

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

December 20, 2013

Mr. Jim Cicconi
Senior Executive Vice President – External and Legislative Affairs
AT&T
1120 20th Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. Cicconi:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on October 23, 2013, to testify at the hearing entitled “The Evolution of Wired Communications Networks.”

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions by the close of business on January 14, 2014. Your responses should be e-mailed to the Legislative Clerk in Word format at Charlotte.savercool@mail.house.gov and mailed to Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Greg Walden
Chairman

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

cc: Anna Eshoo, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

Attachment

Attachment – Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Billy Long

1. Can you elaborate on the types of telemedicine and mobile health applications that would be available to my constituents in the best congressional district in the United States if they did have the IP services?

The Honorable Anna Eshoo

1. I understand that AT&T ultimately proposes moving some of its customers away from both wired voice and broadband service. My concern is that consumers could incur steep charges for applications like streaming video and music if your substitute wireless service is subject to similar usage-based pricing to what we see today with 4G LTE. How do you respond to this concern?

2. AT&T has frequently cited the findings of a CDC survey showing that the number of customers who have cut the cord is large and increasing. But that survey asks only about voice service. Do you have evidence to suggest that those cutting the cord for voice service are also moving away from a wired broadband connection?

The Honorable Henry Waxman

1. At the hearing you stated that the rules of the Telecom Act are not technology neutral, and cited the different titles of the Act that apply to wireline, wireless and cable service. Do you believe that within Title II of the Act, there is a distinction between TDM voice services or IP delivered voice or are the rules for voice service technology neutral?

2. During the hearing, you referenced a chart showing a decline in ILEC Switched Landline service as a share of U.S. household primary line service. Mr. Iannuzzi pointed to slower adoption of wireless and IP voice alternatives by businesses. How would you characterize the differences between residential and business customers' reliance on TDM voice services? How should policy makers consider these differences in the context of the IP transition?