

1 Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

2 RPTS SLEEV

3 HIF181160

4

5

6 OVERSIGHT OF THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

7 AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

8 TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2026

9 House of Representatives,

10 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology,

11 Committee on Energy and Commerce,

12 Washington, D.C.

13

14

15

16 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:01 a.m. in
17 Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Richard Hudson
18 [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

19 Present: Representatives Hudson, Allen, Latta,
20 Griffith, Bilirakis, Carter of Georgia, Fulcher, Pfluger,
21 Cammack, Obernolte, Houchin, Fry, Goldman, Fedorchak, Guthrie
22 (ex officio); Matsui, Soto, Clarke, Ruiz, Peters, Dingell,
23 Kelly, Barragan, Carter of Louisiana, Menendez, Landsman,
24 McClellan, Castor, and Pallone (ex officio).

25 Also present: Representatives Balderson, Joyce; and
26 Tonko.

27

28 Staff Present: Ansley Boylan, Director of Operations;
29 Jessica Donlon, General Counsel; Michael Essington, Chief
30 Counsel; Sydney Greene, Director of Finance and Logistics;
31 Noah Jackson, Clerk; John Lin, Senior Counsel; Joel Miller,
32 Chief Counsel; Elaina Murphy, Professional Staff Member; Ryan
33 Murphy, Director of Member Services; Lillian Noland, Clerk;
34 Dylan Rogers, Professional Staff Member; Chris Sarley, Member
35 Services/Stakeholder Director; Matt VanHyfte, Communications
36 Director; Hannah Anton, Minority Policy Analyst; Jordan
37 Antwi, Minority Intern; Ruth Campos, Minority Intern; Parul
38 Desai, Minority Chief Counsel; Waverly Gordon, Minority
39 Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio,
40 Minority Staff Director; Brendan Lopez, Minority Press
41 Assistant; Dan Miller, Minority Professional Staff Member;
42 Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach
43 and Member Services; Johanna Thomas, Minority Counsel; and
44 Hannah Treger, Minority Staff Assistant.

45

46 *Mr. Hudson. The subcommittee will come to order. The
47 chair recognizes himself for an opening statement.

48 Good morning, and welcome to today's oversight hearing
49 of the National Telecommunications and Information
50 Administration, or NTIA. I want to welcome Administrator
51 Arielle Roth back to the Energy and Commerce Committee.
52 Administrator Roth was once a detailee here at E&C. We love
53 to see our alumni come on -- move on to important roles in
54 the administration, and you certainly have done us proud.

55 NTIA serves as the President's principal adviser on
56 telecommunication issues. This includes issues like
57 broadband deployment, managing Federal spectrum use,
58 international telecommunications policies, advanced
59 communications research, and strengthening public safety
60 communications.

61 Much of NTIA's focus over the last year has been on the
62 42.45 billion Broadband Equity Access and Deployment program,
63 or BEAD program. This program aims to connect the remaining
64 unserved and underserved Americans to broadband. The Biden
65 Administration ran this program for three years, but burdened
66 it with onerous regulations that created only confusion and
67 delays. The result? In three years they only approved three
68 state proposals and zero homes were connected to broadband.

69 Last June the Trump NTIA restructured BEAD, removing
70 many of the Biden Administration burdens. They eliminated

71 technology preference, unlawful rate regulation of broadband
72 plans, and unnecessary labor, DEI, and climate requirements.
73 I proposed a similar approach in my Speed for BEAD
74 legislation, and am thrilled that NTIA implemented many of my
75 ideas.

76 In the one year since reforming BEAD, this
77 Administration got each state to run a new bidding round that
78 saved taxpayers billions of dollars, approved 54 final
79 proposals, and saw homes in two states get connected to
80 broadband. That is the speed we need.

81 Administrator Roth and her team have done incredible
82 work to save taxpayer dollars. Look no further than their
83 work in D.C. Rather than rubber-stamping D.C.'s BEAD
84 proposal, Administrator Roth and her team traveled around the
85 District to see the places where D.C. wanted to use BEAD
86 funds. They found D.C. wanted to spend \$70,000 per location
87 to connect a field house, a construction trailer, a gated
88 Pepco electric utility building, a shed along Amtrak train
89 tracks, a non-existent building along the same Amtrak train
90 tracks, and an open field off the GW Parkway, locations that
91 we can all agree do not need broadband. Following this work
92 D.C. confirmed that they had zero unserved or underserved
93 locations that needed funding. I applaud NTIA's work in
94 rooting out waste and generating real savings in this
95 program.

96 NTIA's BEAD reforms have saved over \$20 billion for the
97 American taxpayers. Now we must consider what to do with the
98 non-deployment money. Although the Infrastructure Law
99 outlines some uses, NTIA still maintains significant
100 discretion on how states can use this money. I have made no
101 secret that I believe some of this money should be used to
102 deploy next-generation 911 nationwide. Deploying this
103 internet protocol-based system at our 911 call centers will
104 open the door to advanced tools for both the public and our
105 first responders, directly supporting the intent of the
106 Infrastructure Law. I know many members of this committee
107 have their own ideas for how we should use this money,
108 including supporting telecommunications workforce development
109 programs and permitting efforts. I hope today's hearing will
110 shed light on how NTIA is planning to use these funds.

111 NTIA also plays an important role in public safety
112 communications. It supports the nation's public safety
113 agencies in their adoption and implementation of advanced
114 communication technologies, including NG911. It also
115 supports the First Responder Network Authority, the
116 independent authority that oversees the nationwide public
117 safety broadband network.

118 I appreciate Administrator Roth visiting my district
119 last year to see how FirstNet is serving the public safety
120 community in Alamance County. As many of you know, the House

121 recently passed the First Responder Network Authorization
122 Authority Reauthorization Act, reauthorizing FirstNet until
123 September 2037 and implementing several essential reforms
124 including bringing the authority directly under NTIA. We now
125 await Senate action on this important legislation. I want to
126 thank NTIA for working with us on this legislation.

127 Thank you to Administrator Roth for being here today,
128 and I am -- really looking forward to our discussion.

129 [The prepared statement of Mr. Hudson follows:]

130

131 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

132

133 *Mr. Hudson. I now recognize the ranking member, the
134 gentlelady from California, for her opening statement.

135 *Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad we are
136 holding this oversight hearing on NTIA. This agency oversees
137 tens of billions of dollars in Federal broadband funding.

138 The American people deserve answers about why the Trump
139 Administration spent the last 18 months delaying broadband
140 build-out and canceling funding for states and local
141 communities, all while pressuring them to give up
142 affordability and consumer protections.

143 Reliable, affordable, high-speed internet is no longer a
144 luxury. It is how our children can learn, how patients
145 access telehealth, how small businesses compete, and how
146 families stay connected. That is why Congress passed the
147 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and invested \$65 billion to
148 close the digital divide, including more than \$42 billion
149 through the BEAD program.

150 Congress made a promise to connect every community with
151 affordable, reliable broadband. Instead of carrying out the
152 promise, the Trump Administration has spent the last 18
153 months gutting it. NTIA has repeatedly moved the goal posts;
154 missed its own deadlines; and created uncertainty for states,
155 providers, and the communities waiting to get connected.
156 Today we see the consequences: providers are walking away;
157 states are being forced to revisit decisions they already

158 made; communities that thought help was finally on the way
159 are once again left wondering again when or if they will ever
160 get connected.

161 California has worked in good faith to meet these
162 shifting demands, but we are still stuck waiting on NTIA's
163 final sign-off before we can get shovels in the ground. From
164 Sacramento to San Joaquin and El Dorado Hills, families are
165 now waiting well into next year while the Trump
166 Administration keeps changing the rules.

167 Even more troubling, NTIA is still sitting on more than
168 \$20 billion in BEAD non-deployment funding. Congress
169 provided those funds because closing the digital divide
170 requires more than laying fiber in the ground or launching
171 satellites into space. It also requires making sure people
172 can afford to get online and have the skills and support to
173 use that connection. Yet months after missing its own
174 deadlines, NTIA still has not told states if or how they can
175 use these funds, leaving states in limbo and families behind.

176 I am equally concerned that in other areas NTIA is also
177 exceeding the authority that Congress gave it. Congress
178 never directed NTIA to override state affordability policies,
179 disregard their net neutrality laws, or discourage states
180 from negotiating stronger contract provisions to protect
181 consumers, and Congress certainly never authorized NTIA to
182 override state AI laws. Yet President Trump is threatening

183 to withhold billions in broadband funding if states -- if he
184 doesn't like their AI protection.

185 The Administration also illegally canceled nearly \$3
186 billion in digital equity funds, including \$70 million that
187 is going to help California families. That decision stopped
188 the proposed project that would have helped more than 500,000
189 digitally disadvantaged California households gain affordable
190 broadband access, digital skills training, and the devices
191 they need to participate in today's economy. Across 50
192 California counties including the Sacramento region's
193 seniors, veterans, students, people with disabilities, and
194 low-income families are left behind because President Trump
195 didn't like a program Congress specifically created to help
196 them.

197 Today I am concerned we will hear NTIA continue to dodge
198 accountability, offer vague answers, shift blame, and exceed
199 the authority Congress gave it. But the American people
200 deserve clear answers. When will states receive certainty
201 about funding? What legal authority does NTIA believe it has
202 to impose requirements Congress never enacted? And when will
203 states finally be allowed to finish the work Congress
204 directed them to do? Congress passed a bipartisan law.
205 NTIA's job is to follow it, not rewrite it.

206 Lastly, we must continue leading the world in a spectrum
207 policy which powers the devices and services Americans depend

208 on to work, learn, and stay safe. And that is why the U.S.
209 government must speak with one voice at next year's World
210 Radio Communications Conference. I urge and encourage NTIA
211 to hold a Spectrum Summit to ensure that the U.S. has a
212 united front with our strategic allies.

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

214

215 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

216

217 *Ms. Matsui. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

218 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. I now recognize the chairman
219 of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, for five
220 minutes for his opening statement.

221 *The Chair. Thank you, Chairman Hudson. Thanks for
222 holding this hearing today, and I thank Administrator Roth
223 for being here.

224 Welcome to the committee, back to the committee.

225 The National Telecommunications and Information
226 Administration plays a critical role in ensuring every
227 American has access to connectivity and that the United
228 States continues to lead the world in technological
229 information. I am sure Chairman Hudson -- I know he spoke a
230 lot about BEAD, and I am sure you mentioned that it took
231 three years of the Biden Administration to not get a penny
232 out. I am sure you brought that up when we were talking
233 about delays.

