1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS DEVIN SHIPLE
3	HIF044160
4	
5	
6	PROTECTING CONSUMERS AND
7	COMPETITION: AN EXAMINATION OF THE T-MOBILE
8	AND SPRINT MERGER
9	WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2019
10	House of Representatives
11	Subcommittee on Communications and
12	Technology
13	Committee on Energy and Commerce
14	Washington, D.C.
15	
16	
17	
18	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
19	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael F. Doyle
20	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
21	Members present: Representatives Doyle, McNerney, Loebsack,
22	McEachin, Soto, Eshoo, Butterfield, Matsui, Schrader, Pallone
23	(ex officio), Latta, Shimkus, Johnson, Long, Flores, and Walder
24	(ex officio).
25	Staff present: Billy Benjamin, Systems Administrator; Jeff
	NEAL P. GPOSS

Carroll, Staff Director; Sharon Davis, Chief Clerk; Jennifer
Epperson, FCC Detailee; Evan Gilbert, Press Assistant; Tiffany
Guarascio, Deputy Staff Director; Alex Hoehn-Saric, Chief
Counsel, C&T Jerry Leverich, Counsel; Dan Miller, Policy
Analyst; Joe Orlando, Staff Assistant; Tim Robinson, Chief
Counsel; Chloe Rodriguez, Policy Analyst; Mike Bloomquist,
Minority Staff Director; Robin Colwell, Minority Chief Counsel,
C&T Kristine Fargotstein, Minority Detailee, C&T Margaret
Tucker Fogarty, Minority Staff Assistant; Stephen Keegan,
Minority Intern, C&T and Peter Kielty, Minority General Counsel.

Mr. Doyle. Well, good morning. Before we get started, I want to express my condolences to Congresswoman Debbie Dingell on the loss of her husband, John. John was a dear friend and mentor to me and many members of this committee. His passion for oversight, accountability, legislative process, and his lifetime of public service is an example to all of us. His passing is a great loss to our nation, to Congress, and this committee which he loved so much.

John, may you rest in peace.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

The chair will now recognize himself for 5 minutes. Welcome to the Subcommittee on Communication and Technology's hearing on Protecting Consumers and Competition: An Examination of the T-Mobile Sprint Merger. This hearing is noteworthy because the last time a merger hearing was had before this subcommittee was almost 9 years ago. And in that time there have been numerous mergers within this subcommittee's jurisdiction that have gone without a hearing. I believe it is the duty of this subcommittee to allow our members to publicly discuss and debate the merits of these transactions and to question the relevant stakeholders. The merger before us today is between two of our country's national wireless providers, T-Mobile and Sprint. These companies have acted as disrupters, competitors, and low-cost options in the wireless marketplace.

T-Mobile's "un-carrier" strategy has ended anti-consumer practices such as data caps, restrictive contracts and much more.

They have also worked hard to build a robust national network that by some accounts is the fastest in the nation. For its part, Sprint has been a leader in roaming agreements for rural providers and wholesale access for prepaid and Lifeline providers. has worked hard to bring its networks to within one percent of Verizon's in terms of network reliability, or so their commercials Consumers have also benefited from Sprint positioning say so. itself as the best value. They are offering a plan right now where new customers can get a year of free service when they switch from another carrier, which sounds amazing. However, this hearing isn't about the benefits that both of your companies have brought to the market. It is about the extraordinary impact that your combined company could have on the public and the marketplace if this merger goes through. We will hear today from the Communication Workers of America, from the Rural Wireless Association, and Public Knowledge. They claim that this merger will have negative impacts on low-income consumers, rural providers, and jobs in the wireless industry.

CWA's testimony suggests that this merger will result in up to 30,000 job losses in the industry and a reduction in industry pay by as much as \$3,000 per employee. The Rural Broadband Association's testimony argues that rural consumers will pay more. They claim that Sprint charges 20 times less than T-Mobile or other national carriers for roaming agreements. These agreements allow customers of rural carriers who build their own

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

networks in the most rural communities to use their phones throughout the country. What guarantees do rural providers have that they won't face increased costs if T-Mobile doesn't adopt Sprint's practices? And Public Knowledge's testimony states that consumer prices will go up due to the reduction in the number of national carriers from four to three. They argue that the merger would hit low-income consumers the hardest because the number of carriers offering wholesale access would drop from three to two.

Sprint, AT&T, and T-Mobile sell access to their networks to prepaid and Lifeline providers who then sell that service under their own brands. What remedy do these carriers or their customers have if the New T-Mobile decides that it wants to get out of the wholesale business or drastically raise rates?

To that end, the FCC found in their Communications

Marketplace Report that the wireless market concentration was

currently at 3,100 HHI. HHI measures how competitive a market

is with a higher number meaning it is less competitive. The

Justice Department's Horizontal Merger Guidelines state that a

market with an HHI above 2,500 is highly concentrated. So we

really aren't starting from a great spot. An increase of 200

points would raise significant concerns about competition.

This merger is expected to result in a market power increase of 280 points for the postpaid market and 2,014 points for the prepaid market. That would take the prepaid market from where

it is right now at 2,467, which is just under DOJ's threshold, to 4,481, a level that raises lots of red flags. These kinds of numbers have historically resulted in higher prices for consumers, less competition, and less innovation.

I appreciate both executives' statement that they believe that this merger will benefit consumers and result in lower prices and their commitments to an accelerated deployment of 5G and promises of expanded rural broadband. These are national objectives that are important to me and many members of this committee. However, I have seen a lot of mergers in this industry and others and it is hard to think of one where consolidation didn't result in people losing their jobs, prices going up, and innovation being stifled.

I look forward to hearing from the testimony from our two telephone companies that wish to merge and from the other panelists. And with that I yield to the ranking member, Mr. Latta, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And if I could just take a point of personal privilege also to express my deepest sympathies to our friend and colleague Debbie Dingell on the loss of Chairman Dingell. And the chairman loved this committee.

You know, this room is named after him.

And I had the privilege of getting to know him in my days not only on this committee, but when I first got to Congress.

Again he loved this committee, he loved this House, but most of all he loved his district, the State of Michigan, and all that he did for it. So with that, I wish the Dingells my deepest sympathies on the loss of the chairman.

And again, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for convening our panel of witnesses today. And to our witnesses, thanks very much for being here. We appreciate your time. I look forward to hearing your expertise and different perspectives as we discuss the future of the telecommunications marketplace and learn more about the proposed merger of T-Mobile and Sprint.

With any talk of merger comes a long list of potential benefits and drawbacks and this one is no different. I understand from the CEOs of T-Mobile and Sprint who are with us today that there are many pro-consumer outcomes possible if the merger is approved. These potential benefits range from providing mobile broadband to millions of unserved and underserved Americans living in rural areas to helping the United States win the global competitive race to 5G.

But I also understand from some of the witnesses representing groups here today that the combined company could pose some harm to consumers. Some of the potential drawbacks include the possibility to eliminate jobs or increase the price that consumers pay for access to wireless service.

Our role in this committee is not to weigh the merits of these arguments and determine if this merger is in the public interest, Congress gave that role to the FCC who along with the DOJ performs a more traditional antitrust assessment on the merger and these two agencies will ultimately determine if the merger is going to be approved. Our role in this subcommittee is to provide policies that advance the telecommunications market including expanding access to broadband to all Americans.

One way to do this especially for rural America and many areas in my district is to build 5G networks. In areas where the broadband is not currently deployed, 5G networks can help connect Americans to high-speed internet for the very first time. And in areas where broadband is already available, 5G networks provide a competitive alternative. This proposed merger reportedly will promote these objectives and I look forward to hearing more about the ways in which companies plan on doing that.

But I also am interested in hearing from all of our witnesses today. This will be an enlightening discussion. The final decision about whether this proposed merger on these two companies is in the public interest is up to the FCC. Again I look forward

to hearing from all of our witnesses today and your testimony and your responses to our questions.

And, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hearing today and I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. Doyle. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes Mr. Pallone, chairman of the full committee, for 5 minutes for his opening statement.

The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Doyle. Today is our first hearing since the loss of our chairman, John Dingell. It is fitting that this room is named the John Dingell Room. After all, over 28 years as the top Democrat on this committee and over his nearly 60 years in the House, he fought to ensure the committee maintained its broad jurisdiction, had deliberative debates, followed regular order, conducted robust oversight, and produced legislation in the public interest.

And in keeping with John's tradition, today we focus our microscope on the proposed merger of two of the four large nationwide wireless phone carriers, T-Mobile and Sprint.

Collectively, these companies directly employ more than 80,000 people and serve more than 130 million customers. These companies are no stranger to merger discussions. In 2011, a struggling T-Mobile was almost purchased by AT&T but was blocked by the Obama administration, and T-Mobile nevertheless went on to flourish. T-Mobile and Sprint attempted to merge 2 years later, but abandoned the deal after competition concerns were raised by regulators. Now once more the parties are seeking

approval to merge.

This hearing marks the first time in 8 years that the committee has met to evaluate the consequences of a merger. For too long the House and this committee paid little attention to that responsibility, but now we resume the practice of reviewing major acquisitions so we can fulfill our obligation for the people to determine how this proposed consolidation will affect consumers, workers, public safety and network resiliency, competition, and future innovation. For the last 8 years, major industry consolidation occurred without significant oversight and the consequences of that have been borne by consumers and hardworking Americans. In the past we have seen mergers jack up consumer prices, cut away meaningful choices and outsource, undercut, and eviscerate good paying jobs.

We have seen previous merger conditions that weren't met or weren't enforced, we have seen the public interest in all its forms undermined, and that is why we must look carefully at these issues before a merger is approved. In this case, the transaction is currently being reviewed by the FCC as well as the Department of Justice. As part of our oversight responsibility we must make sure that the FCC is carefully reviewing the facts and keeping consumers' best interests in mind when deciding the fate of the merger.

I know we are going to have many hard questions today because the facts surrounding this merger are so much in dispute. For

example, Mr. Legere says that New T-Mobile won't raise consumer prices, but others say his company's filings acknowledge consumers could see a price hike, some argue by up to 15 percent, with the merger being particularly hard on the poorest consumers.

How can we be sure that consumers who can least afford to pay more are not harmed by the merger? T-Mobile filed the letter committing not to raise prices with the FCC. Putting aside whether that is sufficient, there is a serious question as to whether the Trump FCC would be willing to impose any conditions in a merger order.

Mr. Legere says that the merger of T-Mobile and Sprint will be a net job creator on day 1, but the Communication Workers of America say we should expect the loss of 30,000 jobs. The truth will have long-term implications for American families across the country. And Mr. Legere says that New T-Mobile will create a world-class 5G network, but opponents say that both T-Mobile and Sprint have committed to investors to deploying 5G networks as separate and independent companies. 5G deployment is important, obviously, and valuable to consumers and the economy, and whether the merger expedites 5G rollout merits consideration.

And Mr. Legere also says that the merger of T-Mobile and Sprint will help New T-Mobile compete with AT&T and Verizon all while new entrants in cable companies begin to compete in wireless. But smaller carriers worry the merger might snuff out existing and new competitive players that rely on wholesale access

to T-Mobile and Sprint's networks. To this end, we must 253 254 understand not only how the merger affects the current wireless 255 marketplace but also the marketplace of the future. 256 And, finally, Mr. Legere says that the merger of T-Mobile 257 and Sprint will help New T-Mobile build out robust rural 258 broadband, while others argue that New T-Mobile will shut down 259 25,000 cell towers across the country. And I would like to 260 understand whether this is accurate and whether it will have a 261 negative effect on the resiliency of the wireless network during 262 disasters. 263 So, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of conflicting opinions 264 on the impact of this merger which is why this hearing is so 265 important and I hope that members will get the straight answers 266 here today. And I yield back. 267 Mr. Doyle. The gentleman yields back. The chair now 268 recognizes Mr. Walden, ranking member of the full committee, for 5 minutes for his opening statement. 269 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And as you all have 270 Mr. Walden. 271 said, I know we all have the Dingell family in our thoughts and our prayers on this difficult week. John Dingell taught us all 272 273 how to be legislators. He was a legend in many respects and 274 nobody, despite everybody's attempt, has ever been able to do 275 the yes or no questioning as effectively as Mr. Dingell did. 276 We have all tried to emulate that. 277 And so he is missed. He will never be forgotten.

am glad we are all honoring his life, his work, his service, and remembering Debbie in our prayers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo my colleagues' warm welcome to all of our witnesses today and to thank you all for making the time to come share your thoughts with the subcommittee. We have generally avoided hearings focused on specific transactions in an effort to allow the regulators who are actually responsible for assessing them to do their work as much as possible free from intense political influence. It has been my hope that experts at the FCC and the Department of Justice who as we speak are reviewing this transaction and its potential impact on public interest and competition will continue their analysis without undue political pressure.

Now in a district like mine which would stretch from the Atlantic to Ohio, it is a district that gives new meaning to word "rural." We have coverage gaps that engulf huge areas of the map in places with as few as one person for every square mile. For Americans in some of these areas who have been awaiting the promise of broadband for far too long with the connectivity, educational, and economic empowerment it brings, any news on this front is great news for celebration. So we have been appreciative of T-Mobile's rapid build-out efforts in Central Oregon and as a result of its newly acquired 600 megahertz licenses. With this committee's bipartisan work last year to keep the repack on track with an additional billion dollars for

reimbursement of broadcasters' moving expenses, more and more districts are realizing the benefits of groundbreaking incentive auction that we made possible through the action of this committee.

The hope is finally becoming reality in many of our areas of the country and I think it is well worth noting T-Mobile's efforts so far in delivering on its promises and in some cases ahead of schedule.

Turning to the particular transaction at issues today, experts including some of our witnesses are painting some very different pictures of the potential effects of this proposed merger. Going forward we do want to see consumers paying less and getting more data. We want to see more choices and we want to see intensified competition in the wireless and in-home broadband markets. We want to see faster rural development and we want to see better service. And we need America to lead in the global race on 5G deployment, reaping economic benefits and transformative services for all Americans.

As we consider the testimony of our witnesses, we need to take a holistic view. Instead of focusing on a particular metric like those who insist the government must intervene to preserve four nationwide wireless operators at all costs, we have to consider scale and operational efficiencies in that equation and the rapidly changing characteristics of the wireless marketplace, especially the convergence of functionality with nontraditional

competitors such as global and satellite operators.

With almost 50 percent of digital video now consumed on smart phones, wireless service is not what it once was. And with the advent of 5G, the capabilities are evolving at an exponential rate. So it is important for us as legislators to adjust our expectations to this new reality and resist the call for artificial market constraints that may not make any sense in a 5G world.

I look forward to the witnesses today and their perspectives on each of these issues and I want us to be the world's fastest and best 5G ecosystem, secure, affordable and accessible to every American. With that I would yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Long.

Mr. Long. Thank you. I would like to take a point of personal privilege here for just a minute too, maybe stop the clock for me for a second if we could, on John Dingell.

Two plane loads of us loaded up yesterday morning out at Andrews to attend John's funeral in Dearborn, and we circled Detroit for about an hour, after an hour delay here, and were told we had 5 minutes of fuel left or we could go to Pittsburgh and refuel and go back and we would miss the funeral.

So I know that Anne Eshoo was on that flight, Mr. Walden that just yielded to me, he was chairman and now ranking member of the committee, Chairman Upton who was Committee E&C and had his office across from John for years. He and John Lewis who is a legend in his own time were supposed to speak at the funeral and Speaker Pelosi happened to be on the same flight or I happened to be on the same plane with them.

So at 30,000 feet, John Lewis led us in a tribute and we had our own service for John Dingell at 30,000 feet yesterday and it was quite moving. Chairman Upton spoke, Speaker Pelosi, John led us in prayer and spoke, and it was a pretty moving tribute. So we did what we did to get to Big John's funeral.

I was born in 1955. John Dingell was sworn into Congress in 1955. He followed his father. His wife Debbie of course follows him today. She is doing an excellent job and thoughts and prayers go out to Debbie and the family. With that I will start my minute that Greg yielded to me. Today's hearing

gives us the opportunity to hear about how the American public can benefit from the proposed merger of T-Mobile and Sprint.

The U.S. telecommunications market has changed dramatically in recent years. In order to foster innovation and growth in any industry it is important that we ensure that there is a fair and competitive marketplace.

I am excited to hear how the third and fourth largest wire carriers in the United States plan to combine their spectrum resources to deliver a more robust, nationwide, wireless broadband network for consumers, drive innovation and investment, and better compete with the top two wireless providers.

Investments in next generation broadband networks are important to reach unserved communities like mine in Southwest Missouri and help close the digital divide. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses on how the New T-Mobile drive for innovation will help close that digital divide, benefit the U.S. economy to provide consumers with more choices at lower cost.

And I would like to submit for the record two documents, an op-ed from the Missouri Times written by the head of the Missouri Farm Bureau demonstrating support for the merger in Missouri, and also a letter in support of the merger to the FCC from myself and several of my colleagues. And with that I yield back. Mr. Doyle. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

18

391 | \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Walden. And, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back, but I just want to say for the record we have another subcommittee going on in important health issues upstairs so some of us will have to go up and back. But again thank you for being here.

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

Mr. Doyle. I thank the ranking member.

The chair would like to remind members that pursuant to committee rules, all members' written opening statements shall be made part of the record.

I would now like to introduce our witnesses for today's First, we will have Mr. Marcelo Claure, executive chairman of Sprint Corporation; next, Mr. John Legere, chief executive officer and president of T-Mobile US; next, Mr. Chris Shelton, president of the Communications Workers of America; then we will have Ms. Carri Bennet, general counsel of the Rural Wireless Association; Mr. Doug Brake -- Doug Brake, thank you, Doug -- director of Broadband and Spectrum Policy for the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation; and last but not least, Mr. Phillip Berenbroick, senior policy counsel with Public Knowledge.

I want to thank all the witnesses for joining us today. We look forward to your testimony. At this time, the chair will recognize each witness for 5 minutes to provide their opening statement, but before we begin I want to explain our lighting In front of you, of the witnesses, is a series of lights.

The light will initially be green at the start of your opening statement. The light will turn yellow when you have 1 minute remaining, and please wrap up your testimony at that point. The light turns red when your time has expired.

Mr. Claure, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

417

418

419

420

?STATEMENTS OF MARCELO CLAURE, EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN, SPRINT
CORPORATION; JOHN LEGERE, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND PRESIDENT,
T-MOBILE US; CHRIS SHELTON, PRESIDENT, COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS
OF AMERICA; CARRI BENNET, GENERAL COUNSEL, RURAL WIRELESS
ASSOCIATION, INC.; DOUG BRAKE, DIRECTOR, BROADBAND AND SPECTRUM
POLICY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION FOUNDATION; AND,
PHILLIP BERENBROICK, SENIOR POLICY COUNSEL, PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE

## STATEMENT OF MARCELO CLAURE

Mr. Claure. Before we begin, I want to pay my respect to Chairman Dingell and his longstanding service to his country.

It is an honor to be here today and I am grateful for the opportunity to speak with you. I would like to take the opportunity to explain why Sprint's proposed merger with T-Mobile will be great for the American consumers, will be great for Sprint employees, and will be great for our country.

I will go into details in a moment, but before I do so I want to tell you a little about me. First, I am an immigrant. I immigrated to the United States as a young man from Bolivia. I had very little money. I went to small university in Boston and I received a priceless education. Second, I am an entrepreneur. After I graduated college I founded a company called Brightstar. I started selling phones out of my car and I gradually grew Brightstar into the largest mobile phone distribution and supply chain services company in the world.

We worked very hard and grew over \$10 billion in sales and thousands of employees. I am most proud that we made Brightstar the largest Hispanic-owned business in the history of our country.

