project.

So I guess the piece I left out in all of that--I was contacted by the Oregon Joint Use person--and, and I'll draw a blank on his name for a minute but--

- Q. Oregon Joint Use person for PacifiCorp?
- A. No, this was for the Oregon PUC.
- Q. Would that be Jerry, Jerry Murray?
- A. Jerry Murray. Thank you.

To see if I had some interest in



Thacker + Co LLC

1	sitting in on, on the board as a director foron
2	the Oregon Joint Use Association Board as a
	director and represent the ILECs as, as part of
3	
4	the Joint Use Association, which I accepted.
5	And so then my, my work with Corey was
6	more than just bringing in applications and
7	attaching to their poles.
8	When RCN really made the announcement
9	that the turnaround in the marketplace was not
10	looking real good, Corey asked me one day if I
11	was interested in looking at PacifiCorp for
12	employment, and so after some discussions over
13	several months, I left RCN and went to work for
14	PacifiCorp.
15	Q. When Jerry Murray contacted you about
16	serving on the Jthe Oregon Joint Use
17	Association, when was this?
18	A. I would say sometime in mid to late
19	2000.
20	Q. Mid to late 2000.
21	At the time you were working for RCN.
22	Correct?
23	A. Correct.



Q.

shut down?

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Had the Portland project at that point



Thacker + Co llc

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

weeks	or a few mon	ths that	you we	ere co	mmuting	
from	Portland to L	.A. to w	ork on	that	project	for
RCN,	if you recall	?				

- I'm sorry, can you restate the Α. question?
 - ο. Yes.

You stated that your best recollection was that Portland was shut down by RCN in late 2001, maybe early 2002, and I asked whether it was a period of a few weeks or a few months that you were commuting from Portland to L.A. to help with the--RCN's L.A. project.

So the question is, was it--were you commuting for a few weeks or a few months? just trying to pin down the chronology, and then we can get on with the more interesting stuff.

- My commute in the waiting to see what the marketplace was going to do to L.A. was somewhere in the neighborhood of six, eight, nine months that I commuted.
- Okay. Were you working simultaneously in Portland and Los Angeles? Was there overlap between your responsibilities as project manager and -- in Portland and, and in Los Angeles?
 - To some extent. I mean, I'm not really Α.



Thacker + Co llc

sure--we had, we had a plan in the air, we had 1 2 underground that had been done, we had purchased 3 three buildings for hubs, satellite, Megapops, and 4 I had a warehouse that was full of equipment that 5 I would go spend some time in Portland during 6 that time frame to kind of keep the monitor on 7 what was going on, maybe sit with the Joint Use 8 Association, check on the warehouse, make sure 9 everything was still safe and secure. 10 Q. But at the time, your primary focus was 11 Los Angeles? 12 Α. Correct. 13 0. Although you did have some monitoring 14 and administrative responsibilities for the 15 project, such as it was at that point in 16 Portland? 17 Correct. Α. 18 Ο. Okay. That's helpful, thank you. 19 I believe you mentioned a little 20 earlier that Jerry Murray of the Public Utility

I believe you mentioned a little earlier that Jerry Murray of the Public Utility Commission in Oregon had asked you to be the ILEC representative to the JUA. Is that, is that correct? The incumbent local exchange

A. CLEC.

representative?

21

22

23

24

25



Thacker + Co LLC

, but my time

1	Q. Okay. CLEC, competitive local
2	exchange?
3	A. Right.
4	Q. So you believe now that you might have
5	misspoken, that you actually
6	A. Correct.
7	Q. That was what I thought, but I wanted
8	to just, just make sure.
9	Couple of questions on, on the past and
10	then we'll, we'lland I know I said this before
11	but this time I mean it.
12	When you worked with Pauley
13	Construction, did you do any work for cable TV
14	companies at the time? You mentioned Cox. Did
15	you do work for their cable TV services?
16	A. I did not personally, no. Pauley
17	Construction had various contracts throughout the
18	Southwest with cable companies. Jones
19	Interconnect was the cable company in Albuquerque
20	and we hadprior to my getting there, they had
21	just completed an overbuild, and so I had some
22	administration over the cleanup of it, but my tim
23	in Albuquerque, we didn't do any construction for
24	cable TV companies.
25	Q. Okay. And how about at AT&T, did you



Thacker + Co LLC

- No, because we were building our own HFC plant.
 - 0. Was the HFC plant that was being built to be a competitive plant with cable TV, HFC plant?
 - Α. Yes.
 - Okay. Okay. You testified earlier you 0. met Corey, and at some point through your acquaintance of the -- with the Joint -- Oregon Joint Use Administration, you began talking about the possibility of your working at PacifiCorp.
- 13 Correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

20

25

- Α. Correct.
- And you said that consideration and discussions went on for a period of months?
 - Α. Correct.
- 18 Okay. So the idea of working at Q. 19 PacifiCorp was first broached end of 2001, early 2002?
- 21 Α. Without specifics I would say early 2002. 22
- That's, that's fine. That's, that's 23 Q. 24 helpful.

So when you started at PacifiCorp, was



Thacker + Co llc

roughly May of 2002 to July of 2002?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	Deposi	tion of	Jim Cop	pedge	CON	IFIDEN	TIAL	05/14/0	4
1	it your ur					were	being	hired	t
2	assist Pac	cifiCorp	with	the	aeri	al pl	ant a	udit?	
3	Α.	Yes.							
4	Q.	Okay.	Could	l you	desc	ribe	for r	ne the	
5	work that	you did	d at P	acifi	Corp	for	the f	irst,	

Initially my first assignment was to put together an RFP, so in order to do that it was to try and understand some of PacifiCorp's existing systems and looking at the schedule and what the efforts were going to be in order to do this in the time frame that, that had been decided and how we would roll that out, manage this project, and what the RFP needed really to address going--before--on going out to bid.

say, three months to get ready for the audit from

- And what were the kinds of issues that the RFP needed to address that you were discovering during this?
- The methodology in which we would capture and collect and report on data.
- And when you say methodology, what exactly do you mean by that?
- My experience with--and my background in, in managing all types of projects was taking



Thacker + Co LLC

a look at the--at what you need to accomplish. So I have a million and a half poles that need to be inventoried systemwide over a given period of time and what resources might I need to collect that data and what would be the best effort, the best method in order to collect that data, to report on it and bring it in.

And, you know, certainly there were some early conversations before giving crews a handprint map to go out in the field and mark this data down. And my experience says, every time you manually touch this piece of data, I have a print that gets rained on. What's the impact to the effort?

And after some time with PacifiCorp and understanding their systems, it became fairly apparent that the best methodology was to somehow electronically build a system to collect that in the field so that I only touch that data a few times in its process before it gets brought back in and compiled.

- Q. So after--to paraphrase--arriving at the conclusion that paper maps, paper maps, bad; digital, good--
 - A. Better.



Thacker + Co LLC

- O. Better. What did you do at that point?
- A. Included in the RFP was the ability for these companies that we had talked to about what their availability was and what their experience was in the field, can you bring to us your experience, your understanding, and some of your thoughts in this RFP as to how you would proceed and collect this data and—
- Q. So you contacted a number of vendors and service providers and said, basically, look, we are going to be issuing this RFP for this really big project, these are the basic things that we are going to try to accomplish, let me hear what you think we should put in the RFP for this.
- A. Or how they are currently collecting data, what are their struggles, what are their successes.
- Q. Which companies did you talk to during this pre-RFP stage?
- A. We did a lot of internal research but specifically communications with Osmose because they had previously gone out in the field and done a connectivity project for PacifiCorp, and we already had that mapping piece in place. But we



Thacker + Co llc



Thacker + Co LLC

with Osmose, the limited conversations that you

25

had with UA--I'm sorry--with Line Soft and your conversation with UAM, you--and other companies-you assembled a profile of issues and pitfalls and considerations that you sought to wrap at some point into an RFP?

- Α. Correct.
- At this pre-RFP stage, can you recall how many conversations you may have had with UAM and PGE on this issue? At the pre-RFP stage.
- Quantity, no. I know we had several. Α. Specifically a number, I don't know.
- Q. Okay. Were there meetings that were specifically between you and UAM to talk about this issue?
- I can't specifically recall that. know that we had several conversations with them. I do know that we looked at their handheld device and their method that they were kind of in the development stages of.
- Do you recall whether UAM was developing at--this handheld device methodology themselves or whether they were doing it or were outsourcing the technology piece of it to another If you know. company?
 - When--let me ask you, when you say Α.



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

outsourcing it to another company, meaning what?

- Q. What I mean--you said, I believe, that they were in the development stage of a handheld device. It sounded to me when you said that that PGE itself or UAM itself was developing this handheld device, which made me ask you the question that -- was PGE really developing the device or were they working with somebody else to develop the software and the device to collect this sort of information?
- My, my understanding from UAM was that Α. they were developing this themselves to use with their own mapping system to, one, use it internal on their own PGE pole audits, but I also believed that they were out soliciting other companies kind of in those early stages to do an audit program for other entities.
- And UAM solicited PacifiCorp to do this audit project?
 - Α. Yes.
- Okay. When did you release the RFP, the final RFP, out to the target vendors?
 - Α. I want to say late July 2002.
 - Q. Late July 2002.

