- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS BURDETTE
- 3 HIF078.160
- 4 FCC REAUTHORIZATION: OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMISSION
- 5 THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
- 8 Committee on Energy and Commerce
- 9 Washington, D.C.

10 The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:02 a.m., 11 in Room 2123 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg 12 Walden [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta, Shimkus,
Blackburn, Scalise, Lance, Guthrie, Olson, Pompeo, Kinzinger,
Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Collins, Cramer, Barton, Eshoo,
Doyle, Clarke, Loebsack, Rush, Butterfield, Matsui, McNerney,

17 Lujan, Cardenas, and Pallone (ex officio).

18 Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Ray Baum, 19 Senior Policy Advisor for Communications and Technology; Sean 20 Bonyun, Communications Director; Leighton Brown, Press 21 Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Andy Duberstein, 22 Deputy Press Secretary; Gene Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; 23 Kelsey Guyselman, Counsel, Telecom; Peter Kielty, Deputy 24 General Counsel; Grace Koh, Counsel, Telecom; David Redl, 25 Counsel, Telecom; Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Clerk; 26 Jeff Carroll, Democratic Staff Director; David Goldman, Democratic Chief Counsel, Communications and Technology; 27 28 Margaret McCarthy, Democratic Professional Staff Member; Tim 29 Robinson, Democratic Chief Counsel; and Ryan Skukowski, 30 Democratic Policy Analyst.

T

31 Mr. {Walden.} If everyone could take their seats? And 32 while they are, I am going to--before we start the clock, I 33 just--as many of you know, I am going to exert a little 34 Chairman's prerogative here, because Mr. Wheeler and I have 35 not always gotten along. And I have my opening statement 36 here, but I am just sick and tired of sort of your third 37 string approach to winning, and the way you are willing to 38 tackle and run over the top of people, and score points just 39 for scoring points. 40 Now, now that the U of O/OU game is over in the national 41 football championship, I want everybody to know I have kept 42 my promise and worn the Ohio State tie. So--43 Mr. {Wheeler.} Mr. Chairman, I--44 Mr. {Walden.} No, you are out of order. 45 Mr. {Wheeler.} I hope we--46 Mr. {Walden.} I am just going to say that right now. 47 Mute the mikes--nothing. 48 Mr. {Wheeler.} I hope we are on the record, because I 49 just want to say two things. Number one, you are an 50 honorable man, and--

51 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. 52 Mr. {Wheeler.} --you had the wrong side, and we were 53 pleased to beat you with our backup to the backup 54 quarterback. 55 Mr. {Walden.} You think this is going to go better for 56 you? 57 Mr. {Wheeler.} But I do think that the color is very 58 becoming on you. 59 Mr. {Walden.} Now, just so you know, I have now filled

my bet that I would wear the Ohio State tie if they beat my 60 61 Ducks, and vice versa. I also want you to know there is a 62 pending matter to be settled. I did offer up dates for lunch, which I will buy, and I suggested February 26 might 63 have been a wonderful day for the Chairman to have lunch with 64 me. He suggested he had other matters to attend to. All 65 66 right. Enough of fun and frivolity. Thank you all for being 67 here, and I thank our FCC Commissioners for being here, and 68 my colleagues. I know this is a ``go away day'', and we will 69 probably interrupt it by votes, so we will try and move 70 through this. But this is really important business we are 71 going to take up, as we always do in this committee, and so

## 72 on to the serious matters.

73 You know, it was just over two weeks ago that we had the 74 Commission's managing director present us with his rationale 75 for the largest budget request in history for the Federal Communications Commission. We were able to discuss with him 76 77 whether the funding levels requested would actually yield an 78 effective and credible agency. Today we have the opportunity 79 to ask the Commissioners themselves whether this agency is 80 functioning as it should, whether it is producing the high 81 caliber policymaking that American society requires and 82 deserves, and I, for one, have to confess, I am skeptical.

83 I think I have a good reason for my skepticism. The Federal Communications Commission was once a transparent, 84 85 predictable agency, presiding with a light touch over an 86 explosion of mobile and Internet investment and innovation 87 that has greatly benefitted consumers. Today that agency, in 88 my opinion, has evolved into a place where statutory 89 obligations are left to languish in favor of scoring points. 90 The agency's capitulation to the President's demands 91 comes at the end of a proceeding mired in what I say is 92 procedural failures, and the White House's behind the scenes

93 influence on the FCC's process has been well documented by 94 credible news sources, including the Wall Street Journal, through e-mails from Senator Reid's office last May as well. 95 96 It is the responsibility of an expert independent agency to 97 issue detailed notice to the public when it intends to act, 98 and to apply its expertise to resolve the hard questions of 99 law and policy. This process should be transparent, and 100 every effort should be made to resist calls to politicize the 101 outcome. Perhaps in this respect, the FCC should learn a 102 thing or two from the Federal Trade Commission, an agency the FCC rendered moot in protecting ISP consumers. 103

104 A properly functioning commission doesn't work behind 105 closed doors with the President to bypass the administrative 106 process, and a properly functioning commission doesn't make 107 decisions based on the number of click and bait e-mails that 108 interest groups can generate. A properly functioning 109 commission focuses on law and facts to generate thoughtful and legally sound analysis, rather than being carried away by 110 111 politically generated populous furor.

112 The Open Internet proceeding is not the only place where 113 the FCC seems to have abandoned good process. I am also

114 concerned about the use of delegated authority. 115 Commissioners have the responsibility for dealing with 116 matters that are controversial or make new policy, and should 117 not simply delegate a decision to bury the result. I am 118 concerned that transparency has suffered between the 119 Commissioners. Lack of agreement should not mean that 120 decisional documents are kept from other Commissioners until 121 the 11th hour. And I am concerned that an excessive number 122 practical proceedings remain unresolved, and thousands of 123 businesses wait in the wings while the Commission focuses on extending its regulatory reach. 124

125 But mostly I am concerned that the FCC has overstepped its jurisdiction too regularly, Net Neutrality, the obvious 126 127 example here, but there are others. An agency only has the 128 authority given to it by statute, and I can't see how any reading of the Communications Act would give the impression 129 130 that Congress granted the FCC authority to be the ultimate 131 arbiter of the use of personal information. I cannot see how 132 the Telecommunications Act could be read to gut the 10th Amendment, place the FCC in the position of deciding how 133 states can spend their tax dollars. I cannot see how the FCC 134

135 could possibly interpret its governing statutes to wrest control of content from the creators and mandate its 136 137 presentation on the Internet. 138 But for the fact that I only have 5 minutes for my statement, we could keep going. A bidding credit waiver for 139 140 grain management, government researchers in newsrooms 141 adopting trouble damages without notice, excessive and 142 unfunded merger conditions, last minute data dumps into the 143 record. The FCC appears to believe it is authorized to take 144 the Potter Stewart approach to its authority. I know it when 145 I see it.

To be fair, some of the responsibility lies right here 146 147 in Congress. We have not updated the Communications Act for decades, and technology has out-evolved its regulatory 148 149 framework. The FCC does not have the tools to do its job, 150 but this doesn't mean the agency should distort or ignore the 151 current law, or worse, threaten to manufacture authority out 152 of whole cloth, should regulated industries have the temerity to resist the Commission's demands. Instead it should work 153 154 with Congress. We have offered a way forward on Net Neutrality that is more certain, and less costly for society, 155

156 and it is not clear to me that the objections to our 157 legislation are based on policy. 158 But if we could work together on fixing the Net 159 Neutrality situation, I think we would be able to chalk up a victory for all of us, and for all our consumers, and for the 160 161 American economy. So it starts today with trying to fix the 162 agency itself. It is our job to do our due diligence and 163 reauthorize this agency for the first time since 1995. I 164 thank our Commissioners, and Chairman Wheeler, for their 165 attendance today, and I look forward to our productive session ahead. 166 167 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]

169 [H.R. \_\_\_\_ follows:]

171 Mr. {Walden.} I would yield the remaining 30 seconds to 172 the Vice Chair, Mr. Latta. 173 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you for yielding, holding today's hearing. I 174 thank the Commissioners for being here. This is--the success 175 176 and productivity of the communications and technology 177 industry never ceases to amaze me, as it has been, and is a 178 constant bright spot in our economy as it rapidly advances 179 and evolves to meet consumer demands. Given the FCC's integral role in the marketplace, it is 180 181 critical that the agency is transparent, efficient, and 182 accountable. That is why I am concerned with the FCC's decision to reclassify broadband Internet service as a 183 telecommunications service under Title 2, despite the fact 184 185 that the order goes against a light touch regulatory approach 186 that was fundamental for providing the industry with 187 flexibility it needed to invest, innovate, and create jobs. The order--and the order process was not transparent, and 188 189 represents a regulatory overreach that will have lasting 190 negative consequences.

191	Today's hearing is a step in the right direction in an
192	effort to make the agency more efficient and effective by
193	reviewing the Commission's policy decision and processes. I
194	look forward to hearing from the Commissioners.
195	Mr. Chairman, I yield back with a point of personal
196	privilege. From an Ohioan, I think your tie looks great.
197	[The prepared statement of Mr. Latta follows:]

Mr. {Walden.} Sure glad I yielded time to you. With that, I will turn to my friend from California, part of the Pac-12, Ms. Eshoo.

Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any 202 203 sports analogies, so--and obviously I hold a much different 204 view, and so I want to express that view with an intensity 205 that I think needs to be brought to really what this issue is 206 all about. And I appreciate having the hearing, but I think 207 that the main point is that on February 26 the American people finally won one, and it was big. The regular guys and 208 209 gals across our country, part of the beleaguered middle 210 class, were heard. It was a historic day when the FCC voted for bright line Open Internet rules to protect the ability of 211 212 consumers, students, and entrepreneurs to learn and explore, 213 create and market, all on equal footing. This is about net 214 equality.

The FCC decision ensures that the Internet remains open and accessible to everyone, a source of intellectual enrichment, and an engine for economic growth and prosperity in our country. The Internet is the public library of our

219 time, a laboratory in the most robust marketplace imaginable, 220 and the FCC declared it open to all, and for all. I think 221 this is nothing short of extraordinary. 222 It was a day when the average person witnessed something 223 very rare. The big shots in Washington, D.C. sided with 224 them. Decision makers actually took in and considered the

advice of over four million Americans. I remember watching TV when Dr. King addressed a million people on the Mall. It was a sea of humanity. Well, put a multiplier on that. It is over four million people that weighed in, and I think that kind of public engagement with our government should be celebrated, and not rolled over and disrespected.

231 Today the majority has offered a legislative discussion draft intended to reauthorize the FCC. I have reviewed the 232 233 draft legislation, and concluded that, in effect, it is meant 234 to squeeze an agency that is already operating at the lowest 235 number of full time staff in 30 years. The FCC has to have 236 the means to fulfill its mission, to protect consumers, 237 promote competition, and advance innovation. That is their mission. This includes huge issues, and they are huge, like 238 freeing up additional spectrum, promoting municipal broadband 239

240 deployment, and enhancing 911 services. Any attempt to overhaul the FCC's funding structure should be fully 241 242 analyzed, and the implications of these changes should be 243 fully understood. We shouldn't be horsing around with it, in plain English, and a 48 hour review is simply insufficient. 244 245 So I find myself wondering, why are we having this 246 hearing today? I hope it isn't a fishing expedition. By 247 compelling the FCC Chairman and Commissioners to testify five 248 times over the course of 8 days, it seems to me that the 249 majority seems to have chosen to ignore a glaring fact. Four million--over four million Americans did something. They, 250 251 and countless more, contacted their members of Congress to say, we don't want to pay more for less. We don't think any 252 kind of discrimination, blocking, or throttling is good or 253 254 fair. We are tired of poor service from providers, confusing 255 bills, and having to wait for a half hour or more on hold to 256 try and talk to a human being, and we don't want any 257 gatekeepers.

258 So I think that is really what this is all about. I 259 welcome the debate. I welcome the discussion with the 260 Commissioners. And I yield the remainder of my time to

```
261 Congresswoman Matsui.
262 [The prepared statement of Ms. Eshoo follows:]
```

Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you very much, Ranking Member. 264 Ι would also like to welcome the Chairman and the Commissioners 265 here today. We know over the last year the debate over the 266 267 future of the Internet has not been an easy one. There have 268 been many twists and turns. But in the end, I was 269 specifically pleased that the FCC's Net Neutrality rules 270 ensure that pay prioritization schemes, or so-called Internet 271 fast lanes never see the light of day in our economy. 272 Americans will not experience Internet slow lanes or gatekeepers hindering traffic. We know, however, the fight 273 274 to preserve Net Neutrality is not over. 275 That said, it is time for us to really get back to working on issues that advance our Internet economy. I think 276 277 spectrum should be at the top of that list. The AWS3 option 278 demonstrated the massive appetite for spectrum. I look 279 forward to re-introducing bipartisan legislation with 280 Congressman Guthrie that would create the first even 281 incentive auction for Federal agencies. With that, I yield back the balance of my time. 282

283 [The prepared statement of Ms. Matsui follows:]

285 Mr. {Walden.} The gentlelady yields back. Chair 286 recognizes the Vice Chairman of the full Committee, Ms. 287 Blackburn.

288 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And to the 289 Commission, I want to say thank you for being here and 290 offering your testimony. As you all know, we have got 291 questions, and we want to move right on to them. I think 292 that the recent actions taken by the FCC have really raised 293 more questions about your scope, and your reach, and your authority, and I will also say about transparency. Chairman 294 Wheeler, I will tell you, I do not think it is acceptable for 295 296 the Commission to pass a Net Neutrality rule before the American people have the opportunity to find out what is in 297 298 it, and that was disappointing to us. Releasing a draft 299 final order should have been a part of the rulemaking 300 process, and it is disappointing that it was not. Every 301 dollar you spend is a taxpayer dollar. Every action that you 302 take affects the American taxpayer, so that lack of 303 transparency is incredibly disappointing.

304 I am sure that also you are hearing from Netflix, and

305	some of the other stakeholders who have been very
306	disappointed on what they found out once they started to read
307	the 322 word-filled pages. I will tell you also, as a former
308	State Senator from Tennessee, and someone that worked on the
309	telecommunications and interactive technology issues there, I
310	was terribly disappointed to see the action of the
311	Commission, to choose to take a vote, and choose to preempt
312	state laws in Tennessee and North Carolina that restrict
313	municipal broadband entry. These are decisions that should
314	be made by their state legislators. Your actions there are
315	disappointing, and we have questions about them.
316	And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.
317	[The prepared statement of Mrs. Blackburn follows:]
318	************** COMMITTEE INSERT *************

Mr. {Walden.} Anyone else on the Republican side 319 320 seeking time? If not, gentlelady yields back. Chair now 321 recognizes the Ranking Member of the full Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes. 322 323 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Over the past 324 few days we have had--we have heard quite a bit about 325 process, fairness, and transparency at the FCC. We just 326 heard it again from the previous--from my previous colleague. 327 But given what has transpired in this Subcommittee over the last 48 hours, I wonder whether we first have to make sure 328 329 our own house is in order. As witness testimony was already being submitted, the Republicans released, with no notice, a 330 partisan discussion draft that would completely overhaul the 331 332 FCC's funding, and this maneuvering is unfair to the 333 witnesses, and unfair to the members of the Subcommittee, Mr. 334 Chairman. Unfortunately--335 Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yield?

336 Mr. {Pallone.} Yes?

337 Mr. {Walden.} Yes. So the draft--discussion draft was338 put out at least an hour and a half before any testimony came

339 in. I realize that is still not enough time, but we

340 circulate--this isn't a markup. This is a hearing. We

341 followed all the Committee rules. We have circulated drafts,

342 and always tried to be open and transparent. We will

343 continue to be. We are not marking up a bill.

Mr. {Pallone.} Well, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, in this Congress, we seem to have halted a tradition. I am not sure it is in the rules, but we have had a long tradition of sharing text with all members of the Subcommittee at least a week prior to a legislative hearing, and we have seen these same partisan tactics--

350 Mr. {Walden.} Will the gentleman yield on that point?
351 Mr. {Pallone.} Sure.

352 Mr. {Walden.} Because actually, when you all were in 353 charge, I have got a list here of examples where that wasn't 354 the case. I agree we should be more transparent--

Mr. {Pallone.} Well, let us just say, if I can take back my time, as--that--I would like to see us go back to a tradition, process, whatever it was, that we have at least a week prior to a legislative hearing. I mean, the same thing happened in the Consumer Manufacturing and Trade Subcommittee

360 in the last couple days, and it just, you know, I understand--you--maybe give examples of things that were done in the 361 362 past by us, but I just think that, you know, Mr. Upton, yourself, the Subcommittee Chairs have all said that they 363 want to act in a bipartisan way, they want bipartisan bills, 364 365 and I appreciate that. But, you know, if you are going to do 366 that, then we need to have more time than just the 48 hours 367 that occurred here today. And we had the same thing 368 yesterday in one--in the other subcommittee. If we are going to really move forward, we are trying to do bills on a 369 bipartisan basis, we need to have more than the 48 hours. 370 371 In addition to that, I have yet to hear a convincing explanation for why this legislation is a good idea. Given 372 373 what we just went through with the Department of Homeland 374 Security, I doubt our constituents are clamoring for us to create another funding cliff, especially for an agency that 375 376 just netted \$41 billion for public safety and deficit 377 reduction without raising a dime in taxes. I just think this 378 agency is too important to play these types of games with its 379 funding.

380 And nonetheless, I am grateful that we are having the

381 hearing today. It gives us the opportunity to show our appreciation in person and in public to the FCC for its work. 382 383 So thank you, Chairman Wheeler, and to his fellow 384 Commissioners for all that you have accomplished. This has been an eventful year for the FCC. The Commission has 385 386 certainly received more than its fair share of attention, and 387 also an unprecedented level of civic engagement. Four 388 million Americans weighed in, overwhelmingly calling for 389 strong Network Neutrality rules. 140 members of Congress 390 engaged in the process. And, of course, the President expressed his opinion as well, which is not something that we 391 392 should be embarrassed about, by the way. 393 Yet despite the withering glare of the spotlight, the Commission stood tall. The Commissioners, and the entire 394 395 staff of the FCC, have shown a steadfast dedication to 396 serving the public interest. You showed everyone who called 397 in, who wrote in, who came in to support Net Neutrality that 398 the FCC and the rest of Washington know how to listen, so

399 thank you.

400 Now, I have repeatedly said that I welcome the 401 majority's change of heart, and their offer to legislate on

402 this issue of Net Neutrality, and I remain open to looking 403 for truly bipartisan ways to enshrine the FCC's Network 404 Neutrality protections into law. But after what has taken 405 place over the past few days, I wonder if bipartisanship may 406 only be in the eye of the beholder.