In 2014, I sold Brightstar to Softbank, immediately after that I became Sprint's CEO. At that time, Sprint, a Kansas company, was near financial distress. In 2013, the company lost \$5 billion and in the previous 10 years Sprint lost over \$25 billion and we had approximately \$31 billion in debt. A great company with tens of thousands of jobs across the U.S. was at risk.

Beginning in 2014, we undertook a massive and painful transformation of the company. We worked hard the same way we did at Brightstar, from the ground up. We reduced our expenses close to \$6 billion through cost reductions, employee layoffs, and some unwanted transfer to jobs overseas. We didn't want to, but we had to.

Today, Sprint is no longer in financial dire straits, but we face some significant challenges. Despite our success we were unable to fix our main challenge, the quality of our network. We could not fix our network because of our poor financial condition and our lack of low band spectrum. Because of our network quality, Sprint still struggles to attract lots of new customers, and many customers that we are acquiring leave at a faster pace than our competitors. Customers today are not willing to sacrifice quality.

Today, the U.S. wireless market has become a duopoly.

Verizon and AT&T have close to 70 percent market share and they control 93 percent of the cash flow generated from the industry.

As a result, it is very hard to invest and compete at the same level. Today, we are at a technological inflection point. Over the next few years 5G is coming, a new standard of connectivity. It is going to completely change the way we connect and the way we live our lives.

But Sprint doesn't have the resources to build a 5G network to provide the necessary competition against the AT&T and Verizon duopoly. We estimate that we will need close to 20 to 25 billion dollars just to offer 5G in our limited coverage area. because we don't generate any cash flow, we would have to raise more debt and to pay for that debt we would have to increase our The only company that can prices to the American consumer. build the world's best 5G network is a combination of Sprint and T-Mobile and we can only do this if this merger is approved. As a combined company, we are committed to invest nearly \$40 billion over the next 3 years to build the world's best 5G network with nationwide coverage. How can we do this together? It is simple. It is the marriage of two necessary and complementary 5G pieces.

Sprint has high capacity spectrum which have acquired over many years. T-Mobile has brought national coverage spectrum.

It is capacity plus coverage. Today, we can build the world's

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

most advanced, covering every corner in America in urban, suburban, and rural areas. We cannot take lightly that America needs to lead the world in 5G. China has made it a priority to win the 5G race. They are investing billions. When a country has the best network with the latest technology it brings massive economic stimulus, explosive job growth, and a new wave of entrepreneurs. America is a land of innovators and disrupters. Let's keep it this way. My story validates this. Letting another country take the leadership away from the U.S. will cost irreparable damage. This is an opportunity for a lifetime.

In addition, yes, we are committed to lower prices. When we merger two companies we will create eight times the network capacity that we would have on our own. We will have to beat AT&T and Verizon on price to fill this capacity. This makes financial sense, it is good business, and most importantly it is our commitment.

Lastly, it is true that most mergers do not create jobs. This merger is the opposite. This is a growth story. This new company will create new jobs, blue-collar, white-collar jobs, jobs in urban, suburban, and rural America. We will need skilled network engineers, construction crews, enterprise sales teams, call center jobs that we are going to bring back from overseas, and new sales reps for the new stores that will be opening.

I can't thank you enough for allowing me to speak today.

522	As I mentioned, I am grateful to this country, and as an American
523	entrepreneur I hope you will approve this merger. I look forward
524	to answering your questions.
525	[The prepared statement of Mr. Claure follows:]
526	
527	******* TNSERT 2 ******

528	Mr. Doyle. Thank you very much.
529	The chair now recognizes Mr. Legere for 5 minutes.
530	

## ?STATEMENT OF JOHN LEGERE

Mr. Legere. Thank you, Chairman Doyle, Ranking Member
Latta, and other members of the subcommittee for inviting Marcelo
and me and the rest of the panel here today. Before I begin my
remarks, let me offer condolences to Congresswoman Dingell on
the loss of her husband, John Dingell, a towering figure in the
House and a leader in this committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to tell you about the tremendous benefits of the proposed T-Mobile Sprint merger and the progress we are making towards making it a reality. So, first, what will this merger deliver? It will deliver a supercharged un-carrier which can ensure U.S. leadership in 5G, increase competition, and create American jobs.

First and foremost, the New T-Mobile will make sure America wins the global 5G race. This is so important because 5G will unlock new capabilities that will fuel innovation and job creation well beyond anything we have seen so far. 5G will completely transform the way Americans live, work, travel, and play. 5G means real-time navigation, downloading a movie in seconds, instant language translation, and much more. Nearly every business in America will be able to use 5G to revolutionize how they create and deliver goods and services.

Best of all, with this transaction the benefits of 5G won't just flow to big cities. Combining Sprint and T-Mobile will

produce a faster, broader, deeper network that is truly nationwide. It will benefit consumers and businesses everywhere including rural America. Neither company could achieve this on its own.

Second, New T-Mobile will have the capital, the scale, and the network to supercharge competition, unleashing significant benefits for consumers that includes keeping prices low. The combined company will continue the T-Mobile tradition of disrupting the wireless space and we will disrupt in-home broadband with new wireless broadband options freeing millions from the stranglehold of big cable.

Budget-conscious customers have the most to gain because they consume the most data. They have the most to gain when data costs less. It will be a huge leap across the digital divide. Our opponents are wrong when they claim that the merger will lead to higher prices. In fact, the opposite is true. Consumers will win with lower prices and better services. How? Our costs will drop sharply and our network capacity will expand tremendously. I am so confident that the merger will lower prices that we are willing to put our money where our mouth is. week we committed in writing to regulators that we will make available the same or better rate plans as those offered by T-Mobile or Sprint for the next 3 years.

Third, this merger will be a tremendous jobs creator at New T-Mobile and across our country. Our merger will be

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

jobs-positive from day 1 and going forward. The build-out of our 5G network, investment in new customer care centers, and expansion into new businesses like video distribution, broadband, and enterprise services means thousands more jobs than the two standalone companies would have needed.

In the first year we will have thousands more employees than the standalone companies combined. By 2024 we will have 11,000 more employees. Our critics are wrong about the impact on jobs. I have looked at their arguments and supposed analyses and they do not make sense. They ignore the facts. They don't account for any areas where jobs will grow, like network integration or new customer call care centers.

And by the way we have heard this story before. They said we would cut 10,000 jobs when T-Mobile merged with MetroPCS.

In fact, we expanded jobs by thousands. Let me say this to every T-Mobile and Sprint employee working in one of our stores today, each of you will be offered a job with the New T-Mobile.

Our opponents have also lobbed false allegations that this transaction will allow Huawei and ZTE into U.S. networks. Let me be clear. There is no Huawei or ZTE equipment in our network today and there never will be. Not today, not tomorrow, not ever.

Many have already recognized the tremendous benefits of this merger. CFIUS and Team Telecom have completed the national security review and approved the transaction. Sixteen of nineteen states have completed their reviews and found the

transaction to be in the public interest, and nearly 200 606 607 organizations, companies, government officials, and community 608 leaders publicly support the transaction. I am particularly 609 honored that Congresswoman Eshoo, Congressman Schrader, 610 Congressman Long, and ten other members have signed a bipartisan 611 letter of support. To those that doubt us I would simply say this. We are the 612 613 un-carrier. My management team and I believe on delivering on 614 our promises and we know if we do not we will lose the credibility 615 and the trust of our customers and employees. I can promise to you the New T-Mobile team will deliver for consumers, American 616 617 workers, and for our country. Thank you and I look forward to 618 answering your questions. 619 [The prepared statement of Mr. Legere follows:] 620

INSERT 3 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Legere.

The chair now recognizes Mr. Shelton for 5 minutes.

## ?STATEMENT OF CHRIS SHELTON

Mr. Shelton. Chairman Doyle, Ranking Member Latta,
Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden and --

Mr. Doyle. Microphone on.

Mr. Shelton. Sorry.

Mr. Doyle. And point it towards your face there a little so we can --

Mr. Shelton. Chairman Doyle, Ranking Member Latta,
Chairman Pallone, Ranking Member Walden, and members of the
committee, first, let me offer CWA's condolences on the passing
of Chairman Dingell to all of you and to his family.

My name is Chris Shelton. I am the president of the Communications Workers of America. We represent 700,000 employees in telecommunications and other industries including more than 45,000 in wireless.

Let's tell it like it is. This merger would kill American jobs and raise prices on American consumers to enrich two foreign companies, Deutsche Telekom from Germany and SoftBank from Japan. Our analysis shows that 30,000 Americans would lose their jobs. More than 25,000 of those jobs would be in retail stores all across the country, some owned directly by Sprint and T-Mobile, others owned by independent retailers. The other job cuts would be in headquarters.

Sprint and T-Mobile compete with each other for the same

type of customers, often low-income households, which is why their stores are located near each other's sometimes right across the street. You will see in Newark, New Jersey how close the stores are together.

You can see from the maps how Sprint and T-Mobile stores tend to be right next to each other. This is especially true for the prepaid brands, Boost and MetroPCS, which tend to be concentrated in lower income areas. So if the companies merge, why would they keep two neighboring stores open? Chances are, they won't. Rather, then the merger will mean pink slips for 30,000 wireless workers across the country. You heard the CEO of T-Mobile say that they will add jobs. Pardon my language, but that is just bull. Without binding and enforceable commitments, and I mean commitments that have no loopholes, such promises are just cheap sales and talk and are easily broken.

First, T-Mobile doesn't differentiate between internal employees and contractors, short-term, temporary hires or long-term employees. Upgrading towers, for example, usually is done by temporary contractors not full-time employees. Second, Mr. Legere talks about call centers, but both companies have a long history of off shoring call center jobs, moving them to the Philippines, Mexico, and other non-U.S. locations.

Third, T-Mobile has a track record of buying companies and then cutting jobs. After it acquired Iowa Wireless in 2018, it closed all Iowa Wireless call centers and more than 90 percent

of its retail locations. It closed every single store in rural Iowa. Finally, trusting Sprint and T-Mobile with American jobs is like trusting a vampire at a blood bank. These are two of the worst companies in the United States when it comes to labor law and the treatment of workers.

In recent years, T-Mobile has been charged with more labor law violations per worker than even Walmart. Violations include surveillance of employees and prohibiting workers from talking to each other about internal workplace investigations even regarding sexual harassment complaints. And what about the people lucky enough to stay employed? The merger would drive down wages for all wireless retail market workers, in some cases by as much as \$3,000 per year.

Fewer firms competing for skilled labor means that each firm will pay its workers less; employers compete for that skilled labor with wages and benefits. Take away competition and the remaining companies can throttle down employees' compensation while jacking up prices on consumers. Both are symptoms of the same disease, too much market concentration. If Sprint and T-Mobile had not fought their workers who wanted a union perhaps the employment and wage impact would not be as bad, but they did and it is. To sum up, 30,000 fewer jobs, lower wages by as much as \$3,000 per year, disproportionate harm to low-income communities, higher prices for all consumers, all to help a state-owned German company and a Japanese billionaire make more

699	money.
700	Members of the committee, that is not in the public interest
701	It is economic treason. Thank you and I look forward to
702	answering your questions.
703	[The prepared statement of Mr. Shelton follows:]
704	
705	   ******

706 Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Shelton.

Ms. Bennet, you are now recognized for 5 minutes. Please make sure your microphone is on and pull the microphone towards you. Yeah, thank you.

710

707

708

## ?STATEMENT OF CARRI BENNET

Ms. Bennet. Chairman Pallone and Doyle, Ranking Members
Walden and Latta, and members of the subcommittee -- my feet don't
touch the ground either, just saying that.

My name is Carri Bennet and I am with the Rural Wireless Association, and I first want to express my condolences to all of you all for your loss of Chairman Dingell. May his memory be a blessing.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify today to discuss the impact that the proposed T-Mobile Sprint merger will have on rural America. RWA opposes this merger. We have heard a lot of promises from T-Mobile over the years that have not been met, so we have no reason to believe that T-Mobile will follow through on their new promises if they are allowed to reduce competition.

In short, this merger is bad for competition. It is bad for consumers especially in rural areas who will experience fewer choices, price increases, and substandard service. It should be denied. T-Mobile has a poor track record in rural America. Let's face it. T-Mobile is making a lot of promises about how they will expand coverage in rural America and improve service for these Americans, but they have a long track record of doing just the opposite and we have no reason to believe that this will change if the merger is approved. In fact, we think it will get a lot worse.

I am going to run through three examples of T-Mobile's behavior that have my members concerned. Roaming. Roaming arrangements are important to rural Americans. Roaming keeps urban, suburban, and rural Americans connected. Sprint has historically worked with rural carriers to ensure rural Americans have robust mobile wireless service. T-Mobile has not. In fact, according to our members, T-Mobile's roaming rates are 20 times higher than Sprint's and T-Mobile's existing roaming agreements are one-sided.

T-Mobile will frequently enter into unilateral roaming arrangements under which rural carrier subscribers can roam on T-Mobile's network with no possibility of T-Mobile subscribers roaming on the rural carrier's network. In such cases, T-Mobile has simply determined that it is better for its own customers to do without coverage in rural areas, rather than pay the rural carrier for network access.

This means that in those areas T-Mobile's customers cannot be reached and are basically off the grid, all because T-Mobile chooses to restrict access. Do we really want a New T-Mobile's 100 million-plus subscribers which would be more than one third of the market share to be unable to access rural carrier's networks across the country?

Next, rural call completion. Less than a year ago, the FCC found that T-Mobile failed to correct ongoing problems with delivery of calls to rural consumers. In fact, T-Mobile

admittedly inserted false ringtones into these calls so that the caller believed the call was ringing on the other end when it wasn't.

Aside from blatantly breaking the law, T-Mobile's actions severely hindered rural consumers from running their businesses, communicating critical information to family and friends, and reaching emergency service personnel. This callous behavior in an effort to save money underscores the fact that T-Mobile's treatment of rural Americans is not in the public interest and harms rural telephone companies who would have received payments for terminating those calls. We believe that T-Mobile's destructive behavior will continue perhaps even more aggressively once its rival, Sprint, is eliminated.

Last, false broadband mapping claims. Our members have serious concerns about T-Mobile's broadband maps submitted in the FCC's Mobility Fund proceeding. That Fund was created to provide \$4.5 billion to mobile carriers over the next 10 years to help connect rural Americans who lack quality wireless broadband service. To make sure they know where the money is needed the most, the FCC asked wireless carriers to submit maps indicating where each carrier offers qualifying 4G broadband coverage.

According to testing done by our members, when T-Mobile submitted its data the company vastly overstated its rural coverage to make its reach even seem bigger than it was. When

rural carriers went to test T-Mobile's claims 95.8 percent of 786 787 the tests showed speeds below the threshold demanded by the FCC 788 or no 4G broadband service at all. In many of the places where 789 T-Mobile certified it had coverage cell sites had not been even 790 put into operation. 791 If left unrectified, carriers will be denied funds causing 792 a loss of service to rural consumers who rely on this funding 793 The FCC is currently reviewing this issue. to connect. 794 before the FCC can make a public interest determination regarding 795 this proposed merger, it must first find that T-Mobile has been honest in its dealings with the FCC. Our members' drive tests 796 797 strongly suggest otherwise. The FCC should not approve a merger

> I thank you so much for your time and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bennet follows:]

if an unresolved enforcement proceeding is pending.

802

803

798

799

800

801

INSERT 5

804

Mr. Doyle. Thank you very much.

805

806

Mr. Brake, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

## ?STATEMENT OF DOUG BRAKE

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

807

Mr. Brake. Thank you. Chairman Doyle, Ranking Member

Latta, and members of the subcommittee thank you for inviting

me to share the views of the Information Technology and Innovation

Foundation, or ITIF, on the pending merger of T-Mobile and Sprint.

First, let me briefly echo the condolences to the Dingell family. He was a real legend and will be missed by all of us and all the members as well as his Twitter followers everywhere.

With that, ITIF strongly believes that a combination of Sprint and T-Mobile would bring about a better future for American businesses and consumers compared to one which each company attempted to continue alone. In my written testimony I explore several reasons to support this merger. In these opening remarks I would like to focus on three key issues. First, this merger provides an accelerated transition to robust 5G. Second, more competitors is not always better. Or put another way, there is nothing special about the number 4. And, lastly, I would like to discuss the right way to define the market when thinking about this transition. First and perhaps most importantly, 5G. The key point here is that a combined firm would have both the spectrum assets and financial strength to deploy a robust 5G network with broader coverage and significantly more capacity compared to what either company could provide alone. Not all 5G is the same. Around the world, carriers are in the process of exploring

business models, deploying pilots, and incrementally replacing old equipment with new 5G gear. These initial exploratory offerings are different in kind, however, from the 5G network the parties envision. The combination of T-Mobile's low band, wide coverage, 600 megahertz spectrum and Sprint's high capacity, 2.5 gigahertz spectrum would make for a high performance, nationwide, next generation network that would help propel U.S. leadership and economic competitiveness not just in 5G itself, but in the applications that an advanced network enables.

This is incredibly important because 5G is anticipated to being more than just faster, more responsive phones. The technology is designed to be adaptive to a wide variety of use cases hopefully driving significant productivity gains throughout the economy.

The capacity from a new 5G network would effectively increase the supply of wireless services, again more than the two companies could provide separately. We should expect this increased supply to maintain downward pressure on prices including in the wholesale and prepaid market segments.

Second, let's talk about competition. You will hear some of my friends or you already heard some of my friends on the panel argue that the government must preserve four carriers for competition. But competition is a means not an end onto itself. Of course any market can have too few competitors, but it can also have too many resulting in wasteful duplication of resources.

I want to stress that again, more competitors is not always better. This is especially true given the economics of communications networks which feature tremendously high, fixed, upfront costs to serve a given geographic area. These high, fixed infrastructure costs allow for vigorous competition with relatively few competitors compared to other industries. We should want infrastructure companies to compete at sufficient scale.

A combined company could do more with less, allowing the new firm to drive greater value throughout the business, ultimately passing a significant share on to consumers in the form of lower prices, a higher quality network, or innovative new offerings. A market of three healthy, relatively equal-size companies that continue to invest and innovate is far, far better than a lopsided market with two firms considerably stronger than the others. There is no reason to preserve four for four's sake.

Lastly, it is important to not define the market too narrowly and acknowledge the dynamic forces changing competition. 5G is accelerating what are already rapidly differentiating business models in wireless services. Basic connectivity is increasingly commodified and wireless companies are instead looking to new revenue sources to recoup their large, ongoing investments. These new revenue opportunities include Internet of Things services, connected vehicles and drones, over-the-top video services, advertising, and perhaps most notably, fixed wireless

broadband to the home, which is in turn prompting cable providers
to explore wireless entry.

These new business models with value-added services built
on top of basic connectivity are likely to keep downward pressure
on price for the traditional bundles of voice, text, and data

on top of basic connectivity are likely to keep downward pressure on price for the traditional bundles of voice, text, and data whether there are three or more facilities operators. Because this merger will accelerate flourishing U.S. 5G future, improves the market structure with three strong firms with sufficient scale to vigorously compete, and comes at a time of rapidly changing business models, we believe it is in the public interest and hope it is quickly approved.

Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Brake follows:]

895

896

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 6 \*\*\*\*\*\*

897

Mr. Doyle. Thank you.

898

Mr. Berenbroick, you are now recognized for 5 minutes.

(202) 234-4433

## ?STATEMENT OF PHILLIP BERENBROICK

Mr. Berenbroick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Latta, and members of the subcommittee. And I want to associate myself and Public Knowledge with the statements of the panel and the members of the subcommittee honoring Chairman Dingell's life and his service.

Thank you for inviting me to appear today and thank you for shining a light on the harms of the proposed Sprint T-Mobile merger. Today's hearing will show that this proposed merger is a bad deal for consumers, for competition, and for America's wireless future. The evidence clearly shows that this transaction does not serve the public service and is unlawful under the antitrust laws.