234 But anyway, but I won't focus on that. I am going to
235 focus on the work you are doing on spectrum. My good friend,
236 the ranking member of this subcommittee, and I have worked
237 very closely together and very long hours on spectrum, so I
238 appreciate being here together with her.

239 So one of the important roles the NTIA plays is managing
240 the use of Federal spectrum. As demand for 5G, 6G, WiFi, and
241 AI continue to grow, we need to make sure spectrum is

242 available for the private use sector. The Working Families
243 Tax Cuts directed NTIA in coordination with the FCC to
244 identify 500 megahertz of Federal spectrum for reallocation
245 for commercial use. I am pleased to hear that NTIA has
246 already begun identifying bands for reallocation and studying
247 other important mid-band spectrum bands. I hope NTIA can
248 move quickly to get these bands to auction. This is crucial
249 to maintaining United States' leadership in wireless
250 innovation.

251 NTIA also plays an essential role in representing the
252 United States in the international telecommunications
253 discussion, including this year's I2A meeting and next year's
254 World Radio Communications Conference. We have our work cut
255 out for us. It is in China. I don't know who decided to
256 locate that in China, but it is. And I know we are going to
257 have to have all hands on deck and working together.

258 I look forward to hearing from Administrator Roth about
259 our preparations for these two important events. American
260 leadership globally is key. Otherwise, the next generation
261 technology will be dominated by adversaries who do not share
262 our values and who cannot allow them to set standards to
263 drive innovation and reap the economic benefits of our --
264 that should be ours.

265 As I say that, I always say we are not competing with
266 Europe to regulate; we are competing with China to innovate.

267 We, as we did yesterday, protect our children from purveyors
268 on the -- in social -- through social media, but we also need
269 to make sure that we have in place -- what has been really
270 interesting to watch, and I have been -- I have talked about
271 Europe quite a bit, and how -- that example of what not to
272 do.

273 As European teams are staying in our -- not just in our
274 cities, which we have -- I put our cities up against any city
275 in the world, but particularly in our suburbs, I was just in
276 Chattanooga at a wedding. And the French -- I mean, excuse
277 me, the Spanish team is staying in the city of Chattanooga,
278 and they are just seeing that American prosperity is
279 throughout the country. It is amazing how they look at the
280 way everyday middle-class Americans live, and they can't
281 believe we have the standard of living that we have. I think
282 that has been a great outcome from what we have seen of
283 hosting the world in the United States because people in the
284 world can see they can live the same way we live if they have
285 the right innovation and the right policies in place. So as
286 I always say, we have twice the economy of Europe, where we
287 had equivalent-sized economies in 2007.

288 So it is important that we maintain our leadership so we
289 continue to grow and raise the standard of living not just
290 for the people running the companies, but the people who are
291 working for the companies and benefiting from the

292 efficiencies that come from these companies. And we
293 appreciate that.

294 [The prepared statement of The Chair follows:]

295

296 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

297

298 *The Chair. And I will yield back.

299 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Chairman. I now recognize the
300 gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking member, for five
301 minutes for his opening statement.

302 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Chairman Hudson.

303 The National Telecommunications and Information
304 Administration, NTIA, plays a critical role in planning and
305 coordinating U.S. communications strategy at home and abroad,
306 expanding internet access and connectivity, and improving
307 public safety communications. And as the President's
308 principal advisor for telecommunications policy, the NTIA
309 administrator is responsible for leading an agency charged
310 with ensuring Americans continue to have reliable access to
311 communications capabilities.

312 The BEAD program was established and funded as part of
313 the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law in 2021 to provide a
314 generational investment in broadband infrastructure for
315 unserved and underserved communities across the country. And
316 for decades we have heard countless stories about how
317 pervasive the digital divide has become, especially in rural
318 communities. And that is why passing that law was a victory
319 not just for red states or blue states, but for all
320 communities lacking internet access. And this program was
321 meant to address that inequity with state-of-the-art
322 investments that would last for multiple decades.

323 Unfortunately, the Trump NTIA has strayed far from that
324 mission since January of 2025. Despite pushback from both
325 Republicans and Democrats at all levels of government, the
326 Trump NTIA is barreling ahead with its shady restructuring of
327 the BEAD program while impounding billions of taxpayers'
328 dollars in grant funds across a number of programs authorized
329 and appropriated by Congress. Commerce Secretary Lutnick and
330 NTIA Administrator Roth have repeatedly violated the law and
331 defied congressional intent in a manner that is increasing
332 the cost of internet service and, I fear, opening the door to
333 waste, fraud, and abuse.

334 Hidden behind the veil they call the benefit of the
335 bargain, the Trump Administration forced states to throw out
336 their broadband plans and bullied state broadband offices
337 into awarding as many locations as possible to Elon Musk's
338 SpaceX on the basis that it is the cheapest option. It is
339 not the best option or the right option, but the cheapest
340 option. When it comes to critical infrastructure like
341 bridges or pipelines and, yes, broadband, Americans just want
342 the job done right.

343 Even then, low Earth orbit, LEO, broadband solutions
344 like Musk's Starlink are only cheaper than the alternatives
345 if you do not factor in each technology's lifespan and costs
346 over time. And let me be clear: satellite connectivity is
347 an important component of the broader communication

348 ecosystem, but NTIA's changes to the BEAD program ignore the
349 fact that Starlink is already accessible to the public.
350 Although prohibitively expensive for many Americans, any
351 household or business currently lacking internet access could
352 sign up today without one dime of taxpayer money.

353 At the end of the day, all NTIA has done is secure
354 hundreds of thousands of locations where satellite is now the
355 lone monopoly provider, robbing consumers of choice and
356 competition that are fundamental to making service affordable
357 to middle-class families. By taking thousands of miles of
358 fiber off the map, the Trump Administration has unnecessarily
359 condemned vast swaths of rural America to the connectivity
360 equivalent of a Band-Aid, ignoring the spirit and intent of
361 this generational infrastructure investment. To make matters
362 worse, NTIA has yet to demonstrate with any certainty that
363 LEO providers will meet and sustain the statutorily required
364 performance metrics at scale.

365 And the Trump Administration is also failing to enforce
366 the statutory requirement of the law that BEAD grantees offer
367 a low-cost service option that is truly affordable to
368 qualifying consumers. This is yet another example of the
369 Trump Administration driving up everyday costs on hard-
370 working American families. It is bad enough costs are
371 skyrocketing as a result of Trump's reckless tariffs and his
372 reckless war of choice with Iran, but now his Administration

373 is defying the law and refusing to ensure consumers have
374 access to low-cost service options for their internet service
375 as the law intended.

376 While households are finally being connected under BEAD,
377 the Trump Administration's inexcusable revamping of the
378 program not only stopped getting shovels in the ground, but
379 has also increased costs. And now we are seeing broadband
380 providers leave the BEAD program and surrender their awards
381 one after another not because of decisions made by the
382 states, but because of moving goal posts and mismanagement
383 from NTIA. To minimize the damage already done, NTIA must
384 immediately deliver each state's non-deployment funds with
385 maximum flexibility for their use consistent with the
386 Bipartisan Infrastructure Act. And time is literally running
387 out to put these dollars to good use, and the delays have
388 gone on long enough.

389 [The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]

390

391 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

392

393 *Mr. Pallone. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back
394 the balance of my time.

395 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. We have now concluded with
396 opening statements.

397 The chair reminds members that, pursuant to committee
398 rules, all members' opening statements will be made part of
399 the record.

400 I would like to thank our witnesses for being here today
401 to testify before the subcommittee. Our witness will have
402 five minutes to provide an opening statement, which will be
403 followed by a round of questions from members.

404 The witness here today before us is the Honorable
405 Arielle Roth, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for
406 Communications and Information; and Administrator, National
407 Telecommunications and Information Administration.

408 Welcome, Administrator Roth. Also, on behalf of the
409 committee, I would like to extend a warm welcome to your
410 husband, Yaakov, and your parents, Mark and Peggy. I know
411 they are proud, and we are very happy to have you with us
412 here today. We extend our welcome.

413 Administrator Roth, you are recognized for five minutes
414 for your opening statement.

415 Make sure your mike is on there. I do that all the
416 time, too.

417

418 STATEMENT OF THE HON. ARIELLE ROTH, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
419 COMMERCE FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION AND
420 ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION
421 ADMINISTRATION

422

423 *Ms. Roth. Okay, Chairman Hudson, Ranking Member
424 Matsui, and members of the subcommittee, it is great to be
425 back, and thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

426 It has been nearly a year since I was confirmed to lead
427 NTIA, and I am grateful for the opportunity to work alongside
428 the dedicated public servants at the agency to advance an
429 ambitious agenda developing the largest spectrum pipeline in
430 our nation's history, ensuring nationwide broadband
431 availability, strengthening public safety communications, and
432 promoting American leadership in the technologies of the
433 future. It is especially meaningful to appear before you
434 just days before our nation celebrates its 250th anniversary.

435 Throughout our history break-throughs and communications
436 have helped expand opportunity, accelerate the exchange of
437 ideas, and strengthen American prosperity. From the
438 telegraph to the telephone to wireless, satellite, the
439 internet, and now AI, America has repeatedly led the
440 technologies that shape the modern world. At NTIA our
441 responsibility is to ensure that the next generation of
442 communications technologies continues that tradition by

443 removing obstacles to innovation, expanding opportunity, and
444 strengthening American leadership.

445 Consistent with the Working Families Tax Cut Act and
446 President Trump's memorandum establishing U.S. leadership in
447 6G as a national priority, NTIA is moving aggressively to
448 identify at least 500 megahertz of spectrum for commercial
449 use. Thanks to our progress across the 7 gigahertz, 2.7
450 gigahertz, 4 gigahertz, and 1.675 gigahertz bands, we are on
451 track to meet that target ahead of our statutory deadline.

452 To support transparency and accountability, NTIA
453 recently launched spectrum.gov so that Congress, industry,
454 and the public can track progress in real time. NTIA is
455 strengthening engagement in international standards bodies,
456 preparing aggressively for the 2027 World Radio Communication
457 Conference, supporting American leadership at the ITU, and
458 helping ensure next-generation networks are built on secure
459 and resilient technologies, rather than standards shaped by
460 authoritarian regimes.