So from the time you started, roughly



Thacker + Co LLC

1	May 2002, you were in a research and RFP drafting
2	mode?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Any other vendors that you recall
5	speaking to during this research drafting phase
6	that culminated with the issuance of the RFP in
7	late July?
8	A. Well, I think I said earlier we had
9	talked to a company called Transmap.
10	Q. Correct.
11	A. We obviously had talked to UAM. We had
12	talked to Osmose because of my relationship with
13	Northstar, who had done the engineering for RCN
14	for me in a job that they had done. We included
15	them in some of those discussions.
16	I know that there was some discussion
17	with a company called Southwest Solutions because
18	of their pole audits in the industry.
19	There may have been others, but I don't
20	recall that right now.
21	Q. During this research drafting phase,
22	forwho did you speak to at Osmose about this
23	project?



was Chris Diliberto.

24

25

Α.

Thacker + Co LLC

Initially my conversation with Osmose

- 1 You, you say initially. 0. Were there 2 others at Osmose that you spoke to?
 - Α. At some--when I say initially, it was looking at their handheld device and, and kind of their experience and issues, and at some point then Jim McGifford--I don't--Chris was pretty much the point person for the technology and, and the field data, so I think--I don't recall earlier in the game really talking to anybody else.
 - You mentioned Jim McGifford? 0.
 - Jim McGifford. Α.
 - And what was Jim's function at Osmose? Q.
- He was Vice President of the western 13 Α. region for Osmose. 14
 - Q. Is he based in Portland?
 - Based in Phoenix. Α.
- 17 0. Phoenix.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

18

19

20

- During this research, pre-RFP phase, how many conversations would you estimate that you had had with Chris Diliberto?
- 21 Α. Five, six.
- 22 Q. Are these in-person meetings?
- 23 Some of them. Α.
- 24 Q. How many?
- 25 Two. Α.



Thacker + Co LLC

And three phone calls? 1 Yes. Λ. 2 And how many discussions with Jim 3 McGifford? 4 Probably only one. My recollection was 5 that in--whether he called me or I called him, it 6 was about the availability or the ability, rather, 7 of Osmose to do this kind of audit. 8 Okay. The RFP was issued in late July 9 2002. Correct? 10 Correct. Α. 11 How many target companies were sent a 12 Q. copy of the RFP, if you recall? 13 My recollection is eight. Α. 14 Eight. 0. 15 How many responded? 16 I believe seven. I believe there was 17 Α. only one company that declined based on the 18 intensity of the schedule. 19 And based on the seven responses you 20 got, what was the next step in the process? 21 I believe that when the bids came in 22 that we sat down and analyzed the numbers and 23 looked at some of the information, material that



24

25

801-983-2180

Thacker + Co LLC

they had provided about their experience levels.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And out of that group of I believe seven, we narrowed the field to really two candidates that based on their bids and their understanding of the schedule and, and the data that needed to be collected, we offered to two companies to come in and do a formal presentation and really get into hours of discussion about their ability to And those two companies were Osmose and succeed. a company called CLS, Custom Lighting Services.

- Q. When you said we sat down and looked over the seven responses, who do you mean by we?
- John Juerin was--works for PacifiCorp Α. in Procurement and assisted in putting together all of the contractual aspects and the procurement guidelines as PacifiCorp standards. So we did the--John and I did kind of the analysis on the bid packages.
- Anybody, anybody else in those discussions after you got your RFP responses back from the list of seven to the list of two?
- I'm sorry, can you ask me the question Α. again?
 - 0. Yes. I'm sorry.

Bids went out, eight of them, seven responses came back, quote, we sat down to go



Thacker + Co LLC



Thacker + Co LLC

	A. Asset Management I want to say.
2	Q. He was in Asset Management as opposed
3	to Procurement?
4	A. Correct,
5	MR. THOMAS: Okay. Counsel, would you
6	like to take a short break here? Is that all
7	right?
8	MR. SACKETT: Seems like a good time,
9	an hour and a half.
10	MR. THOMAS: Sure. You want to take a
11	quick break here?
12	(Recess taken.)
13	Q. Before we recessed, we had talked about
14	some of the PacifiCorp individuals that you had
15	spoken to after the bids had come back from the
16	vendors.
17	Who else did you speak to in PacifiCorp
18	before the RFP was issued at the end of July of
19	2002?
20	A. For clarification, before the RFP went
21	out?
22	Q. Correct. During the research phase.
23	A. Specific to the RFP would have been
24	Corey Fitz Gerald and Jack Vranish.
25	O Nobody else?



Thacker + Co LLC



Correct.

Α.

Q.

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Okay. And you had worked with him

A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Was he your principle point of contact at Northstar when you were at RCN seeking to built Portland?
- A. Not initially. They had another manager in place that was my point of contact and that manager left, and Joe took that position over, but I had known Joe before that so--
- Q. When did Joe, if you know, start, start working for PacifiCorp?
- A. I believe he started February of 2002, in that time frame.
 - Q. Just a few months before you?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Bids are in, you decide on two to come back and make a presentation. Osmose gets the contract. Correct?
- A. Correct.
 - Q. Why did Osmose get the contract?
- A. One, because of their price. But certainly as well to their credit, their experience in the industry and their ability to assist us in the technology since we already had the, the FastGate mapping system in place and how



Thacker + Co LLC

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

we	would	tie	thatth	eir 1	handhel	ld de	evice	or,	or
c o 2	llectio	n pi	ecetie	e tha	t into	our	mappi	ing	
dat	tabase.								

- Did Osmose develop the FastGate Q. application?
- Yes. Well, it, it was developed by a company called CNI, Coherent Networks, who was its own independent entity, but at some point Osmose purchased CNI.
 - Do you know when that occurred?
- I can't give you a specific date. I don't know.
- Do you know when PacifiCorp purchased 0. and implemented FastGate for its systems?
- Not specifically dates, but several years prior, they had done a connectivity project that CNI at the time assisted PacifiCorp in, in implementing what we call FastGate.
- So Osmose and CNI worked together to install and implement FastGate for the PacifiCorp connectivity project?
 - Α. Correct.
- And just so I'm clear, when we are talking about the connectivity project, we're talking about a--well, let me ask you this way.



Thacker + Co LLC



24

25

Thacker + Co llc

projects did Osmose do for PacifiCorp across the

connectivity projects, what other kinds of

service area, the multistate service area?

1	A. Osmose, as a company, not specificnot
2	necessarily specific to PacifiCorp, but they have
3	a test and treat, and that's really how Osmose
4	was formed is they go out and test and treat
5	poles for various companies.
6	Q. And does PacifiCorp utilize Osmose's
7	test-and-treat services, to your knowledge?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Are there other scrvices that Osmose
10	provides to PacifiCorp that you know of?
11	A. As part of that test and treat, there
12	isit's a facility point inspection that looks at
13	that pole and collects certain kinds of data is
14	it's really directed at power issues, is, is a
15	insulator broken on a cross arm, is a cross arm
16	broke. They note some types of violations that
17	are on that pole.
18	Q. Okay. After you decided that Osmose
19	was the winner, did you then enter into a
20	contract with Osmose?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. How farwhen the decision was made to
23	hire Osmose, how long was that decision made after



My recollection is that mid September

the bids came in?

Α.

24

25

we informed Osmose that they were going to be awarded the contract. And several weeks after that--I don't have a specific date for you--then we signed a contract.

- Q. Do you remember who from PacifiCorp signed the contract with Osmose, who was the individual whose signature appeared on the contract?
 - A. I really don't.
 - Q. Was it your signature?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Who was the gentleman you worked with in Procurement to develop--
 - A. John.
 - Q. Was it John's signature?
- A. I don't believe so. I believe that it was upper management, a managing director. My guess would be that Alec Burden was the person that signed the contract, but without really--
 - Q. That's fine.
 - A. --looking at the document--
- Q. I understand. No, we, we will probably at some point have an opportunity to take a look at that and we can nail that question down. I just wanted to see what, what your recollection



Thacker + Co LLC

	Deposi	tion of Jim Coppedge Confidenting 33, 21, 1
1	was.	
2		Do you remember who signed the contract
3	for Osmose	??
4	Α.	Jim McGifford.
5	Q.	Jim McGifford.
6		And Jim was the vice president for the
7	northwest	region?
8	Α.	For western region.
9	Q.	Western region. Okay.
10		Were you involved in the nitty-gritty
11	negotiatio	ons over the contract with Osmose?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Who else was involved in that from
14	PacifiCor	o?
15	Α.	John Juerin.
16	Q.	Just John?
17	Α.	Right.
18	Q.	Is John an attorney?
19	Α.	No, not to my knowledge.
20	Q.	Okay. Who was involved from Osmose's
21	side?	
22	Α.	I know Chris Diliberto, I know Jim
23	McGifford	. I don't believe there was anybody else



Okay.

