- 1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
- 2 RPTS BROWN
- 3 HIF203.160
- 4 PROMOTING BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT
- 5 WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 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 12:30 p.m.,
11 in Room 2322 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg
12 Walden [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.
13 Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta,
14 Shimkus, Scalise, Lance, Guthrie, Olson, Bilirakis, Johnson,
15 Long, Collins, Cramer, Eshoo, Doyle, Loebsack, Matsui,
16 McNerney, Lujan, and Pallone (ex officio).

Staff present: Ray Baum, Senior Policy Advisor for 17 18 Communications and Technology; Leighton Brown, Press 19 Assistant; Andy Duberstein, Deputy Press Secretary; Gene 20 Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; Kelsey Guyselman, Counsel, 21 Telecom; Grace Koh, Counsel, Telecom; David Redl, Counsel, 22 Telecom; Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Clerk; Christine 23 Brennan, Democratic Press Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Democratic 24 Staff Director; David Goldman, Democratic Chief Counsel, 25 Communications and Technology; Lori Maarbjerg, Democratic FCC 26 Detailee; Margaret McCarthy, Democratic Senior Professional Staff Member; and Tim Robinson, Democratic Chief Counsel. 27

28 Mr. {Walden.} If we could go ahead and get started, I 29 am going to call to order the Subcommittee on Communications 30 and Technology with apologies up front that with the 31 classified briefing that got scheduled at the end of last 32 week for later today on the Iranian agreement. That got 33 scheduled about the same time this hearing was originally 34 scheduled to start. So we moved it up to now so that we 35 could hear from this distinguished panel of witnesses.

And I have asked my colleagues, and I think this is on both sides, because we also now have votes scheduled prior to all of that, we are going to dispense with our opening statements, which is anybody who watches Congressional hearings knows is unprecedented in the historical annals of Congress, but they will all be in the official record.

42 So unless there is objection from either side of the 43 aisle, I would like to just proceed straight to our panel of 44 witnesses for their expert testimony.

This is an important hearing on promoting broadband infrastructure investment. You all are on the front lines of that, and we look to you for guidance, suggestions as we

48 forward.

49 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]

51	Mr. {Walden.} So we will start right out with Jonathan
52	Adelstein, President and CEO, PCIA, former distinguished
53	Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.
54	Mr. Adelstein, we are delighted to have you here.
55	Please go ahead with your testimony.

Ι

56	^STATEMENTS OF JONATHAN ADELSTEIN, PRESIDENT AND CEO, PCIA;
57	STEPHEN THE HONORABLE STEPHEN ROE LEWIS, GOVERNOR, GILA RIVER
58	INDIAN COMMUNITY, ARIZONA; CRAIG MOFFETT, SENIOR RESEARCH
59	ANALYST, MOFFETT NATHANSON; MICHAEL SLINGER, DIRECTOR, GOOGLE
60	FIBER CITIES; AND DEB SOCIA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NEXT CENTURY
61	CITIES

62 ^STATEMENT OF JONATHAN ADELSTEIN

63 } Mr. {Adelstein.} The committee has shown leadership on
64 this issue over many years. We appreciate the opportunity to
65 testify at such a critical hearing today.

As you said, I run PCIA. We represent the companies 66 that build, design, own and manage telecommunications 67 68 facilities around the world and in the United States. The 69 members include wireless carriers, infrastructure providers, 70 equipment manufacturers, and professional services firms. 71 Our mission is to expand wireless broadband to everywhere, 72 helping our members provide wireless facilities to meet 73 consumers' growing mobile data needs any time, any place.

74 The wireless infrastructure industry, as you know, plays an essential role in meeting that data demand that people are 75 76 asking for so much of. Put simply, infrastructure makes 77 wireless work. It enables the delivery of innovative 78 applications and life-changing services like telemedicine and 79 distance learning. Wireless infrastructure is a catalyst for 80 economic growth and job creation. A PCIA study found that 81 investments in our industry will generate \$1.2 trillion--that 82 is trillion with a T--in economic growth and create 1.3 83 million new jobs over 5 years.

84 And this committee, as I said, has shown grown 85 leadership, Mr. Chairman. You have done so much to try to eliminate barriers to infrastructure deployment. I commend 86 87 you, and our industry is thrilled with the leadership of this 88 committee. Most notably, section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act 89 of 2012 has had a real impact on the ground in speeding the 90 deployment of 4G infrastructure. It eliminated major local 91 regulatory barriers to upgrading existing wireless 92 infrastructure, and the FCC, I might add, has done an 93 outstanding job on a bipartisan basis of implementing that 94 law with a clear framework of rules.

95 Now, we will face major challenges. Cisco projects that 96 demand for wireless data is going to increase by about 700 97 percent over the next 5 years, and the question is how we are 98 going to meet that exploding demand for data.

99 Now, one way is more spectrum, as much as we can get as 100 fast as we can get it. And again, this committee has done 101 great work on that front. Spectrum, as you know, is 102 expensive, scarce, and takes a long time to get into actual 103 use by consumer, all the more reason to move quickly.

Another way to increase data throughput is technological advances that foster greater spectral efficiencies like moving from 2G to 4G and beyond, and the networks themselves are getting smarter, directing capacity where it is needed. These advances also take time to develop and to implement.

109 A third way to meet the exploding demand for data is 110 through the rapid deployment of infrastructure. Wireless 111 infrastructure driven by private capital addresses the 112 wireless data crunch as soon as it is deployed. Solutions 113 range from traditional tall towers that provide wide coverage 114 and capacity to small cells and distributed antenna systems 115 that fill gaps in capacity and target high-traffic areas,

116 intensifications of networks reused as existing scarce 117 spectrum. Deploying more antennas closer to end users allows 118 carriers to squeeze more out of existing spectrum. 119 Now, there is still resistance to siting this equipment where it is necessary, and Congress can help even more to 120 remove these barriers. One way is by streamlining the 121 122 process of siting wireless infrastructure on federal lands. 123 Despite the law enacted by Congress with the leadership of 124 this committee and an Executive Order by the President, 125 significant challenges remain on federal property. Further legislation is needed to facilitate access to federal lands 126 127 to expand broadband coverage and increased deployment in 128 rural areas. PCIA supports S. 1618, which was recently introduced in 129 130 the Senate to address this issue, and we look forward to 131 continuing to work with this committee on developing 132 legislation as well. Additional roadblocks remain despite 133 the assistance this committee has provided. For example, 134 some State and local entities require proof of need before

136 both illogical and costly. Local communities shouldn't be in

authorizing infrastructure bills. These requirements are

135

137 the CTO business of deciding where services are needed. Our members invest their capital where it is needed to serve 138 139 consumers and local governments aren't in a good position to be second-guessing these kind of technical questions. 140 141 Continued efforts to harmonize the rates for pole attachments 142 would also help promote broadband investment. 143 The FCC has taken important steps to provide greater 144 access, timing, and fair rates. States that regulate their 145 own poles should follow the FCC's lead. 146 In sum, wireless infrastructure boosts every sector of 147 the economy. Mobile broadband is demonstrating its 148 effectiveness in promoting economic growth, job creation, and 149 global competitiveness yet challenges remain in reaching its 150 full potential. Policymakers from Congress to local 151 governments need to eliminate regulatory barriers so our 152 industry can invest their capital without resistance and not 153 add costs and delays that will slow the rollout of wireless 154 broadband. 155 Our member companies are very grateful for the

156 bipartisan recognition of the centrality of wireless 157 infrastructure by this committee, by Congress, by the

158 Administration, and by the FCC.

I would add that we look forward to making continued progress together on some of the ideas we have laid out here today and other panels will share, and we thank you, and thank you, Ranking Member Eshoo, for joining us, and thank you for holding this hearing to address these urgent issues. [The prepared statement of Mr. Adelstein follows:]

Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Adelstein. We appreciate your testimony and look forward to further discussions on these matters.

We will now go to the Honorable Stephen Roe Lewis, Governor, Gila River Indian Community in Arizona. Governor, we are delighted to have you here. I enjoyed the time I was in your community and toured your facilities, and we are glad you could be here to share your thoughts on the challenges you face.