461 Another major priority has been reforming the BEAD
462 program. When this Administration took office, BEAD was
463 weighed down by unnecessary red tape, market-distorting
464 restrictions and requirements that exceeded the statute.
465 Under Secretary Lutnick's leadership we restored the
466 program's focus to its core mission: connecting Americans
467 through competition, accountability, and respect for the law.

468 By embracing technology neutrality, encouraging meaningful
469 private investment, and focusing on fiscal discipline, NTIA's
470 benefit of the bargain reforms have produced more than \$21
471 billion in savings while expediting deployment. Today nearly
472 every state and territory has received approval of its final
473 proposal, and Americans are already being connected through
474 the reform program.

475 NTIA is also working to improve connectivity in tribal
476 communities through reforms to our tribal broadband
477 connectivity and native entity programs that reduce
478 administrative burdens and maximize the impact of Federal
479 dollars.

480 Public safety communications remain another core
481 priority. NTIA applauds this committee's leadership on
482 FirstNet reauthorization and the bipartisan efforts to
483 strengthen governance and accountability for the network.
484 Thanks to NTIA's enhanced oversight of FirstNet, Secretary
485 Lutnick was able to secure an additional \$2 billion in value
486 under the contract, enabling further expansion of coverage
487 and connectivity for first responders.

488 In addition, NTIA continues to support this committee's
489 bipartisan efforts on next-generation 911, including through
490 our recently-released study providing updated data on
491 nationwide implementation costs.

492 Finally, I want to mention NTIA's work on excessive

493 screen time in schools. As a mother of six, this issue is
494 deeply personal to me. Technology has a role in education,
495 but it should support learning, not replace the reading,
496 writing, critical thinking, and face-to-face interaction
497 children need to thrive. As parents have become increasingly
498 concerned about the amount of screen-based instruction their
499 children receive during the school day, NTIA has convened
500 parents, teachers, researchers, and our partners across this
501 Administration to ensure Federal policies put children's
502 learning and healthy development first.

503 NTIA is delivering results across our core missions. As
504 our nation marks 250 years of freedom, innovation, and
505 ingenuity, we remain committed to advancing policies that
506 remove barriers, unleash private-sector innovation, and help
507 ensure America leads the next technology frontier.

508 Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

509 [The prepared statement of Ms. Roth follows:]

510
511 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****
512

513 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. We will now begin questioning,
514 and I recognize myself for five minutes.

515 Administrator Roth, let's jump right in. When can we
516 expect guidance on how states can use remaining BEAD non-
517 deployment funds?

518 *Ms. Roth. No, I understand that everyone, and the
519 members of the committee in particular, are very focused on
520 this question.

521 NTIA is extremely outcome-driven. We saw those results
522 through our management of the BEAD program. We inherited a
523 program that had been weighed down and we course-corrected it
524 and saw incredible outcomes both in terms of taxpayer
525 savings, faster deployment, and universal connectivity. And
526 we want to see the same effective outcomes when it comes to
527 the remaining funding that states have worked so hard to
528 produce.

529 We want the funding to be -- to produce real measurable
530 outcomes, be non-duplicative, non-distortionary. And, you
531 know, I think we are really focused on getting the funding
532 right. We are -- we have received a tremendous amount of
533 interest and comments on how the funding should be used, and
534 so we are proceeding cautiously in producing the guidance so
535 that we can ensure that this funding achieves the same
536 success as the first segment of the BEAD program. And we
537 plan to release guidance this summer.

538 *Mr. Hudson. Well, I appreciate that answer, and I
539 think your track record on the BEAD program writ large was
540 excellent. And so that, at least in my case, creates some
541 trust that you will handle this appropriately and correctly.

542 But obviously, we want to make sure these funds are used
543 but, to your point, we want to make sure they are used
544 correctly and effectively so they actually reach real people
545 out there. So I appreciate the care with which you are
546 using, but we want to work with you to get this done as
547 quickly as we can.

548 You know, you and I have talked many times. You know I
549 am a strong supporter of next-gen 911, and I have called for
550 upgrading across the country to NG911. And we are having
551 conversations across the aisle here to try to come to some
552 bipartisan consensus on this issue, but I have said that I
553 think some of these non-deployment funds could be used to
554 fund this NG911 upgrade. Will you take this into
555 consideration as you are making your plans with this money?

556 *Ms. Roth. Absolutely. It was one of the
557 recommendations that we saw when we held public listening
558 sessions on the use of the funds, and I thank you for your
559 leadership on this issue, Chairman Hudson. I should have
560 mentioned that it was -- I have really enjoyed working with
561 you on public safety communications ever since my second day
562 on the job visiting your district in Alamance County for a

563 FirstNet groundbreaking.

564 You know, NTIA has sought to provide helpful information
565 to this committee on next-generation 911, and I applaud your
566 efforts on this issue through our recently updated study. I
567 have personally visited several 911 centers, most recently in
568 Fairfax County during Public Safety Telecommunicators Week,
569 and it is just very clear that ensuring that we see upgrades
570 to modern IP-based technologies are critical for better
571 response times, better location tracking, and triage of
572 calls. So I am looking forward to -- I appreciate the
573 opportunity to work with you and the committee on this issue,
574 on your bipartisan efforts on this issue.

575 *Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that, and I should have
576 mentioned the study you did on the cost was crucial, and you
577 moved very quickly on that. And that really gives us the
578 facts we need, I think, to move forward with this program.
579 So thank you for that.

580 Going back to BEAD program writ large, I understand that
581 some providers have rejected their awards and have backed out
582 of the program. What is NTIA doing to ensure that homes and
583 businesses these providers were supposed to serve ultimately
584 receive service?

585 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for the question.

586 So our goal is to see universal, ubiquitous connectivity
587 through BEAD. That is the law and we have -- we are

588 achieving that.

589 To level set, we have seen some changes in the BEAD
590 program. I think that is to be expected in a program of this
591 size. We have only seen about one percent of BEAD locations
592 affected by changes, but the good news is that we planned and
593 we have a process in place to ensure that areas that are
594 subject to changes get served. And we have successfully
595 backfilled in about a dozen states where that has occurred,
596 and we are -- you know, we are eager to ensure ubiquitous
597 connectivity.

598 You know, there are multiple reasons for why a, you
599 know, a provider would back out. But ultimately, we are
600 ensuring that providers that can deliver on their obligations
601 are participating in the program.

602 *Mr. Hudson. That is great to hear. So the folks who
603 may be backing out represent about one percent of the
604 coverage, and you have been able to successfully backfill
605 those cases?

606 *Ms. Roth. That is right.

607 *Mr. Hudson. That is great. Thank you for that.

608 My time has expired. I will now recognize the ranking
609 member for five minutes for her questions.

610 *Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and
611 welcome, Administrator Roth.

612 NTIA doesn't have the authority to regulate broadband

613 rates and force states to give up their consumer protections,
614 yet NTIA is instructing companies receiving Federal broadband
615 dollars to insist that states include contract terms
616 exempting these companies from state consumer protections
617 like affordability and net neutrality.

618 Administrator Roth, you have said -- and I am quoting
619 from your October 2025 Hudson Institute remarks -- "Any state
620 receiving BEAD funds must exempt BEAD providers throughout
621 their state footprint from broadband-specific economic
622 regulations such as price regulation and net neutrality.'"'
623 California has strong consumer protections, including our own
624 net neutrality law, and has long negotiated stronger
625 broadband contracts to protect consumers. Yes or no, should
626 California lose broadband funding because it wants stronger
627 consumer protections than what NTIA requires?

628 *Ms. Roth. No, we believe that every state, including
629 California, should get access to broadband through the BEAD
630 program. What we -- our job is to implement the law, and the
631 law specifically tells us to ensure the timely and effective
632 deployment of broadband projects through the BEAD program.

633 And we know that one of the challenges of deploying
634 broadband is an inhospitable regulatory environment. We want
635 to ensure that the program is successful, that these projects
636 are successful, they are not subject to defaults. And so
637 that -- and so we are doing our job by ensuring that the

638 states do their part to provide that --

639 *Ms. Matsui. Okay, but --

640 *Ms. Roth. -- regulatory environment.

641 *Ms. Matsui. -- what specific authority did Congress
642 give NTIA to require California to suspend or limit
643 enforcement of its own consumer protection laws, not just for
644 BEAD-funded networks, but for a company's broadband
645 operations throughout the state?

646 *Ms. Roth. The law requires NTIA to provide rules and
647 guidelines on the effective deployment of broadband through
648 the BEAD program. We know and history has shown that
649 government price regulation undermines incentives to invest,
650 particularly in rural areas where deployment is already
651 challenging. And so regulations that are hostile to that
652 investment, as we saw, you know, in -- under the previous
653 rules, providers stayed away because -- precisely because of
654 hostile rate regulation mandates. We don't want to see that
655 mistake happen --

656 *Ms. Matsui. Well, I am asking where Congress
657 specifically authorized NTIA to affect legal rights and
658 obligations outside the scope of the BEAD --

659 *Ms. Roth. Oh, we are --

660 *Ms. Matsui. -- funding project.

661 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, we are not preempting any state
662 laws. What we are saying is that states have to -- with

663 respect to BEAD projects, because our mandate and our
664 jurisdiction is BEAD -- BEAD projects need to be protected
665 from regulations that undermine the success of BEAD program
666 and BEAD projects.

667 *Ms. Matsui. So you are saying that NTIA can actually
668 tell them to just forget about any consumer protections, in
669 this case in the state?

670 *Ms. Roth. No, we -- you know, we support consumer
671 protections. I think that our focus is on rate regulation.
672 We are motivated -- or we are driven by evidence and data. A
673 bipartisan Congress recognized -- or actually, precluded NTIA
674 firm rate-regulating in the BEAD program precisely because of
675 data showing that rate regulation harms investment. We don't
676 want to jeopardize the success of BEAD projects, and so
677 therefore we have entered agreement -- into agreements with
678 the states where they have promised to ensure a healthy
679 regulatory environment so that these projects can be
680 successful.

681 *Ms. Matsui. Okay. Well, I think I am going to have to
682 follow up with you later on that.

683 Congress passed the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to
684 connect Americans to affordable, reliable broadband. It did
685 not condition broadband funding on whether a state regulates
686 AI, yet the Trump AI executive order directs NTIA to withhold
687 broadband funding from states with so-called onerous AI laws.

688 California has led the nation on broadband and
689 responsible AI. It shouldn't have to choose between
690 protecting consumers and receiving broadband funding. That
691 is why I co-authored the Guardrails Act to repeal this
692 dangerous executive order.