Q.

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Can you tell us how the

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

over the contract. I don't believe so.

financial terms of the contract were structured? And I'll be more specific.

Was there a aggregate contract amount that was established or was there an amount on, say, a per pole basis that was established in the contract?

- A. The pricing structure was based on a per pole visit, broken down to a joint use pole and a distribution pole with no joint use attachments.
- Q. Okay. And what were those price points for the two different ones?
- A. Distribution only pole was \$3.25 and a joint use pole was \$12.27.
- Q. What did the contract specify in terms of the work that Osmose was to perform on PacifiCorp's behalf? In other words, what exactly were they doing for PacifiCorp under the contract?
- A. The whole intent of the RFP was to visit every distribution pole or every transmission pole that had joint use associated with it. Obviously there is towers and structures that went out miles that obviously don't have any joint use on them.

They were instructed to collect every



Thacker + Co LLC

licensee attachment on that pole specific to joint use and also any infraction that was associated with that pole, as well as collecting information on guys and whether they are correctly bonded, whether they are correctly anchored, risers, attachments on the poles, power supply attachments on the pole, and some types of equipment that would produce weight on that line and then take a photo of the pole, get a GPS location.

I mean, in, in--each one of those entities--I mean, well, they have a height on the pole, but is there an amplifier on the pole and--or a fiber slack loop on the pole. There are a lot of different choices associated with those attachments that they could record.

- Q. This was for all of PacifiCorp's service states?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did the inspections record such things as strand tension and inputs that would be used for performing loading calculations?
- A. If there was strands attached only and no cable, then that attachment was recorded.

 There was no tensioning analysis done on guys other than perhaps this guy was not sufficiently



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Like a slack guy?

Deposition of Jim Coppedge

- Α. Right.
 - Ο. Okay.
 - Or if there was a missing guy guard on Α. it but not enough information to do pole loading on.
 - And was this just an examination of the 0. communication facilities that were on the pole?
 - Osmose was asked to report any urgent, Α. imminent hazard, a line that's fixing to fall down, then that was basically a phone call back to the office, send a crew out here and fix it.

The only measurements that they collected for PacifiCorp would have been where the secondary line was or the bottom of a transformer or a weather head, only for the purposes of a reference point to calculate NESC violations.

- Okay. So if the inspector or Osmose technician were in the field, he would be out there to look primarily at facilities in the communications space and at the top of the communications space, insofar as there, there was an issue with separation from electric?
 - Correct. Α.



Thacker + Co LLC

	Deposition of Jim Coppedge CONFIDENTIAL 05/14/04
1	Q. But if they were out there and they saw
2	a secondary sagging and sparking and rubbing with
3	the communications strand, there would be a call
4	back?
5	A. To get it fixed.
6	Q. To get it fixed. And PacifiCorp would
7	roll a truck and get it fixed.
8	A. (Witness nods head.)
9	Q. Okay. The process would involve
10	countingidentifying the attachments of
11	communications companies on the pole. Is that
12	right?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. Okay. We have some idea of how the,
15	the process worked from recording in the field
16	PDAs to eventually being incorporated into
17	PacifiCorp's systems, but I was wondering if you

PacifiCorp's systems, but I was wondering if you could walk me through that process because I'm not sure that I got it all when I was making inquiry of that recently.

And we can start from field guy has a PDA, 300 poles in the PDA, and then he goes back to the office once he has completed the 300 poles. Then what happens? I, I understand that part.



18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters

- Do you understand the front end on 2 the--before that process?
 - Let's assume I don't. Yeah, I, I think Ο. I do, but it wouldn't hurt me to hear it again.
 - The FastGate data model mapping shows Α. where the poles are and the facility point numbers, and that data is specific to a district or an area is posted--is electronically posted like an e-mail on an FTP site and Osmose will go in and retrieve that district, that data set, and take it in to their in-house.

Osmose then takes that package and cuts it up in work packages, manageable size, for the crews in the field to put on their PDA.

Those work packages, once they are cut up, are then sent out to a supervisor in the area with a laptop, downloaded and then they are distributed to the, the foreman or fielders and-that are actually collecting the data. And they put that on their handheld and take that information out into the field.

So from that point I have 200 poles, or whatever that work package might consist of. go out and -- I mean, it has streets on it, the pole lines and they're basically following that



Thacker + Co llc

Court Reporters

Toll Free: 877-441-2180

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14

15

23

24

25

pole line. And when they click on a pole, there is a data set that is available for them to collect, so I can put in the licensee, the height of the attachment, if there is a violation, if there is a guy, a riser.

Once that pole--there are certain data sets within that that that inspector has to fill out or when he tries to close or save that data set, it sends him a message, you haven't completed your information and here are the ones that you need to go back and fill in, which would be the facility point number, the licensee name or type of the attachment.

That pole virtually, on the mapping system, turns from red, not collected, to green as I've completed all of my tasks and he would move to the next pole and start the process all over again, which was to gets the GPS locations and the photo of the pole as well.

Once that work package is complete, he then returns that to the supervisor, who would then electronically send that work package back to Osmose's CNI office in Buffalo, and they would start compiling that data and, and dependent upon the size of the district and how long it would



Thacker + Co LLC

take to, to really inventory this area, Osmose would then package that data back up so we might get 10 percent of the district with work packages compiled.

Let me--I missed a step in there.

Osmose in their contract also has a responsibility to QC a percentage of those poles that they field, so prior to--once the fielder was done with the package and gave it to the supervisor, the supervisor would distribute that to a group of individuals that would go out and QC a percentage of those poles to validate that the accuracy was correct.

Then they would then submit that back to Osmose, compile it, give us whatever data set was completed.

We bring that data in-house and distribute those packages back out to our internal PacifiCorp contracted by Volt to go out and analyze a portion of those packages as well, to validate not only did poles that were only fielded but never QC'd met our criteria. The poles that were QC'd also met that same criteria.

And then we would send that data back to Osmose as accepted. And once that area had



Thacker + Co LLC

been completed, then they would redeliver it and the, the point that needs to be understood is there is a conversion process in the GPS that takes place from what the satellite tells me to actual point on the earth and make sure that those GPS coordinates are in line with one another, and then we would bring that data back in and start running whatever reports necessary and do kind of a final QC on that data before it was applied to production mapping, which was originally where it came from. Got it. Q.

Okav. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you. Good explanation. I have a Ο. couple of, of follow-up questions.

The first one is are--throughout PacifiCorp--and let's focus just on Utah for now, but in PacifiCorp's Utah service area, would there be Qwest poles interspersed with PacifiCorp poles?

- Yes. Α.
- Would those appear on the, the PDA map Q. that, that the, the fielder would have?
 - Correct. Α.
- Would they appear as a foreign-owned pole?



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Α. It would show up as a different color pole because it was a foreign-owned.
 - So--I think you mentioned that it was, Q. it was--a PacifiCorp pole where no data had been collected was red, when the data was collected, it turned green. Right?
 - Right. There--there is kind of a Α. dark--a circle around--well, there is a circle around that red pole that says that -- it's black and so this pole is owned by PacifiCorp, but there would be a blue circle around that pole indicating it was leased.
 - Indicating that --0.
 - Foreign-owned. Α.
 - PacifiCorp -- okay. PacifiCorp leased Q. space on that pole for its facilities?
 - Α. Yes.
 - When the fielder goes out, sees a pole with a blue circle around it indicating a foreignowned pole, would the fielder conduct the inventory of that pole?
 - Only to collect information on a, on a leased pole, only that PacifiCorp has any infractions on it that are of concern because we are only worried about our space on that pole,



Thacker + Co llc

Α.

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

to validate that my records, leased pole,

space at the top of pole, you are not worried--

off of our records and if there is urgent hazards on it.

You are worried about the electric

So I have a facility point because I want

If there are any urgent hazards on that

So--just to get this clear in my--my Ο. head, you got two poles right next to each other; one is a PacifiCorp pole and the one immediately adjacent to it is a Qwest pole.

Fielder goes out to the PacifiCorp pole, which at that stage of the process is red with a black circle around it. Am I right so far?

Yes. Α.

The fielder looks up at the Okay. Ο. communications facilities, does some measurements and records information in the PDA regarding who is on there and what the separations and the like are and records that. Is that correct?

Correct. Α.

Α.

0.

about Qwest poles.

21

23

24

25

Thacker + Co llc

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

And you said PacifiCorp poles.

We are. We are.