175 ^STATEMENT OF STEPHEN ROE LEWIS

176 Mr. {Lewis.} Thank you, Chairman Walden and members of } the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on 177 178 behalf of the Gila River Indian Community. I also want to 179 again thank Chairman Walden and Mr. Lujan for visiting the 180 community, as you just heard, to see firsthand the obstacles 181 that tribes face in deploying broadband. And I want to thank 182 Ranking Member Eshoo and Mr. Lujan for their request to have the Government Accounting Office, the GAO, look into the 183 184 challenges and barriers to deployment on tribal lands. 185 Our broadband provider is Gila River Telecommunications Incorporated, which we refer to as GRTI. It was founded in 186 187 1988 and is wholly owned by our community. Our reservation

188 is approximately 372,000 acres. We have more than 20,000 189 members and almost 12,000 community members living on our 190 reservation. When we first purchased the exchange from 191 Mountain Bell in 1988, only 10 percent of our residents had 192 access to basic phone service. More, those looking to get 193 connected had to pay tens of thousands of dollars before

194 Mountain Bell would install a party line connection.

195 Today, GRTI offers phone service to 100 percent of our 196 residents, and 84 percent of the residents subscribe. We 197 also offer broadband service across the reservation. We are 198 very proud of GRTI's success.

199 GRTI along with the National Tribal Telecommunications 200 Association work together to raise awareness about the unique 201 challenges for deploying broadband on tribal lands. Tribal 202 lands are the least served areas in the country.

Approximately 48 percent of tribal lands in the lower 48 204 States lack access to speeds of 10 down, one up, and 68 205 percent lack access to 25 down, 3 up.

There are a number of obstacles that present challenges to broadband deployment on tribal lands, and I have set those out with more detail in my written testimony, but I would like to summarize them for you here.

First, population density is an obstacle. The GilaRiver, for example, is at 20 persons per square mile.

212 Maricopa County, which is adjacent to the reservation, has

213 approximately 414 persons per square mile. Rugged terrain,

214 $\,$ characterized by mountains and hard soil, is also typical of

215 tribal lands. Low median income and high rates of poverty on 216 most reservations present a severe challenge for the delivery 217 of broadband. The median income on our reservation is 218 \$24,000 to \$59,000 in Arizona. Approximately 48 percent of 219 the persons living on the reservation live below the poverty 220 level compared to 15 percent for Arizona. These economic 221 circumstances are not unique to our tribal community.

Failed federal policies from the past continue to negatively impact many tribes. Our community and others like it continue to struggle with the failed policy of allotment. Because of the allotment policy, obtaining rights-of-way in order to deploy broadband is complex and raises costs substantially and delays deployment.

228 Finally, access to capital is a barrier. Tribal lands 229 cannot be leveraged as collateral for securing loans because 230 they are held in trust by the United States for the benefit 231 of the tribe. Thus, private capital is often not available, 232 meaning the only lender available is the Federal Government, 233 specifically, the Rural Utilities Service. RUS loans were 234 critical to GRTI when it took over its service area and 235 remains critical as a Warms Springs tribe in Oregon can

236 attest.

237 The combination of these challenges has resulted in 238 GRTI's average cost per loop being over \$2,873. Because 239 tribal nations face many unique challenges, we often need unique solutions. Having tribes at the table and engaging in 240 241 government-to-government consultation is critical. Too 242 often, federal policies have unintended consequences on tribes because we weren't properly consulted in the 243 244 beginning.

The current effort to reform the Universal Service Fund is a good example. USF is, when properly scoped, a critically important source of funding that can help make it possible to deploy broadband to our reservations.

249 Tribes have offered a proposal that will target specific 250 support to tribal lands through a Tribal Broadband Factor 251 that could be added to proposals for a standalone broadband fund. Inclusion of this Tribal Broadband Factor would 252 253 promote the targeted use of Universal Service Funding to 254 advance the policy objective of ensuring that broadband is made available to all Americans including those living on 255 256 tribal lands.

257 The FCC's Office of Native American Affairs and Policy has been a welcome addition to the Commission's outreach 258 259 efforts to ensure that tribes are included in the development of proposals to deploy more broadband but sometimes the FCC 260 forgets about tribes. That is why we appreciate the letter 261 262 sent to the FCC from a broadband group of members of this 263 committee, reminding the commission that tribal leaders need 264 a seat at the table.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today and hope to be an ongoing resource for the committee. Thank you. [The prepared statement of Mr. Lewis follows:]

269 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Governor. You can count on 270 that. We appreciate your testimony and your insights. They 271 are very valuable. 272 We will go now to Craig Moffett, Senior Research 273 Analyst, Moffett Nathanson. Mr. Moffett, we are delighted to 274 have you here as well. Please go ahead.

275 ^STATEMENT OF CRAIG MOFFETT

276 Mr. {Moffett.} Thank you, members of the subcommittee, } for your kind invitation to participate in today's hearing. 277 278 By way of introduction, I have been a financial analyst 279 focusing on the cable and telecommunications industries for 280 the past 14 years. Before that, I spent 11 years at the 281 Boston Consulting Group advising telecommunications 282 companies, so this is now my 25th year in the sector, and I have spent much of that career focused on issues of broadband 283 284 deployment and microeconomics. 285 With that in mind, I thought I would share some general 286 observations today about the economics of broadband, particularly focusing on the economics of competitive 287 288 broadband. 289 First, I would start by saying the obvious. 290 Infrastructure deployment requires the expectation of a 291 healthy return on capital. That should be taken as a given but all too often in my experience, the issue of return on 292 capital is either ignored or misunderstood in policy forums. 293

294 It is not a matter of whether a business is or isn't 295 profitable; it is instead a matter of whether a business is 296 sufficiently profitable to warrant the high levels of capital 297 investment required for the deployment of infrastructure. With that in mind, in 2014, the largest companies in the 298 299 cable industry earned a very healthy return. The physical 300 assets of Comcast, Time Warner Cable, Charter, and 301 Cablevision, the four publicly traded U.S. cable operators 302 during 2014, all earned healthy returns in excess of their 303 cost of capital with returns ranging from 13 to 33 percent. Those returns are unusually high for a capital-intensive 304 305 industry. On the other hand, it should be noted that the 306 cable industry earned returns below the cost of capital for 307 decades. Any long-term return on network infrastructure has 308 to earn returns well in excess of the cost of capital during 309 the maturity of that network to offset what were typically 310 years or even decades of losses.

311 By contrast, large incumbent telephone companies do not 312 earn attractive returns on their wireline businesses. For 313 example, a decade after first undertaking their FiOS fiber to 314 the home buildout to 18 million homes, Verizon has not yet

315 come close to earning a return in excess of their cost of capital. In 2014, their aggregate wired infrastructure 316 317 business earned a paltry 1.2 percent return against a cost of capital of 5 percent. For the nonfinancial types in the 318 room, that is the equivalent of borrowing money at 5 percent 319 320 interest in order to earn 1 percent interest. That is a good 321 way to go bankrupt. No one would undertake to replicate 322 those disastrous financial returns.

323 AT&T, which at around the same time began deploying a much less robust and therefore less costly fiber to the node 324 network has also earned poor returns. Their ROIC, or return 325 326 on invested capital, has been declining for a decade and is 327 like Verizon well below the cost of capital. AT&T is 328 committed to the FCC to make fiber available to a total of, I 329 know believe it is 12-1/2 million homes as of what was 330 reported last night to their footprint in order to make their 331 acquisition of DIRECTV more palpable to policymakers, but it 332 is hard to be optimistic that they will do much better this 333 time around.

That said, there have been some changes in the market that make deployment of competitive broadband networks less

336 unattractive than they have been in the past. Corning has developed bendable fiber that has helped lower the labor cost 337 338 of deployment. Google has popularized the concept of demand 339 aggregation whereby communities pledge to subscribe to advanced network services before the network is built so that 340 341 Google can target areas where the company has the best chance 342 of earning an acceptable return, and while some critics would 343 call that redlining as it typically means that broadband 344 won't be built to the lower-income communities, it has been 345 successful in boosting overall project returns, and you can 346 think of it as a way of ensuring that all the children in the 347 class really are above average.

348 Still, the broader takeaway here is that the returns to 349 be had from overbuilding, that is, being the second or third 350 broadband provider in a given market are generally poor.