407 If we are able to find a real partner in this process, 408 we must make sure that our efforts do not come at the expense 409 of all the other work the Commission does. The FCC must 410 remain an effective cop on the beat to protect consumers. 411 The FCC must continue to promote universal service to all 412 Americans. The FCC must ensure that the telecommunications 413 and media markets are competitive. And the FCC must maintain 414 the vitality of our public safety communications. And that 415 is why I look forward to hearing today how the FCC can 416 continue to serve an important role in the broadband age. 417 And so, to the Commissioners, thank you for coming here 418 today, and thank you for your public service.

419 May I just ask--I know, because I yielded time to you,
420 Mr. Chairman, I wanted to yield a minute of my time to Mr.
421 Lujan, but I don't have it now. But if I could ask unanimous
422 consent--

425 Mr. {Walden.} Without objection. Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you. 426 Mr. {Lujan.} Thank you, Ranking Member Pallone, and let 427 me second your comments about the need for us to work 428 429 together. Telecommunications policy has a long history of 430 being made on a bipartisan basis, and I would hate to see the 431 polarization that defined so many of our policy debates 432 dominate our efforts on this Subcommittee. 433 Before us are real challenges. We still have 77 percent of New Mexicans living in rural areas that lack access to 434 435 fixed high speed broadband. And as I have shared with Chairman Wheeler before, if we can have Internet access at 436 30,000 feet on an airplane, we should be able to have 437 438 Internet access all across rural America, including New 439 Mexico. 440 Today I am especially interested in hearing from 441 Commissioner Rosenworcel on the innovative potential of 442 unlicensed spectrum, and I am also excited to hear from a former public utility commissioner, a colleague of mine as 443 well, Commissioner Clyburn's ideas to modernize a lifeline 444

445 program on the broadband era. And I want to hear from all 446 Commissioners on how we can work with the FCC, including 447 strengthening the information and technology systems that collapsed under the weight of millions of comments generated 448 last year when a friend of ours, John Oliver, and four 449 450 million others filed comment to the FCC, which crashed its 451 servers. Four million comments is a lot, but surely the 452 agency that is charged with overseeing the Internet should be 453 able to handle the traffic.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank everyone for being here today, and I look forward to this important conversation today.

457 [The prepared statement of Mr. Lujan follows:]

459 Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman for his comments. We 460 will go now to the Chairman of the FCC for an opening 461 statement. Mr. Wheeler, thank you for being here. We know 462 you have a tough job, and we look forward to your comments, 463 sir.

464	^STATEMENTS OF THE HONORABLE TOM WHEELER, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL
465	COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE MIGNON CLYBURN,
466	COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; THE
467	HONORABLE JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
468	COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; THE HONORABLE AJIT PAI,
469	COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; AND THE
470	HONORABLE MICHAEL O'RIELLY, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
471	COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

472 ^STATEMENT OF TOM WHEELER

473 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, } Ranking Member Eshoo. It is a privilege to be here with all 474 475 of my colleagues. There has been some reference up here about the Open Internet. I am sure we will discuss it more 476 today. Clearly the decision that we made was a watershed. 477 478 You, in your legislation, Mr. Chairman, and we in our 479 regulation, identify a challenge, a problem that needs to be 480 solved. We take different approaches, to be sure, and no 481 doubt we are going to be discussing those, now and in the

482 future. But there is common agreement that the Internet is 483 too important to ignore, and too important to not have a set 484 of yardsticks and rules. We have completed our work, now 485 Open Internet rules will be in place.

Now let me move on to another couple of issues that I 486 487 think are important to the Committee, and one is that there 488 is a national emergency in emergency services, and Congress 489 holds the key to the solution. The vast majority of the 490 calls to 911--Ms. Eshoo referenced the public safety 491 challenges. The vast majority of calls to 911 come from mobile devices. In a unanimous decision of this entire 492 493 Commission, we have established rules for wireless carriers 494 to provide location information as to where that call is 495 coming from. The carriers are stepping up. But delivering 496 that information is only the front end of the challenge. Mr. Shimkus, about 15 years ago, led legislation making 497 498 911 a national number. Amazing it had never been that. The 499 calls now go through, but many times it is like a tree 500 falling in the forest. And there was a recent tragic example 501 in Georgia, when a lady by the name of Shanelle Anderson called as she was drowning in her car, and the signal was 502

503 received by an antenna that happened to be an adjacent PSAP, public safety answering point, that did not have--that had 504 505 decided not to have maps of the area next door. 506 And I have listened to the call, and it is 507 heartbreaking. She keeps saying, well, here is where I am, 508 and the dispatcher keeps saying, I can't find it on the map. 509 I can't find it, I don't know where you are, and didn't know 510 where to send somebody. There are 6,500 different PSAPs in 511 this country. They are all staffed by incredibly dedicated 512 individuals, but there needs to be some kind of set of standards, and only Congress can deal with it. We have dealt 513 514 with the front end, but now it is necessary to do something about the back end. And this is not a power grab. I don't 515 care how it gets done, or what agency is responsible, but we 516 517 really need--we owe this to the American people. 518 The second quick issue that I would like to raise is--I 519 know, Mr. Chairman, that both you and I want a Commission 520 that works openly, fairly, and efficiently. And while three 521 to two votes always get the attention, about 90 percent of

523 two percent have been four to one, and there have been 21 out

522

our decisions during my tenure have been unanimous. About

524 of 253 votes that have been three to two.

525 We also have, during my tenure, the best record of any full Commission this century for getting decisions out 526 quickly. 73 percent of our decisions are released in one 527 528 business day or less. The last--the measure of that is the 529 last Republican led Commission, it took a week before they 530 could hit that number. We also have the lowest number, and 531 percentage, of actions made on delegated authority in--of any 532 Commission, Republican or Democrat, in the last 15 years. 533 But regardless of this, we should be constantly striving for 534 improvement.

535 Commissioner O'Rielly has raised some really good questions about longstanding processes. He and I were in the 536 537 same position. We walked in the door at the same time, and 538 we found processes in place that had been typical for both Republican and Democratic administrations. As I say, he 539 540 raised some really good questions, and to address these 541 questions, I am going to be asking each Commissioner to 542 appoint one staff person to work on a task force to be headed by Diane Cornell, who ran our process reform task force. And 543 544 I am asking Diane--I have already asked her to begin a review

545	of all similarly situated independent agencies so that we
546	know what the procedures are for those agencies, and that can
547	be a baseline whichagainst which we can measure our
548	procedures and move forward to address what I think are some
549	of the legitimate issues that Commissioner O'Rielly has
550	raised. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
551	[The prepared statement of Mr. Wheeler follows:]

553 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will now 554 move to the Honorable Mignon Clyburn, Commissioner of Federal 555 Communications Commission. It is a delight to have you back 556 here, former Chairwoman. We are delighted to have you here. 557 Please go ahead.

558 ^STATEMENT OF MIGNON CLYBURN

559 } Ms. {Clyburn.} Thank you, Chairman Walden, Ranking 560 Member Eshoo, distinguished members of the Committee. Thank 561 you for the opportunity to share my perspectives with you 562 this morning. In my written testimony for the record, I 563 discussed the Commission's work in several policy areas. 564 This morning I will focus on spectrum auctions and inmate 565 calling services reform.

In March of 2014 we unanimously adopted licensing and 566 service rules to auction 65 Megahertz of spectrum in the AWS-567 3 bands. This was not only important for wireless seeking to 568 569 meet skyrocketing consumer demand on their networks, but it 570 was critical for the promotion of more competitive options. 571 My colleagues and I agreed on a plan with smaller license 572 blocks, and geographic licensed areas. We also agreed on the 573 need for interoperability between the AWS-1 and AWS-3 bands. 574 Such rules encourage participation by smaller carriers, promote competition in local markets, and ensure the auction 575 576 allocates spectrum to the highest and best use.

577 Most experts predicted intense bidding in this auction, but no one forecasted that the total gross amount of winning 578 579 bids would be a record setting \$44.89 billion. The success of this auction was due in large part to a painstaking effort 580 to pair the AWS-3 spectrum bands that involve the broadcast 581 582 and wireless industries, Federal agencies, and members of 583 this Committee, and for that I thank you. We should follow a 584 similar collaborative approach in the voluntary incentive 585 auction.

586 Robust participation by small and large wireless carriers in the forward auction will encourage broadcast 587 588 television stations to take part in the reverse auction. A 589 unanimously adopted notice of proposed rulemaking seeks to strike a proper balance between licensed and unlicensed 590 591 services. We also initiated a proceeding to reform our 592 competitive bidding rules in advance of the incentive 593 auction. We proposed comprehensive reforms so small 594 businesses can compete more effectively in auctions, and 595 sought comment on how to deter unjust enrichment.

596 An example of how the markets do not always work, and a 597 regulatory backstop is sometimes necessary, is inmate calling

598 services. While a petition requested relief from eqregious 599 inmate calling rates remained pending at the FCC for nearly a 600 decade, rates and fees continue to increase. Calls made by 601 deaf and hard of hearing inmates have topped \$2.26 per minute. Add to that an endless array of fees. \$3.95 to 602 603 initiate a call, a fee to set up an account, another fee to 604 close an account. There is even a fee charged to users to 605 get a refund from their own money. These fees are imposing 606 devastating societal impacts that should concern us all. 607 There are 2.7 million children with at least one parent incarcerated, and they are the ones most likely to do poorly 608 609 in school, and suffer severe economic and personal hardships, 610 all exacerbated by an unreasonable rate regime. 611 Studies consistently show that meaningful contact beyond prison walls can make a real difference in maintaining 612 613 community ties, promoting rehabilitation, successful

614 reintegration back into society, and reducing recidivism.

615 Ultimately, the downstream costs of these inequalities are

616 borne by us all.

617 We have had caps on interstate inmate calling rates618 since February of last year, and despite dire predictions of

619 losing phone service and lapses in security, we have 620 witnessed nothing of the sort. What we have seen is 621 increased call volumes, ranging from 70 percent to as high as 622 300 percent, and letters expressing how this relief has 623 impacted lives. 624 I look forward to working with the Chairman and my 625 colleagues to finally bring this issue over the finish line,

627 by reforming all rates, while taking into account robust 628 security protections.

my sports reference, the best I am going to do this morning,

629 Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member, and others of the 630 Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you 631 today, and I look forward to any questions you may have.

632 [The prepared statement of Mr. Clyburn follows:]

626

Mr. {Walden.} I think you have a winner there. Okay, we are going to go now to Commissioner Jessica Rosenworcel. We are delighted to have you back before the Subcommittee. Look forward to your comments as well, Commissioner. Thank you for being here.

639 ^STATEMENT OF JESSICA ROSENWORCEL Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Good morning, Chairman Walden. 640 } 641 Mr. {Walden.} I don't think that microphone stayed on. 642 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Have I got it now? 643 Mr. {Walden.} There you go. 644 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Okay. Good morning Chairman Walden, 645 Ranking Member Eshoo, and distinguished members of the 646 Committee. Today communications technologies account for 1/6 of the 647 648 economy, and they are changing at a breathtaking pace. How 649 fast? Well, consider this. It took the telephone 75 years before it reached 50 million users. To reach the same number 650 651 of users, it took television 13 years, and the Internet 4 652 years. More recently, to reach the same number of users it 653 took Angry Birds 35 days. So we know the future is coming at 654 us faster than ever before. We also know the future involves 655 the Internet, and our Internet economy is the envy of the world. It was built on a foundation of openness. That is 656 657 why Open Internet policies matter, and that is why I support

658 Network Neutrality.

As you have undoubtedly heard, four million Americans 659 660 wrote the FCC to make known their ideas, thoughts, and deeply held opinions about Internet openness. They lit up our phone 661 lines, clogged our e-mail inboxes, and jammed our online 662 663 comment system. That might be messy, but whatever our 664 disagreements are on Network Neutrality, I hope we can agree 665 that is democracy in action, and something we can all 666 support.

Now, with an eye to the future, I want to talk about two 667 other things today, the need for more Wi-Fi, and the need to 668 669 bridge the homework gap. First, Wi-Fi. Few of us go 670 anywhere today without mobile devices in our palms, pockets, or purses. That is because every day, in countless ways, our 671 lives are dependent on wireless connectivity. While the 672 673 demand for our airwaves grows, the bulk of our policy 674 conversations are about increasing the supply of licensed 675 airwaves available for auction. This is good, but we also 676 need to give unlicensed services and Wi-Fi its proper due. After all, Wi-Fi is how we get online in public and at home. 677 Wi-Fi is also how our wireless carriers manage their 678

679 networks. In fact, today, nearly one-half of all wireless data connections are at some point offloaded onto unlicensed 680 681 spectrum. Wi-Fi is also how we foster innovation. That is because the low barriers to entry for unlicensed airwaves 682 make them perfect sandboxes for experimentation. And Wi-Fi 683 684 is a boon to the economy. The economic impact of unlicensed 685 activity has been estimated at more than \$140 billion 686 annually. By any measure, that is big.

687 So we need to make unlicensed services like Wi-Fi a priority in our spectrum policy, and at the FCC, we are doing 688 just that with our upcoming on the 3.5 Gigahertz band, and in 689 690 guard bands in the 600 Megahertz band. But it is going to 691 take more than this to keep up with demand. That is why I think the time is right to explore greater unlicensed use in 692 693 the upper portion of the five Gigahertz band. And I think, 694 going forward, we are going to have to be on guard to find 695 more places for more Wi-Fi to flourish.

Now, second, I want to talk about another issue that matters for the future, and that is the homework gap. Today, roughly seven in 10 teachers assign homework that requires broadband access, but FCC data suggests that as many as one

700 in three households today lack access to broadband at any 701 Think about those numbers. Where they overlap is speed. 702 what I call the homework gap. And if you are a student in a 703 household without broadband, just getting homework done is 704 hard. Apply for a scholarship is challenging. And while 705 some students may have access to a smartphone, let me submit 706 to you that a phone is just not how you want to research and 707 type a paper, apply for jobs, or further your education.

This is a loss to our collective human capital, and to all of us, because it involves a shared economic future that we need to address. That is why the homework gap is the cruelest part of our new digital divide, but it is within our power to bridge it. More Wi-Fi can help, as will our recent efforts to upgrade Wi-Fi connectivity--through the e-rate program, but more work remains.

I think the FCC needs to take a hard look at modernizing its program to support connectivity in low income households, and especially those with school-age children. And I think the sooner we act, the sooner we bridge this gap, and give more students a fair shot at 21st century success. Thank you.

```
721 [The prepared statement of Ms. Rosenworcel follows:]
```

723	Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Commissioner. We appreciate
724	your testimony. Those bells that went off, or buzzer, as we
725	so lovingly saywe have got two votes, but we should have
726	time to get through both the other Commissioners' testimony,
727	and then we will probably break to go vote, and then we will
728	come back immediately after votes to resume questioning.
729	So welcome, Commissioner Pai. Thank you for being here
730	Please go ahead with your

731 ^STATEMENT OF AJIT PAI

Mr. {Pai.} Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, members of the Subcommittee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify here today. It has been an honor to work with the members of the Subcommittee on a wide variety of issues, from making available more spectrum for mobile broadband, to improving the nation's 911 system.

I last testified in front of the Subcommittee more than a year ago, and since that hearing on December 12 of 2013, things have changed dramatically at the FCC. I wish I could say that these changes, on balance, have been for the better, but, unfortunately, that has not been the case. The foremost example, of course, is the FCC's decision last month to apply Title 2 to the Internet.

The Internet is not broken. The FCC didn't need to fix it. But our party line vote overturned a 20 year bipartisan consensus in favor of a free and Open Internet. With the Title 2 decision, the FCC voted to give itself the power to micromanage virtually every aspect of how the Internet works.

750 The FCC's decision will hurt consumers by increasing their 751 broadband bills and reducing competition. A Title 2 order 752 was not the result--rulemaking process. The FCC has already 753 lost in court twice, and its latest order has glaring legal 754 flaws that are guaranteed to mire the agency in litigation 755 for a long time.

756 Turning to the designated entity program, the FCC must 757 take immediate action to end its abuse. What was once a 758 well-intentioned program designed to help small businesses 759 has become a playpen for corporate giants. The recent AWS3 760 auction is a shocking case in point. Dish, which was annual revenues of \$14 billion, and a market cap of over \$34 761 762 billion, holds an 85 percent equity stake in two companies that are now claiming \$3.3 billion in taxpayer subsidies. 763 764 That makes a mockery of the small business program. The \$3.3 billion at stake is real money. It could be used to 765 underwrite over 580,000 Pell grants, fund school lunches for 766 767 over six million schoolchildren, or incentivize the hiring of 768 over 138,000 veterans for a decade.

The abuse had an enormous impact on small anddisadvantaged businesses, from Nebraska to Vermont. It

771 denied them spectrum licenses they would have used to provide 772 consumers with competitive wireless alternative. The FCC 773 should quickly adopt a further notice of proposed rulemaking 774 so that we can close these loopholes in our rules before our 775 next auction.

776 Turning next to profits, the FCC is at its best when it 777 acts in a bipartisan collaborative manner. During my service 778 under Chairman Genachowski, Chairwoman Clyburn, 89 percent of 779 votes on FCC meeting items, where the agency votes on the 780 most high profile, significant matters affecting the country, were unanimous. Since November 2013, however, only 50 781 782 percent of votes at FCC meetings have been unanimous. This 783 level of discord is unprecedented. Indeed, there have been 784 40 percent more party line votes at the FCC in the last 17 785 months than there were under the entire Chairmanships of 786 Chairman Martin, Copps, Genachowski, and Clyburn combined. 787 I am also concerned that the Commission's longstanding

788 procedures and norms are being abused in order to freeze out 789 Commissioners. For example, it has been customary at the FCC 790 for bureaus planning to issue significant orders on delegated 791 authority to provide those items to Commissioners 48 hours

792 prior to their scheduled release. Back then, if a 793 Commissioner asked for the order to be brought up for a 794 commission level vote, that request from a single 795 Commissioner would be honored. Recently, however, the leadership has refused to let the commission vote on items 796 797 where two Commissioners have made such a request. Given this 798 trend, as well as others, I commend the Subcommittee for 799 focusing on the issue of FCC process reform, and I welcome 800 the Chairman's announcement this morning.

Finally, I would like to conclude by discussing an issue where it should be easy to reach consensus. When you dial 911, you should be able to reach emergency personnel wherever you are. But, unfortunately, many properties that use multiline telephone systems require callers to press nine, or some other access code, before dialing 911, and this problem has led to tragedy.