1 [Q. Yes. Maybe I wasn't clear. On the
2	PacifiCorp pole, just wanted to make sure there
3	wasn't a bad safety problem there. If there is
4	not one, he is finished with the PacifiCorp pole.
5	He goes to the Qwest pole. Does he do
6	the same thing that he just did to the PacifiCorp
7	pole, look up, gee, no problems, move on?
8	A. If it's a leased pole, foreign-owned,
9	he is really only looking at power, if there is a
10	urgent eminent hazard on it and not collecting
11	joint use data.
12	But if it's a PacifiCorp pole, a urgent
13	hazard, if one exists, and collecting all the
14	joint use data on that pole.
15	Q. Okay. And isall this work is done
16	from the ground?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And crews ofwell, how many members
19	were in, in the fielding crew for Osmose?
20	A. One person. A crew consists of one
21	person.
22	Q. Throughout the entire survey in Utah,
23	one person?
24	A. Yeah.
24	7. 100



Q.

25

Thacker + Co LLC

There was never a time where there were

two or three?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Α. Initially they tried to do, in their collection data, trying to do it with two individuals, one kind of doing the measurements and one doing the handheld that -- and they found after they got into it that really the one individual could collect it as fast, so they split those crews up to one individual.
- Q. Okay. So they could make two crews out of one?
 - Α. Correct.
- Okay. Did--what pops up on the PDA, is it basically a map or was it a more detailed graphic? Did it look just like an electronic version of a flat paper map where--sort of onedimensional, where poles were indicated with a circle and roads were indicated by two parallel lines, that sort of thing?
- Α. One-dimensional, flat line roads, poles.

When you mentioned the word graphical, there are--as I put attachments on that pole, there are not only the licensee, this is AT&T or Comcast or Qwest or whoever, but there is an icon that kind of identifies that as CATV or Telco or



Thacker + Co llc



of--or on a percentage basis?

23

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

as a number of, well, it happened ten times out

1	A. I would say a very few times did we-1
2	percent of the time, 2 percent of the time weI
3	mean, I'm talking globally here, I'm notand
4	maybe I, I don't know that I can specifically say
5	percentages to Utah, but globally, I think 1, 2
6	percent of the time did we fail and force Osmose
7	to go back and revisit that pole or that state
8	data set.
9	Q. And that would be the, the result of a
10	failed QC is that they would go redo the entire
11	data set?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. Can I stop you? Can I take just two
15	minutes to run to the bathroom.
16	Q. Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Please.
17	A. Now that that's on the record.
18	(Recess taken.)
19	Q. Before coming to PacifiCorp to help out
20	with the audit or, in fact, to sort of oversee
21	the audit, had you ever participated in a detailed
22	inventory kind of like this before?
23	A. I guess I would have to answer that an



25

Thacker + Co LLC

inventory such to the extent that PacifiCorp is

doing, no. But through my work history, certainly

6

11 12

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

audits and inventories of existing plants when I worked at RCN, going out and visiting pole after pole after pole to look at any infractions that our construction crews might have created and seeing to it that those were corrected. So on some scale, yes.

- Okay. Do you have any knowledge about Q. how Osmose employees were compensated by Osmose for the work performed in connection with the audit? And we can break this down in a couple of different ways. The first one is we had somewhat of an understanding of how Osmose was compensated by PacifiCorp. It was basically on a per pole basis, one price for joint use, one price for non-joint use.
 - Correct. Α.
- But within the Osmose sphere, do you have knowledge about how Osmose compensated its employees for their work on the PacifiCorp project?
- My understanding is that they are Α. strictly hourly employees.
- Do you have any knowledge about bonuses or premiums which would go to the Osmose employees?



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. I don't. I would assume not, but I don't--

- Q. You don't-what about compensation of Osmose managers or executives, do you have any information about that compensation?
- Α. I do know that Osmose came back to us at some point because of their financial struggle with what they were being paid to do this inventory versus what it was really costing them, and I do know that we looked at some of their financials and some of their projected bonuses, assumptions, but the reality of all of that was that they reduced some of their upper management layers in, in their process. I have to believe that because of their financial struggle through this project that there likely were not any bonuses ever paid at all.
- So in the financial information that Osmose provided you in connection with possible renegotiation of a contract, you had seen projected information for management bonuses?
- What their overheads were, what their vehicles were, what some of their--and I can't--I guess the line item, without specifically looking at the document, probably said salary plus



Thacker + Co llc

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And you, you used the term financial 0. struggle that Osmose was having under the contract. What do you mean by struggle?
- In their assumptions of what time it Α. would take them to actually collect this data in the field versus the price that they were getting to visit the pole was--and, and we talked a little bit ago about initially starting out with two guys in the field and saying, well, I can really do it equally with one so I, therefore, split my cost on that pole. But some of their early assumptions on how long it would take them to collect data on a joint use pole, I think, was probably a little aggressive, so they were taking longer at the pole to collect that data.
- And when they came back and, and said, we'd like to renegotiate this, what did they propose?
- They--there is a tag on the pole that Α. lists year, class, and height of the pole and what they were asking for was that if they could not collect that information. And the relief we gave them for--specific to Oregon and Washington



Thacker + Co LLC

1	and northern Californiawas that we, through
2	their FPI inspection program, already had that
3	data, but for Utah and Wyoming and Idaho,
4	Washington, we had little tiny pieces of that data
5	but globally not. So the relief we gave them was
6	that in Oregon we would use the FPI data to
7	supplement, which meant that thatwhen they
8	visited that pole that was one piece of
9	information that the fielder didn't have to
10	collect.
11	Q. For non-Utahsome non-Utah states.
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Now, I had heard you might give us some
14	abbreviations that we are not familiar with, so I
15	am going to ask you what FPI means.
16	A. Facility point inspections.
17	Q. Okay, thank you.
18	A. That's the only one I know.
19	Q. I'm sure.
20	Just a quick question about those
21	facility point inspections that were done
22	previously in the other states.
23	Whatcan you describe for me what,



Α.

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

There is an inspection program that

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

what that was and when it was done?

	Deposition of Jim Coppedge CONFIDENTIAL 05/14/04
1	systematically goes through a circuit and
2	identifies the condition of that pole. I mean,
3	did a car hit it, is, is the strength of that
4	pole adequate, like we talked before, is the cross
5	arm broke, is the insulator broke and, and it'sI
6	think Oregon is on a ten-year cycle, I believe,
7	to go through the system. So over the years we've
8	collected some of that data that would have
9	assisted them in not having to collect it.
10	Q. Okay. Mr. Coppedge, are you familiar
11	with an audit that was conducted in Utah from
12	approximately 1997 to 1999?
13	A. I am only aware that there was one. I
14	am not familiar with the extent of that project.
15	Q. Did you have, in connection with your
16	management responsibilities for the, the Utah
17	audit, have occasion to refer to the results of
18	that '97/'99 audit?
19	A. Only from the standpoint that the data

at the data that resides in a mainframe database that we'll call JTU, that those records prior to or during that audit reside in that database.

So if I go look at an attachment specific to a facility point, if it was collected in that time frame, it would say, this attachment



20

21

22

23

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

	Deposition of Jim Coppedge CONFIDENTIAL 05/14/04
1	on this pole, 1998, which may or may not have
2	been from the inventory during that period of
3	time. It may have been the application that was
4	submitted in that time frame as well.
5	Q. But you never had occasion to look at
6	raw data from the 1997/1999 audit?
7	A. No. No.
8	Q. Just from what was in the JTU database?
9	A. It's in a mainframe application
10	that'swell, it's, it's difficult to extract data
11	out of it in, in some forms that you would like

Okay. Was there any other--did-consideration or discussions that you had with either Osmose or PacifiCorp individuals regarding the 1997/1999 Utah audit?

to review it in, but the application itself is to

go into specific fields, specific poles, and look

Α. No.

at those specific attachments.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. Mr. Coppedge, do you know whether Osmose had used contractors to perform their responsibilities under the audit contract or whether their people were employees of Osmose?
 - Specific to the inventory RFP? Α.
 - Q. Yes.



Thacker + Co LLC

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

And the inventory project audit, those Α. persons in the field per the contract in the RFP were not to be subcontractors and, to my knowledge, they are all employees of Osmose.

- Okay. That was a contractual Q. requirement?
 - Α. Yes.
- Speaking of contractual requirements, Ο. were the field tasks performed by Osmose personnel conducted from the ground?
 - Α. Yes.
 - No pole climbing? Q.
 - No pole climbing. Α.
 - Bucket trucks? ο.
 - No. Α.
 - Why? Q.
- First of all, there's really no need to Α. use a bucket truck to measure or identify that cable. Usually there is a tag on the table, a fiber cable, that would specifically tell you who that fiber company was. I already know who the licensee is in a specific geographical area and I need a height stick to measure that attachment. And a bucket truck would have only increased the cost to do these inspections. So they had a



Thacker + Co LLC

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

T

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters
Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

little, tiny Ranger pickup, in most cases, or a small sedan vehicle to get from pole to pole and no need to go up in a bucket or climb the pole for any reason.

