

September 26, 2005

VIA EMAIL AND US MAIL

Filing Center Oregon Public Utility Commission 550 Capitol Street NE #215 PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148

Re: UX 29 - Errata Direct Testimony of Dr. Richard Cabe on Behalf of TRACER

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed for filing in the above-named docket is the original and five copies of TRACER's Errata Direct Testimony of Dr. Richard Cabe. Please contact me with any questions.

Very truly yours,

essica A. Gorham

Enclosure

cc: UX 29 Service List Richard Cabe

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE UX 29

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of **ERRATA DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD CABE ON BEHALF OF TRACER** was served via U.S. Mail on the following parties on September 26, 2005:

Ms. Stephanie S. Andrus Oregon Department of Justice General Counsel Division 100 Justice Building 1162 Court Street NE Salem OR 97301

Gregory T. Diamond Covad Communications Company Government & External Affairs 7901 Lowry Boulevard Denver CO 80230-6906

Mr. Dennis Gabriel Oregon Telecom, Inc. PO Box 4333 Salem OR 97302-8333

Rex Knowles XO Oregon, Inc. 111 E Broadway, Suite 1000 Salt Lake City UT 84111

Lawrence H. Reichman Perkins Coie LLP 1120 NW Couch Street, 10th Floor Portland OR 97209-4128

Brian D. Thomas Time Warner Telecom 223 Taylor Avenue North Seattle WA 98109-5017 Doug Denney Eschelon Telecom of Oregon, Inc. Suite 900 730 Second Avenue South Minneapolis MN 55402

Alex M. Duarte Qwest Corporation Suite 810 421 SW Oak Street Portland OR 97204

Karen J. Johnson Integra Telecom of Oregon, Inc. Suite 500 1201 NE Lloyd Boulevard Portland OR 97232

Gregory J. Kopta Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 1501 4th Avenue, Suite 2600 Seattle WA 98101-1688

Mr. Brad Schaffer Rio Communications Incorporated 520 SE Spruce Roseburg OR 97470-3134

ATER WYNNE, LLP

Jessica A. Gorham

underlying that growth shows that all but a miniscule percentage occurred in wire centers that already had UNE-L lines in service at the beginning of the period.¹ That is, while UNE-L CLECs continue to expand in the areas in which they have already established service, they are not expanding the areas they serve.

Q. IS THIS CONSISTENT WITH YOUR DISCUSSION ABOVE CONCERNING SUNK COST AS A BARRIER TO ENTRY?

A. Yes. A UNE-L CLEC perceives the sunk cost of establishing a collocation, as well as the sunk cost portion of establishing transport from the collocation to its switch, as a barrier to entry into the geographic market defined by that wire center. Once the CLEC has established a collocation in a particular wire center, adding additional lines involves the customer-specific sunk cost of non-recurring charges for the UNE loop installation, but adding lines lowers the average cost of serving customers in that area by spreading fixed costs over more customers. Thus, in the terms of the HMG, as discussed above, a UNE-L CLEC is an "uncommitted entrant" within a wire center in which it has a collocation; it is able - "rapidly" and "without incurring significant sunk costs" - to offer service to at least some of the customers in a wire center in which it has already incurred the sunk cost of establishing a collocation.

Q. DOES THE ADDITION OF LINES MEAN THAT CLECS ARE OPERATING **PROFITABLY?**

A. Not at all. The CLEC adding lines in existing collocations may be operating at a financial loss because establishing the collocation was more expensive than expected, or because it hasn't succeeded in enrolling a sufficient number of customers in the area for economies of scale to bring its average cost down to the price it has to charge in order to

1

2

questions are reasonable ones that have no answers, because Qwest's proposed relevant market doesn't make sense. Staff's UX-29 Survey Results avoid these issues by using much more reasonable product market definitions. ³⁰ Highly Confidential Attachment A to Qwest's Response to Tracer Data Request 1, dated August 30, 2005.

²⁶ TRACER/102, Cabe/1-6.