808 Unfortunately, the phone systems at many Federal 809 buildings are not configured to allow direct 911 dialing. 810 Recognizing this problem, Congress directed the General 811 Service Administration to issue a report on the 911 812 capabilities of telephone systems in all Federal buildings by

813 November 18 of 2012. I recently wrote to GSA to inquire 814 about the status of that report, and I was disturbed to learn 815 through a press report just a couple of days at the GSA never 816 completed it.

817 The FCC's headquarters is one such Federal building 818 where direct 911 dialing does not work. But as Ranking 819 Member Eshoo recently observed, when it comes to emergency 820 calling, the FCC could be the example not only for the rest 821 of the Federal government, but for the entire country. I 822 commend her, and Congressman Shimkus, for their leadership on 823 this issue.

Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, and members of the Subcommittee, thank you once again for inviting me to testify. I look forward to your questions, and to working with you and your staffs in the days to come.

828 [The prepared statement of Mr. Pai follows:]

Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Pai.
We now turn to the fifth Commissioner, or fourth
Commissioner and the Chairman, Commissioner O'Rielly. We are
delighted to have you here. Please go ahead with your full
testimony.

835 ^STATEMENT OF MICHAEL O'RIELLY

836 Mr. {O'Rielly.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member } Eshoo, Ranking Member Pallone, and members of the 837 838 Subcommittee for the opportunity to deliver testimony today. 839 I have always held the Energy and Commerce Committee in the 840 highest regard, given my past involvement as a Congressional 841 staffer, with oversight hearings and responsibilities that you have to face every day. I applaud the Subcommittee for 842 843 focusing on this issue of reauthorizing the FCC and improving 844 its process, and I recommit myself to being available of any 845 resource I can in the future.

In my time at the Commission, I have enjoyed the many 846 847 intellectual and policy challenges presented by the 848 innovative and ever challenging communications sector. It is 849 my goal to maintain friendships, even when we disagree, and 850 seek out opportunities where we can work together. To 851 provide a brief snapshot, I voted with the Chairman on 852 approximately 90 percent of all items. Unfortunately, this percentage drops significantly, to approximately 62 percent, 853

854 for the higher profile open meeting items.

855 One of the policies I have not been able to support is 856 the insertion of the Commission into every aspect of the 857 Internet. As you may have heard, the Commission pursued an ends justified the means approach to subject broadband 858 859 providers to a new Title 2 regime without a shred of evidence 860 that it is even necessary, solely to check the boxes on a 861 partisan agenda. Even worse, the order punts authority to 862 FCC staff to review current and future Internet practices under vague standards such as just and reasonable, 863 864 unreasonable interference or disadvantage, and reasonable 865 network management. This is a recipe for uncertainty for our nation's broadband providers, and ultimately--providers. 866 Nonetheless, I continue to suggest creative ideas to 867 modernize the regulatory environment to reflect the current 868 869 marketplace, often through my public blog. I have written 870 extensively on the need to reform numerous outdated and 871 inappropriate Commission procedures. For instance, I have 872 advocated that any document to be considered at an open meeting should be made publicly available on the Commission's 873 website at the same time it is circulated to the 874

875 Commissioners, typically 3 weeks in advance. This fix is not tied to a Net Neutrality item, although it provides a great 876 877 example why change is needed. Under the current process, I meet with numerous outside 878 879 parties prior to an open meeting, but I am precluded from 880 telling them, for example, having read the document, that 881 their concerns are misquided, or already addressed. This 882 could be a huge waste of time and effort for everyone 883 involved, and allows some favored parties an unfair advantage 884 in the hunt for scarce and highly prized information nuggets. 885 The stated objections to this approach, presented under the 886 cloak of procedural law, are really grounded in resistance to 887 change, and concerns about resource management. In addition, the Commission has a questionable post-adoption process that 888 889 deserves significant attention.

While I generally refrain from commenting on legislation, I appreciate the ideas approved by this Subcommittee, and ultimately the full House last Congress, which would address a number of Commission practices that keep the public out of the critical end stages of the deliberative process. I believe that these proposed changes,

896 as well as others, would improve the Commission--the 897 functionality of the Commission, and improve consumer access 898 to information. 899 In addition, I would turn the Subcommittee's attention 900 to a host of other Commission practices that I believe 901 reserve--deserve attention. The 48 hour notification that my 902 friend mentioned, testimony provided by outside witnesses at 903 the Commission open meetings, delegating vast authority to 904 staff to make critical decisions or set policy, the 905 Regulatory Flexibility Act and Paperwork Reduction Act compliance, and accounting for the Enforcement Bureau's 906 907 assessed penalties. 908 Separately, I have also been outspoken on many substantive issues, such as the need to free up spectrum 909 910 resources for wireless broadband, both licensed and 911 unlicensed. I look forward to working with my colleagues on 912 this issue, and so many more in the months ahead. I stand 913 ready to answer any questions you may have. 914 [The prepared statement of Mr. O'Rielly follows:]

916 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Commissioner. We appreciate 917 your input as well. 918 Mr. {O'Rielly.} Thank you. 919 Mr. {Walden.} We will recess now so that members can go 920 to the House floor and vote. Please return as promptly as 921 possible, as we will begin our questioning thereafter. We 922 stand in recess. We have two quick votes. 923 [Recess.] Mr. {Walden.} Public and Commissioners to please resume 924 925 their places. We will get restarted here in the hearing in 926 just a second, when everybody gets settled. 927 All right. Thank you very much, and we will resume the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology. We are now 928 929 into the questioning phase from the members of the Committee. 930 And, again, we want to thank all of you for your testimony 931 today, and the work that you do with all of us every day, so 932 we do appreciate that. 933 You know, throughout the debate on the Internet 934 proceeding, I was amused--there were some comparisons to what former Chairman Kevin Martin did or didn't do with respect to 935

936 his media ownership proceeding. Yes, he wrote a late in the 937 day op-ed, put out a public notice, testified before 938 Congress, but he didn't do a further notice of proposed 939 rulemaking, and that seems to be precisely why the Third 940 Circuit threw his newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule 941 out. Apparently--I quess Federal Appellate Judges don't 942 think much of op-eds, news releases, or even Congressional 943 testimony when it comes to satisfying APA notice and comment 944 requirements. They actually think the agency should go 945 through the procedural steps to make sure that all interested 946 parties, even those outside D.C. policy circles, get a real 947 opportunity to understand a significant shift in direction, 948 and have a reasonable amount of time to comment. 949 So I have got just a couple of questions, and perhaps I 950 will just direct them to Mr. Pai. How many of the Commission's tentative conclusions found in the NPRM were 951 952 reversed in the final order? 953 Mr. {Pai.} Mr. Chairman, virtually all of them. 954 Mr. {Walden.} And how many of the Commission's--or-well, what number paragraph in the NPRM says that they--that 955

956 the Commission planned to assert its authority over IP

957 addressing? Was that in the NPRM?

958 Mr. {Pai.} It was not, sir.

959 Mr. {Walden.} And what number paragraph of the NPRM put 960 the public on notice that the Commission intended to redefine 961 the term public switched network?

962 Mr. {Pai.} There is no such paragraph.

963 Mr. {Walden.} That is what I was concerned about. I 964 didn't see that either. There are a number of issues that 965 are pending at the Commission, and I know Chairman has had a 966 lot on his plate. You all have, I get that. It is a rapidly changing environment, and you have limited resources and all. 967 968 You--some of you have heard me talk about our little 969 applications for FM translators when I was in the radio 970 business, 10 years waiting, 3--30 days to satisfy the 971 requirements and all. And we get a lot of input here from 972 constituencies out across the country. And so I--just because of limited time, has the Commission acted on the AM 973 974 modernization order yet?

975 Mr. {Pai.} Mr. Chairman, it has not yet, and the NPRM, 976 as you know, was adopted about a year and a half ago. The 977 record is complete, unanimous support from the public.

978 Mr. {Walden.} There is another issue that came up, I 979 was speaking at a group, and it involves this issue to allow 980 small cable operators to operate as a buying group for the 981 purchase of content. Has that been acted on yet? That has 982 been pending for some time, I am told.

983 Mr. {Pai.} It has not. I voted on the NPRM about--I 984 want to say 3 years ago, but--

985 Mr. {Walden.} Three years ago?

986 Mr. {Pai.} If I recall, it was the summer of 2012, and, 987 you know, I am not sure what the status of it is. But I 988 stand ready to vote whenever it is teed up for a vote.

989 Mr. {Walden.} And my understanding is the Commission 990 has not yet issued its quadrennial review of media ownership 991 rules for 2010. I believe that is about 5 years ago, is that 992 correct?

993 Mr. {Pai.} Five years ago, but December of 2007 was the 994 last time the actual rules were adopted.

995 Mr. {Walden.} So it has been 8 years since--

996 Mr. {Pai.} Correct.

997 Mr. {Walden.} And isn't that a statutory obligation?
998 Mr. {Pai.} It is, and that is why I said we need to put

999 the quad back in quadrennial.

Mr. {Walden.} And what about the work on the Connect America Fund? Has the Commission finished its work on how Connect America will work in the mobile--support mobile? Mr. {Pai.} My understanding is not yet, but that work is underway.

1005 Mr. {Walden.} These are some of the things that trouble 1006 us, to say the least. We also had an issue come to our 1007 attention involving the Western Amateur Radio Friendship 1008 Association interference case, and maybe, Chairman, I could 1009 direct this to you. I understand it has been going on for quite a while, and it is quite disturbing. I have been told 1010 1011 about some of the audio recordings, allegedly that there is 1012 this jamming that is included. Really awful, repulsive 1013 racial epithets, and threats against a female member. And it has come to our attention this has been sitting there for a 1014 while, where these operators are jamming and using really 1015 1016 awful, awful language. Do you know the status of that? Can 1017 you give us some update on that? Anybody on the--1018 Mr. {Wheeler.} I can give you an update on that, Mr.

1019 Chairman. I will--

1020 Mr. {Walden.} If you could get back to us? Yeah, I 1021 think it is called the Western Amateur Radio Friendship 1022 Association interference case. And as a--I guess there are a 1023 couple of these that -- involving pirate radio operators. Which leads into a discussion, and I am going to run out of 1024 1025 time here, about the closing of the regional office. 1026 You know, when we had the CFO, I guess would be close, 1027 managing director here, it--we weren't really brought up to 1028 speed, or advance notice at least, of this notion that you 1029 are going to close these regional offices. Isn't that where 1030 this enforcement activity generally takes place? 1031 Mr. {Pai.} Mr. Chairman--1032 Mr. {Walden.} That is fine, whoever. Commission Pai? 1033 Mr. {Pai.} Yes. Indeed, I think the field offices of the Enforcement Bureau perform one of the core functions, 1034 1035 which is to protect the public interest by, among other 1036 things, resolving interference concerns, protecting public 1037 safety. And while I--while, obviously, I am still studying 1038 the issue, I have had a chance to meet with our union 1039 representatives. And I know members of this Committee, such 1040 as Congresswoman Clark, have recently expressed concern about

1041 the field offices' function.

1042 Mr. {Walden.} Yeah.

1043 Mr. {Pai.} We want to make sure that, however it is 1044 reorganized, we protect the public interest.

1045 Mr. {Walden.} And I will quit here in a second, but we 1046 clearly don't have--it would leave only two offices, one in 1047 L.A. and San Francisco, nothing for the west coast, which I 1048 am hearing from various entities. And I was pleased--

1049 Mr. {Wheeler.} Can I at least--

1050 Mr. {Walden.} Sure.

1051 Mr. {Wheeler.} --on that? So there are multiple things 1052 going on there. First of all, we need to make sure that, in 1053 flat budgets for reduced budgets, that we are spending our 1054 money efficiently. When you have more trucks than you have 1055 agents, which is the reality that exists today--

1056 Mr. {Walden.} I would sell some trucks.

1057 Mr. {Wheeler.} --you have got to ask yourself the 1058 question, are you distributing resources as they ought to be 1059 distributed? When you have got one manager for every four 1060 people, you say to yourself, is this the right kind of 1061 structure?

Mr. {Walden.} I fully agree, and I understand--1062 1063 Mr. {Wheeler.} Then how do you fix that? That--1064 Mr. {Walden.} So I--so what we would like to have is 1065 the backup for this, because I understand that wasn't what--1066 Mr. {Wheeler.} Happy to. 1067 Mr. {Walden.} -- and I think we have a request pending 1068 for that, and we are told--1069 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes. 1070 Mr. {Walden.} --well, I don't know whether we were told 1071 we can't get it or whatever, but we would like to see--1072 Mr. {Wheeler.} No, I think you have--if my understanding is correct, you asked for the consultant's 1073 1074 report. The final consultant's report is--and--1075 Mr. {Walden.} Yes. 1076 Mr. {Wheeler.} --you will have it when I have it. I 1077 have seen a draft of the--1078 Mr. {Walden.} Okay. Mr. {Wheeler.} --structures, but have also--1079 1080 Mr. {Walden.} All right. 1081 Mr. {Wheeler.} --sent it back for some more detailed 1082 information.

1083 Mr. {Walden.} All right.

1084 Mr. {Wheeler.} You will have that.

1085 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you.

1086 Mr. {Wheeler.} You will--

1087 Mr. {Walden.} I have far exceeded my time. I

1088 appreciate the indulgence, Committee. I recognize the

1089 gentlelady from California.

1090 Ms. {Eshoo.} It is okay, because I will ask you for the 1091 same. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome again to the entire 1092 Commission. It is obvious that, you know, that we have 1093 different takes on the issues, but I sincerely thank you for 1094 your public service. And, to Commissioner O'Rielly, this is a graduate of this Committee. He--you were here under 1095 1096 Chairman Bliley, whom I had the pleasure of working with, and 1097 getting a lot of things done together, so welcome back.

1098 Commissioner Pai, thank you for your advocacy on the 911 1099 issues. You know that the mother and father, the mommy and 1100 daddy of this are right here at the Committee. Congressman 1101 Shimkus and myself founded that caucus, and then helped--

1102 Mr. {Pai.} This--

1103 Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, we did. What is so funny about

that? I think it is terrific. And it was when no one was 1104 1105 paying attention to those issues, but it was before our 1106 country was attacked. Commissioner Rosenworcel, thank you 1107 for your clarity, and your passion when you speak. And 1108 Commissioner Clyburn, go get them. Just go get them. And to 1109 the distinguished Chairman, I don't know how many people 1110 realize this about the Chairman, but he is a man of history, 1111 and so I want to pick on the vein of history. Because I 1112 think it is very important for us--around here, life is 1113 incremental. It is incremental anyway. God gives us life a 1114 day at a time, so those are increments. But I think what I 1115 would like to do is to have you, and I want to say a few 1116 things about it first, to widen the lens of what is before us 1117 today, in terms of history.

1118 Now, the majority has defined, or tries to define, Net 1119 Neutrality with some very scary things. They call it 1120 railroad regulation, billions of dollars in taxes, new taxes 1121 are going to be levied, no investment is going to be made, 1122 the market is going to be chilled. In terms of history, we 1123 have been through the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, the Iron 1124 Age, the Age of Invention, the Industrial Revolution, the

1125 Technology Age, and now the Information Age.

1126 And I think why this is difficult for some to actually

1127 see--and when you see something, you either get it or you

1128 miss it. We are at a moment in our nation's history where we

1129 are moving to a new age. And I would say that those that are

1130 on the other side of this issue are back in an older age,

1131 where you have huge corporations, gatekeepers, duopolies.

1132 That is not what the Internet is all about. So what I would

1133 like you to--as a historian, to address what this moment is,

1134 and place it on the stage of history.

1135 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you, Ms. Eshoo. I am--my--you get 1136 me started on history, and this--we--

1137 Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, we don't have very much time.

1138 Mr. {Wheeler.} We could--

Ms. {Eshoo.} I have got a minute and 40 seconds left.
1140 Yeah.

1141 Mr. {Wheeler.} I think that we are living through the 1142 fourth great network revolution in history.

1143 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum.

1144 Mr. {Wheeler.} And if you look at those, what you will 1145 find is that every single time it was the end of Western

```
1146 civilization--
```

1147 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum.

1148 Mr. {Wheeler.} --as we know it that--

1149 Ms. {Eshoo.} Um-hum.

1150 Mr. {Wheeler.} --was being--people who didn't want to 1151 embrace the change was like, this is awful. I have hanging 1152 in my office a poster from 1839 that was put out by people 1153 who were against the interconnection of railroads. And it 1154 was all patterned around, women and children are going to be 1155 hurt by this. It was paid for by all the people whose 1156 businesses would be affected because the railroads would 1157 interconnect. Yet that interconnection drove the 19th and 1158 20th century.

1159 We always hear these imaginary horribles about the awful 1160 things that are going to result, and we also always end up 1161 saying, as a society, you know, we need rules. We need to have a known set of rules. We need to have a referee on the 1162 1163 field who can throw the flag. And that is the process that 1164 we have gone through since time immemorial, every time there 1165 is a new network revolution. And we have the privilege of living through that, and trying to deal with those realities 1166

1167 today.

1168 Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, I think that that is magnificent in 1169 a short period of time. I wish I could question--I have 1170 questions for all of you. I am going to submit them to you. 1171 And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous 1172 consent that Congressman Cardenas's guestions be submitted 1173 for the record. He is a quest of our Subcommittee today--1174 Mr. {Latta.} [Presiding] Without objection. 1175 Ms. {Eshoo.} -- and demonstrates his great interest in 1176 the issues at hand. And another from many, many--I don't 1177 know, maybe 50 racial justice and civil rights organizations 1178 who have addressed a letter to the Chairman and myself in 1179 support of Net Neutrality. 1180 Mr. {Latta.} Without objection. 1181 [The information follows:]

1183 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1184 Mr. {Latta.} The lady yields back. The next questioner 1185 will be the gentlelady from Tennessee, Ms. Blackburn, for 5 1186 minutes.

1187 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Chairman Wheeler, I will just add my viewpoint of, 1188 1189 when you look at our economic revolutions in society, whether 1190 it was the Agricultural or the Industrial, the Technology, 1191 the Information, successful revolutions are about freeing up, 1192 not restricting. And what we are looking at right now is the 1193 vantage point from--that you all are coming from is taking 1194 away and restricting, not freeing up.

1195 Chairman--Mr. O'Rielly--Commissioner O'Rielly, let me 1196 come to you for a moment and talk taxes. You and I penned an op-ed back in July, calling for the need for a cost benefit 1197 1198 analysis, and really looking at what had been said by PPI, 1199 Free Pressed, Professor Farber, and, you know, what they thought would happen with taxes. New York Times agreed with 1200 1201 that. I want to hear from you a little bit, 30 seconds' worth, about why we should have had a cost benefit analysis, 1202

- 1203 and what you think the outlook is.
- 1204 Mr. {O'Rielly.} So I believe that we should do better

1205 at the FCC on cost benefit analysis, and this is a perfect

1206 case. I think the--

1207 Mrs. {Blackburn.} None was done.

1208 Mr. {O'Rielly.} This is a woeful job that was done in 1209 this instance. We are talking about hypothetical harms and 1210 real world impacts on business.

