

1 business. However, at the same time, competition remains robust – Qwest is no
2 longer “the phone company,” with the implications of a monopoly carried by that
3 phrase. Qwest faces local competition from wireless carriers, CLECs, and cable
4 companies. To the extent that the imputation of directory revenues has
5 historically been associated with flowing the benefit of the publishing operation to
6 the ratepayers, the Commission may note that many companies now have
7 ratepayers side by side with Qwest. Customers have choices for local service.

8 Under the competitive and economic circumstances in the industry alone, the
9 Commission could independently decide that imputation is no longer appropriate.

10 **Q. HASN'T THE CHANGED TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENVIRONMENT**
11 **AND MARKET CONDITIONS HURT THE GROWTH OF**
12 **COMPETITION IN WASHINGTON?**

13 A. No. It has affected the number of alternative carriers offering service in
14 Washington but it has not effected the growth in lines served by alternative
15 carriers. Confidential Exhibit TAJ-5C demonstrates the growth in unbundled
16 services, resale and UNEs that has occurred over the last couple of years. It
17 indicates a 124% ~~224%~~ growth in unbundled loops, a 184% ~~284%~~ growth in
18 ported numbers and a 52% ~~152%~~ growth in UNE-P. Customers who have service
19 from competitive providers no longer receive the benefit of imputation since the
20 prices for these wholesale services do not include an imputation calculation. As
21 more customers have a choice of telecommunications providers and as more
22 customers obtain service priced by the market (as opposed to prices resulting from
23 rate regulation), the benefit of and rationale for imputation is diminished.