693 Now, Administrator Roth, yes or no, can an executive
694 order rewrite law?

695 *Ms. Roth. You know, I serve the President and I
696 implement the law, and those two things are not in conflict.
697 Executive orders are lawful direction to executive branch
698 agencies.

699 *Ms. Matsui. So -- okay. So what specific provision in
700 the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law authorizes NTIA to
701 condition BEAD funding on a state's AI laws?

702 *Ms. Roth. So no final decision on the report has been
703 made. I am not going to pre-judge outcomes before we have
704 completed our review.

705 What I can say is that our report -- the report will
706 comply with the law. I think that it is -- but it is also
707 important to keep in mind the -- as we have seen, there is a
708 -- and as the executive orders shows, there is a symbiotic --
709 oh, I am sorry, I am out of time.

710 *Mr. Hudson. You can complete your answer.

711 *Ms. Roth. Yes, a symbiotic relationship between
712 broadband deployment and AI. AI is how consumers --

713 broadband is how consumers get AI, and AI is increasingly
714 becoming embedded in broadband network architecture.

715 So I think -- so the -- you know, the -- it is per our
716 mandate to ensure timely and effective deployment of
717 broadband; it is important that the regulatory environment --

718 *Ms. Matsui. Okay.

719 *Ms. Roth. -- reflect those --

720 *Ms. Matsui. Okay.

721 *Ms. Roth. -- those outcomes.

722 *Ms. Matsui. I would like --

723 *Mr. Hudson. The --

724 *Ms. Matsui. -- to follow up with questions on -- okay,
725 thank you.

726 *Mr. Hudson. Great. The gentlelady's time has expired.
727 The chair now recognizes the chairman of the full committee,
728 Mr. Guthrie, for five minutes for his questions.

729 *The Chair. Thank you. I thank -- thank you for being
730 here, Administrator Roth.

731 As I mentioned in my opening statement, the Working
732 Families Tax Cut directed NTIA to identify 500 megahertz of
733 Federal spectrum for allocation for commercial. I understand
734 that some bands have already been identified for commercial
735 use and that studies are underway on others. How quickly can
736 these studies be completed from there?

737 And how quickly can we expect these bands to be ready

738 for auction?

739 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Chairman Guthrie, and it was
740 great to meet with you as I started my role as NTIA
741 administrator. Thank you for your leadership and the
742 committee's leadership on spectrum.

743 Getting more spectrum into the marketplace is a core
744 priority of this Administration, and we are working
745 aggressively to meet the mandate set out for us in the
746 Working Families Tax Cut Act. We are on track not only to
747 meet the -- meet that mandate, but beat it, thanks to the
748 President's leadership in the Winning the 6G Race
749 presidential memorandum, and we are going to identify
750 spectrum in the 7 gigahertz band ahead of schedule by the end
751 of this year.

752 And we are -- at NTIA we are extremely focused on this
753 mission. We are working on four studies at once, which is
754 unprecedented, and so we are working with the FCC and other
755 Federal partners to get spectrum studied and identified as
756 quickly as possible so that we can meet Chairman Carr's goal
757 of five auctions during this Administration.

758 *The Chair. Thanks. I was going to ask how we could
759 help you speed this up, but it sounds like you are in the
760 express lane already getting this done. Is there things we
761 could help you with to get it done faster, or do you feel
762 like you are pretty comfortable the way that it is going?

763 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, we are working very fast. We were
764 able to secure funding in the 2.7 gigahertz band in half the
765 time it took the previous administration. So, you know, but
766 at the same time what we are working on and how we can get
767 spectrum identified is through the spectrum relocation fund
768 process, which is really essential to ensure that we have the
769 certainty over what we are auctioning and under what
770 parameters so that an auction can be successful.

771 *The Chair. So let me follow up. So a major component
772 of reallocating spectrum from Federal and non-Federal use is
773 a spectrum reallocation fund. We have heard that these --
774 there can be barriers to agencies utilizing these funds,
775 ultimately delaying new spectrum getting into the hands of
776 commercial users.

777 What can Congress do to reform the spectrum relocation
778 fund so that it can be better used as an incentive to
779 encourage Federal agencies to relocate?

780 *Ms. Roth. So, you know, we would defer to Congress,
781 but -- and we will abide by the law in the SRF. I think --

782 *The Chair. Do you have suggestions on how we can
783 improve it?

784 *Ms. Roth. One --

785 *The Chair. Do you have suggestions for how we can
786 improve it?

787 *Ms. Roth. Yes. So one of the things that we have seen

788 is that some of the timelines perhaps could be truncated to
789 more -- to get funding to the agencies more quickly and
790 enable us to complete our studies quicker.

791 You know, one timeline that the committee could consider
792 would be the 60-day congressional notification timeline.
793 There is also a six-month identification -- congressional
794 notification timeline for transition funding. So we would be
795 happy to work with you and the committee on finding ways to
796 expedite this process and get funding -- get -- enables the
797 agencies to secure funding more --

798 *The Chair. So thanks. So now the -- for the World
799 Radio Communication Conference that takes place next year,
800 obviously in China. So it is critical that we have a -- we
801 go there strong with a unified position. And so can you
802 discuss the status of the preparation for the World Radio
803 Conference 27 and our ability to develop a unified position
804 on different agenda items?

805 *Ms. Roth. This is --

806 *The Chair. So how is the preparation going? Where are
807 we? And can we have a unified position?

808 *Ms. Roth. This is a core focus of this Administration.
809 We are working aggressively with our interagency partners to
810 get our positions identified well ahead of WRC, so that we
811 can build an international commission, a coalition of like-
812 minded partners and build support for those positions.

813 One of the ways NTIA did that was by holding a training
814 in Ghana with 27 key regulators from 20 different African
815 countries. The agenda at WRC is going to be very satellite-
816 heavy, and so we worked with those regulators to promote U.S.
817 commercial space interests, a very important -- which is a
818 very important area, strategically, for us. And we are --

819 *The Chair. What kind of extra considerations do you
820 have to give, given that it is in China?

821 *Ms. Roth. Yes, so one of the things that we need to do
822 is ensure effective leadership at the ITU, the
823 plenipotentiary conference where those -- where upcoming
824 elections are happening is this November. And so we are
825 working to ensure that Doreen Bogdan-Martin wins her election
826 as secretary general of the ITU, as well as the U.S. wins in
827 its other elections. Effective leadership is important to
828 ensure that we can promote our interests in an effective way
829 at WRC without surveillance or interference.

830 *The Chair. Okay.

831 *Ms. Roth. That was an issue I spoke about at ITU
832 Council in Geneva in May.

833 *The Chair. Thanks. Well, my time has expired, so
834 thank you for your answers.

835 And I yield back.

836 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Chairman.

837 I now recognize the ranking member of the full

838 committee, Mr. Pallone, for five minutes for your questions.

839 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

840 I -- as I have mentioned, I have serious concerns that
841 your tenure as NTIA administrator has shown a pattern of
842 decision-making ranging from irresponsible to outright
843 unlawful. And the common thread that ties it all together is
844 a dereliction of your duty to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse
845 of taxpayer dollars.

846 For instance, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law
847 specifically prioritizes broadband technologies in the BEAD
848 program that are the most reliable, scalable, and future-
849 proof, meaning that they will not become outdated or obsolete
850 in the near future. But instead you forced states to
851 prioritize the cheapest bids, regardless of the technology,
852 scalability, or longevity.

853 And it is difficult to ignore the growing list of
854 similarities between your new BEAD program and the failed
855 Trump Rural Digital Opportunity Fund program. Both
856 incentivize a race to the bottom, fraught with numerous
857 provider defaults, and opened the door to waste, fraud, and
858 abuse.

859 And worse, by imposing arbitrary per-location price
860 caps, you failed to accurately reflect the actual cost to
861 serve the rural, low-density locations that are the specific
862 target of the BEAD program, and the decision to ignore the

863 law has redirected valuable funding away from infrastructure
864 that would last for decades to subsidies instead for Elon
865 Musk's satellite service which we know faces affordability,
866 reliability, and spectrum capacity constraints, and is widely
867 more expensive for customers in the long run. Yet you have
868 issued no guidance on how they are supposed to ensure that
869 SpaceX does, in fact, have the capacity to serve every
870 location they have been awarded.

871 So let me ask, Administrator Roth, what evidence do you
872 have to suggest that LEO broadband will be able to meet the
873 law's performance requirements at all times for the entirety
874 of the locations it has been awarded?

875 *Ms. Roth. I agree that the law is what should govern
876 our decisions, and that is exactly what we have done by
877 restoring technology neutrality in the program. And --

878 *Mr. Pallone. But do you have any evidence to suggest
879 that LEO broadband will be able to meet the law's performance
880 requirements?

881 *Ms. Roth. So maybe I could just, you know -- just to
882 explain, rather than requiring a tech mandate on the states,
883 we enabled the states to determine which technologies would
884 work in different areas, given that we have diverse --

885 *Mr. Pallone. All right.

886 *Ms. Roth. -- conditions across the country. And that
887 is -- Congress wrote the law in that manner. Congress set

888 out performance requirements.

889 *Mr. Pallone. Well, I understand, but, you know, I --
890 look, let me ask you this. In order to verify compliance
891 with the law, will NTIA publicly release the results of BEAD
892 sub-grantee speed and performance testing or direct the
893 states to publish performance testing results? That is a way
894 for us to get to the bottom of it.

895 *Ms. Roth. Yes, that is in our rules.

896 *Mr. Pallone. You will do that?

897 *Ms. Roth. Each provider is required to abide by our
898 performance --

899 *Mr. Pallone. No, I am asking if you will publicly
900 release the results of the BEAD sub-grantees' speed and
901 performance testing or direct the states to publish
902 performance testing results. That is a specific question.
903 Yes or no?

904 *Ms. Roth. Yes, aggregated data is --

905 *Mr. Pallone. All right. I appreciate it, because I do
906 believe transparency is important to verify compliance with
907 the law.

908 I am also concerned that you have restricted states'
909 ability to hold delinquent providers accountable, or penalize
910 sub-grant recipients for failing to deploy or reserve
911 capacity. And I think it is critical that we have some level
912 of insight and accountability into the BEAD program going

913 forward.