1211 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Yeah.

1212 Mr. {O'Rielly.} But in terms of your question on taxes,

1213 I would say--I would switch it more to taxes and fees,

1214 because the question has been on universal fees, and what

1215 happens in universal service going forward? The Chairman has

been very clear that the item in and of itself before us does

1217 not impose universal service. That is something we are going

1218 to punt for about a month or two, and we are waiting for the 1219 joint board--

1220 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.

1216

Mr. {O'Rielly.} --this is something that has to go forward. We are going to see those fees in the months ahead. Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Commissioner Pai, you gave an

1224 interview this week and stated that there was going to be a 1225 tax on broadband, and the Commission is waiting for a joint 1226 board to decide April 7 how large that tax is going to be. 1227 You want to expand on that? 1228 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. 1229 The order suggests that the joint board is going to make a 1230 recommendation on April 7. The order also says that a 1231 ``short deadline'' might be appropriate. So at some point 1232 very soon the joint board is going to recommend whether and 1233 how to increase these fees that are--1234 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay.

1235 Mr. {Pai.} -- going to be assessed on broadband for the 1236 first time. In addition, it is not just the USF fees, as 1237 Commissioner O'Rielly has pointed out. It is also state and 1238 local fees. For example, state property taxes. Localities 1239 also impose taxes. The District of Columbia imposes an 11 1240 percent tax on gross receipts. These are all fees that are 1241 going to have to be paid by someone. It is going to be paid 1242 by the consumer at the--

1243 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay. Chairman Wheeler, rate
1244 regulation. I read something from Professor Lyons at Boston

1245 College, and he said Title 2 is fundamentally a regime for 1246 regulation. And then we are looking at another thing which 1247 he said about a person, which might include a large company, 1248 can file a complaint with the FCC under Section 208 if they 1249 don't think their charges are just and reasonable.

1250 So you have denied that the FCC is going to get into 1251 rate regulation through this Net Neutrality order, but--I 1252 understand that the order does not explicitly state that the 1253 FCC will be regulating rates on the date the rules are 1254 effective, but what about the first time that a complaint is filed with the FCC under Section 208 because a party feels 1255 that their rates are not just and reasonable? What is the 1256 1257 remedy going to be, and isn't it true that the FCC will be 1258 engaged thereby in de fact rate regulation?

Mr. {Wheeler.} So--thank you, Congresswoman. I hope somebody files that kind of a complaint. As you know, there hasn't been a complaint filed for 22 years in the wireless voice space, despite the fact that this authority--same kind of authority exists. If somebody files that kind of a complaint, and I don't want to prejudice a decision, but I will assure you that there will be a process that will look

1266 at that, and that will develop, I would hope, a record that 1267 would make it very clear that the FCC is not in the consumer 1268 rate regulation business. 1269 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Mr. Chairman, don't you think what 1270 you just said about there hasn't been a complaint filed in 1271 that space for 22 years proves the point that the Internet is 1272 not broken, this space is not broken, and it does not need 1273 your oversight and guidance? 1274 Mr. {Wheeler.} No, that is--was--I was referring to 1275 wireless voice, not to broadband. And--but I think the key thing is, you know, you said in your --1276 1277 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Okay, let me cut you off there. I 1278 have got one question for Commissioner Clyburn. And I want 1279 to go to the Lifeline and USAC Program--1280 Ms. {Clyburn.} Um-hum. Mrs. {Blackburn.} --with you. You have advocated 1281 1282 restructuring and rebooting that program, and you have had 1283 several supply-side reforms, and did eliminate incentives for waste, fraud, and abuse. And the FCC's Inspector General, as 1284 1285 you know, has performed a review of the verification process 1286 on this, and recommended that the FCC may improve the

1287 effectiveness of the warnings that it gives subscribers, and 1288 reduce the level of fraud in that program. We have had 1289 hearings on this, and I want to work with you on it. 1290 Ms. {Clyburn.} Thank you. 1291 Mrs. {Blackburn.} And is it true that, under the 1292 current system, the penalty for a subscriber defrauding the 1293 program by having multiple phones is to lose the subsidy for that--for those phones, all but one? They get to keep one, 1294 1295 and then the carrier is prosecuted. And I will tell you why 1296 your answer is important. You all are talking about getting 1297 into broadband, and then--in addition to the phones, and you 1298 have got to reform all of this before you talk about 1299 expanding. 1300 Ms. {Clyburn.} I totally agree. And one of the reasons 1301 why I set out five points for reform is because I recognize 1302 two things. One, we need to eliminate all incentives, and 1303 all existing waste, fraud, and those abuses. We need to do 1304 that, and the key way to do that is to get those providers 1305 out of the certification business. They will no longer 1306 greenlight customers--

1307 Mrs. {Blackburn.} We need to prosecute the user--

1308 Ms. {Clyburn.} And--1309 Mrs. {Blackburn.} --not the--1310 Ms. {Clyburn.} And we have --Mrs. {Blackburn.} --you know, not the--1311 1312 Ms. {Clyburn.} Under--with guidance from my colleagues, 1313 and while I was acting Chair--1314 Mrs. {Blackburn.} I yield back. My time is expired. Ms. {Clyburn.} I am sorry. 1315 1316 Mrs. {Blackburn.} Thank you, Mr. Chair. 1317 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. 1318 The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, the 1319 Ranking Member, for 5 minutes. 1320 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want the Commissioners to know, my district was ravaged by 1321 Hurricane Sandy in 2012, and one of the most concerning 1322 1323 impacts of the storm was the loss of communications services. 1324 A lot of people couldn't call their friends, their family, 1325 and 40 percent of our cell towers were knocked out in the 1326 state. A lot of people there basically learned the hard way 1327 that when the power lines go down, communications services go 1328 down along with electricity.

1329 So I wanted to ask Commissioner Rosenworcel, I know that you toured New Jersey after Sandy, and I asked what lessons 1330 did you learn about how to prevent these kinds of 1331 communication failures during future emergencies? 1332 1333 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Thank you for the question. I did 1334 tour the New Jersey shore with public safety officials 1335 following Hurricane Sandy, and I won't long forget what I 1336 saw. A lot of broken homes and businesses, and cars and 1337 boulders strewn this way and that, and piles of sand many 1338 blocks from where the ocean is because wind and water had 1339 delivered it there.

But I also saw a lot of people were very committed to 1340 rebuilding, and I learned a lot about how communications 1341 1342 succeeded and failed during that storm. What stuck with me 1343 was that many of the wireless towers in the affected areas 1344 went out. Now, throughout the 10 states that were impacted 1345 by the storm, about a quarter of the wireless cell towers went out of service. In New Jersey, as you mentioned, it was 1346 1347 about 40 percent. But I would bet the number was 1348 significantly higher on the New Jersey shore.

1349 And in the aftermath of learning those things, we were

- 1350 able, at the agency, to start a rulemaking to ask, well, how 1351 can we fix this going forward? Because we know that 40 1352 percent of all households in this country are wireless only, 1353 and in the middle of a storm, at the very least, they should be able to connect and get the help they need. 1354 1355 So we issued a rulemaking in 2013, and among the issues 1356 discussed in that was the question of how much backup power 1357 is necessary at cell sites, and how much of a reporting duty 1358 our wireless carriers should have when these sites go out of 1359 service. I hope that we can actually turn around and deliver a decision on that in short order because we don't know when 1360
- 1361 the next storm is going to hit, but I am pretty sure people

1362 are going to try to use communications when it does.

Mr. {Pallone.} Well, thank you. Let me ask Chairman
Mr. {Pallone.} Well, thank you. Let me ask Chairman
Wheeler, I understand the FCC, as was mentioned, consideringis considering updates to its rules to ensure that consumers
have access to essential communications during disasters.

1367 Can you commit to updating those rules this year?

1368 Mr. {Wheeler.} I--absolutely. We are--the issue that 1369 Commissioner Rosenworcel raised is a paramount issue. There 1370 are broader issues too, and that is the whole issue of copper

1371 retirement, which got forced by Sandy, and how do we make 1372 sure that, when the power goes down, and you are relying on 1373 fiber, which doesn't carry its own power, that you have got 1374 the ability to make a 911 call? 1375 We have a rulemaking going on that literally just closed 1376 last week. All of these issues interrelate, but first and 1377 foremost in our responsibility, which was why I focused on 1378 the 911 location issue in my statement, first and foremost in 1379 our responsibility is public safety.

1380 Mr. {Pallone.} I wanted to ask you about the designated entity rules, Mr. Chairman. Obviously small businesses are 1381 1382 so important in my state and elsewhere, and I just don't 1383 think small businesses can survive in capital intensive 1384 industries, like telecommunications, without some, you know, 1385 smart public policy. I am concerned that the current rules for small businesses still contain Bush era loopholes that 1386 1387 allow large corporations to game the system, and so I 1388 actually introduced today the Small Business Access to 1389 Spectrum Act to update the FCC's rules, and give small 1390 businesses a fair shot at accessing the nation's airwaves. So I just--I will start--I mean, I--well, there is not 1391

1392 much time left, but I will start with Chairman Wheeler, if 1393 the others want to chime in. Would you commit to working to 1394 maintain a robust designated entity program focused on 1395 genuine small businesses? 1396 Mr. {Wheeler.} You wrote us and asked us that, and I 1397 replied yes, we will, and yes, we are. We have had a 1398 rulemaking going on, and we will issue shortly a public 1399 notice, making sure that it is broadened out, the discussion 1400 is broadened out, and the record is built on the question of 1401 the recent AWS-3 auction, and some of the very legitimate 1402 concerns that have been raised about that. 1403 The thing that is frustrating to me, Congressman--you 1404 say yes, these were Bush era rules, they haven't been 1405 reviewed since then, and it is time to review them. And what 1406 is really upsetting is the way in which slick lawyers come in 1407 and take advantage of rules that this committee -- I was in the room, in this room, when this Committee created designated 1408 1409 entities. And, as you say, the world changes dramatically in 1410 how a designated entity can be structured and can play in now 1411 what is a big market, whereas before it was a much smaller 1412 market.

1413 Our rules have not kept up, but the slick lawyers sure 1414 have figured out how to do it. And we want to make sure, 1415 whether it is in this, or whether it is in slick lawyers 1416 playing around with broadcast licenses, that there is no way 1417 that we keep our rules current. And we are going to do that 1418 on this issue, and we are going to make sure--the commitment 1419 that I will ironclad give you, sir, is that we want to make 1420 sure that we have a new set of DE rules in place before the 1421 spectrum auction that takes place early next year.

1422 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you.

Mr. {Latta.} Gentleman's time is expired, and yields
back. The Chair now recognizes himself for 5 minutes.
Again, thanks very much to the Commissioners for being here
today.

1427 Commissioner Pai, in January the FCC voted to update the 1428 broadband benchmark speeds to 25 Megabits per second for 1429 downloads and three Megabits per second for uploads. The 1430 speeds had previously been set at four Megabits per second 1431 and one Megabits per second.

1432 While I understand the need to update the broadband 1433 span-speeds, I am kind of curious as to the process the

1434 Commission chose the speeds of 25 Megabits and the three 1435 Megabits. It seems, to an outside observer, that an 1436 arbitrary number was picked, especially considering that 1437 recently the Commission voted to spend \$10.8 billion over the 1438 next 6 years through the Connect America Fund to employ 10 Megabits per second broadband. According to the Commission's 1439 1440 new benchmark, 10 Megabits per second is going to no longer 1441 even be considered broadband.

1442 Can you walk us through how the agency came to these new 1443 benchmarks? And then also if you could follow up--and how 1444 does it still plan to spend over \$10 billion on those 10 1445 Megabits per second deployment in light of that new 1446 definition?

1447 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Mr. Chairman. I 1448 think the problem is that the agency has viewed each of these issues in a vacuum, and so, in December, when we were talking 1449 about rural broadband deployment, we agreed to spend, over 1450 1451 the course of a decade, billions of dollars to establish what 1452 we considered to be broadband at the time, which was 10 1453 Megabits per second. Flash forward 1 month, all of a sudden we learn that actually isn't broadband. Broadband is 25 1454

Megabits per second, under which standard there is no such thing as mobile broadband, because even the fastest LG--4G LTE connection can't get you to 25 Megabits per second. Flash forward 1 month more, all of a sudden we learn that there is such a thing as mobile broadband, and it is going to be classified as a Title 2 service.

1461 And I think the schizophrenia that we have seen over the 1462 last several months from the Commission as to what is 1463 broadband illustrates the basic point. We need intellectual 1464 consistency that is grounded in the facts. And the facts in this case basically stem from the question, what do people 1465 use broadband for? And by and large, if you look at my 1466 1467 statement in--on--with respect to the January order, I was trying to look at patterns of usage. And obviously there are 1468 1469 going to be some folks who use the Internet, you know, for 1470 very high bandwidth applications, others who use it for less. 1471 The goal of the FCC shouldn't be to artificially pick a 1472 number so that it can declare that the broadband marketplace 1473 is uncompetitive, and thus justify regulation. It should be 1474 to try to tailor, with some forward thinking, what broadband means in the current era. And that is why I think the 1475

- 1476 problem with the 25 Megabits per seconds standard, which I 1477 forecast would be jettisoned soon, I didn't know it would be 1478 1 month from then, is that it was, you know, simply based on, 1479 I think, you know, more press release--or grabbing--grasping 1480 for press headlines, as opposed to what actually was in the 1481 record.
- 1482 Mr. {Wheeler.} Can I--

Mr. {Latta.} Let me follow up. I am also concerned that this new threshold would reduce the broadband investment in rural areas. You know, if you look at my district, and you have seen it, is that it could ultimately deter the competitive entry into the broadband market. Do you foresee any of these benchmark speeds unfairly impacting consumers and businesses in the rural areas?

Mr. {Pai.} That is a great question, Congressman, and coming from a rural area myself, that is something that I take very personally. The FCC heard from a great number of small providers, and that is service providers in rural areas, who told us that Title 2, ironically, would take us in the opposite direction of getting more competition. A lot of folks in rural areas, if they have an option, it is going to

1497 be from one of these smaller providers.

1498 And so we heard, for instance, from 43 municipal 1499 broadband providers, who said that Title 2 regulation will 1500 undermine our business model that supports our network, raise 1501 our costs, and hinder our ability to further deploy 1502 broadband. We even heard from 24 small broadband providers 1503 on February 17, who said that Title 2 will badly strain our 1504 limited resources, because we have no in-house attorneys, and 1505 no budget line items for council.

1506 And those ISPs, by the way, include very small ISPs, including one called Main Street Broadband that serves four 1507 1508 customers in Cannon Falls. The notion that Main Street 1509 Broadband in Cannon Falls exerts some kind of anti-1510 competitive monopoly vis-à-vis edge providers like Netflix, 1511 Google, and Facebook is absurd, but I think that is part of 1512 the reason why the Obama Administration's Small Business 1513 Administration was exactly on point when it urged the FCC 1514 last year to take a careful look at how these rules would 1515 affect small businesses, because, ultimately, that is where 1516 the digital divide is going to open up. It is for the rural 1517 Americans, who have a tough enough time getting a broadband

1518 option as it is.

1519 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you. I would like to ask the 1520 question now--the Chairman mentioned, in his opening 1521 statement, about the task force starting the agency process, 1522 and I am just curious, Commissioner Clyburn, when did you 1523 find out about the task force? 1524 Ms. {Clyburn.} When did I find out about the actual 1525 task force? To--best of my knowledge, last quarter of last 1526 year. It issued a report in February. There was a very 1527 interactive process. They asked each office to weigh in, and 1528 that is when--subject to check. My memory is--sometimes it 1529 is challenged, but last quarter of last year, with a 1530 February--1531 Mr. {Latta.} All right. Thank you. 1532 Ms. {Clyburn.} Thank you. Mr. {Latta.} Commissioner Rosenworcel? Excuse me. 1533 1534 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} I believe they issued a report 1535 sometime last year. I would have to go back and check. 1536 Mr. {Latta.} Commissioner Pai? Mr. {Pai.} If you are referring to the task force that 1537 the Chairman announced this morning, is that the one? 1538

1539 Mr. {Latta.} Right, the--he asked about--that he spoke 1540 about in his opening testimony. 1541 Mr. {Pai.} Then I learned about it this morning, when 1542 he announced it. 1543 Mr. {Latta.} Commissioner O'Rielly? Mr. {O'Rielly.} Well, I appreciate the kind words from 1544 1545 the Chairman on the ideas that I put forward. I just learned 1546 about it this morning. 1547 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you. My time has expired, and the 1548 Chair now recognizes Mr. Doyle. 1549 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to take a 1550 moment and recognize, along with my colleague, Ms. Eshoo, the 1551 historic step forward the Commission has made in its Open 1552 Internet Order, and the order on municipal broadband. You 1553 know, taken together, these actions by the Commission 1554 represent incredible wins for consumers, entrepreneurs, and millions of Americans who called on the Commission to take 1555 1556 action. Innovators shouldn't need to ask permission, or pay gatekeepers to deploy new products and services, and the 1557 1558 FCC's actions will ensure that this remains true. And I want to point out one more thing too. My 1559

1560 colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been talking 1561 about Title 2 like it is the end of the world. Well, up 1562 until 2002, the Internet was treated as a Title 2 service. 1563 It was a Republican FCC Chairman, and a Republican 1564 Commission, that acted to re-classify the Internet as an 1565 information service. I see this rule as the FCC finally 1566 setting things straight.

1567 Chairman Wheeler, last September you testified before 1568 the House Small Business Committee. You were asked about Net 1569 Neutrality proceedings, and you stated Title 2 is on the 1570 table. Now, my Republican colleagues are making the 1571 allegation that you only started looking at Title 2 as a result of White House interference in November of 2014. 1572 Was 1573 the FCC considering using its Title 2 authority before 1574 President Obama joined millions of Americans in calling on the FCC to take that course of action? 1575 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes, sir, and the Small Business 1576

1577 Committee that you cite there was one member who was saying 1578 to me, don't you dare do Title 2, and I was saying we are 1579 seriously considering Title 2. And there was one member who 1580 was saying, we want you to do Title 2, and I said, yes, we

1581 are considering doing Title II.