- Q. Any other reason that you can recall why it wasn't--it was just a function of need?
 - A. (Witness shakes head.)
- Q. Do--were there maybe union considerations that you know of that might have affected how the audit was performed? If you know.
- A. To do the type of inspection that these individuals were being asked to perform did not require them in any form to climb, get high enough on the pole, and I don't--I wouldn't equate their ability to do the inspection in relationship to a union issue.
- Q. Okay. We spent a good deal of time this morning talking about what the fielders did at, at the poles. Did they look at the facilities along the span to the next pole or were they just concentrated on, you know, tunnel vision at the pole approach?
- A. Looking for mid span clearances along the route, there are NESC rules that apply to a

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

specific height above the road or a drop or, or lateral line that would come off and cross the road somewhere as well as any equipment that would be the prime--the primary--most of cable TV, Telco type of equipment is located close to the pole, but for fiber installations, there are splice cases and slack loops of 150 feet or better and the splice case itself, which adds considerable weight to a mid span, so is it in conflict with another attachment, is it sufficiently placed on the pole.

Certainly if you have driven around and ever looked at poles like we look at poles, you will see these huge coils of cable that as--is just wound up sometimes in a ball that's hanging from the strand with a rope or some tape or whatever they had to tie it with and that in and of itself is an infraction because it requires a slack loop to be placed on the strand. So there were several items that they were looking for walking from pole to pole.

When we break for lunch and go off the record, I'll tell you about something that happened to the three of us recently when we were doing just that, driving in a car looking at



Thacker + Co LLC

poles, but I'm not putting it on the record.

So the mid span inspections would be both for the communications facilities and also to check for serious electric problems that might be at mid span?

- NESC requirements mid span for the distance between a neutral or service line to the communication space. And, likewise, as the fiber coils, you will find where because of the utilities, are—the telecommunications are pushing the NESC 40-inch rules sometimes to their max and attaching at 12 inches below instead of 40 and running their cables, both strand type and mid span, to my—our service lines or, or neutral lines. They are an infraction as well.
- Q. Okay. When the Utah Osmose crews were at full capacity, how many, how many individuals comprised the Utah crews?
- A. I want--I really need to look at a schedule to see what was going on kind of at the same time, but certainly as multiple areas were being collected in a given time, we might have had 40, 50, 60 people kind of going through the area.



Thacker + Co LLC

Early on certainly you had duplicate people. And that was not a long period of time. But then as we wound through the schedule and, and some of the larger districts were getting close to closure, a lot of those people would have been reassigned to Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, wherever the next scheduled area was.

- Q. So Osmose would rotate folks out of Utah and into other states potentially?
- A. Osmose is training primarily but because, because of the locality to Salt Lake to, to Wyoming and--Wyoming because of, of the schedule, we needed to get into Wyoming early in the spring, as soon as the snow would break in order to get done before the snow fell, but, but because of the locality their training center for their fielders was primarily in Salt Lake, so crews would--people would be hired, brought in, go through their training process, go out in the field with fielders that had already had months upon months of field experience and then come back in and kind do a final testing.

And once they were--passed their kind of final exam, then they were put out in the field. Now they may stay here for a period of



Thacker + Co llc

very easily been shipped off to Oregon.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

Was there--how would you characterize Q. the amount of turnover of the Utah crews? slight, moderate, appallingly large?

Two pieces I, I--you need to Α. understand. There was a very high turnover in the training process itself, in that once they went through a week of classroom, a week in the field, and then several days back in the classroom making sure that they knew how to work the IPAC, could identify an infraction, could identify who a cable company was, there was a fair amount of fallout in their ability to comprehend what they needed to.

- Q. Fallout because of failed examinations?
- Α. Right. Yes.
- Or this isn't for me, I'm going to do 0. something else?
- Well, I would suppose that probably Α. some of them may have decided along the way that this is really not what I want to do but--
 - Q. Right.
- For the crews that were in the field and, and doing the work in specific geographic

areas--

- Q. Who had gone through the training successfully?
- A. Gone through the training, knew that they were going to go to Ogden or to Cedar Falls or wherever those areas were, I would say it was a very slight turnover during that fielding process. There was a higher turnover when you said, I'm now going to reassign you to Washington, and they said, I don't think so.

So for the, for the crews that stayed in a relatively close proximity, all of Utah, or for those crews assigned to Washington or to Wyoming, those crews pretty much stayed intact.

Now, certain family issues, obviously, but the loss really was—and that's why there was a continual training process—was that as soon as they would get assigned from Wyoming to southern Oregon we would lose ten percent. They would say, I am not going to make that move, I am tired of living in a motel, I am tired of being on the road. It rains too much in Oregon.

Q. Do you have an idea of what level of experience the green Osmose trainees came to the process with, in outside plant?



Thacker + Co LLC

The crews that I met, in, in some of

their training sessions, they came from all walks

of life. I mean, I had people that had been in

Α.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

then we can recess.

trainees, if you know?

Q.

0.

cable TV, men were 40, 50 years old and were tired of doing that kind of work but still wanted to be out in the field and, and certainly we had people that had very little outside plant experience. But I would tell you also that it was very rigorous training session, i.e., why there was considerable fallout on the front end. Was the fallout from the training cited Q. by Osmose as a reason for renegotiation of the terms of the initial contract? A. No. Q. To your knowledge, was there a prerequisite for either outside plant or some kind of communications experience for the Osmose trainees? Α. Certainly preferable. I wouldn't say that it was a prerequisite.

Okay. How did Osmose recruit the

I, I don't know. I don't know that.

Okay. Just give me moment here and

Thacker + Co llc

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- that in certain circumstances crews, in order to finish a district or because of weather concerns, trying to get completed with an area, they might have worked Saturdays, Sundays. I don't specifically know exactly but--
- Would the cost of such overtime have Ο. been absorbed by Osmose?
- Absorbed by Osmose. Strictly billed by per pole.
 - Two more questions. Ο.

From the time that the information is collected in the individual PDA until it is made available to PacifiCorp in Portland for it to do the Volt QC function, how, how long was that, in a range?

Could be anywhere from a couple weeks Α. to a month and a half. Would depend on the amount of data that was flowing back and forth



Thacker + Co LLC

and where our QC personnel was completing other areas and data sitting there until they got reassigned or completed their task and moved to the next area to look at data.

- Q. Okay. And from the time that the data was collected in the field and resident in the PDAs until results were communicated to Comcast, what is the approximate lag time?
- Α. Could be a month to two months. Still would depend on how fast an area was being inventoried and how much data we were trying to process.
- 0. Okay. In connection--are you still involved with the, with the Oregon Joint Use Association?
 - Α. Yes, I am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And I won't ask you how you like that, but I will ask, do you have interaction with Comcast employees up in, up in Oregon?
 - Α. Yes, I do.
- Ο. Okay. You have -- who do you interact with up in, up in Oregon for Comcast?
- Bill Woods, at times Reed Hjort. Α. believe that's h-j-o-r-t.

MR. WOODS: That's correct.



Thacker + Co llc

THE WITNESS: Thank you. 1 And then one name that escapes me right 2 now. 3 BY MR. THOMAS: 4 So three individuals from Comcast? 5 Pretty much. 6 Α. Pretty much. Okay. 7 0. Do you ever talk to them about the Utah 8 9 audit? No. Α. 10 Were your discussions limited to OJUA 0. 11 issues? 12 Correct. Α. 13 Oregon matters. 14 Q. And, and I did have on a couple 15 Α. occasions to go out with Bill and I believe Reed 16 to go look at some issues, pole attachments in 17 Portland, on one or two occasions. But pretty 18 much it's limited to, you know, either their 19 attachments, their violations, OJUA concerns. 20 MR. THOMAS: Why don't we break for 21 lunch. 22 Okay. MR. SACKETT: 23 MR. THOMAS: Thanks. 24 (Recess taken.) 25



Thacker + Co LLC

1

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

Mr. Coppedge, I had just a couple of follow-up questions from the morning session that I wanted to ask you. And this refers to when the fielders go out to, to the survey poles with their PDAs.

Have there been occasions that you know of where they had gone out to a location and a pole that was supposed to be at a location according to the PDA information wasn't there?

- The PDA and the software had the Α. ability, even though a new pole has been placed perhaps in between two existing, for them to create a pole, put the facility point number on it and go ahead and collect data.
- Okay. So they would be able to go Q. ahead and insert--you know, a pole had been interset and they could say, oh, new pole, click it, and then just go through the process?
 - Α. Correct.
- What about if there's a pole on their map and they go out to the location and there is no pole there?
 - And they would delete it as well. Α.
 - 0. Okay. Okay.
 - Mr. Coppedge, I want to turn your



Thacker + Co LLC

25

attention to a document which has actually been marked for identification as Fitz Gerald Number 11. And the reason it's marked as Fitz Gerald Number 11 is because it was used in, in Corey's deposition yesterday.

Now that I have presented you with that document, I am going to have to read it upside down. No, no, no, that's okay. I am more familiar with that.

Have you seen this document before?

- Yes. Α.
- Is this document a, a fee schedule that 0. PacifiCorp generated for joint use permitting attachment fees?
 - For inspection fees. Α.
- Thank you. For For inspections. 0. inspection fees.