914 So NTIA's semiannual report requirements for the BEAD
915 program mandate that states submit detailed progress reports
916 every six months, and this report is designed to track
917 progress across the various stages of the BEAD grant roll-
918 out. So my last question is, Administrator, will you commit
919 to publishing these semiannual reports online while
920 protecting confidential information just as NTIA did for the
921 Broadband Technology Opportunity Program?

922 Again, a specific question: Will you commit to publish
923 these semiannual reports online?

924 I understand there is certain confidential information,
925 but, you know, it would not be included. But will you agree
926 to publish those?

927 *Ms. Roth. Yes, I -- there --

928 *Mr. Pallone. All right. I appreciate it.

929 *Ms. Roth. -- is already -- yes.

930 *Mr. Pallone. I appreciate it. I wrote in a November
931 2025 letter to you that good stewardship of taxpayer dollars
932 is as much about the quality and value of the dollars spent
933 as it is about the bottom line. So I am concerned about, you
934 know, these investments, you know, being made, you know, at
935 the cheapest level as opposed to what I consider quality and
936 -- and I think that that is wrong. But I appreciate your
937 responses today, and we will follow up. Thank you.

938 And I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

939 *Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that.

940 You looked like you wanted to say something. I will
941 give you a few seconds to answer that, if you would like.

942 *Ms. Roth. I would just say that we agree we want every
943 American to have high-quality broadband service. Our view is
944 that performance is the gold standard, not any particular
945 technology. That is how Congress wrote the law, and Congress
946 was right to write -- smart to write that. The bipartisan
947 Congress was smart to write the law like that, given --

948 *Mr. Pallone. Well, I --

949 *Ms. Roth. -- the incredible innovation --

950 *Mr. Pallone. I don't think that is what you are doing,
951 but I appreciate your responses today because I think we will
952 have some transparency, hopefully, based on your responses.

953 So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

954 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. The gentleman's time has
955 expired. The chair now recognizes the vice chair of the full
956 committee, the representative from Georgia, Mr. Allen, for
957 five minutes for your questions.

958 *Mr. Allen. Thank you, Chairman Hudson, for holding
959 this hearing. And thank you, Administrator Ross, for being
960 here today.

961 Georgia has been recognized as the best state to -- my
962 home state -- to do business in 12 years in a row. And

963 obviously, because of our favorable business environment
964 there, but also the cost of deployment of resources and that
965 kind of thing. In fact, a home in California cost three
966 times the same home built in Georgia. And so, in deploying
967 these funds it is interesting. You know, I -- again, we make
968 governance for deploying funds throughout the country, but
969 doing business in some states is nearly impossible because of
970 either labor agreements or other things, which affects my
971 district.

972 But getting back to Chairman Guthrie talking about the
973 2.7 gigahertz band, he talked about the timeline. Can you
974 tell me a little bit about the factors that present the
975 greatest risk to that timeline, and what this committee and
976 Congress can do to assist NTIA in expeditious identification
977 in the auction? What is holding this up?

978 *Ms. Roth. So maybe I could just speak to -- just
979 mention -- thank you for having -- meeting me within your
980 office. It was really great to meet with you, and I agree
981 that -- with your point that regulatory conditions in a state
982 are very important for ensuring swift deployment of
983 broadband. It is something that we have really taken to
984 heart in BEAD.

985 And I think -- was your question about spectrum?

986 *Mr. Allen. Yes --

987 *Ms. Roth. Okay.

988 *Mr. Allen. -- spectrum.

989 *Ms. Roth. Yes, so --

990 *Mr. Allen. What is holding up the auction?

991 *Ms. Roth. So I would say we are moving aggressively,
992 and nothing is holding anything up. We are working
993 aggressively across all the bands that we are studying to get
994 them identified and into the marketplace as quickly as
995 possible.

996 *Mr. Allen. What can Congress do to expedite this?

997 *Ms. Roth. Yes, as -- I think one of the things to look
998 at is potentially timelines for the ability to secure
999 spectrum relocation funds, which is a critical part of NTIA's
1000 work, to identify spectrum for commercial use.

1001 But that being said, we are working aggressively. We
1002 just -- we are -- the SRF funds for the 2.7 gigahertz band
1003 just completed the congressional notification process, so
1004 funds are going to be available imminently for -- to begin
1005 those studies. And we are working across all of the bands
1006 that we are identifying --

1007 *Mr. Allen. Okay.

1008 *Ms. Roth. -- going to get 7 gigahertz identified by --

1009 *Mr. Allen. So things are moving as fast as the
1010 government can move.

1011 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we are working around the clock to get
1012 spectrum identified, given its --

1013 *Mr. Allen. All right, I have got a few more questions.
1014 Rural broadband access and the connectivity issues
1015 remain a top concern for my constituents, again, because of,
1016 you know, the policies of the previous administration as far
1017 as labor agreements and all this other stuff. Recently, NTIA
1018 chose to apply FCC pole attachment rules and regulations
1019 across the entirety of a pole-owning sub-grantee's footprint
1020 as a condition of participation in the BEAD program,
1021 including to entities like cooperatives that are exempt from
1022 these rules. Can you explain the requirement and the
1023 rationale for including it in BEAD?

1024 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Congressman. I think it really
1025 goes back to your point that ensuring that there is a
1026 hospitable environment to innovation is critical to our
1027 ability to deliver on our statutory obligation of ensuring
1028 BEAD projects are carried out in a timely and effective
1029 manner. We have really tried to learn from the past, and one
1030 of the past lessons that we know is that pole access can be a
1031 serious impediment when it comes to getting projects deployed
1032 in a timely and effective manner.

1033 And so our job is to ensure that BEAD doesn't get held
1034 up by pole access, so -- and that there is a cop on the beat.
1035 You know, section 224 of the Communications Act still applies
1036 and state laws still apply to the extent that they govern
1037 municipal and cooperative poles, but there is a risk that --

1038 in BEAD -- that because, you know, pole owners have entered
1039 BEAD markets, that incentives aren't necessarily aligned with
1040 the goals of BEAD. And so we just need to have a cop on the
1041 beat on --

1042 *Mr. Allen. Well, these co-ops electrify America. They
1043 are doing great work. Come down and talk to them about how
1044 best to do this and --

1045 *Ms. Roth. Okay.

1046 *Mr. Allen. -- before you implement something that they
1047 have to deal with.

1048 I have another question. I will submit it for the
1049 record because I am out of time.

1050 [The information follows:]

1051

1052 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1053

1054 *Mr. Allen. And I will yield back. Thank you very
1055 much.

1056 *Ms. Roth. Thank you.

1057 *Mr. Hudson. I thank the gentleman. The chair now
1058 recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Representative Soto,
1059 for five minutes for your questions.

1060 *Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1061 Unfortunately, rural America has lost faith in the roll-
1062 out of the rural broadband program. We have seen 18 months
1063 of bureaucracy, 18 months of talk, 18 months of delay. A lot
1064 of my folks back home think that the rural broadband plan was
1065 actually the smaller roll-out of the American Rescue Plan on
1066 broadband because that is the only thing that has happened to
1067 date since 2021.

1068 We saw March of -- 11th of 2021 the American Rescue Plan
1069 was signed into law. In December 1, 2022 Florida was one of
1070 6 states to get funds under the American Rescue Plan Capital
1071 Projects Fund. And in February 2, 2023 Governor DeSantis
1072 announces Yeehaw Junction and Kenansville in our district
1073 received \$4 million, and Deer Park and Bull Creek received
1074 \$3.6 million to deploy fiber and connect rural areas of
1075 Osceola County. I can tell you this was a huge change for a
1076 lot of folks down there. Everyone from small business owners
1077 like Realtors, folks who are using WiFi and GPS and other
1078 technologies for cattle and citrus and smart farming, it was

1079 a big help for them.

1080 But then you contrast it to the BEAD program itself,
1081 passed into law November 15, 2021. July 18, 2022 we saw the
1082 letters of intent due from governors. By 2022 -- in August
1083 they submitted their applications. By 2023 NTIA announced
1084 allocations for all states. And then in January 2025 the
1085 President unfortunately paused the BEAD program to revamp it.
1086 But here we are in, gosh, 18 months later, and we still see
1087 -- I think only Louisiana is the only state that has had some
1088 broadband actually built already. Florida's program was
1089 approved on January 7, 2026, which we appreciate.

1090 But we -- I guess my question, Secretary Roth, is when
1091 will Floridians actually see broadband built in Florida?

1092 *Ms. Roth. So we agree that expediting broadband needs
1093 to be front and center, and it has been front and center of
1094 everything we have done, and we -- in course-correcting the
1095 BEAD program.

1096 We, you know, had to -- we had to course-correct the
1097 program when we got here, precisely because the program had
1098 failed to connect any Americans in the -- during the previous
1099 administration. And now, only a year after the restructuring
1100 notice, we have deployment out the door. I was recently in
1101 Ogallala, Nebraska for the groundbreaking of a BEAD project
1102 where a fixed wireless provider was delivering gigabit
1103 service to a community. That was a technology that was

1104 prohibited from participating. And they are delivering
1105 excellent service to the community and on an expedited
1106 timeline.

1107 *Mr. Soto. Look, this --

1108 *Ms. Roth. We wouldn't have seen that if we had had --
1109 put all of our eggs in one basket.

1110 *Mr. Soto. Reclaiming my time, I think that is great,
1111 and we certainly want broadband and cellular and satellite to
1112 be part of it.

1113 But my question is, when do you think Florida will
1114 finally see this stuff happen?

1115 *Ms. Roth. Yes. So right now states like Florida are
1116 signing their BEAD subcontract agreements with providers, and
1117 five states have already signed with satellite providers for
1118 immediate service in eligible areas.

1119 Thanks to our approach to the program, we are going to
1120 see also streamlined permitting. Louisiana was one state
1121 that was able to complete 25,000 environmental reviews,
1122 thanks to our cloud-based permitting tool.

1123 *Mr. Soto. Is the --

1124 *Ms. Roth. We are going to see -- yes?

1125 *Mr. Soto. Is Louisiana the only state that has
1126 actually started breaking ground on the broadband aspect of
1127 it?

1128 *Ms. Roth. No, states across the nation are leveraging

1129 our permitting tools to get approvals and shovels --

1130 *Mr. Soto. But which states have -- pardon me. Which
1131 states have broken ground already on the broadband aspect of
1132 this?

1133 *Ms. Roth. There are -- so Louisiana and Nebraska have
1134 already gotten communities connected through projects,
1135 through fixed wireless projects.