1582 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me ask you 1583 another question. The Open Internet Order makes great 1584 strides to protect consumers and innovators, but in 1585 particular by including interconnection and protections for 1586 consumer privacy through Section 222 in this order. I want 1587 to get your commitment that the Commission will move quickly 1588 to complete the rulemaking on Section 222, and ensure that 1589 the Commission has rules in place to protect consumer privacy 1590 online. And I would also like your commitment that the 1591 Commission will take seriously this new responsibility on 1592 interconnection. With all of the recent announcements by 1593 over the top providers releasing new streaming video 1594 services, I think it is more important than ever that 1595 gatekeepers do not restrict these new services access to 1596 consumers.

And also, Mr. Chairman, while I have got you here, I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity to mention special access. I understand that the data collection component is complete. I would encourage you to move forward as quickly as possible to complete analysis of that data, and

1602 to take action to address any harms taking place. Fixing 1603 this situation is a great opportunity to improve competition 1604 and economic growth across this country. 1605 Mr. {Wheeler.} So let me see if I can go through it one, two, three. One, on privacy, absolutely, sir, and it 1606 1607 starts next month, when we are holding the workshop that gets 1608 the parties together and says, okay, let us talk specifically 1609 about how Section 222 exists in this new reality. Next 1610 month, and then we move after that. 1611 Secondly, with regard to interconnection, I could not 1612 agree more with your point about how over the top services 1613 are revolutionizing, and are going to be the consumers' 1614 savior. I sit before this Committee before, and other 1615 committees, and it is a bipartisan belief that something has to be done about cable prices, and that starts with 1616 1617 alternatives. And those alternatives are delivered over the 1618 top, and those alternatives are delivered via the Internet. 1619 And that is why the Internet has to be open, so that there 1620 are competitive alternatives for people. And I got myself 1621 so--1622 Mr. {Doyle.} Special access.

1623 Mr. {Wheeler.} Special access. My hair was not gray 1624 when I first started asking the Commission about special 1625 access. Special access. Actually, we are in the process--we 1626 have just gotten permission, and have begun the data 1627 collection on special access. Special access is an 1628 incredibly important issue that is particularly essential to 1629 those who are bringing competition to communications. And my 1630 goal is that we are going to have this whole special access 1631 issue on the table and dealt with before the end of the year. 1632 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, and one last thing. And I-this question, it is on the AWS-3 auction. It raised \$45 1633 1634 billion in revenue, meeting all the funding targets, 1635 including fully funding First Net and next gen 911. You 1636 know, considering this new reality, and the massive appetite 1637 for spectrum by wireless carriers, haven't--hasn't the FCC been liberated from these fully funded objections, and its 1638 1639 reconsideration of its previous decision on the size of the 1640 spectrum reserve, and the incentive auction?

1641 Mr. {Wheeler.} Well, that is one of the issues that we 1642 are going to be addressing again as we put together the final 1643 rules for the auction. I understand your point, that we have

1644 now lived up to our committed obligations, and this is an 1645 issue that we will be dealing with in the next couple of 1646 months. 1647 Mr. {Doyle.} Commissioner Clyburn, Rosenworcel, do you have comments on that too, very briefly? 1648 Ms. {Clyburn.} I--one of the things that I joke about, 1649 1650 and this is a positive joke, is that all predictions were 1651 wrong, that --1652 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Right. 1653 Ms. {Clyburn.} --two and a half, three times the amount of money that was predicted was raised. You were right to 1654 say that we have met our obligations, and we will continue 1655 through other auctions, including incentive auction, to 1656 1657 deliver spectrum to the American people. 1658 Mr. {Doyle.} Yes. 1659 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} I agree with the Chairman. We will 1660 be looking at this in the next few months. It is important 1661 we follow the statute, and it is also important that we make 1662 sure that everybody has some opportunities to bid in this upcoming auction, and that no community--single player walks 1663 1664 away with all the spectrum.

1665 Mr. {Doyle.} All right. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate 1666 your indulgence, then. I would just like to include in the 1667 record this letter from the Public Interest Spectrum 1668 Coalition in regards to the incentive auction. 1669 Mr. {Latta.} Without objection. 1670 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you. I yield back. 1671 Mr. {Latta.} The yields back. The gentleman's time has 1672 expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from 1673 Illinois, Mr. Shimkus, for 5 minutes. 1674 Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome to the Commissioners. It is great to have you here. The--I want to 1675 1676 be careful in--because history does tell us a lot of things. 1677 I was fortunate to be on the Committee during September 11. 1678 Chairman Upton of the Subcommittee, at that time, took us to Ground Zero because we had the Verizon switching station 1679 right across the street. And what I learned in walking 1680 1681 through that process, it was really only a big company that 1682 could get Wall Street back online after that catastrophic 1683 attack. And it is true. I mean, I have still got pictures 1684 of it. The basement was flooded. You had wires going up to 1685 the third floor. You had individuals hand tying the copper

1686 lines. So as we talk about our great country, and 1687 competition, and large entities, sometimes large entities are 1688 very important in the security of this country. 1689 The--and I want to also--thanks for kind words on 911. 1690 It is really a team effort. Anna and I have been fortunate 1691 to work on this, but it is a process that you have got to stay vigilant on, as, Chairman Wheeler, you mentioned. First 1692 1693 we dealt with 911 over cell, then really went to location, 1694 then we went to voice over Internet. Now we are back into 1695 location, because I am being told by some PSAPs that there is 1696 really too many right now, and that they maybe should centralize those. Any comments, briefly, if you can? 1697 Mr. {Wheeler.} Well, you know, one of the interesting 1698 1699 things that was in your bill that you and Ms. Eshoo had was--1700 you asked states to voluntarily have state level coordination of their PSAPs, and by and large, that has been observed in 1701 1702 the breach. It hasn't existed. I mean, the situation I 1703 talked about in Georgia, there is no state level coordination 1704 in Georgia. And this is--introducing mobile means that the 1705 people on the right side and the people on the left side of 1706 the map need to be able to be talking to each other. They

1707 need to have similar standards.

1708 Let me give you just one more--you ticked off some of 1709 the issues, in terms of the technologies. The other is text 1710 to 911, which we have required carriers to do, and when-of 1711 the 6,500 PSAPs in the country, 200 have implemented it. And that means that America's deaf and hard of hearing community, 1712 1713 which, thanks to the unanimous action of this Commission, has 1714 text to 911 capabilities provided by carriers. They can text 1715 away, and there is nobody who hears it. 1716 Mr. {Shimkus.} And I guess the other thing that we also didn't talk about was the testing that you did on the 1717 elevation--I would say the elevation--1718 1719 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes, sir. The ability to get the Y 1720 coordinate. 1721 Mr. {Shimkus.} --stuff like that, and--very excited

1722 about that opportunity. Of course, I don't have much high 1723 rises--

1724 Mr. {Wheeler.} The Z coordinate.

1725 Mr. {Shimkus.} --in--

1726 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yeah.

1727 Mr. {Shimkus.} --in my Congressional district, but I

1728 know it is probably important in large metropolitan areas.

1729 Give me some comfort--my concern with the rule being

1730 presented is, one, litigation. Two, I have this concern

1731 about how do you incentivize build-out of the pipes when it

- 1732 looks like you are moving back to re-regulation?
- 1733 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yeah.

1734 Mr. {Shimkus.} And that, if you are re-regulating, then 1735 you have to have a fee. That is where this fee debate comes 1736 from. So how do you get a fee to help build out? And maybe 1737 I am a simplistic view, but--and then the other question I 1738 have is really about the Megabit debate, 10, 25. How do you 1739 encourage in this new venue, and then I will end, and you 1740 all--if you all can--how--the individual consumer decide what 1741 speed they want versus being forced to buy a speed which they 1742 will never do--use, like my mother-in-law?

Mr. {Wheeler.} Right. It is interesting, Congressman, everybody cites their mother or their mother-in-law in that example. And the--there is nothing in here that regulates or established tariffs for consumer services--for the rates for consumer services. The--there is nothing in here that says that a company can't have multiple levels of services. So

```
1749
     your mother-in-law gets e-mail only, you know, and the person
1750
     next--
1751
          Mr. {Shimkus.} And will pay for that--
1752
          Mr. {Wheeler.} And will pay--
1753
          Mr. {Shimkus.} --simple service--
1754
          Mr. {Wheeler.}
                           --for that kind of--
1755
          Mr. {Shimkus.}
                           --versus what--
1756
          Mr. {Wheeler.} And the person next door wants--
1757
          Mr. {Shimkus.} Just so I can have a contrary debate,
1758
     can I have Commissioner Pai or Commissioner O'Rielly address
     those before I run out of time, which I am about ready to do?
1759
1760
           Mr. {Pai.} Well, a couple different issues,
1761
     Congressman. One, I think the order explicitly opens the
1762
      door to ex-post rate regulation. Anyone can file a complaint
1763
     under Section 208, either with the Commission, or with any
1764
      Federal Court across the country, and that Commission or
1765
     Court will have to adjudicate whether or not the rate is just
1766
     or reasonable. And the fact that, while on the surface you
1767
     might allow for differential prices based on different
1768
      services, nonetheless it is ultimately up to the caprice of
     any given Commission or Court to decide after the fact
1769
```

1770 whether the rate is just and reasonable, and that is the 1771 essence of rate regulation. 1772 Additionally, you pointed out the incentive--or the 1773 effect that this would have on deployment. You have heard 1774 from companies that are--that were responsible for the 1775 largest capital expenditures in our country when it comes to 1776 broadband, and companies that represent very small market 1777 areas, and they have told us that the impact of this kind of 1778 rate regulation, and other Title 2 regulations, is going to 1779 impede them from delivering some of those advanced services 1780 to anybody, whether it is a high bandwidth user or your 1781 mother-in-law. 1782 Mr. {Shimkus.} With respect to my colleagues and 1783 everybody else, I will just yield back now. Thank you very 1784 much. Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you very much. The gentleman 1785 yields back. The Chair now recognizes, for 5 minutes, the 1786 1787 gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Loebsack, for 5 minutes. 1788 Mr. {Loebsack.} Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks to all of 1789 you for being here today. Great discussion about various 1790 issues. I guess I will start out by saying--I don't want to

1791 be too presumptuous about this, but I think a lot of us up 1792 here have a lot of concerns about rural broadband in 1793 particular. I know that that is a big concern for all of 1794 you. I have 24 counties, and although the Committee Chairman 1795 reminded me that his district is a lot larger than mine--I 1796 don't mean the current chair, I mean Chairman Walden, and we 1797 have got some from North Dakota, that is a lot bigger than my 1798 district too.

1799 But I have 24 counties, and I have a lot of rural 1800 broadband carriers, a lot of ISPs--small ISPs, as you 1801 mentioned, Commissioner Pai. But a lot of folks who need 1802 rural broadband for education, educational opportunities, 1803 for, you know, health opportunities -- we are going to see a 1804 lot more tele-health, I think, in rural areas going forward. 1805 We are going to need that. For farmers, who have to access 1806 GPS so they can plant, and do it efficiently, and make a 1807 living, and for economic development, there is no question, 1808 and a lot of other reasons as well.

1809 I have one quick statistical question for you, 1810 Commissioner Pai. You mentioned--you gave us some numbers as 1811 far as--I think it was municipal providers and small

1812	providers. Can you repeat those numbers? You had two
1813	numbers, I believe.
1814	Mr. {Pai.} Sure. We received a letter from 43
1815	municipal broadband providers on February 10, and we also
1816	received a letter from 24 small broadband providers, each of
1817	which serves less than 1,000 customers, on February 17.
1818	Mr. {Loebsack.} Thank you for those numbers. How many
1819	small providers are there in the country? You received 20
1820	from 24. Howdo you know what the number is total?
1821	Mr. {Pai.} I am not sure of the total number
1822	Mr. {Loebsack.} We have a lot in Iowa alone.
1823	Mr. {Pai.} Yeah, I am not sure what the overall number
1824	is, but this is very representative
1825	Mr. {Wheeler.} About 800, sir.
1826	Mr. {Loebsack.} About 800? Thank you.
1827	Mr. {Pai.} We also
1828	Mr. {Loebsack.} Thank you verythank you, Mr. Pai.
1829	Thank you, Commissioner.
1830	Chairman Wheeler, as I am sure you are aware, the FCC
1831	reauthorization bill draft that we had before us on this
1832	Committee that has been offered by the majority would make

1833 the Universal Service Fund subject to the appropriations 1834 process. I have been here 9 years, my 9th year, and things 1835 are pretty dysfunctional here, as we all know, when it comes 1836 to the appropriations process. 1837 In this current environment, where Congress really is--1838 seems utterly incapable, if you will, of passing a bill 1839 through regular order, we saw this with the last minute--with 1840 the DHS, tying USF funding, which is so important for rural 1841 areas, as you know, to the appropriations process, I think, 1842 does risk a lot of instability down the road. I know you may 1843 not be willing to weigh in on this, but my question to you is 1844 do you support attaching USF funding to the appropriations 1845 process?

1846 Mr. {Wheeler.} Well, let me see if I can answer that, 1847 Congressman, by talking about what we hear from the kind of 1848 carriers you were talking about, the small rural carriers. And they say, we need certainty. You are asking us to deploy 1849 1850 capital, and we need to know that the capital from you is 1851 going to come behind that, and we need to know 5, 7 years of 1852 certainty that this money is going to be there. And that is 1853 the way the Universal Service Program has been run, to

- 1854 provide that kind of certainty.
- 1855 Clearly a serious concern is that if, all of a sudden,

1856 that certainty is impacted because the appropriations move

1857 like this, or don't move--

1858 Mr. {Loebsack.} Um-hum.

1859 Mr. {Wheeler.} --and we are dealing with CRs, or 1860 whatever the ability of these rural carriers to make the 1861 investments that are necessary to provide service in high 1862 cost areas will be significantly impaired.

1863 Mr. {Loebsack.} Not to mention putting a cap on such a 1864 fund as well, which I think is something that is called for 1865 as well. It is--this is just a really huge concern for so 1866 many of us, you know, the rural broadband issue, as I 1867 mentioned. And I have had concerns in the past about how the 1868 USF is administered as well.

I want to make sure--and I would be happy to hear from any of you here, I want to make sure that the USF fund actually goes to where it is supposed to go as well, and that those folks who can access that, and provide that kind of broadband that is necessary in those rural areas can have access to those funds. Because we also know that a lot of

1875 those folks are the ones who are paying into it in the first 1876 place, and I have just heard complaints that sometimes the 1877 funding doesn't come back to them, they feel as though they 1878 are being disproportionately put upon, if you will, in terms 1879 of contributing to that fund, and then not getting back, you 1880 know, in a proportionate way what they have been putting into 1881 it. Would any of you care to respond to that? 1882 Mr. {Wheeler.} So if I can pick up on that, 1883 Congressman? The--particularly for the smaller rate of 1884 return carriers. We are going to be putting into effect this year a revision of the Universal Service Program for them. 1885 1886 We are going to deal with the hated quadrennial--or the QRS, 1887 the hated QRS regressive analysis--regression analysis. We 1888 are going to come up with a model that says, here is what you 1889 can base your business decisions on.

And we do need, if I can pause for a commercial--a selfinterested commercial for a second, we do need those carriers to help us come together. Because the reason I knew there were 800 is because we hear multiple voices talking about what they need, and everybody sits in a slightly different position, and we have got to come together with a common--and

1896 if the industry could come together and say, here is a common 1897 approach, that would be very helpful. 1898 Mr. {Loebsack.} Thank you. Mr. {Wheeler.} I also need to correct the record on 1899 1900 something that Mr. Pai said, where he was talking about 1901 making a broad brush statement about small carriers. The 1902 National--the NTCA, they--represents these small carriers, 1903 has said--so the track records of RLEX rural carriers makes 1904 clear, Title 2 can provide a useful framework, and does not 1905 need to be an impediment to investment in ongoing operation 1906 of broadband networks. And the small rural wireless 1907 carriers, in a statement, also said a similar thing, that 1908 they will not object to this. And so we have got to be 1909 careful that we don't haul out a handful of people and make 1910 great generalizations from it. 1911 Mr. {Latta.} The gentleman's time is expired. 1912 Mr. {Loebsack.} Thank you--thank the Chair for 1913 indulging me--Mr. {Latta.} The Chair now recognizes for 5 minutes the 1914 1915 gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Lance, for 5 minutes. 1916 Mr. {Lance.} Thank you very much. Commissioner Pai,

1917 would you like to respond to that?

1918 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you, Congressman, for the opportunity. 1919 I would. I think, first, it is significant to remember that, 1920 number one, one of those folks who submitted the comments 1921 about Title 2 were conceiving of Title 2 in terms of just the 1922 last mile connectivity between the ISP and the customer. 1923 They had no idea, because the FCC never published the 1924 proposal, that this would go all the way to the far reaches 1925 of the Internet, including interconnection.

1926 Mr. {Wheeler.} That is not correct.

Mr. {Pai.} Second--well, Mr. Chairman, please, if I 1927 1928 could respond to the Congressman? Secondly, among the 1929 municipal broadband providers who--these are folks who, by 1930 definition, represent the public interest in their 1931 communities. Indeed, one of the municipal broadband 1932 providers was visited by the President himself in the week leading up to our vote. They themselves said, please don't 1933 1934 fall prey to what they called the facile argument that Title 1935 2 won't have an effect.

1936Thirdly, I think it is important to remember that, with1937respect to the effect that Title 2 will have on investment

1938 and opportunity, no one has said--none of these services have 1939 been subjected to Title 2 previously. At the very most you 1940 can make the argument that last mile connectivity was, but I 1941 think it is critical for us to remember that regulation does 1942 have an effect.

1943 We have heard from members of the American Cable 1944 Association, from small ISPs, from municipal broadband 1945 providers, and we can we all debate about the numbers. What 1946 is indisputable is that these providers have thrived with 1947 light touch regulation, and I think that is part of the 1948 reason why just yesterday we heard from a major broadband provider, ``we have benefitted from, essentially, government 1949 1950 staying out of the Internet, and I am worried that we are now 1951 on a path to starting to regulate an awful lot of things on 1952 the Internet.'' Who was that? That was Google's Executive 1953 Chairman Eric Schmidt--

1954 Mr. {Lance.} Thank--

1955 Mr. {Pai.} --in Washington.

1956 Mr. {Lance.} Thank you. Commissioner Pai, in your 1957 dissenting statement you state, I see no legal path for the 1958 FCC to prohibit paid prioritization or the development of a

1959 two-sided market, which appears to be the--objection by many 1960 to the Chairman's proposal. The NPRM frankly acknowledges 1961 Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act could not be used 1962 for such a ban, and while the NPRM resists saying it 1963 outright, neither could Title 2. After all, Title 2 only 1964 authorizes the FCC to prohibit unjust or unreasonable 1965 discrimination, and both the Commission and the Courts have 1966 consistently interpreted provision to allow carriers to 1967 charge different prices for different services. Could you 1968 elaborate on that--

1969 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congressman. It 1970 has been textbook law since the--Title 2 and its antecedents 1971 were adopted, and this goes back to the 1880s, when--

1972 Mr. {Lance.} Yes.

Mr. {Pai.} --you are regulating railroads, that differential services could be assessed at different prices by common carriers. Extending that toward the Telecommunications Age, it has long been the case, as I pointed out in my dissent, that you cannot ban paid prioritization. And in that regard, I completely agree with the Chairman's statement on May 20 of last year that there is

1980 no, ``nothing in Title 2 that bans paid prioritization.''