As you consider this deal ask yourself, what will it mean for each of your constituents who rely daily on their smart phones? The answer is clear. They will ultimately pay higher prices and have fewer choices for wireless service. Since announcing their intention to merge in April 2018, the companies have failed to show that the merger would not violate competition laws. They have failed to show that the merger would affirmatively serve the public interest as required for FCC approval and they have failed to show that other public interest benefits would offset the merger's substantial reduction in competition.

The evidence Sprint and T-Mobile have presented to the FCC

and the Department of Justice shows that consolidating the wireless market down to three national players would result in substantially higher prices for consumers. And you don't have to take my word for it, the economic analysis submitted by the companies admits as much.

Recent promises that the merged company will not raise prices in the near term underscore the obvious. Post-merger the marketplace will not be competitive enough to discipline the three remaining national carriers when they raise prices. The proposed transaction will eliminate competition and choices for consumers. It will inflict significant harm on the low-income, prepaid, and rural consumers who can least afford to pay more. Additionally, the deal will lead to tens of thousands of lost jobs and lower wages for the workers that remain.

The merger will eliminate avenues for new competitors to enter the wireless market, and, finally, the deal will harm small and rural wireless providers and their subscribers who rely on competitive choices for roaming and wholesale. Remember, under the FCC's public interest analysis, the companies' burden is not merely to show that there is a lack of public interest harms, they must demonstrate specific public interest benefits that would directly flow from the transaction.

The FCC is charged with affirmatively promoting competition, not merely maintaining or protecting the existing level of competition. The companies have not shown that this merger would

increase competition or benefit the public interest. The

Commission's public interest standard is rooted in the text of

the Communications Act and the Commission is charged with ensuring

the availability of advanced telecommunications to all Americans

and that quality services are provided at just, reasonable,

affordable rates and the merger would frustrate all of these

fundamental roles.

For nearly a year, Sprint and T-Mobile have attempted to overcome these overwhelming yet predictable harms to the public interest, consumers, and competition. To distract from the damage this merger would inflict on wireless competition, the companies insist that this merger is about competing with cable companies. Don't buy it. We have heard this before. This is exactly the same song AT&T and T-Mobile sang when they tried to merge in 2011.

Policymakers, the public, and enforcement agencies rejected these arguments then, and these claims are similarly hollow and misleading today. The merger benefits alleged by the companies have collapsed under public scrutiny and the companies' economic and engineering models have come under substantial attack and they actually undermine the case the companies are making here today.

The DOJ, the FCC, and this subcommittee must follow the objective evidence they collect rather than relying on unverifiable and unenforceable commitments made by the companies.

974 That evidence includes prior public statements by the companies 975 themselves, prior FCC and DOJ evaluations of four to three 976 wireless market mergers; international wireless market 977 comparisons. All of this evidence clearly shows that the merger 978 will gut competition in the wireless market, lead to dramatically 979 higher prices for every wireless consumer; further, the evidence 980 undermines the speculative and unverifiable benefits the 981 companies continue to allege and have done so here today. 982 To be clear, this merger is not necessary to build 5G 983 It will not increase investments in 5G. networks. On their own 984 the companies are already competing to deploy robust 5G networks. 985 This will continue preserving the well-documented benefits of 986 vigorous four-firm competition and it will not lead to new 987 deployments in rural areas or help close the digital divide. 988 Thank you for your invitation to appear here today and I 989 look forward to answering your questions. [The prepared statement of Mr. Berenbroick follows:] 990 991 INSERT 7 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* 992

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

993 Mr. Doyle. Thank you.

With the conclusion of witness testimony we are now going to move to member questions. Each member will have 5 minutes to ask questions of our witnesses. And let me say to my colleagues that I love you all dearly and it pains me greatly to bring the gavel down when you have exceeded your 5 minutes. But the kindness that I showed last week resulted in many people going much, much over their 5 minute time.

So if you are near the very end then you ask the question and it takes more than 5 minutes for the answer, we will certainly let that happen. But after 5 minutes, please no more questions or I am going to have to enforce it with the gavel. So, and I will try to set an example by yielding myself 5 minutes and staying within the time.

So, Mr. Legere, I am going to ask you and Mr. Berenbroick the same question but a different way and I am going to hold you each to 45 seconds because I have only got 5 minutes.

So tell me, Mr. Legere, why you think this merger is different than other mergers in the past in highly concentrated areas.

Tell me why you think this isn't going to result in some of the things we have seen in other mergers where it did raise prices and it didn't bring competition. What is different about this?

Mr. Legere. Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. In general, the issue with mergers is that industries consolidate, supply goes down, prices go up, and jobs are eliminated. This is a unique

merger where the outcome of this merger will be a significant increase in supply in the form of eight times the capacity that our network will make available.

It will bring an 87 percent decline in the price per gig of data and jobs will go up. So this is dramatically different.

of data and jobs will go up. So this is dramatically different. It is unique. It is the advent of 5G. The complementary nature of these networks increases supply significantly which will decrease prices. That is quite different.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you. And that was within the 45 seconds. I appreciate it.

So, Mr. Berenbroick, tell me in the same amount of time why you think this merger is going to be the same as any other merger.

Mr. Berenbroick. Thank you for the question. So this merger is remarkably similar to AT&T T-Mobile. That merger was rejected by DOJ and the FCC in 2011. That deal would have led to, DOJ and the FCC found, higher prices, less competition to discipline the marketplace, less competition would also mean less innovation and service plans, less robust networks, lower customer service quality, less incentives to invest and deploy.

Those things are all true here, but in some instances this merger is actually worse. We are actually eliminating both of the smaller maverick competitors that challenge and discipline the behavior of the two larger companies in the marketplace.

There are also increasing harms to the prepaid market, low-income consumers, the Lifeline marketplace, and then lastly, the roaming

and MVNO marketplace. Those harms are exacerbated here compared to AT&T T-Mobile.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you.

Mr. Shelton, if a Sprint employee is working at a retail store and they lose their job because they are working across the street from a T-Mobile store, is the claim being made that that employee will get another retail job in that area or do you think, rather, it is potentially that these jobs will be displaced and at best replaced by different types of jobs in different communities?

Mr. Shelton. First of all, it may not be a Sprint employee that loses their job, but that is kind of the problem with the numbers here. Most of the --

Mr. Doyle. Pull your mike towards you.

Mr. Shelton. Most of the stores are independent contractors who don't have Sprint employees. But I don't see how even a Sprint employee, say, in Pittsburgh would lose their job in Pittsburgh because of consolidation of stores and end up in Pittsburgh. They might end up in Nebraska if Mr. Legere keeps his word and offers that employee a job. But I don't see how they are going to because of the concentration of stores. After this company merges, if it merged, they would have twice the number of stores that either AT&T or Verizon has now. So stores are going to be closed no matter what happens.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mr. Berenbroick, what precedent is set by allowing competitors to merge to achieve an evolutionary step in technology? I mean what happens then for 6G or 7G, and how did the government view similar claims for 3G and 4G?

Mr. Berenbroick. Yeah, Congressman, that is a good question. So as you will recall in AT&T T-Mobile, one of the claims the companies made was that they couldn't deploy 4G LTE coverage to the entirety of their network footprints to the rest of the country if they didn't merge. The government evaluated the evidence that was before it, they rejected that. They found that that was not credible. They found that competition was likely to lead to deployment not consolidation. The same is true here.

So essentially if you buy into the argument that we need to allow these companies to merge for 5G -- by the way that is directly contrary to the statements they have made to Wall Street and investors even, you know, very recently -- you know, it essentially sets the precedent that whenever there is a need for these companies to invest in new infrastructure to employ 6G, 7G as you said, the gates are open to additional consolidation. Consumers need more competition for lower prices and better services, not fewer.

Mr. Doyle. And I see I have 7 seconds left and I am going to yield it back to set a good example for the rest of my colleagues. And I will now yield to the ranking member.

1093 Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you 1094 very much for yielding. 1095 And, Mr. Brake, if I could start my questioning with you, 1096 my district is a microcosm of the country, going from Toledo to 1097 suburban neighborhoods all the way to small communities in 1098 sparsely rural counties. The state of New York is also well-known 1099 for being split between rural and urban communities. 1100 What lessons can the committee draw from the New York Public 1101 Service Commission's approval of this merger last week in terms 1102 of benefits on both for the rural and urban communities? 1103 Sure, yes. I thank you for the question, Mr. Mr. Brake. Yes, the New York Public Service Commission, I think the 1104 1105 main takeaway is that this Public Service Commission took a hard 1106 look at this merger, determined that it was in the public interest, 1107 and allowed it to go forward with minimal conditions, modest 1108 conditions related to jobs. It saw it was benefitting the state 1109 long term. 1110 As far as your question regarding both urban and rural areas, 1111 1112

I think the most important point again is this combination of complementary spectrum assets. You have the low band 600 megahertz that provides great coverage to a wider area but is relatively limited in the capacity it can offer compared to the 2.5 gigahertz spectrum assets that Sprint has ready to deploy for 5G which has a much greater capacity.

So with the two of those combined you get a much better

1113

1114

1115

1116

network in terms of both coverage that can help provide, you know, maybe not the greatest capacity but a wider area in rural areas to provide much of the service of 5G, but also in urban areas you get a much greater capacity with a 2.5 gigahertz to see a more robust 5G network again than either company could provide on its own or even greater than the two individual companies combined, if you want to put it that way.

I would note, however, the jurisdiction of states is somewhat different than the review at the DOJ and the FCC. So if I may if there is time, one of the main issues that is unique to the state level jurisdiction is that of jobs. And so with any merger there are going to be jobs created and jobs destroyed, right. I mean that is inevitable. The companies say that, you know, they will be a job creator from day 1 and apparently the New York Public Service Commission was content with that assertion in addition to some commitments and I believe a call center being built in New York.

But, and this is a somewhat unpopular point particularly with politicians, but wireless services, this is not a jobs program, right. Again perhaps an unpopular point, but if the companies combined -- not even specifically this merger but any companies -- can provide a greater output, more capacity, greater services with fewer inputs including labor that is the definition of productivity. That is what drives economic growth in this country and should be a good thing. I recognize that is not a

1143 popular opinion and especially among politicians, but productivity growth is an important component for this --1144 1145 Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1146 Ms. Bennet, would you like to comment on New York, right, 1147 would you like to comment? 1148 Well, I was just going to point out that the Ms. Bennet. 1149 review by the New York Public Service Commission is not looking 1150 at -- it is only looking at the jobs issue. It is not looking 1151 at the overall merger. That is regulated to the DOJ and to the 1152 FCC and they do not have jurisdiction over that. Ι 1153 wanted to hop back to a point though that Mr. Legere made about 1154 87 percent decline in prices per gig. I would like to see some 1155 of that pass through on the roaming rates because right now roaming 1156 rates are about ten times to fifteen times higher than the retail 1157 rates they offer their own customers. 1158 So essentially that means they made that in a wholesale 1159 environment, the carriers are charging more than the retail 1160 environment. So the cost is definitely lower if they can pass 1161 on retail rates that are lower than the wholesale rates. 1162 not your question, but I just wanted to go back to that for a 1163 minute. 1164 Mr. Latta. Thank you. 1165 Mr. Berenbroick. Congressman, can I jump in for 1 second? 1166 I apologize.

I am sorry. I am almost out of time here.

Mr. Latta.

1168 Mr. Legere, if I could, I have about 38 seconds left if you 1169 would like to comment. Yeah, I would like to comment. 1170 Mr. Legere. 1171 appreciate the comparison. Yes, the New York Public Service 1172 Commission is one of 16 states that has approved the merger and 1173 their review looked at all of the same issues, what it is going 1174 to mean for the state from the standpoint of 5G, median speeds 1175 of 450 megabits, the promise of 5G while having prices decline, 1176 having jobs go up, this was reviewed in total and all of the 1177 benefits that we preach about this merger New York saw and we 1178 committed with them to the things that are appropriate for them. And the promise of it is similar to the reviews that are taking 1179 1180 place with the FCC and the DOJ. 1181 Mr. Long. Well, thank you very much. 1182 And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1183 Mr. Doyle. Thank you. 1184 The chair now recognizes Mr. Pallone, the full committee 1185 chairman, for 5 minutes to ask questions. 1186 The Chairman. Thank you, Chairman Doyle. It is no secret 1187 that unions are under attack, corporations have sought to limit 1188 the power of unions which are fighting to make sure workers are 1189 fairly treated and get a livable wage, and what we are seeing 1190 is a growing disparity between the people at the top and the 1191 hardworking people like those in New Jersey, the folks who haven't 1192 seen a dime to the huge corporate profits in the Trump tax

1193 And just this week, news reports highlighted that qiveaways. 1194 the average tax refund will be 8.4 percent less this year, so, 1195 so much for the GOP tax reform. Now the CWA has argued that 1196 the merger of T-Mobile and Sprint could wipe out as many as 30,000 1197 jobs, about 25,000 in retail and about 5,000 corporate. 1198 same time, T-Mobile has announced it will be opening five new 1199 customer experience centers if the merger is approved which will 1200 create up to 5,600 jobs by 2021. So I wanted to ask Mr. Legere 1201 about that. 1202 In 2012, T-Mobile shut down seven call centers and allegedly sent the jobs overseas, but now, you know, you are saying that 1203 1204 we are going to have these new customer centers. 1205 anything in the law or any legally enforceable protections to 1206 ensure that these new center jobs are actually created, and if those jobs are created is there anything in the law or any legally 1207 1208 enforceable protections to ensure that they wouldn't be 1209 outsourced in a few years to somewhere else? 1210 Mr. Legere. Thank you, Congressman. A couple things I 1211 would like to insert is -- and I am very proud of my tenure of 1212 being the CEO since the end of 2012. I would point out that the 1213 employees, badge-carrying T-Mobile employees since that time have gone up 250 percent. 1214 The employees of MetroPCS --1215 Mr. Doyle. Mr. Legere, is your microphone on? 1216 Mr. Legere. Yes. 1217 Mr. Doyle. Okay.

1218 Mr. Legere. Okay, sorry about that. 1219 Mr. Doyle. Move that a little closer so we can hear you. 1220 Mr. Legere. But I have had a 250 increase in employees, 1221 badge-carrying employees at T-Mobile since the time I have been 1222 I would also like to point out that I am very proud of the CEO. 1223 over 50 workplace awards that the company has worked to attain, 1224 including the 100 Best Companies Award for --1225 But, Mr. Legere, could you address the call The Chairman. 1226 If not, I am just going to move on because I don't have 1227 that much time. 1228 The call centers, they have 5,600 jobs Mr. Legere. Yeah. 1229 including 2,000 additional, making it 7,500 to 7,600 jobs are 1230 a critical integrated part of our business plan, our filing with 1231 the DOJ, our support documentation to the FCC, and it is something that I am completely committed to. 1232 1233 The Chairman. All right. 1234 I mean, Mr. Shelton, if I could ask you, does that comfort 1235 you, his response, or what is your take on how this merger would 1236 affect wages? 1237 Mr. Shelton. Our belief is that it will have a downward 1238 And we have a study from the Economic Policy effect on wages. 1239 Institute and the Roosevelt Institute that just like prices go 1240 up with less competition wages go down with less competition for 1241 The one exception is where you have collective labor. 1242 bargaining, but T-Mobile and Sprint oppose collective bargaining.

1243 And if I may, when T-Mobile laid off those 3,300 people, 1244 call center people in the past, they said that the work did not 1245 The Labor Department did an investigation and found 1246 out that it went to the Philippines. So, you know, how do we 1247 take their word now? And if you look, not only has the workforce 1248 in the United States increased, but also the workforce in the 1249 Philippines and lots of other countries has increased by leaps 1250 and bounds. 1251 The Chairman. All right, let me ask you -- let me ask Mr. 1252 Legere, if I can, one more question about resiliency of the 1253 nation's communications systems and public safety. My district 1254 was hurt probably more than any other district by Superstorm Sandy 1255 and we have done a lot since then on a bipartisan basis to try 1256 to address resiliency for the communications systems. 1257 And I see that the FCC's 2017 Atlantic Hurricane Season 1258 Impact on Communications Report outlines a portion of the problem. 1259 It notes that in 2017 the U.S. experienced 16 natural disasters 1260 with costs totaling 360 billion. I would like Mr. Chairman to 1261 enter that into the record, if I could, that report. 1262 Mr. Doyle. Without objection, so ordered. 1263 [The information follows:] 1264 1265 TNSERT 8 \*\*\*\*\*\*

1266 The Chairman. But my worry is that consolidation of network 1267 infrastructure could prioritize cost savings over resiliency in the face of disasters, and I notice network resiliency wasn't 1268 1269 addressed in your public interest statement at the FCC. 1270 So, Mr. Legere, there is not much time. Can you explain 1271 why you chose to leave this issue out of that public interest 1272 statement and whether you had discussions with the FCC regarding 1273 how this deal will affect network resiliency and public safety? 1274 Mr. Legere. Thank you for that important question, sir. 1275 I think the FCC's feedback on the increase in resiliency and 1276 the response to natural disasters in the last year or 2 by T-Mobile 1277 has been industry-leading and something that they are extremely 1278 Resiliency of our networks has been a critical priority proud of. 1279 and it is a critical priority of the New T-Mobile's network. 1280 And, you know, this infrastructure plan will significantly 1281 increase the resiliency of our network and it is part of the plan. 1282 The Chairman. All right, thank you so much. The chair now 1283 Mr. Doyle. The gentleman yields back. 1284 recognizes Mr. Walden, the full committee ranking member, for 1285 5 minutes to ask questions. 1286 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And before I start Mr. Walden. 1287 I want to thank you for your concern about these jobs. we had a hostile takeover here at this committee and we lost about 1288 1289 half our staff. And I am just wondering, in this new spirit of

protection of lost jobs could we get those back?

1291	[Laughter.]
1292	Mr. Doyle. Yeah. Were they reassigned to a different
1293	neighborhood?
1294	Mr. Walden. Yeah, you could say that.
1295	I want to thank our witnesses for being here.
1296	Mr. Berenbroick, I know Mr. Brake talked in his testimony
1297	about the number 4 carriers. Is there a magic to number 4 in
1298	terms of competition in this space? Is there some magic to four
1299	versus five versus three versus eight?
1300	Mr. Berenbroick. You know, it is a good question. The key
1301	as the Department of Justice and the FCC look at this deal isn't
1302	whether there is a magic number of firms in the marketplace.
1303	It is do the players in the marketplace, does the structure of
1304	the marketplace promote lower prices, more investment, better
1305	choices for consumers, better more deployment of broadband
1306	services? And we believe, frankly, that when you take these two
1307	companies and you merge them together you eliminate the mavericks,
1308	the companies that have been the driving competitive forces in
1309	the industry.
1310	So to answer your question directly, I don't believe there
1311	is a per se magic number, it is about market structure.
1312	Mr. Walden. Okay.
1313	Mr. Berenbroick. But this transaction has significant
1314	concerns.
1315	Mr. Walden. Mr. Brake, do you want to comment on that

briefly?

Mr. Brake. Sure. I mean as I mentioned, right, there is no real magic to the number 4, but it seems to be a lot of the folks pushing to preserve four seem to think that more is necessarily better, you know, why not five, why not six, why not seven? And the answer is clear. It is because then you end up with all of this duplication of infrastructure that leads to a fragmentation of market, increases costs that ultimately have to be borne by consumers of the network, right.

And so the question is, what is the optimal balance between, you know, competition that drives down prices, continues innovation but doesn't see these duplication of resources?

Considering the limited cash flow and the high debt of Sprint, there is a good indication that that number, that optimal number is closer to 3 rather than 4.