351 So let that sink in for a moment. Simply stated, it 352 means that market forces are unlikely to yield a fully 353 competitive broadband market. Neither, by the way, does 354 wireless appear to offer the promise of imminent competition 355 for incumbent wired broadband providers. Wireless networks 356 simply aren't engineered for the kind of sustained throughout

357 required for wired broadband replacement services. And wireless networks, by the way, also generally earn relatively 358 359 poor returns on capital. Returns for Verizon and AT&T are middling, and for Sprint and T-Mobile are very poor as a 360 361 consequence of aggressive price competition in the wireless 362 market. Neither is satellite broadband a compelling 363 replacement for wired broadband in any but the most rural 364 areas. Costs are high, and it is the nature of satellite 365 connection that it has to travel 22,000 miles and back such that latency is going to be a problem. 366

So the simple economic reality is that overbuilding is 367 368 necessarily going to be somewhat limited, given relatively 369 poor financial returns that can be expected, and that alternatives are far and few between. That naturally gives 370 371 rise to the impulse among some to regulate incumbent networks 372 that are already there. That is, it is a not unreasonable 373 assumption that any attempts to foster competition will 374 ultimately be unsuccessful and that regulation of incumbents, 375 in this case, the cable operators, is therefore required. The counterargument, that regulation will only stifle 376 investment among incumbent providers and will therefore make 377

378 the problem worse and will in the process generate unwelcome, unintended consequences is equally well intentioned and 379 380 unfortunately is equally well supported by the historical 381 evidence. That is to say there are no easy answers here. I will conclude only by adding a few additional 382 383 observations about the cable industry. As everyone 384 understands, the cable video business is facing unprecedented 385 pressure. Cord-cutting has been talked about for years but 386 is finally starting to show up in a meaningful way in the 387 numbers, and soaring programming costs are eating away at video profit margins. From a cable operator's perspective, 388 389 the video business and the broadband business are opposite 390 sides of the same coin. It is, after all, all one 391 infrastructure. Pressure on the video profit pool will 392 therefore naturally trigger a pricing response in broadband 393 where cable operators have cable leverage. That may sound 394 nefarious but it's not intended to be so. It is simply an 395 observation that cable operators have historically benefited 396 from the fact that their infrastructure can support two 397 separate businesses and each can be delivered at a lower cost 398 than if that were not the case. The ACA, or American Cable

399 Association, has made this case eloquently in arguing that absent reforms to restrain runaway programming cost growth, 400 401 video will be unprofitable and broadband will be left to 402 carry the entire burden of incremental deployment. All else being equal, that will mean that even new builds of broadband 403 404 will become increasingly economically challenged and 405 therefore will become less and less likely, or as I am quick 406 to add, this is my own editorial rather than ACA's point, 407 they will simply have to sharply raise the price of 408 broadband. As an analyst, I would simply observe that the pressures in the video business are relatively broad-based 409 410 and are attributable to more than just programming cost 411 inflation and that this may therefore be an unavoidable 412 scenario.

413 So I will leave my remarks there. If my remarks sound 414 excessively gloomy, they are not meant to. The U.S. 415 broadband infrastructure is the envy of the world 416 notwithstanding my view that there are politicized and 417 cherry-picked statistics that would suggest otherwise. It is 418 simply the case that broadband is an infrastructure that is 419 very difficult to support two of, and in some cases even one

420	of, and I would submit that a clear-eyed acknowledgement of
421	the microeconomics of the broadband business deserves or even
422	demands a seat at the policy table.
423	So thank you, Mr. Chairman and subcommittee members, for
424	your time and the opportunity to testify today.
425	[The prepared statement of Mr. Moffett follows:]

- 427 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you very much, Mr. Moffett. We
- 428 appreciate your analysis.
- 429 We will go now to Michael Slinger, Director, Google
- 430 Fiber Cities. We welcome you. Thank you for being here, and
- 431 the floor is yours.

432 ^STATEMENT OF MICHAEL SLINGER Mr. {Slinger.} Chairman Walden, Ranking Member--433 } 434 Mr. {Walden.} You will need to pull the microphone very 435 close and push the little button there until the light stays 436 on. 437 Mr. {Slinger.} Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, 438 and members of the committee, thank you for the invitation to testify today about investment in broadband infrastructure. 439 440 We believe a successful agenda for bandwidth abundance will 441 benefit consumers, small businesses, and the economy. 442 My name is Michael Slinger, and I currently serve as the 443 Director of Google Fiber City Teams. In this role, I oversee 444 the operations, business strategy, and on-the-ground outreach 445 to bring gigabit speeds to cities where we deploy Google 446 Fiber across the United States. 447 We have long believed that the next chapter of the 448 Internet would be built on gigabit speeds. A gig delivers 449 enough bandwidth for everyone in the home or in a small

450 business for all their devices, and we know fast connections

451 unleash innovation and entrepreneurship. Think about it in 452 these terms: if today we are riding a bike, having a gig 453 means that we could be driving a racecar. It is just that 454 much faster.

That is why we launched Google Fiber, which provides download and upload connections of up to 1,000 megabits per second. Our goal is to make the Web faster, more affordable, more relevant and more useful for everyone.

459 We launched the service 5 years ago, and today it is available in Kansas City, Kansas; Kansas City, Missouri; 460 Austin, Texas; and Provo, Utah. In addition, we are in the 461 462 process of building out our network in six other markets and 463 we are exploring bringing it to another four on top of that. In rolling out Google Fiber, we physically built a 464 network from scratch--one street, one pole, one house at a 465 466 time. This means reviewing infrastructure and working 467 closely with cities to make sure we are ready to work 468 together to design and build a brand-new network.

This experience has given us insight into barriers to deployment. I will outline some thoughts on policy changes that could reduce delays and barriers.

472 First, policymakers can ease gaining access to existing infrastructure. To construct high-speed networks, broadband 473 474 providers need access to existing utility infrastructure such as poles, conduits on a consistent, cost-effective and timely 475 basis. While the FCC has taken important steps to improve 476 477 rules related to infrastructure access, our own experience in 478 building new broadband networks demonstrates that more work 479 needs to be done to reduce delays and barriers.

480 Second, policymakers can easy rights-of-way. The expense and complexity of obtaining access to public rights-481 of-way in some jurisdictions may increase the cost and slow 482 483 the pace of broadband deployment. Policies that facilitate 484 partnerships between different entities and companies that are doing local construction can be beneficial. We also see 485 486 a lot of benefit in instituting ``dig once'' policies, which 487 may involve the installation of an oversized conduit bank by 488 any new network builder within the right-of-way.

Third, policymakers can help resolve the challenge of high rates for access to video programming. This would help smaller players in the business negotiate fair terms for access to popular broadcasts and cable content and make it

493 easier to attract and retain subscribers for broadband 494 networks. 495 Finally, I would be remiss if I failed to mention the importance of balanced spectrum policies that promote 496 innovation in the wireless sector. Federal agencies should 497 498 pursue a balanced approach to spectrum reallocation that 499 allows for licensed and unlicensed commercial uses at a 500 variety of frequencies. 501 I will note, as we think about deploying gigabit-speed networks, we need to keep in mind that about 30 percent of 502 503 Americans still don't use the Internet at home. This means 504 they are at a disadvantage when it comes to education, job 505 opportunities, social and civic engagement, so one of our main priorities is building digital inclusion into our 506 507 deployment plans from the beginning. We are guided by a

508 couple of main principles: Make the Internet more 509 affordable, make access a party of the community, and teach

510 people how to get online.

511 Just last week, as part of the Connect Home Initiative 512 announced by President Obama and HUD Secretary Castro, we 513 committed to bringing our Google Fiber Internet service to

514	residents in select affordable housing properties across our
515	Fiber cities for zero dollars per month with no installation
516	fee. We are also partnering with community organizations on
517	computer labs and digital literacy programming. We are
518	grateful for the partners we get to work with to get more
519	people connected and for your attention to this important
520	topic.
521	Thank you again for the invitation to speak at this
522	hearing and to share our views on how we can remove barriers,
523	give Americans more choices at higher speeds, and help reach
524	the goal of nationwide broadband abundance.
525	[The prepared statement of Mr. Slinger follows:]

527 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Slinger. We appreciate 528 your testimony. 529 And now we will go to final witness today, Deb Socia, 530 Executive Director, Next Century Cities. We are delighted to 531 have you here as well. Thank you, and please go ahead with 532 your comments.

533 ^STATEMENT OF DEB SOCIA

534 } Ms. {Socia.} Good afternoon. Thank you for holding535 this hearing on such an important topic.

536 My name is Deb Socia, and I am the Executive Director of 537 Next Century Cities, a bipartisan city-to-city collaborative 538 formed just last October. We have already grown to over 100 539 member cities, all of whom are dedicated to ensuring access 540 to fast, affordable and reliable broadband.

