

Responses from Commissioner Olivia Trusty

Oversight of the FCC, January 14, 2026

Attachment —Additional Questions for the Record, due 2/17/2026

The Honorable Rick Allen

1. Existing licensed and unlicensed users in the Lower 900 MHz band (902-928 MHz) argue that NextNav's proposed high-power 5G-based PNT system would cause unacceptable interference. What specific, independent technical analysis has the FCC conducted to verify NextNav's claims that its high-power 5G-based PNT system will not cause harmful interference to incumbent users, particularly critical infrastructure and Part 15 devices (particularly in the logistics, retail and security space)?

In March 2025, the FCC adopted a Notice of Inquiry (NOI) seeking comment on specific actions it can take to help develop complements and alternatives to GPS with the goal of ensuring robust and reliable PNT technologies and solutions. The NOI sought comment on a solution provided by NextNav that combines its PNT system with existing LTE and 5G network signals to deliver 3D positioning and timing information. Separately, in August 2024, the Commission's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau sought comment on a Petition for Rulemaking filed by NextNav requesting to reconfigure the 902-928 MHz band (Lower 900 MHz Band) and adopt new rules to enable the deployment of a 5G terrestrial positioning, navigation, and timing (PNT) network that "complements and backs up" the U.S. Global Positioning System (GPS). The records developed in these two proceedings include robust technical analyses from a variety of outside stakeholders. To date, the Commission has not taken further action.

2. I am committed to finding policy solutions to eliminate the scourge of robocalls and robotexts on consumers, which at the least are annoying but at their worst ripe for fraud and deception. As Congress looks at every angle of this issue, the Commission's efforts in examining transitioning to all-IP networks, if implemented correctly, may assist in this endeavor. I encourage the Commission to take into consideration delays caused by ILECs' resistance to an all-IP transition due to current practices of requiring IP-capable competitors to interconnect through outdated TDM tandem facilities (and charging anti-competitive or unreasonable amounts in TDM interconnection fees in the process), contributing to uncompetitive market-place practices, and unnecessary reliance on outdated technology, which ultimately affect consumers and allow the incessant issue of robocalls to persist. Will you commit to holding ILECs accountable for any uncompetitive practices identified on this issue and specifically review the ways all-IP carriers are forced to engage with ILECs on the issue?

In October the FCC issued an NPRM seeking comment on IP interconnection issues, including the current state of marketplace negotiations and the appropriate policy framework for FCC oversight. I'm committed to acting in that proceeding based on the record evidence and the FCC's statutory authority, and to implementing and enforcing the resulting legal and policy framework for IP interconnection for all providers, including ILECs.

The Honorable H. Morgan Griffith

1. It is my understanding that the Commission is examining state and local permitting practices and that some broadband providers have been denied permission to deploy internet infrastructure because of either express, or *de facto*, state and local *moratoria* on construction. I know the Commission previously found that *moratoria* violate Section 253 of the Communications Act. What can the Commission do to counter overbearing state and local barriers that the Commission determines are unlawful?

The Commission began two proceedings last September to evaluate how it can build on past precedent and clarify how statutory preemption provisions under the Communications Act apply to state and local barriers to broadband deployment. In addition to these proceedings, the Commission can continue to work with Congress to codify FCC rules or adjudications streamlining state and local permitting processes and seek additional tools that providers can leverage to overcome state and local challenges to broadband deployment.

2. What existing authorities does the Commission already possess to prevent program producers from shutting out so-called "independent programmers" on cable television?

Section 616 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 536, directs the Commission to "establish regulations governing program carriage agreements and related practices between cable operators or other multichannel video programming distributors ["MVPDs"] and video programming vendors." As directed by that provision, the Commission's program carriage rules prohibit a cable operator or other MVPD from requiring "a financial interest in any program service as a condition for carriage" of such service, from coercing a programmer to grant "exclusive" carriage rights, or from engaging in conduct that unreasonably restrains "the ability of an unaffiliated programming vendor to compete fairly" by discriminating against such vendor "on the basis of affiliation or nonaffiliation."

- a. Are those authorities being exercised by the Commission or are they largely dormant?

As directed by section 616 of the Act, the Commission established a complaint process for resolving carriage disputes, and the FCC stands ready to address such complaints when filed.

3. What can be done to improve market access for independent cable television program producers?

Promoting continued innovation and competition in the media marketplace as a whole could benefit all participants, including independent programmers, by providing consumers increased options for viewing an increased variety of programming. And working to advance universal connectivity will help ensure the widest access to Internet-based forms of video distribution.

Beyond that, if Congress wished to pursue legislative action, it could consider revisiting the Communications Act by taking a fresh look at its preferred regulatory approach in light of the significant changes in the overall media marketplace since section 616 was enacted in 1992.