Mr. Walden. All right. Thank you both. I appreciate your perspectives on that.

I want to turn to our other representatives here. Talk to me, Mr. Claure and Mr. Legere, about roaming rates and what we should anticipate, consumers. And about data, both data access and costs going to go up, going to go down? As you know, my district is pretty enormous and gives new definition to rural and remote and we are concerned about how these two would work.

And I don't know which among you wants to, between you wants to go first on that, but please, and thank you again for being

here.

Mr. Claure. Thank you, Congressman. One of the most important pillars of this merger is increasing capacity.

Basically when you put these two networks together you are going to create eight times the capacity. So to put things in perspective, imagine if you had a stadium in which two thirds of it is empty. Pretty much you are going to be, you are going to have an economic incentive to basically reduce prices and find different people to fill this capacity.

This is why we have been very clear and we made a commitment to lower prices. Traditionally, most mergers, you don't find companies that go and make a voluntary filing to the FCC like John at T-Mobile did basically making a commitment that prices will remain the same or lower. It is a question of capacity. We are going to have more capacity than ever before, eight times capacity, so we have got to fill it and that is going to be filled by the different partners in the industry.

Mr. Walden. All right.

Mr. Legere, do you want to address those two issues as well?

Mr. Legere. Yes. Thank you, sir. I would first say, let's

be clear. The wireless industry is a duopoly controlled by AT&T

and Verizon who control over 80 percent of the profitability and

95 percent of the cash flow and after the merger they will still

have almost 70 percent market share. What we have done for 6

years at T-Mobile as the un-carrier, the whole thesis of this

transaction is to use this increase in supply, capacity, and decreased price to supercharge the un-carrier, to bring competition. You will see users have an 87 percent decline in the price per gigabit of data. You will have an eightfold increase. Users will go from ten gigs to eighty gigs and that is just in wireless. We expect to take that competition also to the cable industry which is not only a duopoly, it is a monopoly. And most of America, 79 percent, have no more than one choice for high speed broadband access and we plan on entering that market, having as many as 9.6 million customers serving 50 percent of the geography of the United States and saving just in that part over \$13 billion a year to people on their cable and in-home broadband bills.

Mr. Walden. All right. I thank all of our witnesses for your comments. My time has expired. I yield back.

Mr. McNerney. [Presiding.] Thank you.

I recognize myself for 5 minutes, but I first want to reiterate my colleagues and the panel on recognizing the leadership that John Dingell provided on a bipartisan way to get legislation done that was sustainable in the long run, and hopefully we can continue in that tradition.

Many households in my district live paycheck to paycheck.

More than a quarter have an annual income of less than \$35,000 a year. If these households are faced with even a couple more dollars each month it could mean they no longer have access to

1391	wireless service.
1392	So, Mr. Legere, can you cite any recent example where a
1393	country went from four to three wireless carriers and prices did
1394	not increase?
1395	Mr. Legere. Thank you very much for the question, sir.
1396	And the types of customers that you describe we are
1397	disproportionately serving both at T-Mobile and at Sprint and
1398	they disproportionately have benefitted from what we have done
1399	because they are the highest
1400	Mr. McNerney. Which is why we are worried about the merger
1401	reducing competition to those, to that sector of the population.
1402	Mr. Legere. Thank you, sir. Since we have acquired
1403	MetroPCS, the average price of a prepaid service to our customers
1404	has gone down four percent, but the data usage has gone up
1405	twelvefold.
1406	Mr. McNerney. But you really didn't answer my question.
1407	Any recent examples of countries that went from four to three
1408	and did not have prices increase?
1409	Mr. Legere. I am not a study in the countries around the
1410	world, sir.
1411	Mr. McNerney. I understand.
1412	Mr. Berenbroick, is it true that the three to four merger
1413	of T-Mobile Netherlands and Orange led to price increases in the
1414	Netherlands compared to other control countries?
1415	Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, Congressman, between 10 to 17 percent

1416 price increases. 1417 Mr. McNerney. Wow. And is it true that when Austria went 1418 from four to three wireless carriers the prices also increased? 1419 Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, sir, between 14 and 20 percent. 1420 what is particularly important in that market is that one of the 1421 three remaining players is one of T-Mobile's sister companies, 1422 T-Mobile Austria. 1423 Mr. McNerney. Wouldn't this merger have an even greater 1424 impact on lower income people who depend on prepaid services since 1425 we would be moving from three to four facility-based prepaid 1426 providers? Yes, sir. 1427 Mr. Berenbroick. I believe it would. You know, 1428 in this marketplace in the prepaid market you tend to have only 1429 three players currently-T-Mobile, Sprint, who would merge, and 1430 T-Mobile and Sprint would have a dominant position in that AT&T. 1431 marketplace and have the power and incentives to raise prices 1432 on those prepaid customers who, you know, frankly, are likely 1433 to be lower income, likely to be mobile-only, likely to be 1434 consumers of color and, frankly, would have no other choices in

Mr. McNerney. Thank you.

have nowhere else to turn.

Mr. Legere, I have a letter here from you to the chairman of the FCC dated February 4th of this year in which you stated, "I want to reiterate unequivocally that New T-Mobile rates will

the marketplace. So prices would go up on them and they would

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1441	not go up, rather our merger will ensure that American consumers
1442	will pay less and get more."
1443	And I am going to submit this to the committee, without
1444	objection.
1445	[The information follows:]
1446	
1447	******* INSERT 9 *******

1448	Mr. McNerney. Is it also correct that on the same day you
1449	submitted a letter, counsel for T-Mobile submitted an ex parte
1450	filing to the FCC that further articulated this commitment?
1451	Mr. Legere. Yes, sir.
1452	Mr. McNerney. And I am going to submit this to the
1453	committee, without objection.
1454	[The information follows:]
1455	
1456	******* INSERT 10 *******

1457 Mr. McNerney. Mr. Berenbroick, I am curious to take into 1458 your opinion on this commitment. 1459 Mr. Berenbroick. Well, thank you for the question and this 1460 is an important issue. So the history of these merger conditions, 1461 behavioral merger conditions in concentrated markets, is not a 1462 positive one. We saw this with conditions on Comcast where it 1463 violated its merger conditions with regards to Bloomberg. 1464 Well, let me ask you specifically, if a small Mr. McNerney. 1465 amount of data is added to T-Mobile and Sprint legacy plans 1466 consumers could see an increase in the amount they pay for their 1467 plans; is that correct? 1468 Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, sir. Under the letter that was filed 1469 last week that appears to be the case. 1470 Mr. McNerney. Is it your opinion that under the proposed 1471 condition legacy Sprint and T-Mobile fees could be hiked and there 1472 would be nothing to stop that? 1473 Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, sir. And even if those fees were 1474 hiked and even if those were covered by the commitment that 1475 T-Mobile has said it has made, how are consumers supposed to 1476 enforce that? Are they supposed to, you know, come to the FCC 1477 which has forsworn rate regulation and ask it to step in and 1478 enforce this on T-Mobile? It just seems impractical and 1479 enforceable. 1480 Mr. McNerney. And yes or no, is it your opinion that under 1481 the proposed condition legacy Sprint and T-Mobile surcharges

1482 could be hiked and there would be nothing to stop that? Yes or 1483 no, please. 1484 Mr. Berenbroick. Yes. 1485 Mr. Legere. Sir, could I respond to some of --1486 Mr. McNerney. Yeah, I am going to just wrap up here. 1487 hope that your promise that the people will get more for what 1488 they are paying holds true. My concern is that many people won't 1489 even be in a position to take advantage of that promise because 1490 they might not be able to scramble the extra cash they need. 1491 Simply put, I am worried about many of the constituents that I 1492 have would be priced out. 1493 And my time has expired and I yield to Mr. Shimkus. 1494 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1495 Mr. Legere, you can respond to that. Mr. Legere. Yeah. 1496 Thank you very much. And I, you know, 1497 with respect, my colleague continues to interpret what is taking 1498 place at the FCC through his interpretation of what the outcome 1499 is before their work is completed that I highly respect what is 1500 taking place. Several things, I want to be clear. I have worked 1501 very hard to rid the lines between postpaid and prepaid such that 1502 1503 Yeah, let me ask because I was going to have 1504 We that question anyway. I am old enough to know the Uncola. 1505 are using the term the un-carrier, so describe un-carrier. 1506 Mr. Legere. Yeah. Un-carrier is a term that I coined.

1507 It was the thesis and the genesis of who we were going to be. And what it was, was we set out to fix a stupid, broken wireless, 1508 1509 arrogant industry by listening to customers and solving all the 1510 pain points and removing those barriers. 1511 Mr. Shimkus. Like what? Give me some quick examples. 1512 Mr. Legere. We eliminated contracts, eliminated 1513 international data roaming, free, you know, free music streaming, 1514 So things -et cetera. 1515 Mr. Shimkus. So let me follow up on this question. 1516 you enter as a more dominant competitor to AT&T and Verizon, wouldn't that un-carrier characteristics carry into that 1517 1518 competitive marketplace or are you going to jettison that? 1519 Sir, my goal has been not just to differentiate Mr. Legere. 1520 myself by the changes but to force AT&T and Verizon to change, 1521 that the wireless industry would adapt. I have been successful 1522 in changing the industry, but I am not breaking through because 1523 I don't have the scale and the resource and capability. 1524 here is to supercharge that un-carrier and force AT&T and Verizon 1525 to invest more in 5G, to lower prices, broaden services, go deeper 1526 into in-home broadband, and I believe that that is possible 1527 through this merger. 1528 Mr. Shimkus. Yeah, and I appreciate that. 1529 And, Mr. Claure, kind of what is going to happen if the merger 1530 gets approved? You do bring something beneficial to this debate

especially for the rural folks. Greg Walden represents rural

America. I represent rural America, Billy Long. We have a lot of folks here that that is a concern. Is there a way to carry that roaming debate that Sprint trumpeted to this new merged company? Hit your mike.

Mr. Claure. Thank you for your question. Today, Sprint has contracts with most of the rural carriers and those are contracts. And I have been very clear with John that the New T-Mobile will plan to honor the contracts that Sprint has signed. What is important for most of you who have people in the rural part of the country, it is very simple. T-Mobile did not have 600 megahertz spectrum so T-Mobile couldn't basically build a nationwide coverage. Today they do. They like the capacity they can buy with our spectrum.

So we are going to bring 5G to every corner of America and that is going to be a huge differentiator. You have seen the lack of competition that exists today in rural America.

Mr. Shimkus. So, Mr. Legere, I would hope that that would be part of the new corporate culture as far as if this is a successful merged company. I think my folks in the rural wireless would like to see that too.

Mr. Legere. Yes, sir, a hundred percent. I would just like to point out that when you take the topic of rural there is two important components, the rural customer right now who is not being served, does not have choice, and the rural carrier. Both of those carriers will be served greatly by this transaction.

I clearly have honored that I will, you know, commit to honor all of the agreements that Sprint has and I believe that we will be in a position to negotiate even better things for the rural players. And I believe that in that partnership we can be the rural players' partner to bring them to the 5G evolution and the winner will be the rural customer.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Legere.

With my remaining time I want to try to get two things done.

One is to remind my colleagues that this evening at 6:00 in the Rayburn Foyer, the Next Generation 911 has their awards ceremony.

Especially if you are new on the committee and want to know 911, telecommunications, location, that is a good event to stop by and I want to encourage you to do that.

And, Mr. Berenbroick, I am sorry. In your comments in your testimony you lauded the Department of Justice on their decision on the T-Mobile -- what was it -- AT&T merger. Our point is you have the FCC and the Department of Justice making this ruling. Do you trust the DOJ to make the ruling without, as Chairman Walden said or Ranking Member Walden said, political influence?

Mr. Berenbroick. Thank you, Congressman. Yes, obviously that issue of political influence has come up with regards to merger reviews in the past. Yes, I do trust the staff at the Department of Justice to fully review the evidence before them, the staff at the FCC to fully review the evidence and to make those recommendations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1583 Mr. Doyle. 1584 Thank you. 1585 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. 1586 Loebsack. 1587 Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I do thank the 1588 chair and the ranking member for having this hearing today and 1589 I want to thank all of you for being here as well. It has been 1590 pretty enlightening. I think it is an important hearing. 1591 happy to hear that there has been a lot of focus on rural areas. 1592 Both sides of the aisle, we represent, many of us on this 1593 committee represent significant rural areas. 1594 So I am going to get right to my first question. 1595 Ms. Bennet, your testimony you state that T-Mobile has, and 1596 I quote, determined that it is better for its business to do 1597 without any coverage in rural areas, unquote. 1598 representative of a rural district not as big as some of them 1599 but nonetheless pretty darn big, 12-13,000 square miles, 24 1600 counties, where coverage can often be dismal or nonexistent, I 1601 get around my district all the time. I experience this whenever 1602 I find that particular assertion very worrying as I am back. 1603 you might imagine. Can you clarify a little bit more on that 1604 point? 1605 Ms. Bennet. Certainly and I appreciate the question. 1606 members who have built out the rural networks in their rural areas

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.

1607 and it is not everywhere, to be clear it is only in the areas 1608 that they serve. 1609 Mr. Loebsack. And you did mention Iowa in your testimony? 1610 Ms. Bennet. Yes, yes. And what has happened is in negotiations with T-Mobile, T-Mobile elects not to -- they 1611 1612 lack-restrict. It is a technology that you can put in place so 1613 that their customers don't have access to those rural carriers' 1614 So they have roaming agreements because under the 1615 FCC's rules they have to let the rural carriers' customers roam 1616 on their network but not the reciprocal. So that they choose not to do that and that is because they probably don't want to 1617 1618 pay the roaming charges to the rural carriers. 1619 Mr. Loebsack. Well, if T-Mobile and Sprint are combining 1620 services can T-Mobile make a structural commitment to use Sprint's 1621 rural carrier service model? 1622 Ms. Bennet. Those are very hard to enforce after the fact. 1623 And to go back to the favorable agreements that we have with 1624 Sprint, right now those are expiring and we haven't been able 1625 to get any certainty from Sprint about whether those would 1626 continue regardless of whether the merger goes through. 1627 just have been silent. They have gone silent on us and have told 1628 us that we have to wait until the merger is done --1629 Mr. Loebsack. Okay. -- or not done. 1630 Ms. Bennet. 1631 Mr. Loebsack. Thank you.

My second question is for Mr. Shelton. CWA recently released a report on the impact in Iowa from T-Mobile's acquisition of iWireless which has been mentioned. One of the things that stuck out to me from this report was a dramatic decrease of T-Mobile's retail footprint in Iowa. Can you expand a little further regarding T-Mobile's acquisition of iWireless and how that reduced access in rural parts of my state and district?

Mr. Shelton. Yes. When they bought the company in Iowa they closed down 90 percent of the stores. And now for a consumer in Iowa, in a rural place in Iowa, they have to drive sixty eight to a hundred miles to get to the nearest T-Mobile store in Iowa. And if you look at the company's plans, their own plans say that 46 million rural customers will not be served by their 5G network. So that does not bode well for Iowa.

And, actually, I know it is kind of difficult in this political environment to demonstrate fairness, but I am going to do it in this case, Mr. Legere. I am going to give you an opportunity to respond and make your case, because to be frank, Ms. Bennet's and Mr. Shelton's remarks leave me very concerned about the potential negative outcomes in Iowa. I know there are at least two sides to every story, so I want to give you a chance to respond to them. And in particular will T-Mobile make structural commitments to rural constituents in my state who may stand to lose jobs, coverage, or retail services?

1657	Mr. Legere. Yes, sir. Thank you very much. And the facts
1658	associated with what is happening with Iowa Wireless I would be
1659	glad to submit after the hearing as well. But let's just be clear.
1660	There are a hundred more employees than there were a year ago
1661	in Iowa. There are 35 MetroPCS, Metro by T-Mobile stores equaling
1662	the number of what the stores were there before. And Iowa
1663	Wireless was a failing company stuck in 2G and 3G and we came
1664	in and provided the investment. We spent \$70 million so far
1665	upgrading to the 4G and now moving to 5G network.
1666	Mr. Loebsack. I am kind of running out of time here. I
1667	want you to address the structural agreement issue going forward.
1668	Mr. Legere. I would be glad to look at ways to make that
1669	commitment. And I would point out that part of our plan is to
1670	cover 96 percent of the 62 million people in rural America with
1671	LTE coverage and 84 percent of all of rural America with greater
1672	than 25 megabits of in-home broadband.
1673	Mr. Loebsack. And a group of politicians here, we make
1674	promises quite a lot. I would like this to be in writing. That
1675	is what I would like it to be. I would like to see you make that
1676	commitment, that structural commitment.
1677	Mr. Legere. Yes, sir. It will be in my business plan as
1678	well.
1679	Mr. Loebsack. To make sure we have that access here in Iowa.
1680	Thank you very much, Mr. Legere.
1681	And I have 10 seconds left. I am going to yield back my

1682 time, Mr. Chair. 1683 Mr. Doyle. Thank you. 1684 I now recognize my good friend from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 1685 5 minutes. 1686 Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Johnson. 1687 appreciate the panel being with us today. 1688 Mr. Legere, historically, Sprint has been an effective 1689 partner with rural wireless providers -- say that fast -- allowing 1690 their customers to access Sprint's voice and data network when 1691 I represent a very, very rural district in Appalachia. 1692 Ms. Bennet has testified that T-Mobile has been unwilling to 1693 partner with rural providers or otherwise serve rural America. Can you share what services the New T-Mobile intends to 1694 provide in rural America and if there are any plans to partner 1695 with rural providers? I know we have alluded to some of this 1696 1697 already, but if you could do it for me I would appreciate it. 1698 Mr. Legere. Yes, sir. Thank you very much for the 1699 I have two things I would like to point out. One is, 1700 historically, T-Mobile has not had the wherewithal to provide 1701 full capabilities in rural America. We were a very densely urban 1702 company with no low band spectrum that covered rural America and 1703 we only recently have that. New T-Mobile will have significantly more ability to do that. 1704 Secondly, Sprint is not going away. This is a merger between 1705

T-Mobile and Sprint and all of the good of Sprint will be part

1707 of the integrated T-Mobile and we plan to carry those forward. And I believe that in addition to providing broader services 1708 1709 to rural customers, better LTE coverage, in-home broadband, I 1710 believe that we have a great ability to be a partner with rural We need their help with last-mile access with 1711 carriers. 1712 capabilities and I think we can provide them with a pathway to 1713 So I think it is the best partnership for both rural customers 5G. 1714 and rural carriers. 1715 Mr. Johnson. All right. Well, thank you for that. 1716 specifically then, will the New T-Mobile continue to make wholesale agreements available that are in line with those 1717 currently made by Sprint or T-Mobile? 1718 1719 Mr. Legere. Yes, sir. And all wholesale agreements are currently contractual. We will honor those. 1720 I believe with the 1721 supply and capacity that the New T-Mobile will have that wholesale 1722 rates are only going to get better. In fact, carriers that have 1723 agreements with both Sprint and T-Mobile will be able to choose 1724 the better of those and the alternative that suits them as well. 1725 Mr. Johnson. Okay. Well, thank you. 1726 Mr. Brake, Ms. Bennet's testimony indicates that the New 1727 T-Mobile would have zero incentive, quote, zero incentive to 1728 provide commercially reasonable roaming rates, terms, and 1729 conditions to RWA members. Although, aren't there rules at the 1730 FCC in place to ensure that carriers do just that and if they

do not there are enforcement mechanisms that the FCC can take?