541 High-speed access is essential to America's economic 542 future. It is as simple as that. What can be complicated is 543 making it happen on the ground. Cities face a range of technical, economic and political challenges including 544 545 obstacles at the State and federal levels. More and more, 546 providing for this critical need has emerged as a core 547 responsibility for local governments. Many cities and towns 548 from around the country are taking diverse and creative steps 549 to secure their Internet future.

550 When it comes to providing access to high-quality 551 Internet, everyone has a role to play. It is an issue that

552 spans political party, an issue that crosses the urban-rural 553 divide, and an issue that relies on many sectors of our 554 society.

555 There is no single pathway to next-generation broadband 556 network, and several of the most innovative solutions have 557 emerged in unexpected places. The small towns of Ammon, 558 Idaho, and Mount Vernon, Washington, have each developed a 559 gigabit open access network. These local governments are 560 directly involved in building the physical infrastructure and 561 then leasing access to competing private providers. Just outside of Baltimore, Westminster, Maryland, has initiated a 562 563 public-private partnership with Ting, a provider of fiber Internet service, and with the introduction of Google Fiber 564 565 in Kansas City, residents there can now experience giga-level speeds at an affordable rate. Cities like Lafayette, 566 Louisiana, and Chattanooga, Tennessee, have built their own 567 networks and now have some of the fastest, most globally 568 569 competitive access available.

570 Next Century Cities is dedicated to helping all 571 communities achieve high-quality access regardless of the 572 path they choose to pursue. Our membership represents an

573 inclusive cross-section of America from small, rural communities such as Winthrop, Minnesota, to large, urban 574 575 areas like L.A. and Boston. 576 What unites these mayors is a commitment to the 577 imperative of broadband access for continued growth and an 578 understanding that local governments are best situated to 579 understand and provide for the needs of their residents. It 580 is an exciting time, a time for creative local solutions to 581 usher in a new generation of innovation as the Internet 582 continues to transform all aspects of society. 583 Next Century cities recently developed a policy agenda 584 showing how mu stakeholders can help communities develop the

585 crucial infrastructure needed today. Consistent with our 586 mission, this new resource provides guidance that will be 587 useful to communities regardless of how they choose to pursue 588 their broadband goals.

589 Part of the policy agenda looks at steps local and State 590 government can use to ensure high-quality access. Locally, 591 governments can institute ``dig once'' policies that minimize 592 disruption as well as take other steps to ensure their cities 593 are fiber ready.
594 At the State level, the policy agenda addresses changes such as modernizing state regulations and making investments 595 596 in the middle mile infrastructure. But we are here on 597 Capitol Hill today, and I wanted to emphasize some recommendations we heard from mayors about steps the Federal 598 599 Government could take to help empower local communities. 600 First and foremost, Congress can encourage competitive local 601 markets through national legislation and other avenues. In 602 addition, you have the ability to provide a national platform 603 for the issue of broadband as necessary infrastructure. Hearings such as this help to elevate this discussion and 604 attract national attention to this critical issue. 605 606 And finally, the policy agenda discusses how Congress could better require information about available Internet 607 608 access including speed of connection, price for consumers,

609 and areas of operation for service providers.

As is clear from everything we have heard so far today, the need for fast, affordable and reliable broadband Internet access is undeniable. Innovative leaders in communities across the country recognize this urgent need and are developing the critical broadband infrastructure that will

615	allow their residents and their cities to thrive. It is
616	evident by the over 100 Next Century Cities I am speaking on
617	behalf of today, communities that represent over 18 million
618	Americans.
619	Thank you for providing this platform for communities to
620	share their experiences and develop opportunities for
621	collaboration with federal policymakers. I look forward to
622	working with members of this committee and your colleagues to
623	ensure that communities across the country have the next-
624	generation access that all Americans need and deserve.
625	Thank you.
626	[The prepared statement of Ms. Socia follows:]

Mr. {Walden.} Ms. Socia, thank you very much for your 628 629 testimony and your insights. I will start off with questions. 630 Mr. Adelstein, as you probably know, the Middle Class 631 Tax Relief and Job Creation Act directed the GSA--Government 632 633 Service Agency--to develop a master contract to simplify the 634 placement of wireless antennas on federal buildings and other 635 property. Last year, the Administrator of the GSA told Congress that the master contract was complete and available 636 for use by executive landholding agencies. In your opinion, 637 638 do you believe the GSA--General Services Administration--has done everything in its power to give life to the siting 639 directives embodied in section 6409, which you referenced in 640 641 your testimony, of the Middle Class Tax Relief Act? Have 642 they done everything they can?

Mr. {Adelstein.} Mr. Chairman, I do not believe they have. As a matter of fact, I am the former Administrator myself of a federal agency, and if I had implemented something so poorly that Congress instructed me to do, I would be embarrassed, frankly. And it is worse than that

648 because the Executive Branch as well ordered them. There is 649 an Executive Order by the President of the United States 650 directing GSA to move faster to try to get these master 651 contracts together, and to date, nothing has been done, 3 652 years after Congress enacted this legislation. Progress has 653 been slow. GSA hasn't been proactive. The law required 654 standard rates, common forms and applications to provide 655 clarity to agencies in the wireless industry, and I think our 656 members now are having to negotiate for each and every site individually, just as they have in the past. So GSA has not 657 implemented the intent of Congress, and we can't wait 3 more 658 659 years for what is needed I think today. There is an urgent lack of coverage on federal lands. The Administration has 660 made a priority of this, this committee has made it a 661 priority, and yet GSA I think has been dragging its heels. I 662 663 think there might be need for further legislation.

664 Mr. {Walden.} Or maybe a hearing with one witness.665 They always like those.

666 I appreciate that, and for the rest of the panel, if 667 there are issues you are running into with federal siting, 668 let us know because this is one we raised because it is

669 important and we don't--we concur with what Commissioner 670 Adelstein has said. I don't think they have got it right 671 yet. Ms. Socia, traditionally network operators were given a 672 monopoly exchange for the obligation to serve anyone upon 673 674 reasonable request. In the models we have been discussing, 675 carriers only deploy to areas where there is an economic case for the build. How do we balance sound network economies 676 677 with the threat of redlining, a practice of refusing service to areas that are deemed a poor financial risk? And as I 678 heard about the incredible buildout that Google is doing, 679 680 which I applaud, representing a district that is bigger than 681 any State east of the Mississippi, getting access out into 682 our tribal lands, getting access out into our very remote rural communities, whether it is wired or wireless, remains a 683 684 big problem. And so I wonder how we can address that better. 685 Ms. {Socia.} I think that the interesting thing about--686 when you think about profit, I think that is a problem across 687 the board with building out to these more rural locations and therefore requires an influx of capital. There just isn't a 688 way to do this without support. But I think the ways that 689

690 our cities are looking at what is a profit are a little bit 691 different than the ways that a company might look at what a 692 profit is, right? So it is about education, it is about public safety, it is about economic development and 693 transportation and all of these opportunities that are 694 695 presented when you have access. And so what is that worth 696 and how do we ensure that our tribal lands and our rural 697 communities can benefit in the same ways that other 698 communities are able to? 699 Mr. {Walden.} Before I go to Mr. Moffett for his comments, this is also an issue just to get wireless phone 700 701 coverage out in areas of Montana, upstate New York. Elise 702 Stefanik has made this case to me, our new Member from up 703 there, that just getting access, getting connectivity remains 704 a real issue. The job is not done.

705 And so Mr. Moffett, from your perspective as an analyst,706 what do we do?

707 Mr. {Moffett.} Well, I would certainly agree with Ms. 708 Socia's comments that it is simply not realistic to think 709 that those projects are going to be entirely self-funding in 710 the more rural areas. That said, I think the targeting of

711 the funds that are available, the Connect America funds, can 712 be improved such that those funds are more carefully directed 713 to new greenfield projects that really are bringing broadband 714 to places that haven't been served in the past. There is always some controversy around whether an area is either 715 716 partially served or sufficiently served. 717 Mr. {Walden.} Right. 718 Mr. {Moffett.} And then secondarily, I think it is also 719 important that those Connect America funds be made available 720 to all manner of companies so that there can be more

721 competition of potential providers of those services.

Mr. {Walden.} I want to get a quick answer from Mr. Slinger. Does Google have plans to try a model out in sort of rural, remote areas of the country to see if you can make that work?

