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

May 17, 2013

Mr. Billy Jack Gregg
Universal Consulting
P.O. Box 107
Hurricane, WV 25526

Dear Mr. Gregg:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on Thursday, April 25, 2013, to testify at the hearing entitled "The Lifeline Fund: Money Well Spent?"

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 May 31, 2013. 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

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Henry Waxman

1. Mr. Gregg, your testimony cited data claiming that eight states have more Lifeline subscribers than low income households - Alaska, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island. After our hearing, one analysis questioned this conclusion, arguing that your conclusions were based on outdated poverty statistics and an undercount of eligible recipients, among other issues. Would you like to respond?