

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH 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

April 2, 2015

Mr. Robert Atkinson
President
Information Technology and Innovation Foundation
1101 K Street, N.W., Suite 610
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Mr. Atkinson:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on February 25, 2015, to testify at the hearing entitled "The Uncertain Future of the Internet."

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 with a transmittal letter by the close of business on April 16, 2015. Your responses should be mailed to Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to Charlotte.Savercool@mail.house.gov.

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 Brett Guthrie

1. Small, rural carriers are important to my district, so I would ask you to provide your further thoughts on how they in particular might be affected if Title II regulations are challenged in court. What are some of the effects of protracted litigation that you would expect to affect these small, rural carriers both indirectly and directly, especially given that many of them will not have the resources to spend a significant amount of time or money in court, even though we expect a legal challenge to be initiated by some of the larger carriers?

The Honorable Gus Bilirakis

1. Mr. Atkinson, in your testimony you reference the need for a balanced approach of regulation and oversight to produce a market that fosters innovation and provides room for a growing diversity of applications.

Can you explain a little more how the reclassification to Title II would hinder further expansion of broadband applications and uses?

2. Mr. Atkinson, the FCC's plan to forebear certain aspects of Title II from applying to broadband is meant to be a lighter application of a burdensome regulation. Won't this open the door for litigation from multiple angles in the future, not just over the FCC's ability to reclassify generally?