726 Mr. {Slinger.} Well, as you know, Fiber may not be the 727 right solution technologically--

728 Mr. {Walden.} Correct.

Mr. {Slinger.} --for rural areas, and we want to make sure that there is sufficient spectrum available for unlicensed wireless technologies. As well, as you know, we

732	are experimenting with balloon technology with Project Lune,
733	and as well with fixed-wing aircraft out of New Mexico. So
734	we think that in rural areas, it may be new technologies that
735	are going to affordably bring Internet to those areas.
736	Mr. {Walden.} I hate to cut you off, but I know we are
737	all tight for time, so I will turn to my colleague from
738	California, Ms. Eshoo.
739	Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, first of all for
740	having this hearing and for the high level of cooperation
741	relative to witnesses and invitations. We appreciate it.
742	[The prepared statement of Ms. Eshoo follows:]

Ms. {Eshoo.} Jonathan, it is great to see you, former Commissioner at the FCC, and to everyone that accepted our invitation to be here today.

To Mr. Slinger and Ms. Socia, first of all, thank you 747 748 for your important advocacy for the ``dig once'' policy. I 749 wish that the Congress had passed it because I think that we 750 would have more of that policy actually--excuse the 751 expression--embedded in our federal roadways, but how do you 752 think, A, the Executive Order is working? I want to get my questions out first, okay, because the time is very brief, 753 and if you think there are any additional steps that Congress 754 755 should take to incent that deployment of conduit as part of the federal highway projects and that system, which I don't 756 757 know, right now it doesn't seem like the highway project 758 system is going anywhere. It looks like it is being driven 759 off the road in Congress. But anyway, here maybe we can 760 concentrate on that.

Mr. Moffett, I listened very carefully to what you said, and I think it is really highly pessimistic. It was depressing to listen to your description of every last sector

of the telecommunications marketplace, and my question to you 764 would be, where do you see a bright spot? 765 766 To Governor Lewis, thank you for being here. You know, 767 there was a report that just came in out of terms of broadband penetration in our country. We are 24th in the 768 769 world. And I think that a good part of that number is a 770 representation of Native Americans and reservations in our 771 country. It is a shameful record. It is a shameful record. 772 And I think if there is going to be something that moves up 773 to the top of the list here in a bipartisan way is to see that we bring to the parts of the country where there are 774 775 reservations that you get first-class service for first-class 776 citizenship. You really do. I mean, for students to have to 777 be driven by their parents 65 and 75 miles away to sit in the 778 car in order to get some kind of connection to do their 779 homework, I don't think any Member of Congress who is a 780 parent here would ever put up with that. We shouldn't have 781 that in our country. And I hope that Mr. Slinger and 782 Governor Lewis will form a partnership and then come back and report to us. I would really like to have you meet and see 783 what you can come up with because you both need each other 784

785 and we need both of you. 786 To Ms. Socia, do you report--does Next Century Cities 787 support the local municipal--having local municipal systems? 788 Ms. {Socia.} We support whatever it is our local communities need to do in order to get where they are going. 789 790 So--791 Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, that doesn't answer my question, 792 though. 793 Ms. {Socia.} Okay. 794 Ms. {Eshoo.} It is too broad. Excuse the--795 Ms. {Socia.} I understand. 796 Ms. {Eshoo.} --term. 797 Ms. {Socia.} Many, many of our mayors signed on to a 798 letter we sent to the FCC in support of the preemption. The two cities that filed petitions, Chattanooga and Wilson, are 799 800 two of our cities, and we have -- we believe deeply in the idea 801 that competition is important and we believe deeply in the 802 idea that local folks should be able to solve their local 803 problems in a way that makes sense to them. 804 Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, I come from local government so I agree with you, and I think that they should have the 805

806 opportunity to do that as well.

807 Jonathan, I regularly hear from constituents who are 808 frustrated with the tower siting process. Now, here is one 809 for you. Everyone wants great service, the best service in the whole wide world, but no one wants a wireless tower in 810 811 their backyard or where they can see it anywhere near where 812 they live. So how do you respond to this, you know, the 813 people that say that reforms need to be made to take away 814 local jurisdiction, say, over the placement of cell towers. 815 It is really a--it is like trying to get socks on an octopus. I mean, they want it, they don't want it. And yet there are 816 817 some have-tos in this. So those are my questions, and you 818 have 13 seconds to answer them. Oh, no, you don't have any time because I am over time. But you can respond in writing, 819 820 and that way I will get more meat on the bones, I think.

So thank you for being here, and please, Mr. Slinger and
Governor Lewis, come together, and if my office, other

823 offices can help facilitate, let us know.

824 Mr. {Walden.} The gentlelady's time is expired.

825 I will turn to the Vice Chair of the subcommittee, Mr.826 Latta, for 5 minutes.

827 Mr. {Latta.} Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and thanks very much 828 to our panel today. It is always a great discussion that we 829 have in subcommittee.

830 Mr. Adelstein, if I could go back to some of the 831 questions that the chairman was posing and also I think you 832 said about the GSA dragging its feet in getting some of these 833 things done, especially when we are talking about 834 streamlining the process for providers to obtain the 835 necessary permitting and other approvals needed to build on federal lands and protected lands. Just out of curiosity, on 836 average, how long does it take for a negotiation process with 837 838 the Federal Government compared to the private industry? Any 839 idea?

840 Mr. {Adelstein.} It takes about 4 years with the 841 Federal Government, less than half of that with the private 842 sector, and sometimes it can drag on much longer with the Federal Government for many, many years. And so generally 843 844 private companies will just avoid federal lands because it 845 takes so long. They don't see the return on investment that Craig was talking about and so the Federal Government is 846 actually deprived of that revenue because it will go right 847

848 next door if there is non-federal land nearby.

849 Mr. {Latta.} Okay. When you say that then, so you are

850 saying that on average it is four but can drag out even

851 longer?

852 Mr. {Adelstein.} That is right.

853 Mr. {Latta.} And any ideas or examples of how long some 854 of them have taken? Over 4 years?

Mr. {Adelstein.} Yeah, I have heard from people that it has taken 10 years and longer. I have heard sometimes they have tried and it never gets done. And there is never even a finality to it. There is on decision-making process that is in place. That is why this committee in its wisdom said that the GSA was supposed to take steps to standardize the process, and yet it hasn't been done.

Mr. {Latta.} Let me follow up with that. Because of that, you know, 4 to 10 or who knows or maybe into infinity and beyond, what additional costs are incurred when the Federal Government is unable to streamline its process for the broadband infrastructure buildout?

867 Mr. {Adelstein.} Well, there is lost revenue. There is 868 huge costs trying to go through that process for the

869 individuals who are trying to get the site acquisition done. 870 It is a shame. Thirty percent of all the land mass in the 871 United States is federal property, especially in rural areas, 872 and a lot of very valuable federal buildings in dense urban which could use a facility as well to deal with the capacity 873 874 demands. So it is a shame that these negotiations take so 875 long, that they don't lead anywhere. Not only do you lose 876 revenue that you need for deficit reduction, companies lose 877 valuable places and the consumers lose access to service they 878 need.

879 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you.

880 Mr. Slinger, I think in your testimony you were talking 881 about the percentage of the population out there that does 882 not have access to broadband, and what percentage would that 883 be?

Mr. {Slinger.} We are seeing now, the stats that we are seeing, is about 60 million Americans. In some of our cities that we are working in right now, 25 to 30 percent of people have never had an Internet connection at home. They may have access through cell phones but they don't have an Internet connection at home.

890 Mr. {Latta.} Okay. Just two quick follow-ups on that 891 then because again, I represent from urban to very, very 892 rural, and when you look at the numbers then or the 893 percentages, what percentage of that would be urban, 894 suburban, very rural and that percentage when you talk about that? Was it 60 million? 895 896 Mr. {Slinger.} Yes. 897 Mr. {Latta.} And how would that break down, and also,

898 how many people would that include that would not want to 899 have access to broadband?

900 Mr. {Slinger.} I don't have a breakdown of urban versus 901 rural within the numbers but again, in urban areas, I can say 902 in many cities that 25 percent, 30 percent of these cities, 903 residents don't have anything at home at all, no Internet 904 connection.

905 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you.