1732 That is right. Thank you for the question. Mr. Brake. 1733 So the rural coverage is a multifaceted issue. This roaming issue 1734 is a narrow component of it. And I just want to be very clear 1735 about the sort of dynamic here, right. The members of the Rural 1736 Wireless Association enjoyed favorable negotiations with Sprint 1737 mainly because they had a very small network focused on cities 1738 and did not have the rural coverage. And so, and I don't mean 1739 to disparage the members, right. There is nothing more American 1740 than trying to, you know, serve your community with wireless 1741 services. 1742 But this is a wildly inefficient system to have a bunch of small rural operators trying to negotiate with a small limited 1743 1744 coverage nationwide carrier is not an efficient way to do things. 1745 We should have companies operating at scale, building out 1746 coverage into rural areas as best they can. It is better to do 1747 that at scale than to hamstring providers to have individual small 1748 companies in each pocket of rural America. 1749 Mr. Johnson. All right. Well, thank you. 1750 Ms. Bennet. I am sorry. I just have to interject here if 1751 I could have permission. 1752 Mr. Johnson. No. I have got to move on because I am limited 1753 on my time. 1754 Mr. Legere indicated in his testimony, in 2012 CWA claimed 1755 that the T-Mobile MetroPCS merger would destroy 10,000 jobs when 1756 that merger actually generated 12,000 new jobs following the

1757 So, Mr. Shelton, why should we believe CWA's claims transaction. that the current merger will result in 30,000 job losses, which 1758 incidentally exceeds Sprint's entire employee head count? 1759 1760 Well, in the first instance, we were concerned Mr. Shelton. about call centers jobs because T-Mobile had just shut down seven 1761 1762 U.S. call centers in the U.S. laying off 3,300 people and sending 1763 the work to the Philippines. MetroPCS outsourced its entire call 1764 center operation. If T-Mobile adopted MetroPCS's outsourcing 1765 model, then 10,000 T-Mobile call center workers' jobs were at 1766 risk at the time. 1767 Mr. Johnson. Okay, my time has expired. So let me ask Mr. 1768 Legere real quick if the chairman will indulge, do you want to 1769 respond to that as well? Mr. Legere. Yeah, I think what my colleague was attempting 1770 1771 to explain is why his estimates were wrong and it didn't take 1772 I would also just like to submit that the CWA predicted 1773 that the AT&T T-Mobile transaction that was disapproved would 1774 add 96,000 jobs. So I know what my business plan is and I am 1775 very clear jobs will be created. 1776 Mr. Doyle. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. 1777 1778 McEachin. Mr. McEachin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for 1779 1780 holding this hearing to help us better understand these very 1781 complex issues. As for me, I am particularly interested in how the T-Mobile Sprint merger will affect market for low-income consumers with poor credit. The services you provide are absolutely essential in the vulnerable communities and that with reduced access this merger will have profoundly harmful effects. That is why I would like to talk about what this merger would mean for the prepaid market.

Now Mr. Berenbroick -- did I say that right?
Mr. Berenbroick. Close enough, sir.

Mr. McEachin. Thank you. In your testimony you discuss the effects of this merger on these customers, that is again the prepaid mobile market. Can you expand on probably what this merger means for this customer base in terms of choice and price?

Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, sir. And that is an important The prepaid market is, you know, right now it has about 97 million subscribers. I think that was the number at the end of 2017. And, you know, those nearly a hundred million people are more likely to be people who are low income, people who mobile is their only connection. They might not have a fixed broadband connection at home because it is too expensive. They are more likely to be young people or persons of color who maybe have bad This market drastically consolidates credit or no credit. that marketplace. The HHI numbers that we talked about with the antitrust review are even higher for the prepaid marketplace, which means that the combined Sprint and T-Mobile in a duopoly market where only AT&T is there, is going to have the power and

1782

1783

1784

1785

1786

1787

1788

1789

1790

1791

1792

1793

1794

1795

1796

1797

1798

1799

1800

1801

1802

1803

1804

1805

the incentives to raise prices on those consumers, consumers who, frankly, are reliant on that mobile connection and have nowhere else to go.

Mr. McEachin. Now, Mr. Legere, you have suggested that the prepaid market would benefit from the merger and even made commitments to the FCC not to raise rates for these plans for 3 years. And we have already heard arguments that the spirit of those commitments may not really bind you in practice. I assume you are making this commitment in good faith, but business plans change. How can we be sure prices will not increase especially for low-income Americans? For instance, could consumers take you to court?

Mr. Legere. Thank you very much, sir. This whole topic is one that is extremely important. And what I have attempted to do and what T-Mobile has been successful in doing is blurring the lines between what is called postpaid and prepaid, such that it is almost a payment term. You pay on the first of the month or the last of the month, so that prepaid customers are not getting lesser capabilities or quality or data than previously.

We are very proud that we are a large provider second behind billionaire-backed TracFone in serving the prepaid market and that is very important to us. And our track record is that our prepaid customers over the last 5 years have had a four percent decline in price, a twelve times increase in data, and I have implemented plans, by the way, to allow prepaid customers to

1832 create their own credit by their payment history with T-Mobile 1833 as opposed to their other forces and use that as a way if they 1834 choose to move to postpaid. And I have a migration of about 1835 150,000 customers a quarter going from prepaid to postpaid very 1836 proudly and that will continue. 1837 Mr. Berenbroick, I would like to give you Mr. McEachin. 1838 the last word with my remaining time. Can you speak to Mr. 1839 Legere's comments that he just made? 1840 Mr. Berenbroick. Yeah. I guess I just -- I didn't know 1841 if there was a commitment there or a promise. But, you know, 1842 I think what the committee and I think what the Department of Justice and FCC should be looking at with this marketplace is 1843 1844 are prices likely to go up? Does the combined firm and the other 1845 players left in the prepaid market have the power and have the 1846 incentives to raise prices? 1847 And when you constrict this marketplace down to two 1848 facilities-based providers, New T-Mobile and AT&T, that is clear 1849 and evident. A duopoly market will result in higher prices for 1850 the people in the prepaid market who can least afford to pay those higher prices. 1851 1852 Sir, could I just emphasize the last word. Mr. Legere. 1853 I want to be very clear in any which way you would like to ask 1854 the question, prices will go down. Unit cost prices will go down. 1855 Absolute prices will go down. And the pricing commitment that

I asserted on February 4th, I believe was the date, was not in

1857 response to a negative review process. It was an attempt to add another layer in addition to my business plan that says if you 1858 1859 are concerned whether there was any trickery let me be clear, 1860 the rate plans will stay in place and customers that pay X today And that was a very clear attempt that I made. 1861 will not pay more. 1862 Mr. McEachin. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I yield back. 1863 Mr. Doyle. Thank you. 1864 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. 1865 Long. 1866 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Long. 1867 And, Mr. Legere, in my district T-Mobile has a call center that employs nearly 1,000 employees. Since it opened in 2006, 1868 1869 it has shown continuous improvement in employee retention and 1870 And in 2006 and 2007 it was ranked number one by 1871 417 Magazine as the best place to work in Springfield, Missouri, 1872 my hometown. 1873 Can you talk about the New T-Mobile commitment of at least 1874 600 new retail stores, five new customer experience centers, and 1875 11,000 new employees on the ground in rural areas, small towns, 1876 communities that need them most? What affect will this merger 1877 have on jobs in my district?

Mr. Legere. Thank you, sir. I am very proud of the fact that a core component of the un-carrier and T-Mobile was even changing the definition of what is a call center, away from IVRs and robotic responses and taking and empowering those people like

1878

1879

1880

in Springfield, Missouri to own, personally, customers, called team of experts. And what I am doing with the merger is I am creating five new, gigantic centers to deploy call of centers, a team of experts across what is going to happen with Sprint.

So there will be five major centers with 5,600 new employees. The existing centers will expand by 2,000 employees, meaning just in that area 7,600 jobs. Of the increase in jobs at T-Mobile, rural America will disproportionately benefit. There will be 600 new retail stores, 5,000 jobs. About 11,800 of the people that will do the integration and network deployment will be heavily in rural America and so there will be 5,000 retail jobs, over 7,600 customer care jobs, and thousands of jobs on network integration heavily all in rural America.

Mr. Long. Thank you.

And, Mr. Claure, should we be concerned that these two companies once merged would hold a significant share of the prepaid market?

Mr. Claure. Even after the companies are combined, market share will only be 38 percent and the biggest beneficiaries will be those prepaid customers that are going to have the same access today to the great network that we are going to go build. So we believe we have been very clear that everybody is going to benefit from this merger whether you are a prepaid, whether you are a postpaid. Sprint has a long history of serving all prepaid customers all the way down to Lifeline to our different brands

1907 that we have, Boost and Virgin. And we have decided that we are basically going to keep all the brands, so therefore want to 1908 1909 continue to up the ante in the prepaid ecosystem. 1910 Okay, thank you. Mr. Long. 1911 Ms. Bennet, if you came down to Branson, Missouri and you 1912 went to the corner of Commercial Street and Main and on each corner 1913 there were different folks with carts selling Gala apples, apple 1914 company 1, 2, 3 and 4, selling edible apples, and one of those 1915 companies got to talking to the other one on a smoke break and 1916 said, hey, you know, we could combine and we could, you know, 1917 figure out how to grow more apples at less money, save on trucking 1918 expenses, bring them to the market at a smaller fee, do you think 1919 combining those two companies would affect the price of apples 1920 on that corner? 1921 Can you turn your mike on there, please, and turn it up a 1922 little bit? 1923 Since we are talking apples I don't think that Ms. Bennet. 1924 that would have an effect on the market because they are all the 1925 same. 1926 Mr. Long. Okay. And --1927 Ms. Bennet. But the difference here is we are talking 1928 wireless and we are talking about wireless in rural America where both of these companies have had over 20 years to build out to 1929 1930 rural America and Sprint tries a path of working with carriers.

Mr. Brake over here just said, oh, that is a bad path to choose.

1932 Let's just eliminate all the rural carriers. There is your nail on the head on the antitrust concerns about here. 1933 1934 These two companies have worked to -- if they are combined 1935 together we are going to have the New T-Mobile with Mr. Legere 1936 sitting at the head who has not made one iota to build out to 1937 I don't even know if Mr. Legere has been to rural rural America. 1938 America. But it is a very hard row to hoe as you know with your 1939 rural constituents. It is a lot of work. It is a lot of money. 1940 It is a lot of fiber. 1941 The four companies that are competing together Mr. Long. 1942 regardless of the product that they are selling, if one of those combined with the other do you think that prices for their product 1943 1944 would necessarily go up? Ms. Bennet. If we are talking apples and they are all the 1945 1946 same --1947 No, I didn't say we are talking apples. 1948 Ms. Bennet. Your example was apples. Yes, I think the 1949 prices --1950 I moved on. I said we are talking about selling 1951 the same product. 1952 Ms. Bennet. -- are going to go up because I think they 1953 are motivated to put other companies out of business, other small companies. And that is just what I heard Mr. Brake said. 1954 1955 You think prices would go up then if the two of 1956 them combined?

1957	Ms. Bennet. I think prices will go up, yes.
1958	Mr. Long. Okay. Now what if one of those companies just
1959	said this deal of selling whatever that service or product is,
1960	it is of equal value, maybe not apples but whatever that is, what
1961	if they said this is not as much fun as it used to be, you know,
1962	the competition has knocked us out, we are not making the profits,
1963	you know, for a shareholder, we are going to go out of business?
1964	Ms. Bennet. I think there is a lot of that
1965	Mr. Long. If they went away do you think that let me
1966	finish my question, if you would. Do you think that that would
1967	also increase prices or would that lower prices if one of those
1968	three merchants went away? Four merchants, I am sorry.
1969	Ms. Bennet. I think that others will step in and sell the
1970	apples.
1971	Mr. Long. Okay, my time has expired. I yield back. Thank
1972	you.
1973	Mr. Doyle. Thank you.
1974	The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr.
1975	Soto.
1976	Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1977	I think we all understand this is a complex decision which
1978	is why I thank all of you for being here today. We are dealing
1979	with various interests like workers and consumers, advancing
1980	technology like 5G and broadband, rates and competition, and I

think, overall, my broadest concern is will this merger create

1982 Will the ultimate proposed company be greater than a synergy? 1983 the sum of its parts or will it not? 1984 Mr. Legere, first, you know, your company has a reputation 1985 of being a disrupter and that is a good thing, but it also draws 1986 concerns about whether that would continue obviously. We applaud 1987 your promise to have no rate increases for 3 years and have each 1988 worker have an opportunity to work somewhere else in the company. 1989 Would you also agree to have that as a condition of approval 1990 of the merger by the federal government? 1991 Mr. Legere. Could you repeat the commitment, sir? 1992 There were commitments that there would be no 1993 job losses and that rates wouldn't go up for 3 years. And I was 1994 wondering if you all would be in agreement with that being a 1995 condition of approval of the merger. 1996 Mr. Legere. Thank you very much, sir. All of my 1997 submissions of 24 million pages of documentation to the DOJ as 1998 well as all the work with the FCC makes it very clear that I am 1999 committing to prices declining and jobs increasing and I will 2000 make those commitments in any fashion that is necessary. 2001 If I could real quickly point out that I spend a significant 2002 time in my life in rural America as all of my employees around 2003 the country would point out. 2004 Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Legere. I am sorry. My time is 2005 limited. But I appreciate that. 2006 Mr. Claure, would you also agree to these promises as a

2007 condition of approval of a merger by the federal government?

Mr. Claure. Mr. Legere is going to be the CEO running the company, but what I can tell you is before agreeing to merger companies we have had lengthy discussion in terms of how important it is going to be to increase the number of jobs and to bring prices down. If we tried to keep this extremely factually, we are going to increase our capacity by eight times. There is no other way to do it, bringing your customers down to lowering prices.

Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Claure. So I accept those as both yeses then. Thank you for that.

And, Mr. Shelton, can you go into what the current wages right now are at both Sprint and at T-Mobile versus other carriers and what your opinion is as far as how the merger would affect those wages?

Mr. Shelton. Since we don't represent either Sprint or T-Mobile, I don't exactly know what the wages are in either of those companies. But I do know that when you decrease competition for labor, wage rates are going down no matter what you do. And the other problem that this merger would create is that by the companies' own admission there is \$43 billion in synergies here. And to me synergies is a word that has a synonym called job cuts. And if there is \$43 billion in job cuts, you know, you are going to decrease competition for labor, or increase competition for labor and therefore wages are going down. And they are not only

2032 going down in T-Mobile and Sprint, but they are going down in 2033 every wireless carrier in the country. 2034 Mr. Soto. Thank you. 2035 Mr. Legere. Sir, could I provide some facts to this 2036 discussion? 2037 I assume that you disagree with that. Mr. Soto. 2038 some other --2039 That was a significant absence of facts. 2040 can tell you that the average wages of a retail employee at 2041 T-Mobile are approximately \$50,000 a year. A customer care 2042 person makes about \$46,000 a year. Every single employee 2043 receives stock grants every year as well. 2044 Thank you, Mr. Legere. Thank you for that. Mr. Soto. And 2045 that is important to get --2046 Mr. Legere. And synergies are not in jobs. 2047 Thank you for getting that on the record too. 2048 I want to end with Mr. Berenbroick. There is a public 2049 interest analysis that is done by the FCC. Obviously we are here 2050 in oversight of the FCC. Do you have any opinions on how this 2051 would score and any predictions on the FCC's review of this 2052 potential merger? 2053 Mr. Berenbroick. Sure. And thank you for the question. 2054 So as you know the FCC's analysis is different from the Department 2055 of Justice's. They both look at competition harms, harms to consumers, antitrust type issues. 2056 The FCC also looks at issues

	95
2057	like, you know, will Americans continue to have access to
2058	Mr. Soto. Just if we could get to it, how do you think it
2059	will score? What is your prediction?
2060	Mr. Berenbroick. I think this merger has many of the same
2061	harmful characteristics, if not more, as the rejected AT&T
2062	T-Mobile merger in 2011.
2063	Mr. Soto. Okay. Well, thank you all for your opinions.
2064	Mr. Doyle. Thank you. The gentleman's time has expired.
2065	The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Flores.
2066	Mr. Flores. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate the
2067	panel for joining us for today's hearing.
2068	Mr. Legere, would you repeat the comments you made about
2069	the use of Huawei and ZTE technology in your opening statements,
2070	for the record?
2071	Mr. Legere. Yes, sir. There is no Huawei or ZTE equipment
2072	in the network of T-Mobile. There will not be any. We will not
2073	be using any. In fact, we have had a litigious relationship with
2074	them and we are, frankly, very supportive of the United State
2075	Government's increased action against them.
2076	Mr. Flores. Glad to hear that. I spent 30 years of my life
2077	in business before I did this and 20 years of that was as a C-level
2078	person in companies and a big part of my portfolio had to do with
2079	M&A. And I had to look at every transaction as if there were

only two outcomes because that is really the truth, either you

are going to merge or you are not.

2080

2081

The acquisition is going to

2082 | happen or it is not.

2083

2084

2085

2086

2087

2088

2089

2090

2091

2092

2093

2094

2095

2096

2097

2098

2099

2100

2101

2102

2103

2104

2105

2106

So we have had a lot of comments from the panel today about what happens if we do this, both some good, some bad. What happens if it doesn't happen? So, Mr. Legere, if you would, spend about a minute to talk about the impact on T-Mobile's customers and employees and stakeholders if the merger doesn't happen.

Mr. Claure, we are going to go to you next.

And, Mr. Brake, we are going to ask you about the wireless ecosystem at large if the merger doesn't happen.

Mr. Legere. Yeah, thank you. And I will try to be brief and pass to Mr. Claure. I will not be able to and the United States will not be able to enable its promise on building a world-leading 5G network. What we will create and Sprint will create along with AT&T and Verizon will be inferior to what is being created in China and in South Korea. That will lead to loss of jobs and economic impact in the country. I will not have the supply or the capacity to continue to supercharge the un-carrier. I will be able to move forward, but not in the same fashion creating competition. I will have limited if no ability to expand into the in-home broadband and provide Comcast and Charter the competition that they need.

Mr. Flores. Okay.

Mr. Claure, could you talk about Sprint's, if the merger fails, the impact on Sprint's customers, employees, and stakeholders.

2107 Mr. Claure. Thank you. What I think that is important to reiterate is today we live in a duopoly. And you were a 2108 2109 businessman and you know that if the duopoly, AT&T and Verizon, 2110 control over 93 percent of the cash flow that is generated it 2111 is impossible to compete. It is impossible to invest. So Sprint 2112 ain't going away, but what Sprint is going to be is going to be 2113 a very different type of company. It is going to be one that 2114 we can only invest in the traditional urban and suburban and we 2115 will bring a limited 5G. Unfortunately, as you know Sprint 2116 doesn't generate any cash flow. And if we have got to build this 2117 network on our own we need to spend between 20 to 25 billion 2118 We are going to have to go to the banks, we are going dollars. 2119 to have to go to the bond markets, and we are going to have to 2120 borrow that money. In order for us to pay back the investment 2121 in 5G, unfortunately, Sprint is no longer going to be able to 2122 be the price leader. Prices will go up. 2123 And I am going to reiterate one thing that we don't talk 2124 enough, 93 percent of the cash flow in this industry is being 2125 generated by AT&T and Verizon. That is exactly what as close 2126 to a monopoly or duopoly is in this country. 2127 Okay, thank you, Mr. Claure. Mr. Flores. 2128 Mr. Brake, if the merger fails what is the impact on the 2129 wireless ecosystem writ large? 2130 Sure. Of course there will be a number of Mr. Brake. 2131 different impacts. But to my mind one of the most important

2132 impacts is you will see a much slower, more gradual transition 2133 One of the main reasons for this merger is the to a 5G network. 2134 synergistic spectrum that both T-Mobile and Sprint would combine. 2135 The low band spectrum and the mid band spectrum bring together 2136 coverage as well as capacity. Sprint with the limited cash flow 2137 is unlikely to be able to deploy, you know, a 5G network at the 2138 scale that would be needed to get the coverage out of the mid 2139 There is limited propagation. band spectrum. 2140 And the FCC is trying to bring mid band spectrum available 2141 to market that T-Mobile may have the resources to acquire, but 2142 that would be years down the road and would take a much longer 2143 I could talk for a while about the benefits of 5G and 2144 why that is so important. It is anticipated to be a very flexible, 2145 adaptable network, right, that isn't just about phones. 2146 about integrating with business and the broader economy writ 2147 large. 2148 So it is, I think, a strong national interest to make an 2149 accelerated transition to 5G. This combination is the most 2150 obvious, fastest way to get a good combination spectrum to see 2151 a really robust 5G network. 2152 Thank you for your responses. Mr. Flores. 2153 Mr. Chairman, I am going to give you back 15 seconds.

Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman.

The chair now recognizes my good friend from California, Ms. Eshoo, for 5 minutes.

2154

2155

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I apologize to all of the witnesses for not being able to hear all of your testimony. But I did review it. We have another very important subcommittee that is meeting upstairs and I chair that and that is the reason I wasn't here. But I am now. I want to use my time to, not to ask questions but to make a statement. And again thank you for appearing, all of you and for the testimony that you have submitted.

I have had the opportunity to meet with various stakeholders of speaking to them and listening to them both pro and con about this merger. I have given a lot of thought to it. And as I said, I want to use this time to state my position. Since I first joined this subcommittee in 1995, only 5 minutes ago, my work has been guided by two overarching priorities, to create and maintain healthy competition in our country and to protect consumers.

Capitalism doesn't work without competition, and when markets don't work consumers are the first to lose. Competition is the lifeblood of our economy. It stimulates innovation, something that my district produces a great deal of, and it benefits consumers with more choices, lower prices, and better service.

Today, the top two wireless carriers in America control approximately two thirds of the market. They had roughly the same market share 5 years ago, 10 years ago, and 15 years ago. So this is hardly a competitive, dynamic market that we have.

For all intents and purposes we have a duopoly in the country.

Americans pay some of the highest prices for mobile wireless service in the developed world. They have fewer choices when it comes to providers, and the quality of service particularly in rural America leaves a great deal to be desired.

Both Sprint and T-Mobile challenged AT&T and Verizon in recent years and they have fought tooth and nail to gain market share while adopting pro-consumer policies that have forced real change in the industry. I heard the chairman's opening statement and he detailed that I think very well. I admire and respect what they have been able to do, but both companies are missing a crucial ingredient to become heavyweight competitors in the market.

T-Mobile has a strong track record as an aggressive competitor. That I think we can all stipulate to. But the company lacks critical mid band spectrum to provide the network capacity it needs to compete more aggressively with the top two. And that is where Sprint come in. Spectrum is gold and Sprint has it. But Sprint has something else. They have a \$40 billion debt that they are carrying and they can't make the kind of investments that are necessary to build out a network and compete with the top two carriers. Sprint's debt, I think, is unsustainable and I think it is difficult to stay afloat while carrying it. It really holds one back to say the least.

Now imagine if they go out of business, if they go bankrupt.

This outcome would clearly, I think, be worse for the market for employees, for consumers, and I can just picture the chairman of the FCC allowing the spectrum to go to the duopoly, so that is not a pretty picture either. I think it is something that we all need to consider.

Some have argued that consolidating the current market from four carriers to three will increase prices and harm consumers. I think this argument assumes that the new company will not compete to lure new customers away from its competitors. It just doesn't make sense. In reality, I think the merger will increase the new company's network capacity eightfold. New T-Mobile will have the resources and the capacity to grow its subscriber base and to do so it will need to aggressively compete. They are not going to sit -- why would someone buy and then sit on their oars and not try to attract new customers?

So, some have raised concerns that the merger will harm low-income consumers. The companies have sworn under oath and made commitments to continue participating in the Lifeline program that I have fought so hard for and will keep prices low in the prepaid market.

So I have more in my statement, Mr. Chairman, but I think each call center, all call centers are going to be coming back to the United States and new call centers are being added. That means more jobs. I know that one of the biggest rubs for my side of the aisle is that T-Mobile is not union. My personal

2232 preference is I wish they were, but they are not. But I think that competition and the protection of consumers is front and 2233 2234 center in this and that is why I support the merger. 2235 I thank the chairman for his patience with my overuse of 2236 my time. Thank you. 2237 As usual. I thank my friend. Mr. Doyle. 2238 As much in as I can. Ms. Eshoo. 2239 The chair now yields to Mrs. Brooks. 2240 Mrs. Brooks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for 2241 holding this important hearing. I along with my colleague who 2242 could not be here today for obvious reasons, Debbie Dingell --2243 and I just want to extend my sorrow to her and to her state and 2244 district and to those who served with Chairman Dingell -- we formed 2245 a 5G Caucus last Congress. And Congresswoman Dingell and I have 2246 certainly been educated and believe that there needs to be 2247 significant education in the country about the importance of 5G. 2248 And continuing to build on Congresswoman Eshoo's comments 2249 about the importance of competition, I got the sense, Mr. Brake, 2250 and would like because you were supporting this merger, but before 2251 I ask you about 5G, because I think you wanted to talk more about 2252 the importance of 5G, I would like to, I ask unanimous consent 2253 to enter into the record a letter dated September 17 of 2018 from 2254 the Indiana Chamber of Commerce. The Vice President of 2255 Environment and Energy Policy, Greg Ellis, Indiana Chamber of 2256 Commerce submitted to the FCC a letter of support for this merger.

2257	I will say that Indiana, specifically Indianapolis and
2258	Central Indiana, is the first site in the country to have the
2259	build-out by AT&T and Verizon of 5G. So we are the only community
2260	in the country where that is happening right now, and I find it
2261	interesting and ask unanimous consent to submit this letter to
2262	the record that our Chamber of Commerce is asking for more
2263	competition and they are asking that the FCC adopt the merger
2264	and approve of the merger for the New T-Mobile.
2265	Mr. Chairman?
2266	Mr. Doyle. Without objection, so ordered.
2267	[The information follows:]
2268	
2269	****** INSERT 11 ******

Mrs. Brooks. Thank you.

2291

2292

2293

2294

Mr. Brake, on behalf of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, can you please talk with us about the importance of 5G? We need to do a better job educating everybody about 5G and the importance of how 5G, when we have rural communities still at 2G, 3G, 4G, we know there is a growing digital divide and how important it is that we catch up with Japan, with Korea, with other parts of the globe that are right now beating us in 5G. Can you very briefly talk about the importance of 5G?

Right. Thank you very much, Mrs. Brooks, for Mr. Brake. the question. And thank you so much for your leadership with We at ITIF are in strong agreement it is an the 5G Caucus. incredibly important issue. So a lot to unpack with 5G, I will try to be as brief as possible. 5G in its sort of most capacious sense, right, the broadest sense of 5G is best understood simply by the specification, the technology defined by a standard-setting body, international standard-setting body called 3GPP.

This new radio standard unlocks a number of different capabilities, but its sort of defining hallmark is its flexibility, its adaptability, right. As I mentioned in my opening statement, this isn't just about faster downloads and more responsive interaction with your phone, though it is that and that is important. It brings real consumer benefit.

But there are a number of ways in which the technology can

be, can adapt itself, for example, can radically simplify communications for IoT devices. So if something only needs to wake up, you know, once a day to send a little, you know, a few packets of information about the humidity on a farm or, you know, a water main leak or something like that, it can do so while maintaining extremely long battery life on the, you know, measured in the terms of years rather than days.

So all this is to say that 5G poses a unique opportunity to see a much greater innovation of wireless services with the broader economy and has the opportunity to greatly increase productivity overall for businesses throughout America. That is why we want to see a quick transition to 5G in a way that is both broad and deep, right, and that is where the specific spectrum combination at play here comes in.

Mrs. Brooks. This is going to be revolutionary, the possibilities of what 5G will bring.

And so, Mr. Legere, I think the concern that you have heard about is how will this new network, how will the New T-Mobile, you know, help these untapped markets, these underserved areas, the rural areas? I represent both urban, suburban, and rural areas. How can we make it ensure that you are going to get there and that it is going to be more cost effective?

Mr. Legere. Yeah, thank you for this extremely important topic. And very importantly, one of the reasons the nation is lagging in 5G deployment is that Verizon and AT&T have been stuck

2320	in providing millimeter wave in very small geographic areas.
2321	And for the promise of 5G to be true, we need all spectrum bands
2322	across all of the nation. Think about something like autonomous
2323	driving, something where a 10 millisecond delay is attained by
2324	the 5G networks and you are actually going to have autonomous
2325	driving cars. How would that work if it was only in one small
2326	geographic area?
2327	T-Mobile and Sprint together are going to be the only full
2328	broad and deep 5G capability that is nationwide and that will
2329	spur AT&T and Verizon to broaden their views as well.
2330	Mrs. Brooks. Thank you.
2331	My time is up. I yield back.
2332	Mr. Doyle. The chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from
2333	California, Ms. Matsui.
2334	Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I also apologize
2335	for not being here to hear your testimony because I was also on
2336	the Health Subcommittee hearing also.
2337	But I am curious. This is a very important topic and it
2338	is very important for the future of our country. Now I understand
2339	that Sprint is in the process of deploying massive MIMO radios
2340	to utilize its 2.5 gigahertz spectrum and complete the first 5G
2341	data transmission on a MIMO radio earlier this year. I realize
2342	it is technical, but I am leading to something here. As you know,
2343	band 41 was included in 3GPP's 5G new radio specification in late
2344	2017. Of course, the benefits of these radios are that they

software upgraded to the full 5G. This appears to offer a 2346 particularly promising path in the effort to deploy 5G. 2347 2348 Mr. Claure, with Sprint already deploying this radio 2349 technology, is it necessary for the company to combine to deliver 2350 its next generation offering? 2351 Mr. Claure. Yes, thank you for your question. The 2352 important part when you build a 5G network is you want to be able 2353 to combine capacity, which is what Sprint has through massive 2354 MIMO and others, with coverage, which is what Sprint lacks. 2355 will be no good for Sprint to offer just 5G in some specific neighborhood or some specific cities. 2356 What this is going to allow 2357 us to do when we merge with T-Mobile is we are going to be able to have the ultra-capacity that you have mentioned combined with 2358 T-Mobile's 600 megahertz spectrum that will give us the coverage. 2359 2360 So it is necessary in order for the U.S. to lead in 5G which 2361 is quite necessary for our country, the combination of our two 2362 companies, it is the only way that we are going to be able to 2363 build a 5G network that basically has capacity all over the U.S. 2364 Ms. Matsui. So what I get from that is that you are 2365 definitely going to, Mr. Legere, adopt this deployment strategy 2366 and the New T-Mobile will leverage these assets in a way that 2367 Sprint has not by the combination; is that correct? 2368 Very importantly, and thank you for Mr. Legere. Yeah. 2369 introducing 4x4 MIMO and carrier aggregation and 256-QAM which

enable both LTE and 5G transmission simultaneously and are

are the main characteristics of what AT&T is now falsely calling 5GE. We will put that in. One of the big issues with deploying a nationwide broad and deep network is the amount of sites and between T-Mobile and Sprint we have an inadequate set of network macro nodes.

The biggest improvement here is together we have 110,000 macro nodes. We will be able to pick 75,000 of them, build 10,000 more, and the decommissioning of 35,000 of those sites is actually going to provide the significant amount of this synergy. When you take that many sites and you get that extra spectrum per site and the spectral efficiency of 5G that is the magic that unloads, you know, the real promise of 5G.

Ms. Matsui. Now Sprint acquired Nextel Communications in 2005, bringing with it a considerable amount of band 41 spectrum leases and significant groundwork put into IP-based mobile broadband technologies. And with Sprint's Clearwire acquisition, the mobile broadband technology selected by both companies to leverage the spectrum assets for 4G was WiMax. However, Sprint began deploying LTE technology on its network in 2011 and the leap from third to fourth generation of mobile internet that WiMax was supposed to offer by utilizing Sprint's 2.5 gigahertz spectrum assets was not fully realized.

Mr. Claure and Mr. Legere, what lessons do you see as being learned from this effort and how do those lessons inform your companies' 5G strategies?

2395	Mr. Claure. Thank you for the question. I think Sprint
2396	chose the wrong technology. WiMax was not the right technology.
2397	And what makes this merger unique is we are both choosing the
2398	exact same technology for 5G. And basically your complementary
2399	spectrum assets is what is going to allow us to go ahead and build
2400	the fastest and we made both statements. I believe that we
2401	have a chance to build the world's best 5G network, as simple
2402	as combining the two spectrums that we have.
2403	Mr. Legere. Congresswoman, if I could just add, with all
2404	the great work that T-Mobile has done I think it points out that
2405	when these generational shifts take place in wireless, whether
2406	it was 3G to 4G, 4G to 5G, with all the great work we have done
2407	a big enabler of our ability to deploy 5G happened to be the
2408	spectrum and the cash that came to T-Mobile from the failed AT&T
2409	merger as well as the acquisition of MetroPCS and the utilization
2410	of their capabilities. So it does take the kind of things that
2411	we are able to do in this merger to provide that complementary
2412	spectrum as well as the financing and the assets that we don't
2413	individually have.
2414	Ms. Matsui. Okay, thank you.
2415	And I ran out of time, I yield back.
2416	Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentle lady.
2417	Okay, let's see. Who is left over there? Mr. Walberg, you
2418	are up for 5 minutes.

Mr. Walberg. I am looking around and I don't see anybody

else, so it is a pretty good pick here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks to the witnesses for being here.

Representing plenty of rural area in my district, this is an important hearing for me especially as a new member to get up to speed, maybe at 1G or 2G, let alone 5G. But it is incredibly important to my rural district areas that we not be left behind as carriers move to 5G, but also probably more importantly that we get reliable wireless service to begin with, in the process.

So, Mr. Legere, you have talked a lot about the jobs that might result if your transaction were to be approved both in your announcements of the new retail stores in rural parts of the country where you hope to expand service, but also to the new customer experience centers. But taking a step back, as you would build out your new network, can you talk a bit more about the cascade of high skilled jobs that may result, whether it is tower crews erecting new macro cell sites or other industries like agriculture and manufacturing that might be fueled by a better connectivity?

Mr. Legere. Yes. Thank you very much, sir, for the question. I would point out that the rural America has been left behind already. It is that divide that we need to cure. I am very proud of the fact that in the recent broadcast spectrum auction one of the first times that low-bid spectrum was made available T-Mobile showed up and won the majority of the spectrum and has been deploying 600 and 700 megahertz now to 301 million

people in the United States. So we are bridging that basic divide already.

Very importantly, CTIA has shown that the advent of 5G will mean three million jobs in the United States, \$275 billion worth of investment and half a trillion of economic benefits. So whether they are jobs associated with the impact of utilization of new applications in 5G or the onslaught of the utilization, for example, in rural farming applications, et cetera, it is three million jobs that are at stake and with the deployment of 5G rural America will benefit the most.

Mr. Walberg. That is important to understand because it is rural America that is catching up and too often left behind in the thought process that we don't need it. I am looking forward to the first time I have broadband to my house. Or cable. Or anything to my house. My agricultural industry is way beyond now what the capabilities they have available to them in many places.

Mr. Claure and Mr. Legere, there has been a lot of discussion today about the spectrum bands that would help a New T-Mobile competitive and able to better serve rural America. But Sprint also has a widespread network of wireless assets that would be just as critical for connecting the new network to the backbone and ensuring Michiganders can get wireless broadband access.

Can you talk about, both of you, about these wireline components while maybe not as exciting as the flashy 5G, how will

2470 those position your company to expand wireless connectivity to 2471 enterprises, customers both small and large? 2472 So thank you for the question and many times 2473 we don't talk enough of wireline, and wireline has been the 2474 backbone for wireless networks. The plan would be us to continue 2475 to invest in our wireline network and to continue to be able to 2476 compete against Verizon and AT&T who are even more dominant 2477 players in that wireline. And we are going to be able to do that 2478 through a different efficiency that we are going to have in this 2479 merger. 2480 Sir, I would just add, the enterprise business Mr. Legere. is controlled 90 percent by AT&T and Verizon. 2481 2482 2483

T-Mobile and Sprint have 5 and 4 percent market share. We are going to add 1,100 jobs into the enterprise space and we plan to double our market share in the enterprise business. Second part of building out this network, it is a bit of a build-it-and-they-will-come, and the fiber deployment associated with the backhaul required to build our network has been advancing greatly and about 86 percent of our build-out has been covered by that. also good opportunities as well.

Mr. Walberg. Thank you.

Ms. Bennet, can you describe for me how you plan to compete with the New T-Mobile if the transaction were to be approved? What would happen to your prices and what would your subscribers' choices look like?

2484

2485

2486

2487

2488

2489

2490

2491

2492

2493

2495 Ms. Bennet. Our member -- I haven't talked for so long I 2496 forgot to turn it on.

Mr. Walberg.

Ms. Bennet. Our members are again concerned. We have been working with T-Mobile for the -- or a form of T-Mobile before Mr. Legere joined. Back when we were trying to do 3G we tried to work -- they had a big meeting. They brought all the carriers They said they were going to work with us. They were going

I understand. It has been awhile for me too.

to get us equipment discounts, all kinds of things to be a great

That never came to be. It was another promise rural partner.

they made to us that they broke. Again that was not on Mr.

Legere's watch. It was prior to him. Since he has been on board

2507 we haven't seen them looking to work with us.

> So the concern is if T-Mobile wants to come out and build out and overbuild any of these rural carriers then we are there But for every cell site we have seen T-Mobile put up in a rural market we have at least ten times the number of cell sites. So we live and work in those areas.

> And I am sorry that you don't have service in your area. I wish one of my rural carriers was serving out there. I am betting they don't, but if they did you would have a gigabit of You would have fiber. You would have fiber in the backhaul. You would have wireless. You would have 4G and you would have the promise of 5G coming. So we would do it if we were there; unfortunately, we are not everywhere. And I

2497

2498

2499

2500

2501

2502

2503

2504

2505

2506

2508

2509

2510

2511

2512

2513

2514

2515

2516

2517

2518

2519

in.

2520	think what T-Mobile probably fails to recognize is it takes a
2521	lot of work to build out a rural wireless network. We build out
2522	to where maybe only eight people will work a cell site. I don't
2523	think they are going to do that. So.
2524	Mr. Walberg. Thanks for the extra time.
2525	Mr. Doyle. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair
2526	now recognizes Mr. Schrader.
2527	Mr. Schrader. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a good hearing.
2528	I appreciate the hearing.
2529	Mr. Shelton, it doesn't seem like you are a big fan of this
2530	potential merger going forward. And I guess I have a question.
2531	My understanding was that CWA was a big fan of the AT&T T-Mobile
2532	merger which would have consolidated the marketplace much more
2533	than what we are talking about here. So why was CWA in favor
2534	of one and not this particular merger?
2535	Mr. Shelton. During that merger we had a written, binding
2536	commitment for jobs and a binding promise not to interfere with
2537	our organizing at the new company. And that is why we were
2538	Mr. Schrader. Oh. Well, I understand that. That was to
2539	protect the union workers. But, you know, one can argue the
2540	consumers might have been terribly disadvantaged with that degree
2541	of consolidation. I just put that out there. I appreciate the
2542	work you are doing though very, very much on behalf of working
2543	men and women.
2544	I guess for Mr. Legere, you know, T-Mobile has been,

especially since your tenure, been very disruptive -- I mean that in a positive way -- very innovative, you know, coming up with new ideas for the marketplace. You know, once you and Sprint, you know, merge together, you become one of the big three, you know, obviously there is not a lot of incentive to do that anymore. Can consumers expect to see less innovation from the New T-Mobile?