1136 *Mr. Soto. Okay, so we have two states so far --

1137 *Ms. Roth. As well as five states have signed
1138 agreements with satellite providers, and those consumers will
1139 be able to get technology right now.

1140 *Mr. Soto. Well, and look, we -- I agree with you that
1141 there should be redundancy and different technologies
1142 utilized. We launch SpaceX and Blue Origin rockets from
1143 central Florida, and I was part of getting some discretion
1144 early on before in the last administration, and I do think
1145 that has got to be a part of it. And this committee stands
1146 ready to work with you to speed this up a little bit. Two
1147 states is, you know, a long cry away from where we need to
1148 be, and we want to work with you on that.

1149 And I yield back.

1150 *Mr. Hudson. The gentleman's time has expired. The
1151 chair now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Representative
1152 Latta, for five minutes for your questions.

1153 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman,

1154 and thanks for holding this really important hearing today.

1155 And Secretary, thanks very much for being with us today.

1156 You know, it was a privilege of mine to chair this
1157 subcommittee, and I did a lot of work during the time when we
1158 saw BEAD come online. But let me get some dates right here.

1159 It was 2021 that BEAD became law. Is that correct?

1160 *Ms. Roth. That is correct.

1161 *Mr. Latta. And the Trump Administration came in in
1162 January of 2025?

1163 *Ms. Roth. Correct.

1164 *Mr. Latta. How much -- and how much of a deployment
1165 was made in that period of time, from 2021 to January of
1166 2025?

1167 *Ms. Roth. Not a single home connected.

1168 *Mr. Latta. Not a single. Not a single. Not anything,
1169 period. Zero. And we had -- at that -- it was an estimate
1170 at that time that we had eight million households across this
1171 country that did not have broadband at that time. And during
1172 that period of time, from 2021 to 2025, 0 got deployed.

1173 I know that I was out in my district, and we -- I was at
1174 one of my community colleges, and they were trying to get
1175 people instructed in how to deploy broadband because the
1176 thinking was that it was going to be happening quickly.
1177 Well, you know, the locals knew more about things than
1178 Washington, D.C. And they said at one of the meetings I was

1179 at, number one, we didn't have the people that had the right
1180 training to get them out there to deploy. And the second
1181 thing they told me was that they didn't have the trucks with
1182 a bucket on them that might take a year and a half to two
1183 years. And I asked the previous folks at NTIA if they had
1184 even considered that, and they said no.

1185 So there is a lot of other things out there that were
1186 contributing factors, but to just get this deployed is really
1187 important.

1188 Were there -- are regulations out there at the time that
1189 really put things behind for states to try to get the
1190 broadband deployed during the previous administration?

1191 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we saw there were a plethora of
1192 negative consequences from the red tape and hostile mandates
1193 that we -- that were on the program when we inherited it.
1194 But thanks to our reforms, we -- states were able to target
1195 projects to the right areas based on their unique
1196 circumstances.

1197 You know, we are seeing increased skin in the game with
1198 a 40 percent nationwide project match which is really
1199 indicative of projects being sustainable. And we are on
1200 track to connect the entire country, whereas there was a real
1201 risk, including identified by the 2025 OIG report, that under
1202 the previous rules certain states were going to run out of
1203 money and areas would be left behind.

1204 *Mr. Latta. And here is another situation I think you
1205 have to think about. The longer we take to get something
1206 done in this country with regulations -- and there is money
1207 that has been appropriated -- because of inflation it is
1208 worthless. So would that be a contributing factor out there
1209 too that we have to consider, that, you know, we don't have
1210 the \$42.8 billion that have been appropriated?

1211 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, through increased -- through
1212 taking out red tape, participation went up. Providers that
1213 had previously stayed out came back to the table. That
1214 brought down prices and created much better outcomes for
1215 consumers.

1216 You know, even within fiber projects, there was one
1217 company that won an award in a Midwestern state in 15
1218 counties. Its ask to the government decreased from \$2
1219 million from -- between the previous rules and under our
1220 rules. That is a real win for taxpayers.

1221 *Mr. Latta. Well, and you said a real magic word here,
1222 "Washington cutting red tape.'" That is music to a lot of
1223 people's ears.

1224 And Secretary, you know the NTIA had not been
1225 reauthorized for over 30 years. And legislation that I
1226 worked on that has been passed by the House of Representatives,
1227 you know, it is important that we get -- that, you know, NTIA
1228 into the next century, you might say.

1229 Could you speak to the changes they have made to the
1230 deployment program to ensure that we don't repeat what
1231 happened in the previous administration with the changes that
1232 we made for reauthorization for NTIA?

1233 *Ms. Roth. Sorry, could you repeat the question?

1234 *Mr. Latta. Yes. Could you speak to the changes that
1235 have -- made to the deployment program to ensure that we
1236 don't repeat what happened in the previous administration?

1237 I have only got about 39 seconds.

1238 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, we stripped out red tape and
1239 hostile mandates, we restored the program to its statutory
1240 mission, and we have seen incredible results from that in
1241 terms of participation, a diverse technology mix, more skin
1242 in the game for taxpayers -- for projects, and universal
1243 connectivity on a more expedited timeline. Projects are
1244 currently getting deployed as we speak.

1245 *Mr. Latta. In my last eight seconds, when do you
1246 expect to see breaking ground in Ohio?

1247 *Ms. Roth. Well, the state is working with providers to
1248 sign sub-grants. And thanks to our work in expediting
1249 permitting, we will see continued groundbreaking in 2026 and
1250 scaling into 2027.

1251 *Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
1252 My time is expired and I will submit my other questions for
1253 the Secretary in writing. Thank you.

1254 [The information follows:]

1255

1256 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1257

1258 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. The gentleman's time has
1259 expired. The chair will now recognize the representative
1260 from California, Mr. Ruiz, for five minutes for your
1261 questions.

1262 *Dr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1263 Across much of rural America in my district, reliable
1264 broadband is a dire necessity. I have spoken with and seen
1265 families whose children have had to rely on hotspots or
1266 public WiFi to complete their homework, and with patients in
1267 rural communities who have struggled to access telehealth
1268 appointments. In fact, some of our school busses have
1269 hotspots, and they have to park in a -- near trailer parks
1270 and neighborhoods so the kids can go and use their school
1271 busses just to use the internet.

1272 When a child cannot learn from home or a patient cannot
1273 connect with their doctor, the digital divide becomes a
1274 barrier to opportunity, education, and health care. That is
1275 why ensuring affordable, reliable broadband reaches every
1276 community is so important. And for too many rural and tribal
1277 communities, the promise of high-speed internet remains
1278 fulfilled -- unfulfilled.

1279 Families continue to struggle with inadequate
1280 connectivity, students still face barriers to completing
1281 school work, and tribal nations are often left waiting at the
1282 back of the line for infrastructure investments that other

1283 communities take for granted. That is why Congress created
1284 the Broadband Equity Access and Deployment, or the BEAD
1285 program, to close the digital divide once and for all.

1286 So California was allocated nearly \$1.9 billion through
1287 the BEAD program, and has spent years working with local
1288 governments, providers, and tribal nations to develop its
1289 plan. Yet communities in my district are still waiting for
1290 certainty as NTIA continues reviewing state proposals under
1291 "revised" program requirements.

1292 Administrator Roth, thank you for visiting me last week
1293 in the office. I had a wonderful conversation. Can you
1294 provide a timeline for when California's BEAD final proposal
1295 will receive NTIA approval?

1296 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, and thank you for meeting me in
1297 your office. It was really interesting to discuss the issue
1298 that you mentioned of children's technology use. I really
1299 appreciated our conversation.

1300 In terms of California we would want to see every state
1301 approved, including California. We have communicated certain
1302 challenges --

1303 *Dr. Ruiz. What is the timeline? When can we expect
1304 the decision?

1305 *Ms. Roth. Yes, so right now the ball is in
1306 California's court. We have communicated changes that we are
1307 going to need to see in order to ensure that the proposal

1308 complies with our rules and the principles of the benefit of
1309 the bargain. And we are really looking forward to getting
1310 that -- getting California across the finish line, as well as
1311 all states and territories.

1312 *Dr. Ruiz. So while California continues to wait for
1313 its final approval, all states, tribal nations, local
1314 communities still lack clarity about how remaining BEAD
1315 resources can be used and who will benefit. I will remain
1316 deeply concerned that we continue to face delays on this
1317 issue. So we were explicitly promised that guidance would be
1318 issued this month, and we -- and it has not happened. The
1319 continued failure to deploy it is unacceptable. We need
1320 certainty, we need completion of these guidance.

1321 Administrator Roth, can you commit that NTIA's funding
1322 decisions will be based on statutory program requirements and
1323 broadband deployment needs, rather than state policy
1324 disagreements?

1325 *Ms. Roth. Absolutely. Our job is to implement the
1326 law, and that has been front and center for us as we have
1327 approached the BEAD program, and I think it is evident from
1328 the decisions we have made.

1329 *Dr. Ruiz. I also remain concerned about the long-term
1330 stability of the Universal Service Fund. Communities in my
1331 district, including rural agricultural communities and tribal
1332 nations, depend on these programs to remain connected. That

1333 is why I introduced the Tribal Internet Expansion Act which
1334 would ensure that tribal nations are explicitly included
1335 within the statutory framework guiding universal service
1336 policy, rather than relying solely on administrative
1337 discretion.

1338 While I was pleased NTIA finally announced new funding
1339 opportunities for tribes under existing programs that had
1340 been on hold, I am disappointed by how long those processes
1341 were delayed, and that the announcements were made only when
1342 you were right about to appear before this committee.
1343 Administrator Roth, can we get your commitment that NTIA will
1344 work with Congress to strengthen tribal broadband access and
1345 support policies that recognize tribal nations as essential
1346 partners in achieving universal service?

1347 *Ms. Roth. Absolutely. We respect tribal sovereignty
1348 at NTIA, and we actually held two tribal consultations in
1349 developing our TBCP guidance in January, and ensuring that
1350 tribes get universally connected has been at the heart of our
1351 reforms to the TBCP program.

1352 *Dr. Ruiz. Thank you, I appreciate that.

1353 *Mr. Hudson. The gentleman yields back. The chair now
1354 recognizes the representative from Virginia, Representative
1355 Griffith, for five minutes for your questions.

1356 *Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We
1357 had a lot of delays in getting the plan approved originally

1358 during the Biden Administration. Virginia was one of the
1359 first to submit. But I am glad to see that, as a part of
1360 what you all have reworked, that you have allowed for low
1361 Earth orbit satellite internet to be used as a part of the
1362 BEAD program.