1981 Mr. {Lance.} Given that, how long do you think that 1982 this is likely to be litigated in the courts? And I ask that 1983 because businesses need certainty as to what the rules of the 1984 road will be long term.

1985 Mr. {Pai.} I think whether you support or oppose the 1986 FCC's order, the unfortunate aspect, everyone can agree on, 1987 is this will be litigated for a long time.

1988 Mr. {Lance.} And this goes first, I guess, to the 1989 District Court here in the District of Columbia? Is--

1990 Mr. {Pai.} Well, it will depend on where a petition

1991 refer--review is filed. It could be filed in any of the

1992 regional Courts of--

1993 Mr. {Lance.} Um-hum.

1994 Mr. {Pai.} --Appeals. And then, if there are multiple 1995 appeals, it will have to be chosen by a lottery.

1996 Mr. {Lance.} And is it your opinion that this will 1997 eventually reach the Supreme Court of the United States?

1998 Mr. {Pai.} I think it will. It presents a very

1999 substantial question, on which I could easily imagine the

2000 Supreme Court granting writ of certiorari.

2001 Mr. {Lance.} Commissioner O'Rielly, your views as to 2002 the length of a litigation? 2003 Mr. {O'Rielly.} I agree wholeheartedly with my 2004 colleague on this. This is a 3 plus year debate that we are going to have in the court system. 2005 2006 Mr. {Lance.} Commissioner Rosenworcel, your views on 2007 that, please? 2008 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} I believe we will see litigation, 2009 yes. 2010 Mr. {Lance.} And Commissioner Clyburn? And it is 2011 certainly an honor to serve with your father in Congress. 2012 Ms. {Clyburn.} Thank you, I appreciate that. I am 2013 99.99 percent sure that bill will be a legal--2014 Mr. {Lance.} So this is even purer than Ivory soap? 2015 Mr. {Wheeler.} Wait a minute, I will go better than my 2016 colleague, okay? Because they--the big dogs have promised 2017 they are going to --2018 Mr. {Lance.} I see. 2019 Mr. {Wheeler.} --their word. 2020 Mr. {Lance.} I do think that we need certainty going forward, and I am deeply concerned of that--regarding that. 2021

2022 Commissioner Clyburn, in a speech you gave several years 2023 ago, you said, without forbearance, there can be no 2024 reclassification, and I believe you went on to compare it as 2025 peanut butter and jelly, salt and pepper, Batman and Robin. 2026 Would you have supported reclassification under Title 2 2027 without forbearance? 2028 Ms. {Clyburn.} Without forbearance? 2029 Mr. {Lance.} Yes. 2030 Ms. {Clyburn.} One of the things that I think we did 2031 right was recognize the current dynamics of the day. 2032 Mr. {Lance.} Um-hum. Ms. {Clyburn.} This is not your father's or your 2033 mother's Title 2. We forbore from 27 provisions, over 700 2034 2035 rules and regulations, so I am very comfortable in saying 2036 this is looking at a current construct, and that is you 2037 looking at me. My seconds are up. Thank you. Mr. {Lance.} Thank you. I think you should have 2038 2039 compared it to Bogart and Bacall myself. 2040 Ms. {Clyburn.} That will be the next--2041 Mr. {Lance.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I 2042 yield back my time.

2043 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you very much. The gentleman 2044 yields back. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from 2045 California, Mr. McNerney, for 5 minutes. 2046 Mr. {McNerney.} Well, I thank the Chairman--I thank the 2047 Commissioners for your hard work on this. Regarding the 2048 litigation issue, is there any decision you could make 2049 whatsoever on Net Neutrality that wouldn't involve 2050 significant litigation? 2051 Mr. {Wheeler.} I think you have just hit the nail on the head, sir. 2052 2053 Mr. {McNerney.} Okay. Just wanted to make sure about that. You know, most--all--I believe most of all--most or 2054 2055 all stakeholders believe that it is important to meet the big three of Net Neutrality, no throttling, no paid 2056 prioritization, and no blocking, but there is other stuff 2057 that might be controversial in your recent decisions. 2058 Anything that you want to bring up that might be of interest? 2059 2060 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you, sir. Well, there is--2061 actually, there are only four regulations in here, no 2062 throttling, no blocking, no paid prioritization, and 2063 transparency. You have got to tell the consumers what you

are doing, and--so they have a fair choice. The other thing that we do is to establish general conduct rule that says you will not harm consumers, you will not harm innovators, you will not harm the functioning of the Internet and the public interest.

2069 Now, it is really interesting because people come in and 2070 say, I don't know what that means. Well, that is exactly the 2071 way the FTC operates, and the way that the carriers have been 2072 saying, well, let us take things away from the FCC, and give 2073 it to the FTC, because we like this case by case analysis 2074 better than somebody coming in and having a rulemaking. So 2075 we are not having a rulemaking that says we know best, this 2076 is the way you are supposed to operate. What we are saying 2077 is that there needs to be a judgment capability that says, is 2078 there harm? And there needs to be the ability, if harm is 2079 found, to do something about it, but never to pre-judge, and 2080 always to be in a situation where you are weighing all of the 2081 interests.

2082 Mr. {McNerney.} Okay. Commissioner Rosenworcel, does 2083 the FCC have the power to regulate broadband providers, 2084 consumer privacy practices that are unregulated--that are

- 2085 unrelated to their phone services?
- 2086 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} No. I mean, unrelated to their
- 2087 telecommunications.
- 2088 Mr. {McNerney.} Right.
- 2089 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} No.
- 2090 Mr. {McNerney.} No. Is that something that would be of 2091 value?

Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Well, obviously privacy is an important issue to all Americans, and privacy in the digital age is an evolving thing. Our statute, which dates back to 1996, involves customer proprietary network information under Section 222, and that is where the bulk of our privacy authority comes from, with respect to telecommunications services.

2099 Mr. {McNerney.} Are there enough engineers at the FCC 2100 to help you do your job?

2101 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} I think we have terrific engineers 2102 at the FCC, but in revamping the agency, I think we should 2103 make it a priority to have more. It is clear that wireless 2104 technologies are exploding. The demand for our equipment 2105 authorization process is also multiplying exponentially. And

2106	if we had more engineers, I believe we would be in a position
2107	to help facilitate more innovation getting to the market
2108	faster.
2109	Mr. {McNerney.} Do engineers tend to stay out of the
2110	politics of the Commission, or are they like other human
2111	beings and want to get into it once in a while?
2112	Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Well, that is a kind of metaphysical
2113	question. I am not sure I want to answer that one.
2114	Mr. {McNerney.} All right. Let us see. You mentioned
2115	that thethere would bethere should be greater use for the
2116	upper portion of the five GigabandGigahertz band. Could
2117	you expand that a little bit, please?
2118	Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Absolutely. We benefit immensely
2119	from Wi-Fi in this country. About 50 percent of us use it to
2120	go online regularly in public places, and 60 percent of us
2121	use Wi-Fi at home. The bulk of our Wi-Fi activity takes
2122	place on the 2.4 Gigahertz band, but that place is getting
2123	mighty crowded. We also have spectrum in the five Gigahertz
2124	band that we use for Wi-Fi. Many of us, for instance, our
2125	home Wi-Fi systems are based on it. But only a portion of
2126	the five Gigahertz band is dedicated to unlicensed and Wi-Fi

2127 services. We have got some other uses in there, and I think 2128 we should start studying those other uses, and find out if we 2129 can free up more spectrum in the five Gigahertz band so more 2130 people have more access to unlicensed and Wi-Fi service. 2131 Mr. {McNerney.} Well, what are the physical limitations 2132 of the five Gigahertz band? Line of sight, or what are the 2133 physical limitations? 2134 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} So the easy way to describe it is 2135 the higher you go, you get more capacity, but it doesn't 2136 travel as far. So five Gigahertz is really good inside buildings, inside households. And as more of us use devices 2137 2138 that are not tethered to a cord, having that functionality is 2139 really important. 2140 Mr. {McNerney.} Thank you. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

2141 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you very much. The gentleman yields 2142 back. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas for 2143 5 minutes.

2144 Mr. {Olson.} I thank the Chair, and welcome to all the 2145 Commissioners. Folks back home noticed that Commissioner Pai 2146 and Commissioner O'Rielly weren't at the rollout of the new 2147 rules on February 26 this past year. They have got some

questions they want answered, and want to know what you guys 2148 2149 would answer if you had been at that rollout. 2150 I know there are claims about these Open Internet rules, that they do not violate the Fifth Amendment by ``taking'' 2151 2152 broadband providers' property. The Commission states that 2153 the rules do not break the Fifth Amendment because they 2154 ``actually enhance the value of broadband networks'' by 2155 protecting innovation. If these rules enhance the value of 2156 these networks, as the FCC's majority claims, why do 2157 broadband providers large and small, wired and wireless, 2158 oppose the rules? Any thoughts, Commissioner Pai? 2159 Mr. {Pai.} Congressman, thank you for the question. I 2160 think part of the reason why established broadband providers 2161 oppose these rules is that they have invested in literally 2162 hundreds of billions, if not trillions of dollars since the inception of the Internet in reliance on the bipartisan 2163 consensus, started in the Clinton Administration, that the 2164 Internet would ``remain unfettered from Federal and state 2165 2166 regulation''. That same combination of President Clinton and 2167 Congress agreed that access to the Internet would be an information service in Section 238 of the Act. 2168

2169 In reliance on that determination, a lot of these 2170 providers went to the capital markets, spent a lot of money, 2171 took a lot of risk, to build out what I consider to be the 2172 best Internet environment in the world. As Commissioner 2173 Rosenworcel has said, our Internet is the envy of the world. 2174 And part of the reason why they have a concern about 2175 regulatory takings is, under the leading case of, you know, 2176 Pension Benefit Corporation vs. Connolly, there is a question 2177 about whether reliance expectations have been disturbed by 2178 the exertion of these Title 2 regulations, and that is 2179 something that a court is going to have to work out and take 2180 very seriously. 2181 Mr. {Olson.} So they think it is taking it, it sounds 2182 like. Mr. O'Rielly, your thoughts, Commissioner O'Rielly? 2183 Mr. {O'Rielly.} So I would suspect that there will be 2184 an argument made and challenged on the Fifth Amendment, and 2185 the assumptions made by the Commission are likely to be put 2186 to test in court.

2187 Mr. {Wheeler.} Congressman?

2188 Mr. {Olson.} Yes, sir. One question for Commissioner 2189 Pai, hold on a second, if I have some time, but I have got

2190 some questions my--want me to answer.

2191 Commissioner Pai, let us talk about transparency, how 2192 the Committee works behind the scenes. You wrote in your 2193 testimony that your edits in the e-rate proceedings were 2194 rejected, and yet miraculously they came back when another 2195 Commissioner introduced those same edits. Is that true, 2196 false? Can you elaborate on what happened there? 2197 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congressman. I 2198 put my own proposal for e-rate on the table 2 years ago. 2199 When the FCC teed up its own proposal last year, I suggested, 2200 okay, I don't need to go with my proposal. Working within your framework, here are a number of suggestions that would 2201 get my vote. I was told no, a lot of these are all red 2202 2203 lines, we don't want your vote.

2204 One of the suggestions I had didn't--obviously didn't go 2205 to the core of the item. It said, I want to allow schools 2206 and libraries to be able to use e-rate funds for caching 2207 servers. Doesn't seem too ideologically troublesome to me, 2208 but that was rejected explicitly as what was ``a red line''. 2209 Miraculously, when the order was ultimately adopted, and when 2210 my colleagues on the other side suggested it, it was agreed

2211 to. Same thing on the incentive option. I made 12 different 2212 asks. I was told no to 11, and maybe on the 12th. 2213 One of the ones that was deemed a red line was extending 2214 the comment deadlines, because we had put some very complex 2215 proposals on the table, we might want to understand what the 2216 public thought about it. I was told no, that was a red line, 2217 that would risk delaying the incentive option. Lo and 2218 behold, now the Bureau on Delegated Authority has extended 2219 those very comment deadlines twice. These are just some of 2220 the pretty non-ideological proposals I have made that have 2221 been rejected. 2222 Mr. {Olson.} Is that standard practice? 2223 Mr. {Pai.} It has not been historically. I can tell you that, based on my first year and a half with the 2224 2225 Commission, while I might have disagreed with, you know, some

parts of an order that were ultimately adopted, nonetheless there was a spirit of collaboration and consensus that ultimately gained buy-in from all the Commissioners. And that, I think, ultimately really makes our product stand the test of time. It gains us legitimacy among the American public, and gives us more insulation from litigation risk.

2232 Mr. {Olson.} One final question. It is just about--2233 there are some parties out there that have said this action 2234 has been essential because the Internet is so essential to 2235 our life, the American life, and that the current situation 2236 is outdated, and it must be changed. This is a change. 2237 Should that agent of change be you all, or Congress, the 2238 elected officials for the American people, our voices, as 2239 opposed to, not an offense, but five unelected Commissioners? 2240 I am going to go home today and take some heat, good and bad, 2241 about what has happened here. You guys will go home to your 2242 families and be okay. How about us being in control, as 2243 opposed to you all? Any thoughts?

2244 Mr. {Pai.} Congressman, that is precisely why, when the D.C. Circuit rendered its decision last year, I said, without 2245 2246 knowing how this would turn out, we should go to Congress for 2247 quidance. You wrote the Communications Act. You have 2248 updated it over the years. You are the elected officials who 2249 should decide how the Internet economy should proceed. On a 2250 matter this important, with laws to essentially constrain our 2251 authority, we should turn to the experts, which is Congress. Mr. {Olson.} Constitution. Yield back. 2252

2253 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you very much. The gentleman yields 2254 back. The Chair recognizes for 5 minutes the gentlelady from 2255 California. 2256 Ms. {Matsui.} --Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield my 2257 time, and I--we are going to switch our time. 2258 Mr. {Latta.} Well, in that case, the gentlelady yields 2259 her time to the gentlelady from New York. 2260 Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you. 2261 Mr. {Latta.} Five minutes. 2262 Ms. {Clarke.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to yield a few seconds to my Ranking Member, Ms. 2263 2264 Eshoo. 2265 Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you for your time, appreciate it. To Commissioner Pai, as you went through the litany of your 2266 2267 ideas, and you didn't get your way, welcome to the minority. Ms. {Clarke.} Thank you. Let me just ask a few 2268 questions of our distinguished Commissioners. And the first 2269 2270 question is to Commissioner--Chairman Wheeler. 2271 Chairman Wheeler, I am concerned about multilingual 2272 broadcasting alerts, and the FCC's urgency around this issue.

2273  $\,$  In addition to 911 upgrades, what is being done to ensure

- 2274 that the EAS reflects the growing ethnic and language
- 2275 diversity of our nation?

2276 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you, Congresswoman, I am glad you 2277 asked that question. Literally yesterday I was meeting with 2278 our--what is called--which is our public safety and security 2279 body that is an advisory group, and talking with them about 2280 the importance of updating EAS, and the recommendations that 2281 they have put out, insofar as making sure that those updates 2282 are communicated to all the parties. Yes, we have an EAS 2283 system that hasn't been updated since the Cold War. We have to fix it to represent not only new technology, but also 2284 2285 increased diversity.

Ms. {Clarke.} And I hope that we will make that a priority because, you know, with the challenges that we are facing, 21st century challenges of climate change, of flooding, of, unfortunately, terrorist attacks, it is becoming more and more of a pressing need, a current day need.

The next question I have to you has to do with the Section 257 report. Congress requires the FCC to report on market entry barriers every 3 years, but your latest report

to Congress, the 257 report, was due December 31, 2012, and it is still forthcoming. Would you give us an idea, or share with us how the FCC will prioritize this as a process reform to ensure more diversity and inclusion in the media and

2299 telecom industries?

2300 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you. This has been an item of 2301 contention. My colleague, Commissioner Clyburn, when she was 2302 acting Chair, was moving this process forward. I think it is 2303 fair to say that it ran into some difficulties inside of the 2304 Commission on the--amongst the Commissioners. She did an 2305 admirable and excellent job that I am attempting to pick up on, and to move forward on, because these kinds of issues are 2306 2307 important to not only the future of how we build out 2308 telecommunications, but the future economic opportunities and 2309 structure in our country.

2310 Ms. {Clarke.} Very well, I appreciate that. And 2 2311 years ago I sent a letter to then FCC Chairman Julius 2312 Genachowski, asking that the issue of activated FM chips in 2313 cell phones be examined. I also understand that you, 2314 Chairman Wheeler, are interested in this issue. What 2315 progress has been made to ensure that my constituents have

- 2316 every tool at their disposal to receive life-saving
- 2317 information in the event of another terrorist attack, power
- 2318 grid outage, or weather emergency?

2319 Mr. {Wheeler.} So FM chips are a great idea, and they 2320 are in an increasing number of phones. They bring with them a couple of technological challenges. One is antenna size. 2321 2322 They need a bigger antenna to get the FM signal that -- in a tiny device, that becomes an issue. They also can drain 2323 2324 battery power. But they are increasingly showing up, and 2325 consumers have the ability to purchase them, and some carriers specifically focus on them. 2326

I think the broader question is whether or not the Commission should be forcing wireless carriers to activate these chips, or whether they ought to be leaving that to consumer choice. I know that broadcasters around the country

- 2331 are running commercials--
- 2332 Ms. {Clarke.} Um-hum.

2333 Mr. {Wheeler.} --saying write the FCC, write your 2334 Congressperson, and make them do it. I think this is 2335 something that is being resolved in the marketplace, and that 2336 we ought to monitor that, and watch what happens.

2337 Ms. {Clarke.} I appreciate it. I have a few more 2338 questions. I will submit them to the record, Mr. Chairman, 2339 but I thank you, and I thank all of you Commissioners for 2340 your hard work and diligence.

2341 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you very much. The Jenny--2342 gentlelady's time has expired. The gentleman from Illinois 2343 is now recognized for 5 minutes.

2344 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you 2345 all for being here. Thanks for serving your country, and 2346 spending all afternoon with us. We appreciate it. Hopefully 2347 not overly much longer.