Mr. Legere. Yeah. Thank you very much for the question. Several pieces, in spite of how innovative we have been and the changes that we have been able to create, we have been unable to crack the share of the top two. They are fighting. We drag them kicking and screaming. But the capacity and the scale and the power of the network that this will give us will really let me take it to them and bring competition in a way it hasn't been seen before. And I am salivating to take it to the cable players as well.

Suffice it to say, if in fact there was ever a fear that there would be a cozy side discussion of the apple vendors getting together, I am pretty sure these folks wouldn't speak to me if I was the last person in the room. So that is what this is about is creating scale and capacity to supercharge this un-carrier, bring the country to the forefront of 5G, and really drag these duopolists kicking and screaming to what they need to do for the consumer in wireless, I mean rural, as well as let's get into the in-home broadband market as well and make these cable guys

2570 start playing also.

Mr. Schrader. Pretty good.

Ms. Bennet, you have talked about the concern about low-income folks, the minorities, people that ostensibly don't have as easy access to, you know, internet services, broadband, and that the merger could be very detrimental to a lot of those folks that rely on some of the largesse from both Sprint and T-Mobile at this point in time.

The question I have is why are you so concerned about that but the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators, National Rural Education Association, Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce all think this is a good thing? Why the disparity?

Ms. Bennet. Well, first of all, I have been focusing on the rural carriers' perspective and we do have low-income folks in rural America that those carriers also serve. It is just a different position. I can't speak to why they are for it. It seems odd to me and I will just leave it at that.

Mr. Schrader. Well, that is very fair, very fair.

Mr. Legere, back to you, you know, while the market share may be small, a lot of the population in different areas seems to be concentrated in the Sprint T-Mobile arena. With the merger, isn't this going to increase consolidation in the marketplace from a pure population standpoint and how do you respond to that as a problem, or?

2595	Mr. Legere. Yeah. Well, first of all, the wireless
2596	business is a national market. Our pricing is national, the
2597	programs are national, advertising is national and the share
2598	concentration that we have will still, you know, be small compared
2599	to AT&T and Verizon as well as the marketplace for what we are
2600	trying to do is broadening. And, you know, you need to look at
2601	what the cable players are doing and the in-home broadband market,
2602	et cetera. So I think there is plenty of room.
2603	Mr. Schrader. All right, very good.
2604	And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
2605	Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman.
2606	The chair recognizes Mr. Bilirakis.
2607	Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it.
2608	And I want to thank the witnesses of course for being here today
2609	and testifying.
2610	Mr. Brake, toward the end of your written testimony you
2611	mentioned costs associated with switching providers and number
2612	portability. Over the years we have all seen the commercials
2613	in the cell phone market comparing rates, statistics, and data
2614	services. Can you further detail the ease, if it is easy, and
2615	costs of switching wireless providers, and do you have any
2616	information related to frequency a customer switches providers
2617	whether in the prepaid or postpaid market?
2618	Mr. Brake. Sure. Thank you for the guestion. Right, so

switching costs have historically played a very important role

in competition in communications networks, I mean going far back beyond even the advent of wireless, right, for wired telephone service. Number portability played an important role. If you can't bring your own phone number that all of your friends know to a new network you have little incentive to change costs.

So there are a number of different tools that have made those switching costs lower and lower over time that makes it very easy for consumers to change providers. I think an important one going forward is this advent of the so-called eSIM, the electronic SIM card that allows for consumers to very easily change carriers and also plays an important role in the -- or important future role in the MVNO market. When virtual providers can change the carrier that their consumers use it has an important role in maintaining competition in those markets.

Mr. Bilirakis. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. Legere, based on what you have heard, in a post-merger world if one of your competitors offers a great deal to new subscribers will a New T-Mobile be worried that it will lose users and feel pressured to offer a substantially similar deal to retain consumers in the marketplace?

Mr. Legere. Yeah. Thank you very much for the question.

I want to point out that T-Mobile has been one of the main reason
that customers are able to switch. Amongst the first things that
I did was separate the device in the rate plan so that customers
would know which was which, eliminate all contracts, and then

I mean you

2645 I instituted the payment called "contract freedom," where I would pay any costs that would be required if you wanted to leave your 2646 2647 We have also been a strong proponent of eSIM as well 2648 which allows customers to move freely between them. 2649 I am not afraid of any kind of a competition from a standpoint 2650 of creating the value that customers would need to switch. 2651 with the capacity that this network will bring and the scale and 2652 scope that I will be able to have and the unit cost, it is highly 2653 likely that I will be the one creating those offers that are going 2654 to cause people to think twice. Thank you. It sounds like there is decent 2655 Mr. Bilirakis. 2656 competition within the marketplace; is that correct? 2657 just said that so I will assume that. Is that right? 2658 Mr. Legere. Yes. 2659 Mr. Bilirakis. Yeah, all right. 2660 Let's see. 2661

In closing, like Mr. Walden, I am wondering now is the process already in place for these types of mergers. agency review process has been used successfully in the past to approve, conditionally approve and deny mergers. sought-after mergers before this, I have full faith that the FCC and DOJ thoroughly review all the facts to determine whether it is in the public interest of course, the merger. witnesses, I await the decision and the reasoning for that conclusion from all the information in the record.

And I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for holding this

2662

2663

2664

2665

2666

2667

2668

2670 hearing. 2671 Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman. 2672 The chair now recognizes Ms. Clarke. 2673 Ms. Clarke. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I thank 2674 our ranking member, and our panelists for their testimony here 2675 today. 2676 Speaking on behalf of my constituents in Brooklyn, New York, 2677 they care about creating and keeping good paying jobs particularly 2678 in New York City. However, they have grown quite weary and 2679 cynical of big corporations that seem to rake in money hand over 2680 fist while their hardworking neighbors have to pinch pennies to 2681 make ends meet or to even afford the corporate offerings that 2682 we hear about and that sound so great for the consumer. 2683 T-Mobile and Sprint merge there is going to be one less employer 2684 in this particular labor market. 2685 So my question, first, is to Mr. Shelton. And Mr. Shelton, 2686 I would like to know if at all how will losing one additional 2687 employer affect the wages of communication workers, even those 2688 that don't work for the new T-Mobile? 2689 Mr. Shelton. As I have said before, when you decrease 2690 competition for labor, wages go down. And that is what will 2691 happen and it will happen throughout the whole wireless industry 2692 if this merger takes place not only at T-Mobile and Sprint, but 2693 also at Verizon and AT&T and any other wireless carrier. 2694 Ms. Clarke. Now what makes you say that? I mean currently

you have a baseline of wages and what would less competition do 2695 2696 in terms of particularly those in unionized shops of impacting 2697 I think it is important for the public to on their wages? 2698 understand that. 2699 Well, we believe that there will be Mr. Shelton. 2700 substantially less employees working at T-Mobile Sprint and 2701 therefore you will be flooding the labor market with people who know the wireless industry and know how to do the job at any 2702 2703 wireless company. The only one that we really have protections 2704 because of collective bargaining is AT&T. So at Verizon and 2705 T-Mobile and Sprint you will have wages going down. 2706 Ms. Clarke. Okay. Mr. Legere, would you care to respond 2707 to those concerns of --2708 Thank you very much. And I would say Mr. Legere. Yeah. 2709 that I have already made my commitments very clear to the State 2710 of New York associated with what employment would be and that 2711 jobs will be going up after this transaction. Competition is 2712 clearly going to go up and I would actually welcome greatly that 2713 you walk around Brooklyn to the many stores and experiences --2714 Ms. Clarke. They are all in my neighborhood. 2715 to walk because they are right there. 2716 And I would say you are going to find a very 2717 happy, very well paid, highly compensated group of employees that

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Well, let me ask another question.

are extremely excited about this merger and the future.

Ms. Clarke.

2718

2719

I don't have

Given that

2720 Lifeline provides essential service including mobile broadband 2721 service, does the New T-Mobile intend to continue Sprint's 2722 existing commitments to Lifeline and other contractual agreements 2723 that they have currently engaged in? 2724 And thank you very much for that Mr. Legere. Yes. 2725 opportunity to discuss this because it has been a question. 2726 Very clearly we are supporting the Lifeline agreements that Sprint has. And, frankly, you know, New T-Mobile will have a 2727 2728 capability to support Lifeline that old T-Mobile didn't. think not only will we support all the agreements, but we will 2729 2730 be a better Lifeline provider than we were before. 2731 Ms. Clarke. Very well. And then I would like to get a sense 2732 from you post-merger. What would be -- well, what is the current and future racial and gender composition of your board of 2733 2734 directors and executive management team? Can we get that 2735 information? 2736 Mr. Legere. I would be glad to. Our employees are 62 2737 percent diverse, but I would be glad to provide all that 2738 information. 2739 Ms. Clarke. Looking at particularly the board and 2740 management as well as currently with Sprint so we can see what 2741 this merger does in terms of inclusion and diversity at the 2742 leadership level. 2743 Mr. Legere. I would be glad to include that. 2744 Ms. Clarke. Very well.

2745	Mr. Chairman?
2746	Mr. Berenbroick. Congresswoman?
2747	Ms. Clarke. Oh, sure.
2748	Mr. Berenbroick. Can I jump in on the Lifeline question
2749	very quickly?
2750	Ms. Clarke. Would you, please, absolutely.
2751	Mr. Berenbroick. So, you know, as you know, and you have
2752	been a champion of the Lifeline program, it is the service that
2753	serves the most low-income segment of the population that
2754	absolutely needs that subsidy for basic connectivity.
2755	Ms. Clarke. Yeah.
2756	Mr. Berenbroick. Sprint has been a great partner in the
2757	Lifeline program. And you just heard Mr. Legere fail to make
2758	any commitments that New T-Mobile will actually participate in
2759	the Lifeline program other than keeping Sprint's current
2760	commitments in the Lifeline program. There was no future
2761	commitment to Lifeline. And most importantly, Sprint is a
2762	wholesale provider to many of the wireless resellers that
2763	participate in the Lifeline program and serve 70 percent of that
2764	marketplace. There was no commitment to continue those
2765	relationships going forward as well.
2766	Ms. Clarke. Very well. My time is up. But Mr. Legere,
2767	my eyes are on you.
2768	Mr. Legere. Yeah, my microphone might have been off when
2769	I said we will honor all of the Lifeline commitments. We will

2770 be a good provider going forward and we honor all of the wholesale 2771 agreements that are in existence and look forward to extending 2772 those. 2773 Ms. Clarke. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. 2774 Mr. Doyle. Thank you. 2775 The chair recognizes Mr. Veasey. 2776 Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2777 Mr. Legere, I wanted to ask you particularly about your 2778 economists. They told the FCC that this merger is in the public 2779 interest because consumers should be willing to pay more for a And I want to know, will low-income consumers 2780 better product. 2781 be able to participate in this better product or will they be 2782 forced to endure second-tier service because they cannot pay for 2783 the more expensive product? 2784 I appreciate the question, but I don't recall Mr. Legere. 2785 any time I have ever made a statement that customers should pay 2786 more for a better product. My whole philosophy has been to pay 2787 less and get more and that is the philosophy of the New T-Mobile 2788 as well. 2789 Mr. Veasey. If Sprint becomes your partner on this merger 2790 and it goes through, one of the areas that I would be interested 2791 in learning more about is if Sprint is not willing to make the 2792 commitment right now to build out their broadband and all the

they be willing to do it if there was a merger?

capacity that they have in that and expand upon that, why would

2793

2794

If the investors

that play a big part in T-Mobile and Sprint right now, many of them are the same investors, they have invested money in other adventures outside of the cell phone product.

Mr. Legere. Yeah.

Mr. Veasey. So I guess I am trying to figure out what is it about this merger that would actually make them want to invest money moving forward.

Mr. Legere. Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much. It is a good opportunity to clarify. And I won't speak for the pace at which Sprint has invested, but I think Mr. Claure has been clear about the financial limitations that were put upon them. This transaction itself provides the financing that both of us need to do this build-out. And pinnacle to the whole thesis of this merger is an integrated network plan, you know, tens of millions of pages of documents and models that I have submitted to the DOJ as well as the FCC that show how at the time of merger moving forward we will fully integrate and build out these networks and how the \$43 billion worth of synergies, 26 billion of which are coming from the network integration, will provide the financing for \$40 billion worth of investment in the first 3 years in the 5G network.

So the transaction itself is not only the financing but it is the accelerant of the investment. And it won't be Sprint building out, the New T-Mobile will be doing the integration and the build-out of the network.

2820	Mr. Veasey. The investors have the money right currently
2821	now. Why are they not building out that capacity as we speak?
2822	Mr. Legere. Again I think we have both been very clear that
2823	neither of us have the capital and the financing to do this 5G
2824	build-out. We have created a business plan and we have reviewed
2825	it with rating agents and we do have the ability to finance this
2826	through the New T-Mobile's company as well as the synergies that
2827	the deal will provide.
2828	And I just want to point out that at some point synergies
2829	were referred to as job losses and they are not. They are coming
2830	in the form of decommissioning of sites, of things that are part
2831	of the network integration, so that is the funding mechanism for
2832	this transaction.
2833	Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back.
2834	Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman.
2835	The chair recognizes the distinguished Minority Whip, Mr.
2836	Scalise.
2837	Mr. Scalise. I thank the gentleman.
2838	Mr. Doyle. And second baseman.
2839	Mr. Scalise. The second baseman in baseball, right?
2840	I thank the gentleman from Pittsburgh for yielding. The Pirates
2841	are represented very well with you.
2842	And I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this merger,
2843	some of the things that could potentially be done to increase
2844	the ability for consumers to be able to experience 5G. You know,

you look at the growth in the industry and just, you know, what we are seeing in terms of more wireless usage, connectivity, the devices that are able to be connected, you know, and of course you see trillions of megabytes of data being used by Americans and that number is increasing.

As people find out more uses it creates more jobs. It creates more opportunity. It creates more efficiencies and improvements in people's quality of life. And I do think that is an important point to talk about as, you know, as Americans use so many more devices and rely on that increased amount of data that they are able to access it does really improve their lives on a daily basis. There is things that I know I am able to do. You watch how it is able to allow people to do more things and in a much more effective way.

I know you have talked about the jobs. I think, to me, some of the things that the Department of Justice should be looking at is, you know, if this merger goes through would it help consumers? Will it help lower costs? Will it create more jobs? And I know you have talked about some of that in your testimony, Mr. Legere. So if you could first talk about the ability for consumers to have more competition and have access to lower costs for the increased amount of data that they are using.

Mr. Legere. Thank you very much for the question. There is so much in what you said that is extremely important including starting 5G. The promise of 5G is a hundred times the speeds,

a hundred times the number of devices that can go on networks, ten times the improvement in the response or the delay that is created. Our New T-Mobile will provide 15 times the speed that we have now, up to 450 megabits average speed across the U.S. and users will go from an average of ten gigs of data usage to 80 while the unit price will go down 87 percent. And the track record is there, especially with low-income users who have had a price decline and a disproportionate increase.

So that is what this transaction with the DOJ heavily is about, showing the network modeling that will take this industry and significantly increase capacity and provide a pricing decline, and because of that network integration how that will impact consumers, the offers that they have and the utilization. And that is what their whole transactions review has been about thus far.

Mr. Scalise. Yeah. I think the idea that not only can you see in your case 15 times the speed as well as lower costs, both of those are, I think, something that would be very attractive to consumers who shop around really good for all kind of products, but clearly data plans. You know, you watch the commercials and the reason there are so many commercials is because there is a competition for consumers because everybody knows how important it is to be connected. And how you have talked about an integrated network plan, what these two companies can do to combine the resources that you have.

2895 I think hopefully one day not too long from now that little 2896 circle that you see when you are waiting for something to download 2897 will become a relic that the Smithsonian Institute might hold 2898 because people won't have that problem anymore. You will have 2899 to Google that -- well, what are you talking about? I don't know 2900 what that circle is you are referring to. 2901 Mr. Legere. Sir, that will happen as soon as you switch 2902 to T-Mobile. 2903 [Laughter.] 2904 Mr. Scalise. I see you are already well branded. 2905 Mr. Legere. Yeah. 2906 Mr. Scalise. You know, it is a nice opportunity to give 2907 a plug for, you know, for your products. And again competition 2908 is what made this industry great. You know, when we look at what 2909 5G can mean for consumers, because ultimately that is what, you 2910 know, we are trying to help make sure the consumers can have an 2911 even better experience, all this is coming from private investment 2912 and, you know, this isn't government that is spending billions 2913 of dollars to build out these networks. It is companies like 2914 yours and other companies. 2915 And, you know, we know all the other players in this space, 2916 but, you know, here we are talking about this, you know, this 2917 potential merger and how, I know what you talked about is how 2918 you can make those synergies work to provide an even faster 2919 experience and help you invest billions more to build that 5G

2920 | network.

Let's talk now about the jobs side of it. And I have heard numbers like 10,000 new jobs referenced. What kind of jobs are you talking about? I don't want to get into spectrum and some other things, but I am not going to have enough time to get into all of that. And maybe for the record later if you can let me know about some of the combined spectrum assets of the companies and how that would be good for more innovation and opportunities, but on the job side if you can touch on that is my last question.

Mr. Legere. Yeah, I would be glad to. We have talked a bit today about customer experience centers which are one of the core jobs in our company now. There will be 5,600 new jobs, 2,000 expanded jobs in that, so about 7,600 in the customer experience centers. And those are good paying, 45-\$50,000 wage jobs. It would be about 11,800 people involved in network integration and deployment.

There will be 5,000 people in new retail stores especially in rural America. And there will be about 11,000 jobs created over the period for the new businesses we are going in-Internet of Things, video, broadband, et cetera, businesses that we aren't in now. So those are the key growth areas of new jobs.

Mr. Scalise. Thanks, Mr. Legere. I appreciate your testimony.

Thanks for your discretion, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman.

## NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2946 Mr. Lujan. 2947 Well, I appreciate the conversation today about 5G and what 2948 it will mean for our economy and our future. However, 2949 unfortunately, too many people where I live in a very rural state 2950 -- my district is 47,000 square miles, it takes 8-1/2 hours to 2951 drive across it -- I have better connectivity over the state of 2952 New Mexico in many cases when I am on an airplane than when I 2953 am on the ground. I don't understand that. There is a 2954 promise now that 5G is going to answer this problem for people 2955 like me that live in rural America, and that is where my 2956 questioning concentrates. As Mr. Berenbroick -- did I pronounce 2957 that correct, sir? 2958 Mr. Berenbroick. Close enough, sir. Pronounce it correctly for me. 2959 Mr. Lujan. 2960 Mr. Berenbroick. Berenbroick. 2961 Mr. Lujan. Berenbroick notes in his testimony, this gap 2962 exists because low population density and high per consumer costs 2963 means that rural areas have historically lacked the economies 2964 of scale needed to attract strong investment from major carriers. 2965 Mr. Legere, in your testimony you insist that a merger will 2966 allow you to, quote, close the gaps in rural broadband access and increase outdoor wireless coverage to reach 59.4 million rural 2967 2968 residents or 95.8 percent of the estimated 62 million rural 2969 Mr. Legere, first, yes or no, do you agree with Phil's

The chair now yields to Mr. Lujan.