1363 I may have told you when you came to my office or may
1364 have mentioned it in the hearing, I don't remember where, but
1365 I actually had a gentleman in Grayson County, Virginia who
1366 came to me and said, you know, we are never going to get it.
1367 And the bottom line is, in a mountainous region of Virginia
1368 it may not be as big as the mountains out West, but you can't
1369 run fiber to every nook and cranny, every holler out there,
1370 and we are going to need low Earth orbit. And he was
1371 thrilled when I told him that that had now been included as a
1372 part of the plan, and he looks forward to that -- getting
1373 some lower cost for him to be able to get the low Earth orbit
1374 internet availability.

1375 And further, I have to say I think it is very prudent --
1376 and I think you might agree -- to have redundant technologies
1377 in regions for critical broadband customers like hospitals
1378 and schools. You probably want to have more than just one.
1379 And I also bring up Grayson County because that was part of
1380 the -- it borders North Carolina, and it got hit hard by
1381 Hurricane Helene. And I went out and observed a road that
1382 was completely gone. It was just gone. And in the road bed

1383 was the fiber. So that end of the county that had had fiber
1384 was out for months because of that.

1385 Now, fortunately, the hospital in the region was not
1386 affected by that because it was far enough to the east that
1387 it didn't get as much damage. They had other issues, but
1388 they didn't have that issue. But don't you think that the --
1389 allowing BEAD to be used with low Earth orbit satellite will
1390 help our hospitals and our schools to stay online in times of
1391 natural disaster?

1392 *Ms. Roth. Thank you.

1393 *Mr. Griffith. Mike.

1394 *Mr. Hudson. Make sure your mike is on there.

1395 *Ms. Roth. Sorry, still getting used to this. Thank
1396 you, Congressman, and I was really grateful for the
1397 opportunity to meet with you and discuss, you know, your
1398 district's challenges, especially as such a rural part of
1399 Virginia.

1400 And I really agree with you that, you know, different
1401 technologies are going to work in different areas. That was
1402 what the bipartisan Congress recognized in writing the BEAD
1403 law. It set out performance requirements that each
1404 technology had to meet. Our gold standard is ensuring that
1405 projects meet those performance requirements.

1406 But it didn't make sense, given the diverse conditions
1407 of our country, to force a one-size-fits-all solution down

1408 the states, especially, as you mentioned, that different
1409 technologies work differently. Fiber is incredibly -- is an
1410 incredible technology. And indeed, most of our program is
1411 fiber. But, you know, as we have seen, there have been
1412 incredible innovations in fixed wireless technology. A
1413 technology that just was seen as inferior now can provide
1414 gigabit service, even in non-line-of-sight environments.

1415 And similarly with technology -- with satellite. We
1416 have seen incredible increases in throughput and latency, new
1417 generations of satellites coming online, new launches. And I
1418 think it is just not correct or a reflection of reality to
1419 consider a single technology inferior. It is at odds with
1420 our -- America's historical approach to facilities-based
1421 innovation and competition that has made America's broadband
1422 the best in the world.

1423 *Mr. Griffith. I appreciate it. Now let me shift to a
1424 -- maybe a little more difficult subject because you have got
1425 good folks competing, but there have been some -- and you all
1426 have updated BEAD to provide guidance explicitly conditioning
1427 funding on following pole attachment statutes. Will you
1428 commit to referring entities for FCC enforcement and clawing
1429 back BEAD funding if pole attachment statutes are not
1430 followed by the BEAD grant recipients?

1431 *Ms. Roth. Yes. So part of our role right now at NTIA
1432 is oversight and ensuring that projects are deploying and --

1433 deployed in a timely and effective manner, and that -- part
1434 of that is working to figure out where there are challenges
1435 on the ground and working with companies and states to
1436 address those. And we have a process in our rules, in our
1437 terms and conditions specifically on addressing permitting
1438 challenges.

1439 *Mr. Griffith. And last, but not least, I will just
1440 note that I thought it was interesting not only did we have
1441 delays in the Biden Administration, but there were requests
1442 earlier for you to talk about some laws and where did you all
1443 get your authority. And I remember because the problem we
1444 had in Virginia with the Biden Administration, that -- one of
1445 the things they were trying to force at that time was that
1446 there be a specific low-cost plan that met the approval of
1447 the Biden Administration, and yet the law specifically
1448 prohibits you from -- you are supposed to have a low-cost
1449 plan, but it -- the law specifically prohibits you from
1450 deciding what that low-cost plan is, doesn't it?

1451 *Ms. Roth. I agree, the law specifically prohibits from
1452 rate regulating and micromanaging markets in that way. I
1453 think a bipartisan Congress recognized that that was not the
1454 right approach to get -- to maximize participation and
1455 success in the program.

1456 *Mr. Griffith. And I yield back.

1457 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. The gentleman's time has

1458 expired. The chair now recognizes the representative from
1459 California, Mr. Peters, for five minutes for your questions.

1460 *Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,
1461 Administrator Roth, for joining us today. And thank you also
1462 for meeting with me earlier on.

1463 In November of 2021 Congress voted to invest over \$42
1464 billion to advance America's goal of universal broadband
1465 service with over \$1.8 billion reserved for California in the
1466 Broadband Equity Access and Deployment, or BEAD, program.

1467 And when I came to Congress, one of the things I heard
1468 all the time was about rural broadband. Republicans were
1469 really concerned about that. And in the pandemic we learned
1470 that the digital divide wasn't just rural or urban; it was
1471 also -- it existed in wealthy cities like my own. And so
1472 this was a really important thing, it was a huge advance.

1473 And I have to say I was critical of the Biden
1474 Administration's deployment of this. I was frustrated that
1475 after three years we didn't have any projects in the ground.
1476 And the witness came here when the Republicans took the
1477 majority and they -- the witness, the Democratic witness,
1478 said the states hadn't gotten through the paperwork yet.
1479 They said -- she said it was hard to do. And I thought that
1480 the criticism of the Biden Administration was, in many
1481 respects, very fair.

1482 Then this Administration came in promising to speed up

1483 the timelines. After months of silence on BEAD funding at
1484 the beginning of last year, NTIA requires states to go
1485 through an entirely new process, the benefit of the bargain
1486 round. And because of this additional round, states that
1487 were on the cusp of receiving funding at the beginning of
1488 2025 were delayed by at least 11 months. Then NTIA missed
1489 its own deadline to issue non-deployment guidance by months.
1490 That threatened the ability of states to do critical permit
1491 process overhauls to ensure the success of the program.

1492 California has still not received its funding for this
1493 critical program. California is one of only two states that
1494 has yet to receive final proposal approval from NTIA, and we
1495 know that if California were to receive NTIA approval today
1496 my state will still need to seek final approval from NIST;
1497 receive the notice of its award; sign its award agreement, a
1498 process that is likely to take anywhere from an additional
1499 six months to a year. That is if NTIA were to approve
1500 California's final plan today.

1501 After months of going back and forth between NTIA and
1502 California on its final proposal with multiple rounds of
1503 curing earlier this spring, California thought it was nearing
1504 final approval. And then, after months of silence from NTIA,
1505 NTIA recently sent California a completely new round of
1506 curing requests with new issues and questions NTIA had never
1507 previously raised. So we all know California will not be

1508 seeing the money any time soon, leaving our unserved and
1509 underserved rural and urban communities behind.

1510 Administrator Roth, can you explain how changes brought
1511 under your leadership have fulfilled your claims of
1512 accelerating BEAD deployment?

1513 And when should Californians expect to see shovels in
1514 the ground?

1515 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Congressman, and it was great to
1516 talk to you in your office. You know, I -- where I -- and
1517 thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain some of
1518 the challenges that we have seen in California.

1519 I told you one of the challenges that I think you
1520 mentioned in our approach to curing was that there were some
1521 mapping anomalies we found. You know, we -- oversight of the
1522 program and conducting our due diligence is really important
1523 to ensure protection of taxpayer dollars, and there were
1524 several examples in California where, you know, there were
1525 requests for really exorbitant amounts of money ostensibly to
1526 serve apartments in the middle of nowhere. And so we had to
1527 work with the state to ensure that we addressed those mapping
1528 challenges.

1529 We are working with the state. We intend to -- we look
1530 forward to receiving California's revised proposal so that we
1531 can get California and all states and territories across the
1532 finish line.

1533 But I think that the data speaks for itself with respect
1534 to expediting projects. You know, thanks to our restoring
1535 the project -- the program to its statutory mission, we have
1536 already seen --

1537 *Mr. Peters. You have said that before. You said we
1538 have got projects in Louisiana, we have got a project in
1539 Nebraska. And that --

1540 *Ms. Roth. Yes --

1541 *Mr. Peters. To me, you know, that is not that great.
1542 What we have now is, instead of a three-year delay, we have a
1543 five-year delay. The witness is here blaming the states, the
1544 witness is here telling about how it is hard, the same things
1545 we heard from the Biden witness when you all came into the
1546 majority. I hope you are not breaking your arms patting
1547 yourselves on the back that this is better. This is the
1548 same. This is the same. We have -- instead of a three-year
1549 delay, we have a five-year delay. And I would love to see
1550 some of the same frustration that I showed with the
1551 administration of my own party on the other side of the
1552 aisle, to see the Republicans showing frustration with this
1553 implementation, because this is unacceptable. This is as
1554 unacceptable as it was at the beginning of this term.

1555 I have more questions, but I will submit them in
1556 writing.

1557 [The information follows:]

1558 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1559

1560 *Mr. Peters. I yield back.

1561 *Mrs. Fedorchak. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields
1562 back. The chair now recognizes Representative Fulcher for
1563 his five minutes of questions.

1564 *Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Madam Chair.

1565 Administrator Roth, I want to start with a thank you.
1566 In May we had sent an inquiry in regard to the possible use
1567 of next-generation 911 deployment, and didn't get a full
1568 answer yet for a number of reasons. However, you were very
1569 responsive, and just the response means a lot, keeping us
1570 cued in on the status.

1571 In my state we have a lot of rural space, and the rural
1572 broadband deployment is a big, big deal. In addition to
1573 being a member of Energy and Commerce, I am also on Natural
1574 Resources. And one of the things that we struggle with is a
1575 permitting process for this deployment. That is a huge issue
1576 for us and a huge issue in terms of how this deployment is
1577 handled, the timeliness of which it is handled, whatnot.