Governor, if I could turn to you, and again, thanks very much for being here with us today and for your testimony. Because again, you said that you have, you know, a very, very rural population, I think you said that you have 20 persons per square mile, and you know, it is of great concern in your

911 area along with all the rural areas in the country about 912 having that essential broadband for our constituents, and you 913 talked about the USF and that that would help you, but are 914 there other areas besides the USF that you could see that would be of benefit to you and your community? 915 916 Mr. {Lewis.} Thank you for that question, and first of 917 all, I would like to recognize that I have two of my council 918 members here, Councilman Devin Redbird and Councilwoman 919 Caroline Williams, and also from our GRTI, Gila River 920 Telecommunications, Belinda Nelson and Pamela Thomas from the Gila River Community. 921 922 Mr. {Latta.} Thank you. 923 Mr. {Lewis.} Thank you. And I would say that one critical issue is rights-of-way, and you know, rights-of-way 924

925 is a challenge where it is a complex issue. It has to do 926 with the nature of tribal land. It goes back, as I said, to 927 the allotment policy that has a devastating effect on tribal 928 lands, and so the short answer is that GRTI in regards to 929 rights-of-way, if they do not get rights-of-ways, we have to 930 build around it, and of course, that costs--it is very 931 capital-intensive, and so we either have to move to another

932 route or where we can in some cases have to build a wireless link to go over the right-of-way, and obviously this is 933 934 pretty costly as compared to trenching through an established 935 right-of-way, but sometimes this is our only course of action. That is an issue that, you know, we really need to 936 937 look at. 938 Another is the ETC designation process, which is overly 939 complicated, and so streamlining of that ETC designation 940 process would be welcome to many tribes. 941 Mr. {Latta.} Well, thank you very much, and Mr. 942 Chairman, my time is expired and I yield back. 943 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. 944 We will now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes. 945 946 Mr. {Pallone.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 947 I want to get one question in to Mr. Adelstein about 948 infrastructure during disasters like Hurricane Sandy, but 949 then I want to get a question in to Governor Lewis, so I am 950 trying to split this up. 951 Three years ago, Hurricane Sandy devastated my district. The force of the storm knocked out some communication for 952 54

953 days. Mr. Adelstein, you testified about all the wireless 954 infrastructure that is being deployed and upgraded across the 955 country, and I support all this deployment, but my 956 constituents are also concerned about whether the equipment works in a disaster. 957 So what is your industry doing to make sure people can 958 959 call for help and reach loved ones in an emergency, and what 960 do you think of the FCC's work to improve resiliency? 961 Mr. {Adelstein.} Well, ensuring--Mr. {Pallone.} Two minutes. 962 Mr. {Adelstein.} Ensuring reliable access to 963 964 telecommunications is a real top priority for our industry. 965 We want to make sure all of the customers get access when they need it most, which is in a disaster. You know, during 966 967 Hurricane Sandy, we saw cooperation, for example, between T-968 Mobile and AT&T that agreed to share each other's network in 969 the region affected by the storm and share their network 970 operations centers. I would say that in terms of the 971 structures themselves, not one of them went down during the

972 storm, not one. The issue was things that were beyond the

973 control--power companies, access to roads, trees that fell.

974 But what makes it difficult is that sometimes we can't even get generators sited on these things. Going back to the 975 976 issue of this committee, we find from localities that you 977 can't put a generator there because it violates a noise 978 statute. It is only going to be used in a time of emergency. 979 I don't think anybody in the neighborhood would complain 980 about the noise of a generator when otherwise their wouldn't 981 work, and yet localities will not allow us to put them there 982 and then complain when the system doesn't work in a disaster. 983 We need more proactive thinking about having backup power and facilitating access to it. 984

985 And one more point to add, which is the best thing you 986 can do for reliability is redundancy. The more these facilities are up, the more likely you are going to have one 987 988 that works in a time of emergency. So all the work done by 989 this committee to promote deployment is promoting redundancy 990 and ensuring that there will be adequate facilities in case 991 of emergency and more likelihood that they will survive the 992 disaster and be available for use of public safety as well as 993 for the citizens in the community.

994 Mr. {Pallone.} Do you want to comment on the FCC's

995 work? Because Chairman Wheeler committed to me that the FCC 996 would act by the end of the year to complete its rulemaking 997 on improving wireless network resiliency. 998 Mr. {Adelstein.} We are thrilled with what the FCC is 999 doing. We have worked very closely with Chairman Wheeler and the other members of the Commission that are looking at a 1000 1001 cooperative arrangement where we can try to provide 1002 incentives for industry to deploy this kind of equipment. I 1003 think industry is doing a lot already, making major 1004 investments in things like backup power, and we are working 1005 together with them in a very cooperative fashion. We believe that the goals are shared in making sure that these networks 1006 1007 are resilient and redundant. 1008 Mr. {Pallone.} All right. Thank you. 1009 Let me go to Governor Lewis, and I should say that I 1010 love the Gila River Reservation. I haven't been there in a 1011 long time. It is about time I go back. 1012 But you know, on the one hand I was thinking that I 1013 guess relative to many tribes, you might have more ability 1014 than even some of the, you know, more remote, even more 1015 remote or even, you know, poorer tribes, if you will, you

1016 know, to achieve some of the goals that you mentioned. So I 1017 just wanted to ask about funding. You mentioned the 1018 Universal Service Fund. I guess the gentleman from Google 1019 talked about this Connect Home Initiative. I think the 1020 President was actually at the Choctaw Reservation last week 1021 or so talking about that.

1022 I mean, what are these sources of funding? Is the 1023 Universal Service Fund useful to you now? What would we have 1024 to do to improve it? You know, what could the Federal 1025 Government do in terms of funding for tribal infrastructure, 1026 particularly for those tribes that might even be--have even more difficulty. I am thinking of like the Pueblos in New 1027 1028 Mexico or the tribes at the Grand Canyon, you know, smaller 1029 than Gila River, less funding available. How are these funds 1030 helpful to you, the ones that we do have, these programs that 1031 we do have, or are they?

1032 Mr. {Lewis.} Thank you, Congressman Pallone, and you 1033 are always welcome at the Gila River Indian Community.

1034 And with USF funding, stable funding mechanisms are 1035 critical to businesses like GRTI and those in Indian Country 1036 where they have to develop deployment plans and rely on

1037 federal funding sources to be there to begin with. Now, our 1038 U.S. funding is critical as well for providing funding for 1039 infrastructure buildout, and that is critical to the long-1040 term sustainability of these telecommunications providers in 1041 Indian County. 1042 Mr. {Pallone.} Now, are you able to--are you using 1043 funds from Universal Service now? 1044 Mr. {Lewis.} Yes, we are. 1045 Mr. {Pallone.} And how is that working? What does it 1046 mean? How do you do it? 1047 Mr. {Lewis.} That is critical to the overall business 1048 plan of Gila River Telecommunications. You know, they rely 1049 on that source of income moving forward. It is critical to 1050 the long-term business outlook. And also in regards to long-1051 term capital buildout as well. 1052 Mr. {Pallone.} All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1053 1054 Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman's time is expired. 1055 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, 1056 Mr. Shimkus, for 5 minutes. 1057 Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a great

1058 panel. I appreciate you all being here.

I want to go to Adelstein, Commissioner, and Governor Lewis real quick to highlight the challenges because especially the environmental review process, especially on federal lands, is a burden. So have you thought through how local municipalities and they do their zoning outside of federal lands and how we could marry that with which goes on there and can you comment on that?

1066 Mr. {Adelstein.} Yes. You know, some localities are 1067 great, and what we heard today from Google, from Ms. Socia, 1068 is that those communities that promote broadband make it 1069 easier to get access, and that is where the investment goes, 1070 and those that throw up roadblocks, not to name any specific 1071 parts of the country represented by folks here but there are 1072 some that aren't seeing investment they would get if they 1073 weren't throwing up roadblocks, and to the question of Congresswoman Eshoo about, you know, people saying not in my 1074 1075 backyard, they are not going to have service in their 1076 backyard. So we work very cooperatively with local 1077 communities. I mean, we try to--every single facility that 1078 has been sited has been sited in cooperation with local

1079 government. But to have it to be dragged out, it took the 1080 work of this committee to say you don't have to get another 1081 zoning hearing for something that has already been zoned to 1082 put a 4G antenna up on a tower that is already there. Why 1083 should the committee have to do that? Increasingly, 1084 communities are recognizing this. The smart ones are moving 1085 ahead. Ten States have enacted laws in the last several 1086 years since 2013 to streamline deployment in their States, 1087 and those States are seeing more investment. They are 1088 working with local partners, the National Association of 1089 Counties, the National League of Cities and others to get out 1090 word about the way the FCC is implementing the law that you 1091 passed. Commissioner Cliburn asked us to go out--1092 Mr. {Shimkus.} Let me get to Governor Lewis on the 1093 federal properties because that is another big challenge 1094 because they have got to get past the government land issue, and Governor, really, the question is, can't we force a 1095 1096 zoning issue, get you guys the zoning ability like we do 1097 municipalities?