2970	diagnosis of why rural communities have been left behind?
2971	Mr. Legere. I apologize. I am not sure what the diagnosis
2972	was.
2973	Mr. Lujan. The gap exists because low population density
2974	and high per consumer costs means that rural areas have
2975	historically lacked the economies of scale needed to attract
2976	strong investment.
2977	Mr. Legere. I would submit that that is an analysis that
2978	had to be have done by those that had the low band spectrum to
2979	cover those communities, which was AT&T and Verizon at the time.
2980	Right now that we have nationwide low band spectrum we are
2981	deploying quickly across all of rural America and it is our hope
2982	to cover every square inch.
2983	Mr. Lujan. So do you agree with Phil's assessment?
2984	Mr. Legere. I guess, sorry.
2985	Mr. Lujan. I am going to say yes, unless I was told no.
2986	Mr. Legere. I will make that a yes, sir.
2987	Mr. Lujan. Second, yes or no, would you agree that the
2988	merger's stated benefits to rural Americans are an important
2989	aspect of whether it should be approved?
2990	Mr. Legere. Yes.
2991	Mr. Lujan. Then help me quickly understand how this merger
2992	specifically incentivizes this proposed New T-Mobile to better
2993	serve rural communities and when can my constituents expect to
2994	enjoy the wonders of 5G connectivity?

Mr. Legere. Thank you very much, sir. And yes, the rural 2995 2996 divide is extremely important for us. One of the things that 2997 is very clear in the output of the models associated with the 2998 New T-Mobile is the deployment of the 5G capability will have 2999 a penetration across the country where 90 percent of every person 3000 in America will have greater than a hundred megabit speed and 3001 capacity by 2024. And I can break that down by rural community 3002 in any different part of the country.

Mr. Lujan. So what I will do is I will submit some questions for the record. Here is the question that I have is that T-Mobile's chief technology officer, Neville Ray, states in an article CNET authored February 6, Mr. Chairman, that I would ask unanimous consent to submit to the record.

Mr. Doyle. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Lujan. What Neville says is that we wouldn't go after 5G millimeter wave deployment in rural America. So help me understand what this comment means. Will my constituents not enjoy the same speeds as people living in urban and suburban communities?

Mr. Legere. That is a very good point, sir. And I would point out that that is probably more of a condemnation on the Verizon and AT&T deployment of 5G only in millimeter wave spectrum. Because the analysis would show that in order to use only millimeter wave to make a nationwide coverage it would need a site every thousand yards which would cost \$1.5 trillion.

3003

3004

3005

3006

3007

3008

3009

3010

3011

3012

3013

3014

3015

3016

3017

3018

So in order to deploy 5G nationwide you need to use millimeter wave, mid band, and low band across all frequencies so you have full geographic coverage. Nobody could cover the United States with millimeter wave spectrum. What is likely to happen is millimeter wave will be used in some densely populated urban areas and then enhanced with mid band and low band 5G coverage to make a broadband capability nationwide.

Mr. Lujan. So the concern that I have is we also don't have robust fiber in many parts of rural America, and that is where I point my question back to Phil to give you a chance to respond. I notice your testimony, you discuss how 5G networks will need backhaul support from fixed broadband networks. Does anything about this merger address that need?

Mr. Berenbroick. Congress, it is a perfect question. That is absolutely right. For 5G, especially for 5G that you know, we are talking about to get the full benefits of 5G that Mr. Brake has walked us through, you essentially need fiber backhaul everywhere to connect to those cell sites and towers. The companies don't actually bring those assets to the table. They need to lease those assets, which that is not a merger-specific necessity. They can lease those assets today.

And T-Mobile, you know, has gone out on the marketplace and acquired 600 megahertz spectrum. You know, kudos to them for winning that spectrum at auction, and they have started to deploy it. They are making the case that their 5G deployment in rural

3045 America is based on that 600 megahertz spectrum. Those are assets 3046 they already have. That is not a merger-specific benefit of this 3047 deal. 3048 Mr. Lujan. And, Mr. Chairman, I know my time has expired, 3049 but as a former regulator details matter. And when I am told 3050 the rural America is going to get these assets and things don't 3051 exactly add up, I have a lot more questions. And so I appreciate 3052 the importance of this hearing, Mr. Chairman. There is some 3053 important aspects that we need some answers to associated with 3054 the commitments with mapping and looking at rural deployment. 3055 So, thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3056 Mr. Doyle. The chair recognizes Mr. Cardenas. 3057 Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, 3058 Mr. Chairman, and thank you so much for bringing this important 3059 hearing before the public. 3060 Mr. Legere, I understand you have made commitments to 3061 continuing the Lifeline program. You used the word, "I will 3062 honor, " just a few minutes ago. T-Mobile began withdrawing from 3063 the program in 2014 and no longer provides Lifeline services 3064 today. This service is extremely important where connectivity 3065 is basically required to survive both economically and when it 3066 comes to safety and education, et cetera. 3067 What is your commitment to Lifeline and how long do you intend 3068 to continue offering Lifeline services should this merger go

And when you say you will honor, are you talking about

through?

3070 the person, current CEO Legere, or are you talking about the New 3071 T-Mobile will commit to that in writing and make it real beyond 3072 your tenure? 3073 That would be the person and the New T-Mobile Mr. Legere. 3074 will put in writing and commit to honoring the Lifeline agreements 3075 that Sprint through assurance has. And I would point out that 3076 T-Mobile didn't withdraw from the Lifeline market, we moved to 3077 being a wholesale provider of it. But yes, the commitment is 3078 from the New T-Mobile and very willing to put it into any form. 3079 Well, thank you for clarifying. Mr. Cardenas. I wouldn't 3080 want to mischaracterize your business practices. But when you look at Claure, his Sprint is more robustly involved in the 3081 3082 What I would love to see is a future if this Lifeline program. 3083 merger goes through, a future organization, the New T-Mobile as 3084 some people are calling it, to actually be more like Sprint. 3085 So, Mr. Claure, what would the New T-Mobile have to do in 3086 order to adopt and expand on what you have been able to do with 3087 your company? 3088 Mr. Claure. Thank you for the question. The New T-Mobile 3089 has made a commitment and they are doing it in writing, and we 3090 have taken one step above what was required from us and that is 3091 make a voluntary filing to the FCC that includes Lifeline. 3092 asked us to do that. We thought it was the right thing to do 3093 to take --3094 Mr. Cardenas. On that point, is the New T-Mobile willing

3095 to do exactly what Mr. Claure just described should this merger 3096 go through? Let me have one quick thing and that is we have 3097 3098 always got to look at, yes, Mr. Legere is the CEO and there will 3099 be a New T-Mobile, but what is important to know is the new network 3100 we are going to build is going to have eight times the capacity 3101 that we have today. So therefore we have an economic incentive 3102 to bring as many customers as we can whether they are Lifeline, 3103 whether they are prepaid or they are postpaid. So yes, we made 3104 commitment. but in addition we have an incentive to do that just to fulfill our business plan. 3105 3106 Mr. Cardenas. Without -- now my question to you, Mr. Legere, 3107 about following suit with what Sprint has done to actually file 3108 a commitment in writing, is the New T-Mobile ready to do that? 3109 Mr. Legere. Yeah. Just to clarification, sir, it was me 3110 that made the filing --3111 Mr. Cardenas. Okay. 3112 Mr. Legere. -- on behalf of the New T-Mobile. And again 3113 I want to reiterate we are merging with Sprint. Sprint is not 3114 So all of the good characteristics and behaviors going away. 3115 of Sprint we are adopting into the New T-Mobile and this is one 3116 And I will make the commitment in Lifeline in whatever 3117 form is needed. 3118 Mr. Cardenas. Mr. Berenbroick, are you familiar with that 3119 submission in writing that they are referring to?

3120 Mr. Berenbroick. Yes, sir. I am. 3121 Mr. Cardenas. Is it what I seem to be describing or is it 3122 a little bit less nuance than that and is it -- what is it? 3123 Mr. Berenbroick. It is heavily caveated. 3124 Mr. Cardenas. There you go. 3125 Mr. Berenbroick. Sir. And, you know, like many of the 3126 commitments that we have seen here today, you know, I think 3127 Congresswoman Clarke asked questions about Lifeline too and the 3128 commitments were to honor existing commitments. There were no 3129 commitments to honor participation in the Lifeline program as 3130 the combined company going forward. 3131 Ms. Bennet has spoken about, you know, the high costs likely 3132 going up for roaming partners and in the MVNO market. 3133 a huge problem for Lifeline subscribers who may see costs go up 3134 and the commitments of these companies go down. Those issues 3135 all do need to be explored. 3136 Mr. Cardenas. And another thing, look, Mr. Legere, I have 3137 heard a lot of wonderful things about you and how you have really 3138 changed in a positive way T-Mobile. I commend you for that 3139 American business. 3140 Also, Mr. Claure, I followed your career as well. 3141 One of you guys wears tennis shoes. The other guys wear 3142 Apparently the tennis shoes guy is going hard shoes to work. 3143 to stick around as a CEO, likely, and then the hard shoes guy 3144 is going to probably remain on the board because of the shares

it comes to Lifeline specifically, I like the hard shoes guy and 3146 what he has been doing as CEO rather than the tennis shoes guy. 3147 3148 So what are we going to expect to see from the New T-Mobile 3149 when it comes to really adhering to this opportunity when you 3150 very clearly pointed out the market share opportunity for the 3151 New T-Mobile is going to be amazing especially when it comes to 3152 your positioning to be able to provide 5G which is the future 3153 of any provider? 3154 Yes, sir. I can only reiterate the New Mr. Legere. 3155 T-Mobile's commitment to Lifeline and I will follow up in any 3156 form necessary after this hearing to make sure that that 3157 commitment is clear. Mr. Cardenas. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 3158 3159 Mr. Doyle. Right. 3160 The chair recognizes Mr. Welch. 3161 Mr. Welch. Thank you for the hearing, Mr. Chairman. 3162 going to make a few comments that express what I consider to be 3163 major concerns about rural America. We do not have good coverage 3164 in Vermont. And the assertion that both gentlemen are making 3165 is that this will be tremendous for rural America. I would like 3166 to believe that is true, but I have an apprehension that it won't 3167 necessarily occur. 3168 You know, last February Congress passed and the President 3169 signed some bipartisan legislation that I worked on with David

that Sprint has or what have you. But what I have found when

Young improving rural call quality. And it turned out that 3170 3171 shortly after that bill became law, T-Mobile and Sprint -- the 3172 FCC announced that T-Mobile agreed to pay \$40 million, \$40 million 3173 in a fine for violating FCC rules with a practice of faking 3174 I mean this is a big deal for us in Vermont. 3175 Farms in the Christmas season depends on those calls. 3176 Hump School gets the word out that it has been canceled because 3177 of weather. 3178 And in the settlement, T-Mobile acknowledged it had injected false ringtones in hundreds of millions of calls. 3179 I mean that 3180 is really upsetting to us. And I am struggling to see how this 3181 past gives me confidence about the future. So, Mr. Legere, can 3182 you explain how T-Mobile did fail to abide by the basic call 3183 quality standards in not connecting hundreds of millions of calls 3184 in rural America, but very briefly because we don't have much 3185 time. 3186 Yeah, sorry. You know, the details associated Mr. Legere. 3187 with the settlement associated with that action are far more 3188 complex and I am not sure we could go into the process here. 3189 Mr. Welch. Well, maybe offline we could do that. 3190 Mr. Legere. I would be glad to. 3191 Because that is -- what is you are admitting 3192 to or T-Mobile admitted to was that it actually had the system 3193 false ringtones.

Yeah, there was no admission to a willingness

Mr. Legere.

3195 participation in any kind of fraud.

Mr. Welch. Well, that is, I mean you and I both know that is sort of the deal, but it happened. And then this brings me to my point about wireless coverage and I am a little skeptical about the deployment promises in rural areas.

Mr. Chairman, we have got a map of T-Mobile coverage in Vermont and it looks pretty good. It is pretty much the whole state. But the Burlington Free Press had somebody get in a car and travel the roads, the main roads, for 6,000 miles, and take signal coverage over 6 weeks this fall. And as I mentioned it was only on the main roads and it was covering about 65 percent of the buildings in Vermont.

And its results contradict many of what the assertions that are made by T-Mobile and Sprint. The data on T-Mobile and Sprint, T-Mobile covers 22 percent of the area tested in the state with five megabits per second or greater speed. T-Mobile has no service or spotty service in 62 percent of the areas. Sprint has no service or spotty service in 50 percent of the areas. And when I sit here and hear what I believe is your sincere goal to serve rural America and bring 5G to rural America, in a lot of Vermont we have no G and these maps don't correspond to what the Burlington Free Press found.

So I am a skeptic, all right. And I guess I am going to ask both of you, Mr. Legere and Mr. Claure, when you use your maps you are saying it is 96 percent coverage? These maps are

3220	bogus. I mean they just don't work. So are you going to redo
3221	your mapping so that what we are talking about is apples and apples
3222	and not apples and oranges, briefly?
3223	Mr. Claure. Thank you. I will take the answer. Today,
3224	Sprint has a very limited coverage and we rely mainly on AT&T
3225	and Verizon to be our roaming partners outside of core zone.
3226	So we are basically replicating what the maps of AT&T and Verizon.
3227	Mr. Welch. Well, they are no good.
3228	Mr. Claure. What is that?
3229	Mr. Welch. These are no good. These are phony maps.
3230	Mr. Claure. But the problem that we have today is a very
3231	serious problem. The two spectrum holders have been AT&T and
3232	Verizon and they have failed to serve rural America. The
3233	commitment that we are making is to build a nationwide coverage
3234	
3235	Mr. Welch. Right.
3236	Mr. Claure because we just got 600 megahertz just a
3237	couple of years ago and we are going to deploy it as fast as we
3238	can.
3239	Mr. Welch. Well, I mean if you were sitting where I am and
3240	getting the calls I am getting from Vermonters who have a map
3241	that says they have fantastic service and they can't get a dial
3242	tone, you would share my skepticism. This is a big deal.
3243	Mr. Legere. Sir, your concerns are very real. And the
3244	commitments and the filings that we have made are about the network

3245	we will create and we have a strong commitment to cover of rural
3246	America. Thank you.
3247	Mr. Welch. Okay. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for
3248	the record these documents that I referred to.
3249	Mr. Doyle. Without objection, so ordered.
3250	[The information follows:]
3251	
3252	******* INSERT 12 ******

3253

Mr. Welch. I yield back.

3254

Mr. Doyle. And now we come to our final witness, Mr.

3255

O'Halleran. You have got 5 minutes.

3256

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I didn't O'Halleran.

3257

make it on time today. I had a commitment at the other side of

3258

But, boy, I have sat here through this hearing and listened

3259

intently on issues about rural America and I have heard time and

3260

time again that they will be treated differently from now on.

3261

That doesn't seem to be the case. They are still going to

3262

be at the low end of the pole. They are going to be down there

3263

with the lack of ability to compete, lack of ability to make sure

3264

the families of rural America have the health care necessary

3265

through telemedicine, the need for our businesses to be able to

3266

expand and economic development to expand and all of a sudden

3267

we are back to the same old thing. We are back to the cities

3268

and everybody else getting the higher amount of coverage than

3269

rural America. That is unacceptable. I have a map just like

3270

the gentleman from Vermont had and I travel. My district is

3271

58,000 square miles. Half the time that map says I should be

3272

covered. Half the time I am not, by anybody. And so there is

3273

a lot of work to do. And what I have also heard today are

3274

semi-commitments, you know, we are looking into it.

-- and I have also heard that it is about productivity.

3275

3276

Mr. Brake, I understand productivity. I also understand

3277

the needs of the citizens of rural America and the needs of the

3278 citizens for everywhere to be competitive with the rest of the We understand that. But I really am concerned with the 3279 world. 3280 type of information I heard today. 3281 Mr. Legere, and you have indicated very much that on the 3282 Lifeline and tribal Lifeline program that you are -- are you 3283 Are you going to ensure, are you going to guarantee 3284 that those programs will be completed, completed and stay, and 3285 how are you going to do that? What is the plan, the real plan 3286 of how, and be specific as you can. 3287 Sir, on -- thank you very much and I Mr. Legere. Yeah. 3288 appreciate your patience. On Lifeline it is very clear Sprint is a big provider of Lifeline services and we will honor their 3289 3290 commitments and move forward providing Lifeline in the fashion 3291 that they do. And the 5G capabilities that we have will make 3292 us an even better Lifeline provider. 3293 Second, sir, I would submit to you --3294 O'Halleran. Just a second. I want to make sure that --3295 their commitment, honor what they do, for how long? 3296 Mr. Legere. For as long as the contracts are available. 3297 O'Halleran. So how long are those contracts available for? 3298 Those are contracts that self-renew. Mr. Claure. And we 3299 have, as part of the merger we have discussed that the New T-Mobile 3300 will basically honor all the commitments and we will continue 3301 to be a fierce competitor in the Lifeline the same way as Sprint has been. 3302

3303 O'Halleran. So as long as the contracts go. It is not into 3304 the extended future, it is just the contract life of that 3305 particular contract. 3306 Mr. Legere. Sir, could we be clear? The New T-Mobile is 3307 3308 O'Halleran. And just a second, I am sorry. It is my time. 3309 Okay. Sorry, sir. Mr. Legere. 3310 I just, as somebody that represents tribal 3311 nations, 12 of them, as somebody that represents vast amount of 3312 towns in rural America, I am really concerned from what I have 3313 And, Mr. -- I am going to try to get your name right, 3314 but I know I am not going to do it -- Berenbroick -- no, never 3315 What do you anticipate this merger's impacts could be on 3316 the tribal Lifeline program and do you anticipate the FCC and 3317 DOJ will meaningfully enforce any conditional commitments made 3318 as part of an approval, and anything that we talked about here 3319 if you have comment on that? 3320 Mr. Berenbroick. Sure. And thank you for the question. 3321 This is an important line of questioning and I am glad the 3322 committee has gotten into this. So, you know, as you know tribal 3323 lands are some of the most underserved areas of the country. 3324 You know, facilities-based providers often provide wholesale 3325 service to resellers that serve the tribal Lifeline marketplace. 3326 One big concern in this merger that we have talked about here 3327 is we are consolidating that MVNO, or sorry, that wholesale

marketplace under only three providers who have fewer incentives to provide a low-cost wholesale access. And Carrie, Ms. Bennet has spoken to this a little bit.

So what we think that means is the incentives in the marketplace will be to increase the costs that those resellers have to -- that those tribal resellers have to pay for Lifeline, those resellers that serve tribal lands pay for Lifeline driving up the costs in the Lifeline marketplace, potentially driving some of those resellers that serve those communities that you care about out of the market entirely, potentially leaving those consumers without any Lifeline provider.

O'Halleran. Thank you.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Legere. Mr. Chairman, could I make a final comment, please, shortly, which is just that with all the concerns about rural America, this transaction is the best path forwar4d for this country to solve the issues of rural America. So I vehemently believe that is the best path forward.

Mr. Doyle. Okay. All time is expired. I request unanimous consent to enter the following documents into the record: A map from CWA of Sprint and T-Mobile's retail distribution for Newark, New Jersey; an op-ed by former reps Waxman and Tauzin; a statement for the record from Consumer Reports; a blog post from EnCompass; a report from the Vermont Department of Public Service; a map of T-Mobile's U.S. wireless

3353	coverage; a report from the Democracy Reform Task Force; a report
3354	by GSA Inspector General; a letter from Representative Cardenas,
3355	et al, to John Legere; a letter from the National Diversity
3356	Coalition; a letter from CASE; a letter from J. Kenneth Blackwell;
3357	a letter from Let Freedom Ring; a letter from Consumers' Research;
3358	a letter from Americans for Limited Government; a letter from
3359	Americans for Tax Reform; a letter to the FCC and DOJ from members
3360	of Congress; and last, but not least, a letter from coalition
3361	members. Without objection, that is so ordered.
3362	[The information follows:]
3363	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\* INSERT 13 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Doyle. Well, I want to thank the witnesses for their
participation in today's hearing. And I want to remind members
that pursuant to committee rules they have 10 business days to
submit additional questions for the record to be answered by the
witnesses who have appeared. I ask each witness to respond
promptly to any such questions you may receive. At this time,
the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:08 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]