



1 **Q: Please state your name.**

2 A: Gary Goldstein.

3 **Q: Have you reviewed the rebuttal testimony PacifiCorp submitted in connection**  
4 **with Docket No. 03-035-28?**

5 A: Yes.

6 **Q: On page 6 of her rebuttal testimony, Ms. Fitz Gerald refers to a sign-in sheet for**  
7 **a Joint Use meeting held in October 1996. She claims that although your name**  
8 **is on the sign-in sheet, you have testified that you have no recollection of**  
9 **attending the meeting. Is this correct?**

10 A: No. As I stated in my deposition, I recall attending one joint use meeting. Although I  
11 cannot recall the exact date or all the issues discussed, I clearly testified that I  
12 attended one such meeting. With her direct testimony, Ms. Fitz Gerald submitted a  
13 sign-in sheet dated October 18, 1996, that has my name written in my handwriting, so  
14 I assume I was present. It is possible that the October 18, 1996 meeting is the one I  
15 referenced in my deposition, but I cannot say for sure.

16 **Q: On pages 2 and 3 of his testimony, Bruce Jensen states that permitting maps**  
17 **would not have been sufficient evidence of Comcast's (or its predecessor's)**  
18 **authority to be on transmission poles. Do you have any comments about Mr.**  
19 **Jensen's statement?**

1 A: Yes. In my direct testimony, I explained that when I was involved in Tele-  
2 Communications, Inc.'s new builds in the 1970's and 1980's, Utah Power approved  
3 attachment applications by signing Exhibit A forms with permit maps attached. We  
4 did not use a separate permitting process for transmission poles. This means that the  
5 only permits we would have had to show Mr. Jensen were the signed Exhibit A forms  
6 with accompanying permitting maps. I don't know exactly which Exhibit A's or  
7 permitting maps Mr. Bell showed Mr. Jensen, but I do know that since we permitted  
8 attachments to transmission poles in the same way we permitted maps for other poles,  
9 by using Exhibit A's and accompanying permitting maps, those documents would be  
10 the only permits Comcast could have shown Mr. Jensen.

11 It is possible that Mr. Jensen was confused by Mr. Bell's use of the term "blanket  
12 authorizations." Whatever terminology they prefer to use, the documentation Mr.  
13 Bell had available was the Exhibit A's and accompanying maps.

14 **Q: On pages 2 and 3 of her testimony, Ms. Fitz Gerald discusses the reliability of**  
15 **the 2002/2003 Audit. Do you have any reason to doubt its reliability?**

16 A: Yes. Attached to my testimony is a spreadsheet showing 22 attachments in the  
17 American Fork district that PacifiCorp identified as belonging to Comcast in  
18 connection with the 2002/2003 audit, but that do not actually belong to Comcast.  
19 Comcast does not have any attachments in the Cedar Fort area where these

1 attachments are located. MasTec attempted to locate these attachments and created  
2 this spreadsheet based on the data PacifiCorp provided to us.

3 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

4 A: Yes.