There are a series of fees described on this document. Reading from the top, there is an application processing fee of 26.65 plus \$4 per pole. Down under the pre inspection fees, there's a \$31.30 application fee for a level one inspection, \$41.20 for level two, 88.55 for level three inspections. Is that correct?

That's correct. Α.



Thacker + Co llc

Q. Starting at the top with the 26.65 fee plus the \$4 per pole, could you describe to me what that would be for?

A. That's the, the application process fee for receiving the information from whatever licensee and to enter that data into our database, process the application, notify it to the inspector to go out and then do the in-the postor pre-inspection and then communicate the results, either it was denied or approved and, and sometimes that goes back and forth several times.

If, if you made an application for a pole and it was pre-inspected, there was not room on the pole, then the ASCs would communicate back to the licensee, Comcast in this instance, that there was no available space and an estimate or pole replacement might be required, do you want to proceed with that.

And then that response coming back from the licensee saying proceed or, no, we'll do something else. So for all of that communication that's the fee for that portion of the work.

- Q. Okay. You used an acronym ASC?
- A. ASC. Stands for administrative services coordinator.



Thacker + Co LLC

3 4

0.

5

acronyms now, Mr. Coppedge?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

- Which is a person that's receiving and corresponding to the licensee.
- Understand. For the record that's two
 - Touche. Α.
- Would you describe for me the--under the pre-inspection heading, the level one inspection, which carries a \$31.30 charge for the first pole and then 17.65 for each pole thereafter. What would be involved in a level one pre-inspection?
- Simply getting that information out to the utility specialist and then having them perform the inspections on whatever quantity or poles that were in that application.

So those costs involve paying for that person's time to drive wherever that might be and, and do a visual inspection on those poles.

- Okay. And what's the difference between a level one inspection and a level two inspection?
- Level two inspection is the same thing Α. except that the utility specialist, the fielder, is actually going to have--because of the



Thacker + Co llc

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

25

24

inability to say, This is really enough room, that they would have to get out and physically inspect that particular pole and measure that there is clearance or take notes that it would go back to the administrative coordinator to communicate whatever necessary steps were needed to make an authorized attachment on that pole.

- Q. Okay. And could you describe for me what the level three inspection is?
- A. A level three is a more in-depth study of that pole, which can include pole loading.
- Q. Okay. Can but doesn't necessarily include pole loading?
 - A. (Witness nods head.)
- Q. Okay. Now, going down to the post-inspection fees, which are described as level four, level five, and level six, they carry the same dollar amounts as the pre-inspection level one, level two and level three fees. Correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And is it a fair characterization to say that level fours, level fives, and level six is approximately the same degree of work that was necessary for level one, level two, level three, which is why they carry the same charge?



Thacker + Co LLC

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. Going back up to the top, to the Q. 26.65 plus \$4 per pole, did you--were you involved in determining what the proper amount for this fee should be?
- Only at a very high level. When, when Α. this was initially put together, primarily by Joe Clifton and with, with, obviously, some review with Corey, I had looked at some of the analysis that was done, but at this particular time my responsibilities were strictly to inventory as a project manager as opposed to Joe, the supervisor for that region--or those regions. So I only looked at it kind of at a review level. then, of course, now I have responsibility for both of those areas. I am familiar with the information and, and how it was arrived at.
- Did you--well, who was primarily responsible for deriving these, these fee levels?
- I, I think Joe Clifton would certainly Α. have been the lead on, on putting this information together but it was a--as my memory serves me right, it was a joint effort, really, with all of the supervisors in those different regions because



Thacker + Co LLC

where they are located or their utility specialists were located and the distance from one end of their area that they are assigned to has kind of--obviously differences in how far they have to drive to this district to inspect as opposed to another area. So all of those were taken into consideration.

- So these fees apply to all PacifiCorp service areas?
 - Correct. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Would you say that you were made familiar with these fees toward the end of the development process before they were rolled out to your pole licensees?
- I might have in the early stages offered some advice, certainly toward the end of, of accepting and saying, This data looks good and makes sense and it's reasonable, then I would have probably had more involvement in it at that time.
- You said it was developed by -- I believe you said it was developed by Mr. Clifton and other, other supervisors across the service area?
 - Α. Correct.
- How many other, how many other individuals do you think were--



Thacker + Co LLC

Deposit cross or the state of t
A. There are four supervisors, and
probably each one of them would have toor Joe
would have to speak what involvement each one
independently had, but Brian Lund is responsible
for Washington. I'm sorry. I would like to
retract that. He is responsible for Wyoming and
Idaho, and at the time John Cordova was in charge
of southern Utah, basically from Ogdenor the
southern part of Ogden south. And Joe Clifton
would be responsible for northern Oregon and
Washington. And Mike Leonard, Oregon into
California.

- Were there work papers that were used Q. to, to derive these numbers that might give an indication of how they got to the various fee levels that we have been discussing here, that you know of?
- I would certainly have to make some Α. assumptions. I mean, I, I, I do remember looking at kind of how they arrived at some of those fees and, and the process that -- to what detail I don't--I can't tell you.
- Do you recall when they gave you, when they gave you these numbers did they say, here is how we got here, or did they say, these are the



Thacker + Co llc

1	numbers that we have come up with for these
2	various functions, what do you think?
3	A. Certainly we wouldI would have looked
4	at some of the assumptions as how they arrived
5	there.
6	Q. Okay. To the extent that you know,
7	were there other, other individuals within
8	PacifiCorp other than the ones that you
9	specifically mentioned here, including Corey, who
10	were involved in the development of these numbers?
11	A. Again, it wasn't my realm of
12	responsibility
13	Q. I understand.
14	Aat the time so from my perspective,
15	not that I know of.
16	Q. How about in the approval of the
17	numbers after they had been developed?
18	A. It was not within my realm of
19	responsibility. I would have offered my opinion
20	that it looks reasonable to me.
21	Q. But you didn't know whether there was
22	managing director level approval of them?
23	A. I don't know that.



25

Thacker + Co LLC

Okay. And you don't know whether there

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

was more senior level approval than--

70	т	don	+ 1	
Α.	1	don	L	•

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. And you don't have any Q. recollection about the sub-elements that went into the development of these individual elements, amounts, functions?
- Nothing other than I indicated before in, in the time and, and effort, mileage, it would take to get to different areas and how long it would take to do those types of inspections and how many poles you could actually do in a given period of time.
- Okay. So your, your best information, Q. your best testimony here is that Joe Clifton would, would be in a better position to answer those kinds of questions?
 - That's correct. Α.
 - Okay. Thank you. Q.

I think we'll take another quick look at another document that --

(Discussion off the record.)

We are going to look at two different documents here again as expeditiously as possible. And those, Mr. Coppedge, have been already marked for identification as Fitz Gerald Number 8 and Fitz Gerald Number 9. And what you actually have



Thacker + Co LLC

in your hand now is Fitz Gerald Number 8.

And this--are excerpts from a report that appears to have been generated from an Excel spreadsheet and attached to an April 8, 2004, letter to Genevieve Sapir from Jennifer Chapman of the Troutman Sanders law firm.

Do you see that document?

Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Let's turn to the first page of the table which is marked as PCA1. Just a couple of, of quick questions with respect to this document.

Do you see the first two rows of data on that document that each says CATV attachment with--each has the same map string of 11405001.0 and the facility point number 01000. Those first two rows.

- Yes. Α.
- Do you see in the column where it says a violation, in the first row it says 235 40-inch rule?
- Α. Yes.
- And you see where it says attachment height 19, mid span-I mean, attachment mid height 16.83?



Thacker + Co LLC

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does attachment mid height mean a mid Q. span attachment height?

Yes. Α.

- Okay. In the second row, in the violation, do you see where that violation column is blank?
 - Α. Yes.
- Okay. Does the map string and facility point number for the first row and the second row indicate that this is the same pole?
 - Yes. Α.
- Why would there be two separate rows Q. for the same pole on this spreadsheet?
- Without looking at a photo or really seeing some more data behind this, I would assume that there are-there is a cross arm on the pole. It could be that we have cable on both sides of That happens in some cases, so it would have been collected at the same 19 feet. If that--and, and maybe--I mean, I am just throwing out some speculation here.
 - Sure. Q.
- I mean, it's very possible that because when you measure the pole you are measuring from



Thacker + Co LLC

- this point, just looking at this, is that there are probably two separate attachments to the same pole?
 - A. (Witness nods head.)
- Q. Could be a boxed pole, could be a pole with a extension arm or cross arm on it?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. I didn't get your answer with the box pole, all I got was head nod.
- A. Yes, for both.
- 19 O. Thank you.
- 20 Could it be a service drop, for
- 21 | example?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 22 A. It's possible. I doubt it but it's
- possible.
- Q. It's possible. Okay.
- 25 Looking into the column that says



Thacker + Co LLC

25

utility code 0877, my understanding is that that would be a signal for an attachment by Comcast to a distribution pole. Is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And around the middle of the page you'll see a utility code in there of 1051. My understanding of that is that is a signal for a Comcast attachment to a transmission pole.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. You will see a few places in that spreadsheet where there is zero indicated as the utility code. Do you see those places?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you explain what the significance of zero is in those rows in the utility code column for us?
 - A. Yes.

