

Susan B. Cunningham Counsel

susan.cunningham@dentons.com D +1 816 460 2441 Salans FMC SNR Denton dentons.com

Dentons US LLP 4520 Main Street Suite 1100

Kansas City, MO 64111-7700 USA

T +1 816 460 2400 F +1 816 531 7545

December 18, 2013

Commissioner Stoll Missouri Public Service Commission Post Office Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Re: Documentation of Oral Conversation: TX-2013-0324 MO USF Rulemaking Regarding High Cost Support (4 CSR 240-31.040)

Dear Commissioner Stoll:

In accordance with 4 CSR 240-4.020(8)(B)(1), this letter shall serve as documentation of our recent conversation regarding the pending rulemaking referenced above.

Participants: Commissioner Stoll and Susan Cunningham

Date/Time: 4:00 p.m. on December 17, 2013

Means: Electronic mail w/attachment

Subject: Comcast's concerns regarding the billing requirements in the proposed

4 CSR 240-31.040.

Pursuant to 4 CSR 240-4.020(8)(B)(1), no further disclosure, filing or actions are required.

Sincerely,

/s/ Susan B. Cunningham

Susan B. Cunningham Counsel

Susan Cunningham Counsel

susan.cunningham@dentons.com D +1 816 460 2441

Dentons US LLP 4520 Main Street Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111-7700 USA

T +1 816 460 2400 F +1 816 531 7545

December 17, 2013

Via email: steve.stoll@psc.mo.gov

Dear Commissioner Stoll:

Regarding the proposed rule under consideration in docket number TX-2013-0324, Comcast has an important concern I would like to bring to your attention.

Under the proposed 4 CSR 240-31.060(4)(B), the rule would require the surcharge for the Missouri Universal Services Fund to appear as a separate line item on a customer's bill.

This addition to current billing requirements is unnecessary. Under 47 C.F.R. 64.2401(b), Comcast is already required to include a "brief, clear, non-misleading, plain language description of the service or services rendered." Comcast already ensures that its billing practices comply with federal truth-in-billing requirements. An additional line item on a customer's bill is duplicative and burdensome.

Importantly, Comcast also believes that, under Section 392.550.4, the Commission is granted only specific authority over Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) providers, and that authority does not extend to billing practices. The Commission is thus without jurisdiction to promulgate a rule requiring modifications to a VoIP provider's bill, and should consider removing this section from the proposed rule.

Comcast's current billing practice provides full disclosure to customers. Comcast explains that a fee is assessed by Comcast to recover its contributions to various federal, state and local programs, and that such fee is neither government mandated nor a tax. Comcast includes these fees in a separate line item labeled a "Regulatory Recovery Fee." In its Missouri Residential Service Price List, Comcast clearly lists each of the fees included in this line item, and how each fee is determined.

Comcast operates in 39 states and thousands of municipalities, adding up to a very burdensome regulatory structure. Certain Comcast markets cross state lines and the billing formats in one state can then affect the format in other states that encompass the same market. One example of such a market is the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Because the statute grants only certain, limited authority to the Commission regarding VoIP providers, the proposed billing requirements should be dropped for Comcast and other VoIP companies.

In the alternative, in an effort to reduce the regulatory strain to customers and providers, we ask that the Commission consider a change to the proposed rules. As proposed in the comments filed by the Missouri Cable Telecommunications Association, the Commission should change the proposed language in 4 CSR 240-31.060(4)(B) to require that "The surcharge shall be [appear as a separate line item] detailed as a 'Missouri Universal Service Fund[.]' or otherwise identified as a state regulatory fee or charge on the

Commissioner Steve Stoll December 17, 2013 Page 2

customer's bills." This will allow companies the freedom to provide more detail if they wish, but will also not bind carriers operating in several states to a superfluous requirement.

Thank you for your consideration, and please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Best regards,

/s/ Susan Cunningham

Susan Cunningham Attorney