4. The Federal Communications Commission is considering changes to the sharing framework designed to protect geostationary orbit satellites (GSOs) from interference from non-geostationary orbit satellites (NGSOs). Some GSO owners are concerned that this sharing framework could cause harmful interference for the subscribers who rely on them. This could mean that satellite television subscribers would experience significantly increased incidences of picture interruption and distortion as they attempt to watch programming. How is the Commission ensuring that satellite television subscribers are protected?

In the last year, the Commission has opened several rulemakings to advance the Nation's space economy and modernize rules to promote current and future innovations in space technology. This work includes an FCC rulemaking to examine the decades-old spectrum sharing regime between different types of satellite systems that may affect the development of modern commercial satellite operations and cutting edge, emerging satellite broadband. Recognizing that changes to EPCD limits in shared spectrum bands may also affect GSO operations, the Commission sought comment on potential protections for GSO operations while accommodating intensive NGSO use of shared spectrum. I look forward to reviewing the record evidence in these proceedings.

The Honorable Russ Fulcher

1. Commissioner Trusty, as you know, CBRS has become an important tool for rural broadband deployment and private wireless innovation across the country. My colleagues and I wrote to Chairman Carr earlier this year to urge the FCC to avoid disrupting the CBRS and 6 GHz bands because doing so could strand significant private sector investments and hamper connectivity in rural communities. Even increasing power levels could upset the balance. Given that CBRS's sharing framework has worked as intended and protected defense operations while enabling new commercial deployments — can you tell me your view on protecting CBRS as the FCC considers future spectrum policy?

The United States has long been a leader in innovative uses of spectrum and CBRS is an example of that. I am always committed to ensuring spectrum is put to its highest and best use, and I am not aware of any Commission-led proceeding under this Administration to walk-back the CBRS framework.

The Honorable August Pfluger

1. Commissioner Trusty, you've spoken powerfully about the importance of 6 GHz unlicensed operations to US innovation and global competitiveness. Since joining the Commission last year, you've taken a leadership role in our international advocacy, including representing the United States at the recent Worldwide Telecommunications Development Conference in Baku, Azerbaijan. Commissioner Trusty, can you describe how our advocacy at WRC-27 depends on clear messaging about the US commitment to unlicensed operations in the 6 GHz band?

We have seen significant domestic growth in WiFi and development of other innovations since the FCC opened the full 6 GHz band for unlicensed use during the first Trump Administration. Clear messaging on U.S. domestic spectrum policy at the WRC-27 will help further U.S. leadership in standards development, reduce dependence on foreign-controlled infrastructure, promote innovation, and strengthen the Nation's geopolitical influence.

2. Recently, the FCC has adopted major new rules aimed at both accelerating the deployment of subsea communication cables and enhancing their security against foreign adversaries. Subsea cables are the backbone of global communications, carrying around 99% of international internet traffic and vast amounts of financial, governmental, and strategic data. We cannot let our adversaries, namely China, gain access to and control of this critical infrastructure, as it could allow them to intercept data, influence critical communications routing, or create backdoors into sensitive traffic. How is the FCC assessing indirect control risks, such as minority ownership, vendor lock-in, or maintenance contracts tied to foreign adversaries?

The FCC is assessing these issues consistent with President Trump's Executive Order 13873 that establishes a framework for the protection of the ICT supply chain from foreign adversary risks. The Commission also works closely with national security agencies who can further inform these assessments given their added level of situational awareness and expertise on national security matters.

- a. Do you believe the U.S. should move toward a presumptive ban on PRC-origin equipment in subsea cable systems, similar to terrestrial telecom? Recent incidents in the Baltic, the Red Sea, and the Indo-Pacific suggest that cables are increasingly targets of gray-zone activity.

Equipment and services closely tied to the foreign adversaries, like China, can allow the CCP to surveil Americans, disrupt communications networks, and otherwise threaten U.S. national security. The Commission continues to make updates to the Covered List based on determinations made by national security agencies that certain equipment or services pose unacceptable risks to the national security of the United States and its citizens.

- b. How does that change the FCC's threat model?

The Commission will continue to work with national security agencies to inform threats to the security of the Nation's communications networks.

The Honorable Erin Houchin

1. My Data BRIDGE Act (H.R. 4950) directs the FCC to incorporate USDA cultivated land data into the National Broadband Map so rural coverage reflects entire farms and fields—not just a farmhouse address. Would integrating this data materially improve the map's accuracy for rural coverage and precision agriculture use cases? If so, in what specific ways? How critical are accurate, parcel-level broadband maps to ensuring rural and agricultural communities actually receive the broadband access and funding Congress intends?