The handheld that they take in the field and they are collecting data, when they pull up the licensee dropdown box, it has choices of the entities that are in that district, and they have the ability to add others, but they really have choices that they pick from. And so AT&T Cable Services would have been their choice.

And when it comes back in through



Thacker + Co LLC

- Q. So would that pole with a zero in it in this spreadsheet otherwise indicating Comcast attachments be deemed as a Comcast attachment?
- A. Yes. Well, let me just clarify what you just asked me.
 - Q. Please.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Because what you--in the case of AT&T or Comcast, the--because there is a licensee name, then the utility code would be assumed to be 877. For whatever reason it didn't come through. But your point to the specific line says that it was construed as an attachment, and a guy attachment isn't construed--is, is only a guy but not a billable item as an attachment. The line I'm looking at says zero, and this one says it's a guy so it only is classified as a guy attachment.
- Q. Does PacifiCorp charge separately for quy attachments?
 - A. We don't charge for guys or risers.



Thacker + Co LLC

Okay. Ο.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Your, your attachment is at the pole where the cable strand, whatever, is placed, and the riser is just part of the accommodation to get there and the guy is--wherever those would be found is the accommodation to support that structure. So you--you're being billed for--the licensees are billed for the attachment. Obviously you wouldn't have just a riser on the pole, you would have to have some way to get there to somewhere else, and you wouldn't just have a guy on the pole because it wouldn't be necessary to support.
 - Right. Okay. 0.
 - So--Α.
- If there is a attachment on a pole with 0. a strand and a communications cable and a--say, six inches above that is that service drop, would that be considered one attachment or two attachments?
- Two. Α.
- Okay. Let's turn our attention to Fitz Q. Gerald Exhibit Number 9 and, Genevieve, you've got an extra, extra copy of this?

Sure. MS. SAPIR:



Thacker + Co llc

1 THE WITNESS: Do you want this back? 2 Q. That's your copy. You may keep it if 3 you like. 4 They are--just so you know, I think 5 your counsel in the case has, has indicated that 6 these materials are subject to protective order. 7 so they need to be, you know, treated sensitively. 8 Α. Okay. 9 (Discussion off the record.) 10 I'm sorry. This was exhibit--11 Q. I'm sorry. This was Fitz Gerald 12 Exhibit Number 9. And what we are probably going 13 to do, Mr. Coppedge, is just to have you 14 understand, is probably not associate any specific 15 exhibits with your deposition since Corey had 16 these already in hers. So when, when the 17 transcripts come out and hers looks a lot thicker, 18 don't be jealous. 19 This is a document that is titled as 20 Inventory Report Key Comcast Discovery Index. 21 have that document in front of you? 22 Α. Yes. 23 0. Are you familiar with this document?



Yes.

Α.

Q.

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Did you help prepare the document?



the data requests.

24

25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters

Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

Α. Correct.

2 3

4

th

5

Α.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

	Q.	Whod	uring	th	at perio	d w	ho w	as	your	-
a s	Sara	Johnson	sort	of	filling	in	for	уот	ıin	
hat	rega	ard?								

- And we talked probably--well, at least weekly, not necessarily every day but--
- Okay. I remember from our earlier time Q. this morning that you're, that you're not being treated currently by a doctor, and I am glad to see you are doing better. You look good to me. We are glad to have you here today.

But Sara was primarily responsible for generating this document. Did anybody else help her with that, to your knowledge?

- Mike Paolicelli probably typed the form Α. for her.
 - Q. Okay.
- But she pretty much had cataloged all of the documents that you were sent.
 - Okay. Thank you. Q.

Mr. Coppedge, a minute ago I think you mentioned that the attachment mismatch report was where if there was an attachment in FastGate but not in the JTU that was what was considered an attachment mismatch. Is that correct?



Thacker + Co llc

Deposition	ΟÏ	Jlm	Cop	pec	19
					_

Correct.

Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- What if it was the other way around, what if the attachment was in FastGate--I'm sorry. What if the attachment was in the JTU but didn't show up in FastGate? Did that ever happen?
- It would show up on that report as well.
- It would show up on that report as well. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Coppedge, you're aware that there is a \$250 unauthorized attachment penalty that was assessed for Comcast attachments that emerged in the mismatch report, Is that correct?

- Correct. Λ.
- Do you know, do you know when that \$250 penalty charge was, was developed?
- It was prior to my employment at Α. PacifiCorp.
 - Prior to your employment. Q.

So when you arrived at PacifiCorp that was what the charge was?

- Α. Correct.
- Okay. Mr. Coppedge, we are going to provide you a copy of two separate documents that had been previously marked as Fitz Gerald Exhibit



Thacker + Co LLC

1 Number 2 and Fitz Gerald Exhibit Number 3.

And Fitz Gerald Exhibit Number 2, do you have that—yes, this is Fitz Gerald Exhibit Number 2. And this is a document that is styled as the initial comments of the Utah Rural Telecom Association. Do you have that document in front of you?

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Are you familiar with this document?
- A. I can't say that I am.
- Q. It's okay if you are not. I'll make you familiar with it if you're not.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. So you are not familiar with it?
 - A. I am not.
- Q. Okay. Well, I won't make you familiar with all of it but maybe just a part of it. Give me a moment, and I will point you to exactly where we want to be on this.

Mr. Coppedge, would you please turn to page four, paragraph nine. And I am going to--I am tired of talking, so I am going to read a little bit to you. It says, "URTA has begun trying to resolve the issue of accounting for pole ownership through inventories, but the commission



Thacker + Co LLC

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- I would say I'm--I am aware of pole owners, foreign owners, concerned over ownership of poles.
 - Have they contacted you about this? 0.
- When you say they--you are talking about URTA?
- Not the association but their members, their specific telephone--
- There, there are--there have been, in a few cases, where the inventory results, they are disputing ownership of that pole.
- How many rural telephone companies in Utah have, have contacted you about this issue?



Thacker + Co LLC

1	A. Me personally, I am only aware of one.					
2	Q. One?					
3	A. And there may have been other disputes					
4	that were sent. I don't know.					
5	Q. And who is that?					
6	A. I don't recall.					
7	Q. You don't recall who that was with.					
8	To your knowledge, have they contacted					
9	other individuals at PacifiCorp regarding this					
10	issue?					
11	A. They would have contacted initially					
12	Billingwould have received the initial.					
13	Q. Diddo you know that Billing received					
14	the initial?					
15	A. I do not.					
16	Q. Have you been involved in attempting to					
17	remedy the issues referred to here regarding pole					
18	ownership?					
19	A. Any, any pole that is disputed or any					
20	attachment, for that matter, is going back into					
21	the records and seeing if we can validate when we					
22	say we own the pole or when the original					
23	attachment might have been made to that pole.					
24	And certainly if we incorrectly identified or the					
25	records show that this poleand, and a company					



Thacker + Co LLC

6

10 11

12 13

15

14

17

16

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

provide the documentation that says either that attachment or that pole is, is ours and here is the records to prove it, we certainly would credit those issues.

- What if the company doesn't have Q. documentation and they--it's ambiguous? What happens then?
- Well, how--I guess my--in response to that, how do I--how do you dispute ownership, but you don't have any records to say it belongs to you?
 - That's a good question. Q.

If a, if a pole owner comes to you and says that we own these series of poles on, on this route but PacifiCorp has tagged them as theirs, what would the process be in that circumstance?

Going into the data to--where the Α. original facility point number was assigned and trying to identify when we placed the pole or when we might have taken over ownership. I mean, there are those cases where the pole has been-ownership was transferred, so we would have record of that.

Now, I guess--and I would just make



Thacker + Co llc

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

T

clear, I guess we would sit at the tables and trade poles for some equity. Q. Has that, that happened? A. Not to this date, that I know of.

and when I go look at the data and my records are

some assumptions that if your records are clear

- Q. Is, is the--to your knowledge, is the environment surrounding this issue making such a horse-trading exercise likely?
- A. I think, I think our records are very well documented, and there may be a few issues where we dispute actual pole ownership with your records versus mine. I would think that would be a rare case.
- Q. Who else at PacifiCorp has participated in trying to resolve this pole ownership issue?
 - A. This specific issue?
 - Q. No, generally speaking of, of--
- A. There would be several people that I would call in mapping or go into the data and try and look at the records.
- Q. But if you got a complaint from--if Billing--you said initially that, that the Billing would be the person--the outfit most likely--
 - A. That would be the initial contact.