1098 Mr. {Adelstein.} Yes. You know, there is a bill that 1099 was introduced in the other body by Senator Rubio that would

1100 create a standard fee schedule, fee retention for the agency 1101 that the agency could keep the money they get from that to 1102 pay for the cost of processing it. There would be common 1103 forms and contracts, which you have already tried to get 1104 enacted, but there is a need for more legislation to get them 1105 to do what you asked them to do already. There is an 1106 expectancy of lease renewals, so when somebody invest there, 1107 they are not going to get cut off. 1108 Mr. {Shimkus.} Let me get Governor Lewis to respond.

1109 Mr. {Lewis.} Federal lands in Indian Country, that has been a long issue in regards to, you know, our unique 1110 situation as Indian tribes and the nature of Indian land in 1111 1112 regards to highly fractionated land interest that, you know, 1113 are just so critical and sometimes are one of the major 1114 obstacles to buildout in regarding to getting right-of-ways. 1115 If we can somehow streamline that process through the Bureau 1116 of Indian Affairs, through the Department of Interior, that 1117 would greatly help out tribal infrastructure buildout in the 1118 future.

1119 Mr. {Shimkus.} Great. Thank you.

1120 Mr. Slinger, let me go to you real quick. My largest

1121 community in my Congressional district is 33,000 people. 1122 When do you think Google would hit that community on your 1123 timeline? 1124 Mr. {Walden.} Did you want to name that community? 1125 Mr. {Shimkus.} But I am not the chairman of the 1126 committee so I don't have as much power. 1127 Mr. {Slinger.} Well, you know, we published this Fiber 1128 checklist so that we can, as Mr. Adelstein said, get cities 1129 to ready by themselves for Fiber deployment, whether it is 1130 Google Fiber or any other provider, by making sure that they 1131 have smooth permitting processes that allow for a large 1132 volume of permits to go through to make it easy for people to 1133 get onto telephone poles through streamlined make-ready 1134 engineering and construction. 1135 Mr. {Shimkus.} So it is the same type of debate as we 1136 are talking with the rural or the federal lands deployment, 1137 the ease of being able to have access and a timely response. 1138 And let me finish up with Mr. Moffett. It is all about return on investment--I don't care how people want to marry 1139 1140 it--if you believe in the capital model. So if a rural area can't make a go based upon the formula, then you have to be 1141

1142	able to dip into RUS or other forms of low-interest loans to
1143	make the business sense. Is that correct?
1144	Mr. {Moffett.} That is exactly correct.
1145	Mr. {Shimkus.} And also, time is money. So any delay,
1146	as what we have just talked about here, affects the ability
1147	for someone to go to the capital markets to make a pitch that
1148	they are going to get their return on investment that you
1149	propose.
1150	Mr. {Moffett.} That is correct as well, yes.
1151	Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back
1152	my time.
1153	Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman yields back his time.
1154	The chair now goes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania,
1155	Mr. Doyle, for 5 minutes.
1156	Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
1157	this excellent hearing and this excellent panel.
1158	Jonathan, welcome back.
1159	Mr. {Adelstein.} Thank you.
1160	Mr. {Doyle.} Broadband infrastructure has become a
1161	critical component to almost every facet of our daily lives
1162	from students using Blackboard for school or watching Netflix

1163 and Amazon to stream movies and TV shows, and by all levels 1164 of government to communicate with citizens and increasingly 1165 leverage the network to improve the delivery and efficiency 1166 of services.

1167 Pittsburgh in partnership with Carnegie Mellon 1168 University and Google is deploying a connected platform that 1169 will integrate road sensors, traffic cameras and information 1170 kiosks to create a living laboratory at a city scale for the 1171 next-generation technologies. This platform will be used to 1172 improve traffic patterns in real time, allowing city 1173 departments to efficiently predict road wear and schedule 1174 maintenance and to allow people to explore and interact with the city more effectively. Fast, available and ubiquitous 1175 1176 broadband infrastructure provides the basis for these next-1177 generation solutions.

I for one am a big fan of making every tool in the toolbox available to local governments to make sure that they have access to the best networks and the best platforms in order to improve the lives of the people living there. Mr. Chairman, I would love to work with you on putting

together some legislation to address some of these

1183

1184 challenges.

1185 Let me start with Ms. Socia. How can localities 1186 leverage shared infrastructure to expand access and increase 1187 the deployment of broadband? As cities like Pittsburgh build 1188 this infrastructure to address our own municipal needs, how 1189 can we and other municipalities use what we are building to 1190 expand access more broadly and what, if anything, stands in 1191 the way of municipalities leveraging the infrastructure? 1192 Ms. {Socia.} Really interesting work has been done all 1193 over the country, as you suggested. Many of our cities are 1194 using smart infrastructure to do really interesting work, 1195 determine particulates in the air and checking asthma rates 1196 and using streetlights that also have cameras in them for 1197 public safety. We are seeing a lot more of that happen, and 1198 I think there are barriers for cities to doing this work as 1199 well, and some of them are the State regulations that prohibit their building out their own infrastructure, and in 1200 1201 some case, it is, as was mentioned earlier, issues of how 1202 densely populated, the circumstances of their current 1203 financial situation. All of those things impact the capacity of a city to actually build out their own. 1204

1205 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you.

Mr. Slinger, I am curious. What dividends has Google 1207 Fiber found in communities where you have deployed your 1208 gigabit broadband to? Has it impacted jobs or the local 1209 economy or education or local government? What are you 1210 finding in these communities?

1211 Mr. {Slinger.} Yes, we are seeing a great economic 1212 impact in the cities that we are in. There have been reports 1213 that Kansas City, Missouri, is not working on an economic 1214 impact analysis. Let me start by saying there are certain 1215 categories of employees where there is no unemployment, because obviously when you build a big network, there is a 1216 1217 lot of demand for jobs for certain types of labor, and I 1218 think last week the Fiber to the Home Council released some 1219 research that showed that GDP growth in cities with a gig 1220 network rises and the average cost per home or, you know, 1221 value of a home goes up 3.1 percent in those cities, and that 1222 is new data from about a week ago.

But we also see, and we have heard from Mayor Holland and Mayor James in Kansas City that they have seen it as a draw to regional economic development. Other companies when

1226	deciding where to locate in the Midwest will now look at
1227	Kansas City and say hey, this place has a gig network, let us
1228	join.
1229	Mr. {Doyle.} I am curious too about the discrepancies
1230	that exist between price and speed. In Pittsburgh, for
1231	instance, I can get 500 megabits a second but it will cost me
1232	about \$400 a month. When we look at cities like Chattanooga
1233	and Kansas City and Austin and other cities, residents can
1234	get a gig for less than \$100. I am curious, maybe Mr.
1235	Moffett and Mr. Slinger and Ms. Socia, you could comment on
1236	why you think these discrepancies exist.
1237	Mr. {Moffett.} Thank you for the question. My
1238	observation would be, you are right, there are a very wide
1239	range of economic models, and it is a challenge because there
1240	is no near-term variable cost that dictates a cost-plus model
1241	and so you see a lot of companies experimenting with
1242	different prices, in part because they are trying to figure
1243	out what the quantity demanded will be at different prices.
1244	The challengebut obviously you tend to have lower
1245	prices where you have multiple competing networks and then
1246	again it raises the question of whether the providers are

1247 earning a sufficient return at the market share and the 1248 prices that they are charging. In many cases they are not. 1249 This is a very difficult area to do economic research, 1250 however, because you will find that there are a lot of the 1251 companies who have different motives rather than simply 1252 profitability of the network itself. 1253 Mr. {Doyle.} I want to give Mr. Slinger just a--because 1254 I know our time is up. 1255 Mr. {Walden.} Yes, we have go to--1256 Mr. {Slinger.} Well, I would say that if you look at the cities in which we are already operating or cities where 1257 we have announced, we have seen incumbent prices drop 1258 1259 immediately and speeds go up, so I think there is more room 1260 there. 1261 Mr. {Doyle.} Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. {Walden.} We will now go to the gentleman from 1262 Louisiana, the Whip of the House, Mr. Scalise, for 5 minutes. 1263 1264 Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate 1265 you having this hearing. 1266 And Mr. Adelstein, I know you talked in your opening

1267 statement about a lot of the work that has been done to

1268 expand spectrum, of course, a lot of that within this 1269 committee where we have come together to make more spectrum 1270 available. I know the chairman has been a great leader in 1271 that effort too. 1272 One part of that equation absolutely is expanding more 1273 spectrum, and then of course, the other part of that is your 1274 members where you all come to actually build it out and to 1275 build that infrastructure to take advantage of the new 1276 spectrum. If you could maybe share with us some of the 1277 challenges or hurdles that your members face to make the 1278 investment that they need to make to take advantage of that 1279 spectrum and hopefully even make more spectrum available in 1280 the marketplace? 1281 Mr. {Adelstein.} Yes. You know, spectrum has been 1282 quite a hurdle. You saw that \$41 billion was spent for a limited amount of spectrum recently, basically 65 megabits. 1283 Mr. {Scalise.} It is a little bit better than the CBO 1284 1285 estimate, Mr. Chairman, wasn't it? 1286 Mr. {Walden.} Which was zero, and it was \$41.9 billion. 1287 Mr. {Scalise.} Hopefully the CBO recognizes the value of the spectrum that clearly everyone else seems to know 1288

1289 about.