It is critical that the information used to make broadband funding and policy decisions be as complete and accurate as possible. As directed by the 2018 Farm Bill, the FCC established a Task Force to review the connectivity and technology needs of precision agriculture. In its final report in December 2024, the Task Force recommended that the Department of Agriculture produce a map that includes mobile coverage over agricultural land. Accurate maps help policymakers to know where broadband is available and where it is not, and, in turn, where federal investments should be focused. As required by Congress, the FCC and its contractor review many data sets and incorporate new locations into the National Broadband Map on a biannual basis, which serves to consistently refine the data shown on the map to ensure it is as accurate and up to date as possible. As the FCC continues its work to improve the National Broadband Map, I'd be happy to work with Congress on future steps the FCC, the Department of Agriculture, and other stakeholders can take on mapping broadband availability on agricultural land, in whatever form that takes.

2. It's imperative to have the most accurate understanding of where there is and is not broadband service if we are to fully connect rural America. Current FCC mechanisms for measuring mobile coverage continue to fall short and is not as verified as the fiber fabric. Mobile service measurements are affected by topography and terrain which complicate efforts to ascertain exactly what is, or is not, served. Incorrect data affects everything from federal funding for future deployments to real-time emergency services capabilities. It is

critical that the federal government requires mobile service be measured using mobile metrics, not simply by stationary points which do not reflect consumer experience or actual service. Currently, the FCC permits stationary points to qualify under mobile metrics, continuing the frustrating cycle of incorrect and incomplete federal broadband data. Will you commit to the FCC requiring and using established mobile data metrics and measurements for federal programs that support mobile deployment?

The FCC's maps show mobile service in both "in vehicle" mobile environments as well as outdoor stationary environments. Providers are required to submit maps showing both environments and a consumer can challenge either or both maps. The FCC's Broadband Data Task Force continues to work on ways to improve the accuracy of the National Broadband Map, and I commit to working with my colleagues at the Commission to support those efforts and to ensure that the Map's use in policymaking reflects an accurate understanding of its content.

3. As you know at a time when demands on spectrum are increasing across the economy, the FCC has a responsibility to ensure that available spectrum is being used efficiently and in the public interest. The U.S. financial sector leads the world in innovation and technology, and to maintain that role, our nation must encourage investment in the latest communications technologies, including radio spectrum. The result of these technological enhancements can benefit Main Street investors by lowering costs and increasing efficiencies. What is the status for the Commission to adopt a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to allow parties to make use of the shortwave spectrum band (2-25 MHz) band for fixed, long-distance, non-voice communications?

I defer to the Chairman on the Commission's status regarding this issue but remain open-minded about reviewing commercial spectrum policies to ensure this critical resource is put to its highest and best use.

The Honorable Doris Matsui (D-CA):

1. How does the FCC plan to support U.S. space and satellite priorities – including for LEO constellations in which the U.S. leads the world – at the ITU and the World Radiocommunication Conference over the next two years, particularly in light of increasing Chinese influence and competition to develop space? What are the benefits of U.S. leadership at the ITU and WRC as they set global spectrum rules and satellite orbits?

The Commission will continue to coordinate with the State Department and NTIA, as well as private sector stakeholders, to develop a unified U.S. strategy that supports the Nation's space and satellite priorities at WRC-27. U.S. leadership at the ITU and WRC are foundational to our ability to promote American values, our economic competitiveness, and national security around the world.

2. The FCC is currently considering an open proceeding on SIP Interconnection. IP interconnection is key to modernizing our telecommunications networks and realizing some of the innovations which will improve consumer experience, enhance public safety via Next Generation 911, and aid in combating robocalls and robotexts. As the FCC considers this proceeding, how is the FCC working to ensure a seamless transition, and how do you plan to support these network enhancements?

In October the FCC issued an NPRM seeking comment on IP interconnection issues, including the current state of marketplace negotiations and the appropriate policy framework for FCC oversight. At the Commission's February 18 meeting it will consider a companion NPRM that would seek comment on rules governing cost recovery related to IP interconnection and the IP transition. Taken together, these proceedings will position the FCC to evaluate what legacy rules should be modified or eliminated because they stand in the way of the IP transition while also ensuring a predictable transition that enables providers to continue investing and consumers to benefit from advanced networks and services. I look forward to reviewing the record in those proceedings.

The Honorable Greg Landsman (D-OH):

1. Bearing in mind that we should not mimic China's authoritarian, communist approach, what are one or two priorities we should focus on for WRC27 and how can Congress help the FCC, the rest of the federal government, and the private sector address these priorities in Shanghai next year?

The United States delegation to WRC-27 should focus on spectrum harmonization, including for satellite and wireless applications, and promote free and fair market practices so American companies can compete internationally. In advance of WRC-27, Congress can work to promote alignment among public and private sector interests; encourage pre-WRC coordination with international allies; and ensure the U.S. delegation to the WRC-27 has the resources to support technical and diplomatic representation.

3. Is the FCC able to effectively coordinate with the other important agencies in this process – State and Commerce?

Yes.