Thacker + Co LLC

Then would The initial contact. 1 0. Billing contact you? 2 If it was a dispute on ownership or Α. 3 attachments based on inventory results, then, yes. 4 Okay. Has Billing contacted you 5 Q. regarding such, such disputes? 6 I, I know that we've had conversations 7 Α. about ownerships of pole, but to say that I have 8 a contact from a company that lists these poles are in conflict and had to go and provide data to 10 them, no, they have not done that yet. 11 Okay. My, my question was has somebody 12 0. from PacifiCorp's billing department contacted you 13 about a dispute over pole ownership of a foreign 14 pole owner. 15 No. Α. 16 You said that you had heard that Okay. 17 0. there were issues of pole ownership dispute. 18 19 Correct? I have heard that, yes. 20 Α. Who did you hear that from? Q. 21 Specifically I don't know. 22 Α. How did you--23 Q. I mean, as an industry, there is an 24



25

Thacker + Co LLC

Court Reporters
Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

issue of records over pole ownership. I mean,



25

Thacker + Co LLC

we are finished with Exhibit 2, and I don't think

Court Reporters
Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

we'll need to look at Exhibit 3.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I have enough documents.
- Q. I am sure you do. I am sure you do.

Mr. Coppedge, I've, I've struggled with a number of things in the questions today, and, and your answers have been very helpful. What I'm trying to sort of get at with my next question is a--your view of how the two, the two companies, Comcast, Comcast and PacifiCorp, can sit down and resolve the issues between how many poles from the audit are turning up with Comcast attachments that, you know, you, you have now versus what Billing thought they were previously. And I'm just interested in, in learning what you think would be the, the steps to getting to that point of resolution of those numbers because--and the reason I'm asking you is, is because you're extremely familiar with, with all of the data here, you are extreme ly familiar with the process and with, you know, the, the plant in Utah now, and it could come in handy.

MR. SACKETT: Was that a question?

MR. THOMAS: That was a question. I



Thacker + Co LLC

was interested in hearing his views on how, on how to reconcile the differing data sets.

THE WITNESS: Let me first preface this statement.

I, I think to sit down at the table with the parties and try and resolve the differences and look at records is a good start and probably so we should have started that process months ago and maybe we wouldn't be where we are today.

Let me also say that my years of experience in the industry—and I will specifically talk to RCN, since we spent a lot of time doing that. When you go into a marketplace and look at the number of poles and the number of attachments, it's relatively easy by looking at just a few numbers, I have this many poles in this area, but I only have this many attachments, and the industry standard would say at least 50, more like 68, sometimes 75 percent of those poles should have some type of cable attachment.

BY MR. THOMAS:

- Q. Uh-huh.
- A. And if the telecom was built on the same power structures instead of their own pole



Thacker + Co LLC

line, you would make that same assumption as well.

And when you look at the number of attachments that were being billed and paid by AT&T/Comcast, it's relatively quickly apparent that a large portion of poles in those areas do not have any record and are not returning rent.

that and, and I'll just throw out kind of some generic numbers. When you say that in a particular district I have 4,000 attachments prior to inventory, but now with all of the found attachments on these poles, I have something in the neighborhood of 10,000, we have a lot of records to go through. I mean, I am okay with the 4,000 over here that were original, and maybe there are some issues there and certainly any, any disputes that would say, well, I think I'm paying Qwest as a pole owner for that attachment, then we can certainly talk about that.

But I don't know what kind of documentation--and certainly in the early conversations with Comcast I am willing to change any record that I think is unauthorized that you think is not, and that would be a good starting point.



Thacker + Co LLC

- Did you, did you ever work in the cable TV industry?
- Α. We only went back through about 1990 in my employment.
 - 0. Right.

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- And prior to that -- after I got out of diesel mechanic school and the industry was such I couldn't find a job to do what I just got trained for.
- And what year was this when you got Q. your associate's?
 - It was 19--oh, I don't know. 1980, Α.



Thacker + Co llc

I ended up doing some, some labor work for a construction company, and in the process of these years ran equipment, learned how to put up cable, learned how to bore cable, plow cable. If there was a method to get cable from point A to point B over the, over the years of '82 to '90, I learned it. I—my experience was with underground, was with aerial. I can't even begin—and I am glad you didn't ask me—how many miles of cable that I personally installed.

- Q. How many miles of cable did you personally install?
- A. A lot. But I, I certainly would say to you that my, my experience actually in the field doing that kind of work and knowing the method and the methodology to correctly install cable kind of led me to where I am.
- Q. Okay. And just--we are coming full circle now.

From the 1982 to 1990 time frame, you were involved in labor and construction and, to paraphrase, a significant part of that was doing both aerial construction and, and underground construction?



Thacker + Co LLC

Α.

- Α. That's correct.
- 2

1

- 0. Did, did you work--
- 3 4
- I was foreman, I was supervisor.
- 5
- All kinds of capacities? 0.
- 6
- (Witness nods head.)
- 7 8
- And kind of working your way from the 0. ground up?

And I was labor and I was operator and

- 9
- From the field. Α.
- 10
- Literally--well, the underground up if you were doing underground construction.
- 11 12
- Did you work for contracting companies or did you work for actual communications
- 13
- companies? 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- During that period, before 1990, because basically after that point I worked for operating companies that had their own facilities. Prior to that, it was for contract companies, for U.S. West, for GTE, for Sprint United, for--I mean, all the major cable companies, telephone companies, some of the early fiber companies putting in facilities for them.

And that was when--now, did you ever--

Thacker + Co llc Court Reporters

companies that you just named?

were you ever an employee of any of those

1	A. No.					
2	Q. Were you ever an employee of a cable TV					
3	company?					
4	A. No.					
5	Q. Okay. But you were an employee of					
. 6	construction companies that did work for local					
7	telephone companies. Correct?					
8	A. Correct.					
9	Q. Newly emerging fiber companies?					
10	A. Correct.					
11	Q. And cable TV companies?					
12	A. And cable TV companies.					
13	Q. Which cable TV companies did you work					
14	for, if you can recall? Was this in Portland					
15	area or was this in different places?					
16	A. It, it was pretty muchI would say					
17	primarily Oregon. We traveled all over. We went					
18	up into Washington. We went into California. So					
19	for the major telecoms, forearly on, Store					
20	Cable.					
21	Q. Falcon Cable?					
22	A. I remember doing a little bit of work					
23	for Falcon way, way, way back but					
24	Q. TCI?					
25	A. Some for TCI. I was trying to think of					



Thacker + Co LLC

1 the company that bought --2 Q. United Cable? 3 --Store out. 4 MR. WOODS: That was TCI. 5 BY MR. THOMAS: 6 Q. Viacom? 7 I didn't do much for Viacom. 8 Q. Okay. What I'd like to do, if we could, 9 is maybe just take a short recess. We are just 10 at the end. Maybe you can confer with counsel 11 and, and see if there is a clarification that, 12 that you might want, want to make on anything and 13 we can wrap this baby up. 14 Α. Okav. 15 MR. SACKETT: Okay. 16 MR. THOMAS: Thanks. 17 (Recess taken.) 18 We are back. We have gone through our Q. 19 notes and happy to report I don't have any other 20 questions. MR. SACKETT: I just have one area and 21 22 it has to do with--actually I had several but 23 between you, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Coppedge, you 24 have managed to clear them all away except one,



25

Thacker + Co LLC

and I'd like to refer to Exhibit 8. Can we get a

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: I have got one here

3 somewhere. Okay.

EXAMINATION

BY-MR.SACKETT:

- Q. Mr. Thomas asked you some questions about, about the chart, which actually consists of three pages, and in particular he asked you some questions about the, the column that's titled, Utility Code. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And you recall he asked about some zeros in that column and you explained that you thought that those zeros were the result of kind of mistranslation of field data. Is that correct?
- A. Or, or making the association from the licensee to its correct utility code.
- Q. Okay. And if you'd look through the other pages of this report, the other two pages of this report, that—where the utility code column exists, there are other places where there are zeros. Are there not?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And in connection with all of the zeros, what is the JU class that's associated with



Thacker + Co LLC



25

today.

Thacker + Co LLC

Thank you for your time

Court Reporters Utah's Leader in Litigation Support

MR. THOMAS:



Thacker + Co LLC

CERTIFICATE

COUNTY OF	; ss.
I HEREBY CERTIFY that I	have read the testimony consisting of is a true and correct transcription of exception of the corrections I have
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	Correction
Page Line	Correction
	Jim Coppedge
SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to day of,	
My Commission Expires:	NOTARY PUBLIC

CERTIFICATE

2

3

4

_

5

6

7

8

9

ر

10

11

12

سه مد

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is to certify that the foregoing deposition was taken before me, DAWN M. DAVIS, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah;

That said witness was duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth;

That the deposition was reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting, and that a full, true, and correct transcription of said testimony so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages;

That no review of this deposition was requested by either party or the witness and, therefore, pursuant to Rule 30 (e) of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure the review was waived.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause and am not interested in the event thereof.

Dawn M. Davis, RPR
My Commission Expires:

March 8, 2008



Notary Public DAWN M. DAVIS 1105 North 1100 West Farmington, UT 84025 My Commission Expires March 8, 2008 State of Utah