Commissioner Pai, I have to tell you, when you were 2348 2349 asked by Mr. Olson about your suggestions to the Commissioner 2350 were ignored, and then other folks made the same suggestion, 2351 and they were taken in, that was actually pretty mind blowing to me, to be honest with you. And, you know, the joke was 2352 2353 made earlier, and I chuckled too, about how--welcome to the 2354 minority, but I hope the Commission doesn't become like 2355 Congress, because I think the intention of the Commission was 2356 not to be overtly partisan. That is Congress's job. We battle issues, we debate them. I mean, that is what happens. 2357

2358	We look for compromise. I hope the Commission doesn't follow
2359	our lead on that.
2360	Commissioner Pai, in your statement of dissent on the
2361	Open Internet Order, you spent some time talking about the
2362	procedure surrounding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
2363	Specifically, you talked about how much the order changed
2364	from its initial creation, and stated that the standard is
2365	whether all interested parties should have anticipated the
2366	final rule, not that they could have anticipated the final
2367	rule. Could you explain a bit further the problems you see
2368	with what was originally proposed by the Commission, as
2369	compared to what was eventually adopted?
2370	Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congressman, and
2371	for the kind words about some of the bipartisan efforts I
2372	have made at the Commission to reach consensus. I think the
2373	problem with respect to notice is substantial. I think the
2374	FCC teed up, in May of 2014, a very different proposal from
2375	the one it ultimately adopted.
2376	The May proposal, for example, was based on Section 706,
2377	and never mentioned such things as redefining the public
2378	switch network. It never mentioned the extent of

2379 forbearance, or even what specific sections would be forborne 2380 from. It never mentioned a whole host of other things, and I think the problem is that, once the FCC teed up this plan in-2381 2382 -on February 5, and voted on February 26, virtually--a lot of 2383 the things in there, unfortunately, have not--there is no 2384 record sufficient to support them. Forbearance is the best 2385 example of that. There is no evidence in the record, 2386 certainly not on a geographic market basis, to support a 2387 finding sufficient grant forbearance on a lot of these 2388 things.

And that is part of the reason why the FCC completely recast its forbearance analysis, created this new analysis that junked a lot of the private--previous FCC precedence in order to find forbearance. And I think there are going to be substantial legal problems with this.

2394 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Thank you. Chairman Wheeler, earlier 2395 you said that if asked to regulate rates, that the Commission 2396 would make it clear that the Commission will not regulate 2397 retail rates on broadband. Would you agree that a 2398 prohibition on the Commission regulating broadband rates is 2399 consistent with your views?

2400 Mr. {Wheeler.} So I have said repeatedly that we are 2401 not trying to regulate rates, and that, again, if Congress 2402 wants to do something in that--Mr. {Kinzinger.} Sure. 2403 2404 Mr. {Wheeler.} --regard, that is Congress's authority. 2405 I would--2406 Mr. {Kinzinger.} So, wait, you are not interested in, 2407 but what about the next FCC Commissioner? Do you believe 2408 that under Title 2 that they have the authority to regulate 2409 rates? Now, you--I mean, and I respect that you don't want to, but you have created something that will now be passed 2410 down through generations of FCC Commissioners. 2411 2412 Mr. {Wheeler.} Well, as I said in my earlier response, I--if this comes before us while I am there, I hope that, 2413 2414 without pre-judging the issue, that we can build a record that will make it difficult for that to happen. 2415 2416 Mr. {Kinzinger.} But you could understand, then--2417 Mr. {Wheeler.} Congress clearly has the authority to 2418 do--Mr. {Kinzinger.} You could understand--2419 Mr. {Wheeler.} --like to--2420

2421 Mr. {Kinzinger.} You could understand our concern, you 2422 know, again, we respect when you say, I have no intention of 2423 doing it. That is great. But you can understand the concern 2424 of Congress, where you implement a rule, and then, in 2425 essence, say, I don't have any intention of regulating rates, 2426 but I am not going to prevent--I mean, I, you know, the next-2427 \_ 2428 Mr. {Wheeler.} So--2429 Mr. {Kinzinger.} --Commissioner could do it. 2430 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yeah. One of the things that we did was we patterned this after Section 332, and the regulation of 2431 mobile voice. And for 22 years this exact same authority has 2432 2433 rested at the Commission for mobile voice service, and never 2434 been used. 2435 Mr. {Kinzinger.} So if legislation that said, 2436 notwithstanding any provision of law, the Federal 2437 Communication Commission may not regulate the rates charged

2438 for broadband Internet access service, that would be

2439 consistent with that view?

2440 Mr. {Wheeler.} That is what we are trying to 2441 accomplish.

Mr. {Kinzinger.} Okay. Commissioner Pai, we have heard Chairman Wheeler assert that his decision to apply Title 2 to mobile broadband services will have no impact on investment because mobile voice service has been subject to Title 2, and we have seen substantial investment in mobile voice under that regime. Do you agree?

2448 Mr. {Pai.} I do not, Congressman, for a couple of 2449 different reasons. First, it is critical to remember that 2450 the reason rate regulation for mobile voice didn't occur was 2451 because the FCC, from the inception, determined that 2452 competition was sufficient in the voice marketplace so that 2453 there wasn't any need for rate regulation. Here, by 2454 contrast, the FCC explicitly finds that the broadband market 2455 is not competitive, so it explicitly opens the door to the 2456 kind of rate regulation that was not contemplated for mobile 2457 voice.

Secondly, with respect to mobile investment, one of the reasons why we have seen such huge investment since 2007 was because of the inception of the smartphone, and the huge increase in mobile data traffic that was generated as a result. Wireless carriers now, big and small, have to spend

to keep up in terms of infrastructure and spectrum to deliver some of that mobile data traffic. Mobile data traffic has never been classified as a Title 2 service. That is what is driven in mobile investment, not the Title 2 application to mobile voice.

2468 Mr. {Kinzinger.} Thank you, and thank you all again for 2469 your service, and I yield back.

2470 Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman. We now turn to the 2471 gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, for--

2472 Ms. {Matsui.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank 2473 you, Commissioners, for being here. Question for

2474 Commissioner Rosenworcel. One of the keys to innovation is 2475 spectrum, and more spectrum, and I believe we need a national 2476 spectrum plan, actually, a plan that considers both licensed 2477 and unlicensed spectrum. Now, you have done a lot in this 2478 space, I know, so can you share with us briefly some of your 2479 ideas to generate revenue from spectrum sharing, and the ways 2480 to incentivize Federal agencies to relocate?

2481 Ms. {Rosenworcel.} Thank you for this question, and you 2482 do, I know, along with Congressman Guthrie, have done a lot 2483 of work in this area. Let us see. The fuel for our wireless

2484 revolution is spectrum, and if we want to have a modern

2485 spectrum economy, we are going to need a more consistent

2486 spectrum pipeline. Today, as you probably know, when we need 2487 more airwaves for commercial mobile use, we knock on the door

2488 of Federal authorities--

2489 Ms. {Matsui.} Um-hum.

Ms. {Rosenworcel.} --and we beg, coax, and cajole, and over time they will give us some scraps. And then Congress will probably direct those Federal authorities to clear out of that spectrum, relocate, and then you will ask the FCC to auction off those airwaves. This process is slow, it is clunky, it is not reliable, and it is not the pipeline that a modern wireless economy needs.

2497 That is why I think it is really important that we 2498 develop a system of structured incentives for Federal 2499 spectrum authorities so that, when we try to secure more airwaves for commercial use, they see benefits in 2500 reallocation, and not just loss. And that could, obviously, 2501 2502 include anything from changes in their budgets to benefits 2503 through the appropriations process, to the ability to actually security what sequestration might have taken away. 2504

2505 But in any event, I think that this type of pipeline would 2506 actually make our spectrum markets much more effective, and 2507 work more fast. 2508 Ms. {Matsui.} Well, thank you very much for those 2509 comments. Chairman Wheeler, I have a question for you. 2510 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes, ma'am. 2511 Ms. {Matsui.} I remain very concerned about the 2512 Stingray surveillance devices that are used by a number of 2513 local law enforcement agencies, without which appear--there 2514 doesn't seem to be any Federal oversight, and the public 2515 should actually have more access to the information about the 2516 Stingray device, including what it is being used for, its 2517 surveillance capabilities, and who has access to the 2518 sensitive information that it collects. And despite some 2519 assurances to the contrary, it is unclear to me, and many others, how the Stingray device does not collect data on 2520 innocent Americans. 2521 2522 And so, Mr. Chairman, in August you announced the 2523 creation of a task force on the Stingray device and similar

2525 force, and why haven't we seen anything come out of it, and

technology. I would like to know the status of this task

2524

2526 what--a series of questions--and what you are doing to 2527 address the real concern about the lack of oversight over 2528 this device. 2529 Mr. {Wheeler.} Thank you, Congresswoman. The task force did look into the situation, and what we found was as 2530 2531 follows. That our jurisdiction, and our authority, is to 2532 certify the electronics and the RF components for such 2533 devices for interference questions, and that if the 2534 application was being made in conjunction with law 2535 enforcement, then we would approve it. This is for the technology. This is not for who buys it --2536 2537 Ms. {Matsui.} Right. 2538 Mr. {Wheeler.} --sort of thing, but in general, that we would approve it. And that, from that point on, its usage 2539 2540 was a matter of law enforcement, not a matter of the 2541 technological question of whether or not a piece of hardware interfered with other RF devices. 2542 2543 Ms. {Matsui.} So you are saying that it is out of your jurisdiction, and we have to go to other Federal agencies, 2544 2545 including law enforcement? Because I am concerned about the device being sold on the market, or over the Internet, to 2546

2547 non-law enforcement organizations, or the general public. So 2548 this is something we have to follow up with law enforcement, 2549 Federal law enforcement? Mr. {Wheeler.} We would--on the broad issue, it is 2550 follow up with--I think that we would have enforcement 2551 2552 jurisdiction on an--in an unauthorized use of an RF device 2553 if, in fact, it were being sold illegally. 2554 Ms. {Matsui.} Okay. Thank you. I just want to bring up 2555 another issue here. More consumers, particularly the 2556 Millennials, are opting for online subscriptions to buy the TV channels and programming content they want, and we are 2557 really clearly seeing the market react. HBO and Apple 2558 2559 streaming agreement, CBS is offering monthly online 2560 subscriptions, and on and on. I really think this is the future, and no doubt it is a 2561 2562 complex issue, however, cable video is going IP, and soon the 2563 consumer will be basically paying for bandwidth, and we 2564 should look for ways to empower the consumer to be able to 2565 pay for programming they want to watch. So I think this is 2566 something our Subcommittee should explore moving forward in a bipartisan manner, and I just put that out there, and I will 2567

2568 yield back the balance of my time.

2569 Mr. {Walden.} Gentlelady yields back the balance of

2570 time. Chair recognize the gentleman from Florida, Mr.

2571 Bilirakis, for questions.

2572 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I 2573 appreciate it. And I want to thank the Commission for their 2574 patience today, and also for their testimony.

2575 Mr. Chairman, Chairman Wheeler, there was an unfortunate 2576 accident in the Tampa Bay area, the area that I represent in 2577 Congress, last April involving Mr. Humphries. It seems that he had a powerful jammer in his SUV, powerful enough to jam 2578 2579 local law enforcement radios and calls to 911. He had been doing this for the last--for over 2 years. When a local cell 2580 2581 phone company reported interference, the field agents in the 2582 Tampa office quickly tracked him down, and ended the 2583 significant threat to the safety of the folks in the Tampa 2584 Bay area.

2585 It is my understanding you are planning to close this 2586 enforcement office in my area. As a former Chairman of the 2587 Homeland Security, Emergency Preparedness, Response, and 2588 Communications Subcommittee, I have a few questions. How

2589 many offices, if you are closing any, do you plan to close, 2590 sir? 2591 Mr. {Wheeler.} 16. 2592 Mr. {Bilirakis.} 16? Will the job slots saved from the 2593 Tampa Bay area be moved to the Washington, D.C. are, yes or 2594 no? 2595 Mr. {Wheeler.} No. 2596 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Okay. Are you closing the field 2597 offices and laying off staff to support the Enforcement 2598 Bureau's new work under the Net Neutrality order? 2599 Mr. {Wheeler.} No. We are doing it to increase 2600 productivity, that--what we are finding is it costs two to 2601 three times what a centralized operation would cost, that we 2602 have got too many people doing too few things in a specific 2603 area, not meaning there is not--there aren't issues there, 2604 but that we can get greater productivity if we follow the 2605 kind of model the FAA has been doing, where you have strike 2606 forces. And so we would leave in place, in Tampa, for 2607 instance, necessary equipment, and would bring people in out 2608 of the Miami office to deal with the kind of situations that you are talking about, and that that is a more cost efficient 2609

2610 way of accomplishing the kind of goals you are talking about. 2611 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Florida is a big state, sir. According to the budget request, page 50, the agency will 2612 2613 preserve the integrity of public safety communications 2614 infrastructure by taking action on 99 percent of complaints 2615 of interference to public safety communications within 1 day. 2616 Will you commit to ensuring that this metric is met--has been 2617 met historically according to the performance report the 2618 Commission has issued over the years? Will you commit that 2619 this metric will be met--2620 Mr. {Wheeler.} We believe that we can do this without a 2621 diminution in quality, sir. 2622 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Okay. Will you provide the Committee a guarterly report detailing the Enforcement Bureau's success 2623 2624 in meeting that metric, including a list of actions taken through the remainder of your Chairmanship, sir? 2625 Mr. {Wheeler.} Good idea. 2626 2627 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Okay. Very good. What do you want me 2628 to tell the deputies--I know you talked about it. If you can 2629 elaborate a little bit more, what would you like me to tell

2630 the deputies and other first responders in the Tampa Bay area

who may be in danger? This is a very important issue, as you know, public safety, by the delayed response inevitable, and losing an Enforcement Bureau field office, which, again, Florida is a big state, and I know other members probably have questions with regard to the offices that are being closed, 16 nationwide.

2637 Mr. {Wheeler.} So I think the reality that we face is 2638 that we have a flat or diminishing budget, we have unfunded 2639 mandates imposed by the Congress, and we have to say, how can 2640 we increase efficiency? Do I want to close these offices? I don't want to--to hear you--what you are saying, I don't want 2641 2642 other folks who are representing areas that are going to lose 2643 offices, and hear their complaints. But I have got a fixed 2644 amount of dollars to work with, and--

2645 Mr. {Bilirakis.} I will go on--

2646 Mr. {Wheeler.} --so the question becomes how do you 2647 become efficient? And that's what we're trying to do.

2648 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Thank you. Commissioner O'Rielly, how 2649 do we, the United States, have any credibility telling other 2650 countries, like China or Iran, not to control network 2651 management practices within their borders if we are taking

2652 large steps in that direction, with the recent overreaching 2653 broadband reclassification? 2654 Mr. {O'Rielly.} So I think there is an extreme trouble 2655 that we are setting our stage by passage of this item on Net Neutrality. I think it sends the wrong message 2656 2657 internationally. It was--that matches up with my 2658 conversations internationally, when I went to both Spain 2659 recently, and I was in South Korea for the ITU. They are 2660 interested in engaging on issues of the broadband. They 2661 would like to get as much involvement as they can. 2662 Those regimes you speak of obviously have greater 2663 government control on the practices of Internet in their 2664 nations. So it is a bifurcated messages that we were able to send before the passage of this item, that we shouldn't do it 2665 2666 here, and you shouldn't do it there. Now we are saying, 2667 well, we are willing to do some things on regulating 2668 broadband, but you shouldn't do them over there, or that it 2669 is okay, acceptable practice across the world, which I think 2670 is just a terrible message for them to send--2671 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Mr. Pai, what are your thoughts on this issue? 2672

2673 Mr. {Pai.} Congressman, thanks for the question. I 2674 agree with my colleague, Commissioner O'Rielly, and I would 2675 associate myself with the State Department's views 5 years 2676 ago, when the represented, ``We are concerned that in some countries Net Neutrality may be used as a justification for 2677 2678 blocking access for purposes of preventing unwelcome 2679 political, social, or cultural information from being 2680 disseminated to their citizens.'' And I think this is a 2681 bipartisan issue on which the U.S. has historically stood 2682 together, and I hope, notwithstanding the February 26 order, 2683 that would continue into the future. 2684 Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman's time--2685 Mr. {Wheeler.} Congressman--2686 Mr. {Bilirakis.} Thank you. 2687 Mr. {Wheeler.} Mr. Chairman, could I just say, for the sake of the record, could we submit for the record--2688 2689 Mr. {Walden.} Sure. 2690 Mr. {Wheeler.} --the full quote that was just excerpted 2691 by Commissioner Pai? 2692 Mr. {Walden.} Absolutely. 2693 Mr. {Wheeler.} Great. Thank you. Because it is really

2694 taken out of context.

2695 Mr. {Pai.} It is not.

2696 Mr. {Walden.} Yeah. We now recognize the gentleman

2697 from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 minutes.

2698 Mr. {Johnson.} From the great state of Ohio--

2699 Mr. {Walden.} Stop it.

2700 Mr. {Johnson.} Chairman Wheeler, I want to tell you how 2701 honored I am that you have chosen to join with our Chairman 2702 in paying tribute to--

2703 Mr. {Wheeler.} You--

2704 Mr. {Johnson.} --Ohio State today.

2705 Mr. {Wheeler.} You picked up on this, sir, the--

2706 Mr. {Walden.} Is this button the one I use to mute? 2707 Mr. {Johnson.} Okay. Commissioner Rosenworcel, I--in 2708 your opening testimony, I want to associate myself with 2709 something you said. You said we rarely go anywhere these 2710 days without our mobile devices on us. I couldn't agree with 2711 you more. I was in information technology for over 30 years, 2712 long before there was any such thing as the Internet as we 2713 know it today, and I submit that the reason we have these things is because we have had an unregulated, by the Federal 2714

2715 Government, Internet and information services that have 2716 allowed the innovators to blossom. So I agree with you. 2717 Chairman Wheeler, we have requested--this Committee has 2718 requested a number of documents that have been denied under 2719 the claim of deliberative process privilege. For the 2720 deliberative process privilege to apply, an agency must show 2721 that a communication was a ``direct part of the deliberative 2722 process, and that it makes recommendations or expresses 2723 opinion on legal or policy matters''. And in proceedings 2724 like the Open Internet proceeding, ex parte filings are 2725 required to disclose communications between the FCC and the 2726 executive branch, or its staff, if those discussions are, I 2727 quote, ``are of substantial significance and clearly intended 2728 to affect the ultimate decision''.