1290 Mr. {Adelstein.} I think the CBO estimated zero, and it 1291 was \$41.9 billion, so they were off--1292 Mr. {Scalise.} They were off by a little bit there. 1293 Mr. {Adelstein.} 41.9, yeah. But the fact it, that was 1294 for a 12 percent increase in the available commercial mobile 1295 spectrum. So you just got a 12 percent increase in the 1296 throughput and you have 700 percent you need in the next 5 1297 years. So we are down to 688 percent, a long way to go to 1298 build out to meet the needs of people, and as I said, local 1299 communities often are saying no to these facilities. We 1300 have--the business case has to be made in rural areas as we 1301 have discussed today, and overall investment is very 1302 difficult with those prices for spectrum. We can't afford to 1303 have regulatory drag on these investments, slowing them down, 1304 making it more expensive when there is not enough capital to 1305 build out to meet these needs already. I like to joke, you 1306 know you are in trouble when you quick solution is 1307 infrastructure, but that is kind of where we are at in this 1308 country, and as slow as it is, it is immediately available when it is built if you take that same spectrum and reuse it. 1309

1310 So all of these burdens on federal lands, in urban areas, the 1311 FCC has done a great job, this committee has done a great job 1312 of trying to address that, but we need to work with our 1313 partners and State and local governments as well. 1314 Mr. {Scalise.} And clearly on federal lands too, we 1315 have been grappling with that here trying to remove some of 1316 those burdens, not just in the spectrum space but in a whole 1317 lot of other areas, especially as it relates to energy 1318 production where federal lands and even in the local areas, 1319 some of those restrictions make it really hard to experience a lot of the economic opportunity we can. Thanks for that 1320 1321 answer. 1322 Mr. Moffett, I want to ask you, in some of your analysis, if you could share with us some of the similar 1323 1324 challenges that, you know, what are some actions maybe that Congress or the FCC can take to further expand the 1325 opportunities for WiFi, for broadband? 1326 1327 Mr. {Moffett.} Well, as I said earlier, I think there 1328 are opportunities in Connect America Funds and making those 1329 available to a wider range of companies for bringing broadband to rural areas, but there is an overarching 1330

1331	question here, and it relates to the question that Ranking
1332	Member Eshoo asked earlier about where are the bright spots.
1333	If you think about this as a larger value chain of
1334	microeconomics from everything from the content companies and
1335	the internet providers to the infrastructure providers, where
1336	the bright spots are is very clearly outside of
1337	infrastructure. The apps developers and the content
1338	companies are actually earning extraordinary returns, and
1339	there is a very knee-jerk and familiar regulatory impulse to
1340	say let's try to protect the companies that are making very
1341	high returns from the ones that are making very low returns.
1342	As an economist, that is a very odd structure.
1343	Mr. {Scalise.} Well, final question as I am running out
1344	of time, Mr. Slinger. When Google Fiber was being deployed,
1345	it has been reported you all were able to work with some
1346	local governments that gave some exemptions, maybe some
1347	expedited approval processes so that not just your but other
1348	new entrants were able to move things a lot quicker. If you
1349	can talk in general about the ability for more local
1350	governments to take more of that deregulatory approach and
1351	how deregulation in a sense of helping expedite the expansion

1352 of technology has helped you and could help others to develop

1353 even more broadband?

1354 Mr. {Slinger.} Sure. And I am going to go back to the 1355 Fiber checklist which we published in 2014. Some of our 1356 major barriers obviously are getting access to poles and 1357 making it easy to do the make-ready construction and get the 1358 poles ready. One thing that has been suggested, I believe by 1359 the Fiber to Home Council, was if municipalities took a 1360 proactive step in doing pole maintenance, and while they are 1361 doing pole maintenance, if they could do that make ready, get rid of the old wires that aren't needed and make slots that 1362 1363 would allow new entrants, Google Fiber or any other entrant, 1364 to get in guickly and attach to poles, that is one thing that 1365 would really help.

And again, ``dig once'' policies and access to the right-of-way, there is more we can do with local communities and more we could do with federal highways to make sure that if someone is ripping up a road to do construction or repaving, that we put in conduit that anyone can use. Those are just smart things. They allow new market entrants and ultimately more competition and choice at the local level.

1373 Mr. {Scalise.} Thanks for your answers. I yield back 1374 the balance of my time. 1375 Mr. {Walden.} The gentleman yields back the balance of 1376 his time. Unfortunately, we are going to have to pull this to a 1377 close because we are down to about 4 minutes left in the 1378 1379 vote. 1380 This is not the last hearing. We expect to continue 1381 this work going forward. Your testimony has just gotten us 1382 to a really good starting place. We have a lot more work to 1383 do, some follow-up to do. I know there are members who didn't get a chance to ask 1384 questions. We do have information to submit for the record 1385 1386 including from TIA, Comptel, CCA, Tech Freedom. 1387 [The information follows:]

1389Mr. {Walden.}Mr. Olson, I believe you had a document1390you wanted to submit, some articles on broadband deployment,

1391 $\,$ and with that, I am afraid we are going to--unless, Ms. $\,$

1392 Matsui, do you want just a minute or two?

1393 Ms. {Matsui.} Yes, just a minute or two.

1394 Mr. {Walden.} Go ahead.

1395 Ms. {Matsui.} I was curious, I wanted to ask Mr. 1396 Slinger some questions. I find what you are talking about 1397 very interesting because I look at this, and what you say is all very important about deploying broadband infrastructure, 1398 1399 and I am from Sacramento, so we have wonderful areas that are 1400 doing great things. I am looking at a particular area in our 1401 city that is economically deprived, and we have a light-rail 1402 station that is going to be--a light-rail line that is going to be completed there with fiber and transit-oriented 1403 1404 development stations. But yet we have schools and libraries 1405 that are just deprived and businesspeople there who just have 1406 no access. If we were to do something there, and I don't 1407 know whether we can have a special project, but I'm looking 1408 at this being very, very special for economic development.

1409 Is that something that we can provide the access, as you say 1410 that you need, is that something that you or somebody else 1411 can take on as a project working with us? Because I am 1412 trying very much to help this area that feels very deprived, 1413 looking at the rest of my district that feel like they are on 1414 the move and they are not on the move, and I want to get them 1415 on the move if there is something we could do there. 1416 Mr. {Slinger.} Yes. There is a lot that we do really 1417 early stage with all the cities that we look at to make sure 1418 that they have the right kind of digital inclusion plans in 1419 place early, to make sure that the cities have a focus on it, 1420 and again, there is no silver bullet with any one company but 1421 we want to make sure that all providers and local community 1422 groups take this on, and as Fiber or any other technology is 1423 built out in those areas to really make sure people understand the relevancy of the Web, and hopefully get more 1424

1425 people online.

1426 Ms. {Matsui.} Okay. Well, thank you very much, and 1427 thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1428 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you.

1429 We are going to have to call it to a conclusion here.

1430	Again, we do have votes on the House Floor followed by the
1431	Iranian briefing. So thank you to all of you for your
1432	testimony, your counsel. We look forward to being back in
1433	touch with you as we move forward and to others who have
1434	ideas for the Congress on how we can expand access to
1435	affordable broadband across the country, on Indian
1436	reservations, rural communities, urban communities, wherever
1437	it is not.
1438	And we have some tribal letters for the record as well
1439	from Mr. Lujan, which we are happy to accept.
1440	[The information follows:]

1442 Mr. {Walden.} And with that, we will adjourn. 1443 [Whereupon, at 1:41 p.m., the subcommittee was 1444 adjourned.]