

February 18, 2015

Samuel L. Feder
Tel 202 639-6092
Fax 202 661-4999
sfeder@jenner.com

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: *Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet*, GN Docket No. 14-28;
Framework for Broadband Internet Service, GN Docket No. 10-127;
Implementation of Section 224 of the Act, WC Docket No. 07-245

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 12, 2015, Alex Hoehn-Saric, Charter Communications, Inc.'s Vice President for Government Affairs, Christianna Barnhart, Charter's Vice President for Regulatory Affairs, and the undersigned met with Gigi Sohn, Daniel Alvarez, and Eric Feigenbaum, and, in a separate meeting, with Rebekah Goodheart. On February 13, 2015, the same Charter representatives met with Matthew DelNero, Jim Schlichting, Scott Jordan, Stephanie Weiner, and Claude Aiken. Also on February 13, Catherine Bohigian, Charter's Executive Vice President for Government Affairs and the undersigned met with Priscilla Argeris. In the meetings, Charter commended the Commission for working to ensure that the Internet remains open and thriving and argued that reclassifying broadband under Title II was both unnecessary and harmful to those ends. See Comments of Charter, *Protecting and Promoting the Open Internet*, GN Docket Nos. 14-28 and 10-127, at 13-21 (July 18, 2014). Charter also discussed the Commission's transparency regulations, see *id.* at 21-35, the regulation of Internet interconnection, see Letter from Matthew A. Brill to Marlene H. Dortch, GN Docket Nos. 14-28 and 10-127, at 22-25 (Dec. 23, 2014), the importance of non-regulation of broadband pricing, and the preemption of state public utility regulation, see *id.* at 12-22; Letter from Jonathan Banks et al. to Marlene H. Dortch, GN Docket Nos. 14-28 and 10-127 (Jan. 23, 2015). Charter sought clarification that the FCC did not intend the reclassification to change the status of broadband providers for purposes of taxes and fees under state or local law and that nothing in the decision would make broadband providers "telephone companies" or "utilities" as those terms are commonly understood. Any effort to increase state or local taxes or fees on the basis of reclassification would undermine broadband deployment and adoption, and accordingly, the goals of the Commission. Additionally, Charter discussed the implications of reclassification for pole attachments, see Letter from Steven F. Morris to Marlene H. Dortch, GN Docket No. 14-28 and WC

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch

February 18, 2015

Page 2

Docket No. 07-245 (Jan. 22, 2015), and argued that any change in pole attachment rates caused by reclassification is prospective-only, as reclassification would clearly be a change in existing law.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this meeting.

Sincerely,

/s/ Samuel L. Feder

Samuel L. Feder

cc: Gigi Sohn
Daniel Alvarez
Rebekah Goodheart
Priscilla Argeris
Matthew DelNero
Jim Schlichting
Scott Jordan
Stephanie Weiner
Claude Aiken
Eric Feigenbaum