Now, I am trying to figure out how these two different concepts apply here. In withholding certain communications between the White House and the FCC, you have asserted the deliberative process privilege. If those communications were relevant to the Commission's deliberation, several questions emerge. Weren't they subject to the Commission's ex parte rules? Are the concerned--or are the contents of those

2736 meetings memorialized in any docket at the Commission? How 2737 could these conversations with the White House have been both 2738 a direct part of the deliberative process, but not have been 2739 of substantial significance in that proceeding? Those are 2740 questions that are rolling around in my mind. Now I will get 2741 to a question for you.

2742 I know that you have indicated in your written testimony 2743 that you received no secret instructions from the White 2744 House. But, of course, secret instructions, that is not the 2745 standard for determining when ex partes are available. In 2746 the 10 meetings that you had with the White House--here is my 2747 question. In the 10 meetings that you had with the White 2748 House in advance of the FCC's action on the Open Internet, is 2749 it your opinion that only--that that was the only meeting 2750 that addressed the merits of the Commission's Open Internet proceeding occurred last November? 2751 2752 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes, sir, and--

2753 Mr. {Johnson.} That--did you say yes?

2754 Mr. {Wheeler.} Yes, and the 10 meetings, just to be 2755 clear, were not meetings that were necessarily on Open 2756 Internet. We had trade issues, we had national security

2757 issues, we had cyber issues, we had auction issues --2758 Mr. {Johnson.} But in the 10 meetings that came in advance of the FCC's action on the Open Internet, you are 2759 2760 saying that there was no information or discussions of substantial significance and clearly intended to affect the 2761 ultimate decision, which would require the disclosure of that 2762 2763 information? Mr. {Wheeler.} There are--2764 2765 Mr. {Johnson.} Is it your opinion that--2766 Mr. {Wheeler.} There are two parts here. One, you 2767 have--2768 Mr. {Johnson.} No, that is a yes or a no answer--2769 Mr. {Wheeler.} No, you have--you correctly identified 2770 what the test--2771 Mr. {Johnson.} So is it yes or no? Mr. {Wheeler.} -- and I did not get instructions in 2772 2773 those meetings. 2774 Mr. {Johnson.} No, I am not talking about that. I said 2775 do they qualify under ex parte, or do they--how do they 2776 qualify for both--I am asking you a question--2777 Mr. {Wheeler.} And there is an exemption--

2778 Mr. {Johnson.} Mr. Wheeler, I am--my time. 2779 Mr. {Wheeler.} And--2780 Mr. {Johnson.} How do they qualify under both? If they 2781 are discussion with the White House, my goodness, that is the 2782 highest office in our land. I find that the American 2783 taxpayer doesn't see that as significant and substantial. 2784 How can they not be significant and substantial, clearly 2785 intended to affect the ultimate decision, and yet you deny 2786 them under a deliberative process claim? 2787 Mr. {Wheeler.} Well, there is multiple parts to that. You asked how. One is there were not instructions given to 2788 2789 me. I have been on the record on that, and been clear. 2790 Second is that --2791 Mr. {Johnson.} That is not the determination. 2792 Mr. {Wheeler.} I am about to--the determination also is 2793 that, specifically, interactions with Congress and the White House are excluded from ex parte, and have been since 1991. 2794 2795 And--but I am going beyond that, and saying that is a non ex 2796 parted conversation, if there was a conversation that was 2797 taking place in that kind of a construct, and two, that--I 2798 will even go--

2799 Mr. {Johnson.} Under what basis? 2800 Mr. {Wheeler.} --I got no instructions--2801 Mr. {Johnson.} Under what basis? I mean, you can't just make that up. The law says what is required to be 2802 2803 revealed and what is not to be revealed, and a deliberative 2804 process privilege applies when you can show a direct part of 2805 the deliberative process, and that it makes recommendations, 2806 or expresses opinion in legal or policy matters, rather than 2807 substantial significance and clearly intended to affect the 2808 ultimate decision. 2809 Mr. {Wheeler.} I am quoting the--Mr. {Johnson.} Well, I am disagreeing with you, Mr. 2810 2811 Chairman, and I think it is irresponsible that you are 2812 withholding information that rightfully should be open--2813 openly disclosed to this Committee, and to the American 2814 people. And, Mr. Chairman, I have--2815 Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman's time--2816 Mr. {Johnson.} --exhausted my time. 2817 Mr. {Walden.} Chair now recognize the gentleman from 2818 New York, Mr. Collins, for--2819 Mr. {Collins.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get

2820	to my questions for Commissioners O'Rielly and Pai, one
2821	follow up to Mr. Johnson's question, Chairman Wheeler. There
2822	were 10 meetings, and we do understand there was, on the ex
2823	parte side, disclosure on one of those 10 meetings. It is my
2824	understanding that on the other nine meetings there was
2825	nothing of significance discussed relative to the FCC, where,
2826	under the rules of ex parte, that you should have, or would
2827	be required to otherwise disclose those. Is it true there
2828	was nothing disclosed on nine of the 10 meetings?
2829	Mr. {Wheeler.} No, there isthe test is
2830	Mr. {Collins.} No, I am not asking you for the test.
2831	Mr. {Wheeler.} No, there is a
2832	Mr. {Collins.} Was there anything disclosed?
2833	Mr. {Wheeler.} There is
2834	Mr. {Collins.} Sir, I am asking the questions.
2835	Mr. {Wheeler.} Okay.
2836	Mr. {Collins.} Was there anything disclosed on the
2837	other nine meetings? That is a yes or a no.
2838	Mr. {Wheeler.} I had no
2839	Mr. {Collins.} That is a yes or no.
2840	Mr. {Wheeler.}instructions. No. I had no

2841 instructions.

2842 Mr. {Collins.} Well, I guess I would just--am befuddled 2843 that in nine of the 10 meetings in the White House there was 2844 nothing of any consequence discussed relative to the FCC that 2845 would require disclosure. I will take you at your word, and 2846 just say I am befuddled by that.

2847 Now, one thing that we were clear about today is the 2848 importance of certainty. And Mr. Wheeler, more than--

2849 Chairman Wheeler, more than anyone, stressed the importance

2850 to the providers in the Internet space of certainty,

2851 certainty, certainty, and I can't agree more, with my life in 2852 the private sector. Certainty drives investment and returns, 2853 and with certainty you invest in innovation. And I would say 2854 it is pretty obvious today, the way things have worked has 2855 been pretty good, the light touch.

We have the number one service in the world. The investments have been billions, and, as Chairman--or as Commissioner Pai said, maybe trillions of dollars. We lead the world today. Now, here is my concern. We have also heard unanimous agreement by the Commissioners litigation is coming, and likely to take 3 years. It is guaranteed.

2862 Chairman Wheeler said guaranteed there is litigation coming 2863 for 3 years. Well, if that is not the definition of 2864 uncertainty, I don't know what is. 2865 The--for the next 3 years the folks looking to invest 2866 and innovate in this world have to live under the ultimate

and innovate in this world have to live under the ultimate uncertainty of which court is going to rule how, and when does it move, and what do you do? So, to me, there is a real issue here, a very genuine issue of inconsistency with the Chairman stressing importance of certainty, and then saying, and one thing is certain, we are going to court, which

2872 guarantees uncertainty.

So I guess, Commissioner Pai, I would like to say again, 2873 2874 to me, lack of certainty is a wet blanket on investment. 2875 Lack of certainty is a wet blanket on innovation. And my worry is, with less innovation, and less investment, we will 2876 2877 someday wake up and not be the leaders in the world relative 2878 to what we think and know is probably one of the most 2879 important aspects of where we are headed. Could you briefly 2880 comment on that, and perhaps take a minute, and then I would 2881 like Mr. O'Rielly to fill in the remaining time.

2882 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congressman. I

2883 couldn't agree with you more that uncertainty is the bane not 2884 only of the private sector, but ultimately--who won't get the 2885 benefit of some of that private sector risk. I will give you 2886 just two instances of uncertainty that this order generates. 2887 First, with respect to the so-called Internet conduct 2888 standard, which lays out seven vaguely worded non-exhaustive 2889 factors under which the FCC is going to determine what is 2890 allowed and what isn't allowed. And the FCC, after the vote, 2891 conceded ``we don't know where things go next''. The FCC 2892 will sit there as a referee and be able to throw the flag. The Electronic Frontier Foundation targeted this particular 2893 2894 rule and said the problem with a rule this vague is that 2895 neither ISPs, nor Internet users, can know in advance what 2896 kind of practices will afoul of the rule.

2897 Second example, the Enforcement Bureau advisory opinion 2898 process. Nobody knows exactly how it is going to work. 2899 Commissioners aren't going to have the ability to have input 2900 into that. And when you pair the Enforcement Bureau advisory 2901 opinion process with this Internet conduct standard, 2902 essentially the entrepreneurial spirit of American is going 2903 to be funneled through this regulatory bottleneck, and nobody

is going to know in advance until they get permission from

2904

2905 Washington what is allowed and what isn't. 2906 Mr. {Collins.} I couldn't agree more that the only 2907 thing certain is uncertainty for the next 3 years. 2908 Commissioner O'Rielly? 2909 Mr. {O'Rielly.} I couldn't agree with my colleague any 2910 more. I think he has hit it right on the head. I would say 2911 I was in St. Louis not but a couple weeks--month ago and 2912 talked to wireless ISPs, and talked about what could happen 2913 under this item, and what it would mean for their business. 2914 And there is--these are the guys that are the small guys. We 2915 talk about 800 other providers, well, these are 800 wireless 2916 ISPs trying to serve in the most rural parts of America, and 2917 they are stringing together networks under unlicensed bands, 2918 and they are asking for more spectrum, and they are like, 2919 what does this mean for me? And I am like, it means more paperwork, it means more compliance, it means you don't know 2920 2921 what you can do for your business for a number of years. And 2922 they were just frustrated--belief.

2923 Mr. {Collins.} Well, I share your concerns, and I think 2924 America will too, and we will have to see where that heads.

2925 Mr. Chairman, my time is up, and I yield back.

2926 Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman from New York, and 2927 our witnesses. And I have heard some of the same things from 2928 small Internet providers in my district. They are feeling 2929 like they are going to be overwhelmed by this, and so I am 2930 meeting with some of them as well.

2931 I know Mr. Scalise is on his way here, the Whip of the 2932 House, so we will try to accommodate his guestioning. He--2933 Ms. {Eshoo.} Mr. Chairman, I am going to have to leave. 2934 I have to catch a flight, and I don't know if that has an 2935 effect on--if I leave, can you keep the hearing open? 2936 Mr. {Walden.} We can seek counsel on that. But, 2937 obviously, we should try to accommodate the third Ranking 2938 Member of the--

2939 Ms. {Eshoo.} No, I know, but I--

2940 Mr. {Walden.} --of our Committee, who is on his way. 2941 Ms. {Eshoo.} We started at 11 o'clock, so, I mean, he 2942 could--

2943 Mr. {Walden.} I--

2944 Ms. {Eshoo.} He has had some time to get here.

2945 Mr. {Walden.} I--

2946 Ms. {Eshoo.} I mean, I am--

2947 Mr. {Walden.} I understand.

2948 Ms. {Eshoo.} I am a patient person, but I am--I don't 2949 want to miss my flight, so--

2950 Mr. {Walden.} What time is your flight?

2951 Ms. {Eshoo.} I have to go out to Dulles.

2952 Mr. {Walden.} So while we--

2953 Ms. {Eshoo.} It doesn't leave from the Rayburn

2954 horseshoe, unfortunately.

2955 Mr. {Walden.} So while he comes in the door here--we are now going to let him get settled, but, as he is--first of 2956 2957 all, if I could ask all of the witnesses to--there will be 2958 some follow-up questions. Some of them you have all taken 2959 down. Because of the nature of our work, we would like to 2960 have prompt responses to the questions. I know you have 2961 probably had questions from other Committees as well, I get 2962 that, but the extent to which you can respond promptly, that 2963 would be helpful. Thank you, Anna. And we would like your 2964 feedback on the draft legislation that we put out there. All 2965 of your feedback would be most helpful. It is not a rush job. We are trying to get this right, and we think it is 2966

2967 very important.

2968 So, with that, I would now recognize the gentleman from

2969 Louisiana, the Whip of the United States House of

2970 Representatives, allowing him to catch his breath fully, Mr.

2971 Scalise.

2972 Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I tested my 2973 40 speed getting here, but I appreciate the Commissioners 2974 being here, coming to testify about their Commission, also 2975 about this Net Neutrality proposal that I know I have strong 2976 concerns about, and a lot of my other colleagues have 2977 expressed real strong concerns about as well.

2978 You know, I guess when you get back to the basic 2979 question of what has worked so well with the Internet, and 2980 the technology community as a whole, you know, somebody who 2981 graduated in computer science, who has worked in the 2982 technology industry, I have always felt that the reason that 2983 the industry has been so successful is because the Federal government hadn't figured out a way to regulate it, to slow 2984 2985 it down. And then yet here you come with an answer to a 2986 problem that doesn't exist, a heavy handed role of government, and the FCC's traditional role has not been to 2987

2988 have a heavy hand.

2989 And this, when you look at the proposal that has come 2990 out, my goodness, I mean, over 300 pages of regulations. And 2991 this is just the first round, before the proposal is even 2992 been put into effect. I guess, you know, anybody is looking 2993 for a free and Open Internet, I am sure they looked to the 2994 over 300 pages of regulations from the Federal Government to 2995 start that process. It is not broken. Why is the Federal 2996 Government here to fix something that has been working 2997 incredibly well? Especially when you look at the role of 2998 Federal regulations over the years, and just what they have 2999 done to harm our economy.

3000 I do want to ask you, Commissioner Pai, because you made 3001 some comments earlier about the potential taxes and fees that 3002 can come with this Title 2 classification, and when you look at Section 202 of the law, it clearly gives that ability to 3003 get involved--for the FCC to get involved in regulating costs 3004 3005 for the Internet. And so if you could share with me just 3006 what kind of impact this can have on both fees being 3007 implemented, higher prices that consumers will ultimately pay 3008 from this new classification?

3009 Mr. {Pai.} Thank you for the question, Congressman. I 3010 think a multitude of fees and taxes are going to be levied on 3011 broadband in a way that is ultimately going to--down to the 3012 consumer's detriment. Just to give you one example, now that 3013 broadband has been reclassified as a telecommunication 3014 service, it--that order explicitly opens the door to billions 3015 of taxes and fees being assessed through the Universal 3016 Service Fund. So now, in addition to that line item you see 3017 on your phone bill which only applies to your voice, the 3018 Universal Service Fee, you are going to be paying a fee on 3019 broadband, and that will happen, I would imagine, in the next several weeks or months. 3020

3021 Secondly, and critically, there are all sorts of other fees that are going to be assessed. For example, currently a 3022 3023 lot of broadband providers that had not been classified as 3024 telecom providers paid a lower rate for the equipment that 3025 they attached to the utility poles, known as pole 3026 attachments. They paid a rate under Section 224(d). Now, 3027 because they are all telecom providers, they will have to pay 3028 a much higher rate at Section 224(e), and smaller providers 3029 in particular will have to pay \$150 to \$200 million a year

just for those higher pole attachment rates. Then you add on top of that the higher state and local property taxes that a lot of these companies will have to pay, because they are now telecom providers. All of these costs have to come out of somewhere, and it is going to be the consumer's wallet, and that is one of the reasons why I am concerned.

3036 Mr. {Scalise.} Yeah, and we have seen this time and 3037 time again, that these kind of regulations, and ultimately 3038 these new fees and taxes that would be paid are ultimately 3039 going to be paid by consumers, by people that have been 3040 enjoying the benefits of the investments that have been made 3041 by private companies. This isn't the Federal Government 3042 investing. This is private investment, to the tune of 3043 billions of dollars.

I will read you this quote, and maybe I will let you answer it. ``There is nothing worse for investment, innovation, job creation, all things that flow from investment, than businesses not knowing what the rules are.'' You want to comment on that?

3049 Mr. {Pai.} I think that is, as I have pointed out many 3050 times, the bane of not just the private sector, but the

3051 consumer, to not know what is going to be allowed and what 3052 isn't. And it is in--exactly in that environment where the 3053 private sector is the least likely to take the risk, to raise 3054 the capital, to build the infrastructure that is going to 3055 connect Americans with digital opportunities.

And I believe, as you pointed out eloquently in your statement, that part of the reason why we enjoy the best Internet experience in the world is because we have had this historic bipartisan commitment, dating back to the Clinton Administration, that the Internet would be free from state and Federal regulation.

Mr. {Scalise.} That quote, by the way, was Chairman 3062 3063 Wheeler at his confirmation hearing. I do want to ask you, 3064 Commissioner O'Rielly, because you commented on this order 3065 that it will negatively impact edge providers. Of course, 3066 many of the edge providers have been proponents of these Net Neutrality regulations, but you have raised some concerns 3067 3068 about how even they would be negatively impacted, people that 3069 even asked for this. So if you could comment on that? 3070 Mr. {O'Rielly.} Yes. A number of people have highlighted on this fact, is that the lines between an edge 3071

3072 provider and a telecommunications provider under our new 3073 definition are blurring over time. And so you may be--today 3074 you may be an edge provider, tomorrow you may be something 3075 else. You may have multiple parts to your business, and that 3076 is going to, you know, that is problematic as you try to 3077 figure out how best to comply with our rules.

3078 More importantly, I believe that the Commission is going 3079 to continue to push its regulations up the chain. And so 3080 today is about telecommunications providers, and we talked 3081 about that under our new definition. And then we are going to, you know, we now are having a debate in terms of -- we are 3082 3083 going to have some kind of structure to deal with 3084 interconnection, or the middle mile, what used to be known as 3085 peering. In my conversation, we are bleeding right into the backbone of the Internet, and I think that only leads us to 3086 3087 edge providers over time.

3088 Mr. {Scalise.} I see I am out of time, but I appreciate 3089 your answers, and hopefully this does go forward. But, with 3090 that, I yield back the balance of my time.

3091 Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back, and now that I 3092 know the rules only require two members of either party to be

- 3093 here, we could go five or six more rounds.
- 3094 Mr. {Scalise.} Let us go. I am sure they would love to
- 3095 stay around longer, and--
- 3096 Mr. {O'Rielly.} Could we order in?
- 3097 Mr. {Walden.} I want to thank our witnesses. I know
- 3098 you have a tough job, and we may disagree, but we are all
- 3099 trying to do the right thing for the country, so thanks for
- 3100 testifying. Again, if you can promptly respond to our
- 3101 questions, that would be appreciated, and we look forward to
- 3102 your return visit in the not too distant future, we hope.
- 3103 So, with that, the Committee stands adjourned.
- 3104 [Whereupon, at 2:15 p.m., the Subcommittee was
- 3105 adjourned.]