1578 To what extent is NTIA involved -- or suggestions have
1579 you got in regard to working with Federal, state for this
1580 permitting process?

1581 A lot of this is on -- or related to Federal land. We
1582 have got about 34 million acres of that. To what extent is
1583 NTIA involved with that, and what is happening there?

1584 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, and thank you for the opportunity

1585 to meet with you.

1586 So permitting is front and center of our efforts to
1587 expedite deployment in the BEAD program. We are really
1588 focused on, you know, not just getting paperwork out the
1589 door, but actual deployment. And we know that permitting has
1590 been one of the historical challenges when it comes to
1591 broadband deployment.

1592 What we have done at NTIA is we have introduced a
1593 software, cloud-based software tool, to really
1594 expedite and automate the permitting process. We have 47
1595 categorical exclusions that will apply to, we estimate, about
1596 95 percent of BEAD projects. And through our software tool
1597 we have seen really a much more expeditious process. A
1598 process that used to be email-based and took 3 to 6 months is
1599 now taking 48 hours, according to one of the state broadband
1600 directors. And the proof is in the data. There were --
1601 25,000 locations just got through our permitting process,
1602 thanks to that tool.

1603 And we are working with other Federal agencies -- Fish
1604 and Wildlife Service, National Council on Historic
1605 Preservation -- to, you know, expedite things at the Federal
1606 level. But as you said, there are also a lot of challenges
1607 at the state and local level. And so we are working with
1608 states to, you know, streamline processing, expedite
1609 timelines, reduce permitting costs, because ultimately that

1610 is what will make the BEAD program successful and, you know,
1611 avoid defaults.

1612 *Mr. Fulcher. Okay.

1613 *Ms. Roth. And I also commend this committee's efforts
1614 to address -- address some of those challenges through its
1615 legislation.

1616 *Mr. Fulcher. Okay. Well, our experience in most of
1617 those challenges on permitting have been Federal, but I
1618 understand that there is also the state and local. Just keep
1619 that in mind. It is a big issue for us in rural Idaho.

1620 Shifting gears a little bit, you had referenced the
1621 study. That been talked about briefly. But the One Big,
1622 Beautiful Bill calls for a study of the 2.7 megahertz band.
1623 What is the timeline on that in terms of completing that
1624 study?

1625 *Ms. Roth. So we are working aggressively to complete
1626 that study and get spectrum identified in that band. We
1627 actually just finished the 60-day congressional notification,
1628 time -- notification process to get SRF funding to incumbent
1629 agencies, NOAA and the FAA, so that we can complete the
1630 requisite studies and identification and get the spectrum
1631 auction. It is certainly one of the bands that we are
1632 working with the FCC to get auctioned as soon as possible.

1633 *Mr. Fulcher. What is the speed bumps in -- with -- in
1634 that regard? Is it personnel? Is it lack of responsiveness

1635 from other entities?

1636 *Ms. Roth. No, I think one of the benefits of the
1637 President's leadership on spectrum and his presidential
1638 memorandum on winning the 6G race is that he has really
1639 identified getting spectrum auction as a national priority.
1640 And so we are working really cooperatively with other
1641 agencies, including the incumbents, to get the -- to get
1642 their systems upgraded and the spectrum identified for
1643 auction.

1644 And we are also really working very closely with the FCC
1645 on this too, to figure out ways to expedite timelines and get
1646 the -- get -- achieve the goal of five auctions during this
1647 Administration.

1648 *Mr. Fulcher. Okay. I do have a question on 1675
1649 megahertz and 70 gigahertz, but I am going to put that in
1650 writing because my time is up.

1651 [The information follows:]

1652

1653 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

1654

1655 *Mr. Fulcher. So with that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

1656 *Mrs. Fedorchak. The gentleman yields. The chair now
1657 recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Carter, for five
1658 minutes of questions.

1659 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Madam Chair, and
1660 thank you, Administrator Roth, for joining us today.

1661 In January 2025 Louisiana became the first state in the
1662 nation to secure Federal approval for a plan to deploy \$1.3
1663 billion in funding under the original Broadband Equity Access
1664 and Deployment, or BEAD, program, a program that -- designed
1665 to ensure that everyone, regardless of zip code, has access
1666 to affordable, reliable, high-speed internet.

1667 But instead of building on that progress, the Trump
1668 Administration forced states to redo years of approval
1669 planning which delayed deployment and caused unnecessary
1670 uncertainty. While Louisiana's revised plan has now been
1671 approved again, roughly 800 million in Louisiana's BEAD non-
1672 deployment funding remains frozen. Those dollars were meant
1673 to expand telehealth, strengthen workforce development,
1674 improve digital skills, and help rural and underserved
1675 communities fully participate in today's economy, not sit
1676 idle. These delays are unacceptable. Every day they
1677 continue to cost communities the connectivity, growth, and
1678 opportunity they deserve.

1679 Administrator Roth, Louisiana kept its bargain in a

1680 bipartisan manner first under Democratic Governor John Bel
1681 Edwards and then Republican Governor Jeff Landry. We worked
1682 with state, local, and Federal partners to become the first
1683 state in the nation with approved BEAD plan. Our communities
1684 have done their part. Why hasn't NTIA done theirs? What is
1685 the hold-up in releasing the deployment funds?

1686 *Ms. Roth. Well, thank you. Thank you, Congressman.

1687 Louisiana has, as you have seen, been extremely
1688 successful in its final proposal. The governor of Louisiana
1689 has spoken publicly about the benefits of the benefit of the
1690 bargain reforms in promoting ubiquitous connectivity across
1691 the state, and we have already started to see deployment. We
1692 want to ensure that --

1693 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I am sorry, I have about two
1694 minutes left. Can you just tell me what is the hold-up?
1695 Respectfully.

1696 *Ms. Roth. We are trying to get the guidance right, not
1697 just rush money out the door because --

1698 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So -- but when the Biden
1699 Administration was trying to get the guidance right, you said
1700 they were -- you are wasting time. You can't have it both
1701 ways.

1702 Let me ask you a quick question. Yes or no, can you
1703 assure me that Louisiana will receive its full BEAD
1704 allocation, including the 800 million in non-deployment

1705 funds?

1706 *Ms. Roth. Yes, so Congress allocated funding to the
1707 states --

1708 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So can you assure us that we
1709 will get it?

1710 *Ms. Roth. Pardon?

1711 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. We have. So --

1712 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

1713 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. -- now it is in your park.
1714 Can you assure me and the people of Louisiana that the 800
1715 million in non-deployment funds will be unfrozen?

1716 *Ms. Roth. The states will get their money according to
1717 the law.

1718 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So that is a yes?

1719 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we fully intend --

1720 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Okay, thank you, that is
1721 good.

1722 Thousands of rural, economically disadvantaged locations
1723 in Louisiana that were initially slated for fiber in January
1724 2025 have now, under the benefit of the bargain round, had
1725 BEAD funding diverted to Elon Musk's satellite services. How
1726 do you justify delivering lower-quality broadband to rural
1727 and underserved communities under BEAD when higher-
1728 performance options like fiber are available and states like
1729 mine are willing to -- willing and able to invest in rural

1730 communities?

1731 *Ms. Roth. As I have said, performance is the gold
1732 standard, and the law was written in a tech neutral way, and
1733 our job is to ensure that every last community gets priority
1734 broadband service --

1735 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. But how do you justify going
1736 to an inferior product over a more superior product?

1737 *Ms. Roth. Well, different types of technologies work
1738 better in different communities. You know, fiber can be
1739 great. In some places it is really exorbitant. And, you
1740 know, there was an example in Louisiana where --

1741 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Would you agree that
1742 Louisiana had passed all of its tests, was ready for
1743 everything to go, had shovels ready to go on the ground? So
1744 what is different now? The only thing different now is that
1745 a new administration that clearly wants to put its
1746 fingerprint on it. And I am fine with that, but don't send
1747 us backwards when in fact Louisiana, under a Democratic
1748 governor and a Republican governor, did all the right things
1749 and now the people of Louisiana are being punished, one, with
1750 a delay; two, with \$800 million in non-deployment funds being
1751 frozen; and three, now getting a inferior product.

1752 That doesn't sound like progress. That sounds like
1753 gamesmanship.

1754 *Ms. Roth. We agree nobody should be punished. But we

1755 don't -- we disagree that putting a mandate on a single
1756 technology means better outcomes. In Louisiana, allowing
1757 fixed wireless to participate in the program not only brought
1758 down costs, but --

1759 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. You mentioned --

1760 *Ms. Roth. -- it also expedited deployment in the
1761 state.

1762 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Respectfully, you mentioned
1763 in your comment that Louisiana had gotten it right. You
1764 mentioned your comment that we were -- you acknowledged that
1765 we were first, that we got it right. But now we are being
1766 punished for getting an inferior product after the fact, when
1767 in fact we had gone through all those batteries of tests, all
1768 of those hoops, all of those jumps among two different
1769 administrations, only to find it rechecked, redone, and now
1770 we are getting less money, an inferior product. That is just
1771 not cool.

1772 I would love to meet with you, Administrator Roth, and
1773 have a more in-depth conversation. My time has expired now.

1774 Mr. Chairman, thank you.

1775 *Mr. Hudson. [Presiding.] The gentleman's time has
1776 expired.

1777 I will let the witness take a few seconds, if you would
1778 like to respond to that.

1779 *Ms. Roth. I guess I could -- I would welcome the

1780 opportunity to meet with you.

1781 Our view is that performance is the gold standard. And
1782 I think that the view that, you know, one technology is a
1783 one-size-fits-all solution or future-proof just doesn't
1784 reflect reality when we have seen incredible amounts of
1785 innovation in diverse technologies. Even in the last five
1786 years we have seen incredible progress in fixed wireless, a
1787 service that has become extremely popular among consumers,
1788 and is increasingly becoming viable and -- increasingly
1789 viable and scalable.

1790 And the same goes with respect to satellite. We have
1791 been seeing incredible increases in the technology that I
1792 think weren't anticipated several years ago, and I think that
1793 goes to show the importance of taking a non-distortionary,
1794 tech-neutral approach to the program that recognizes diverse
1795 conditions in the country and also doesn't put a thumb on the
1796 scale for innovation. Innovation has --

1797 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, respectfully,
1798 if you are going to give --

1799 *Mr. Hudson. Sir --

1800 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. If you are going to give the
1801 witness an opportunity to continue to speak --

1802 *Mr. Hudson. Sir, I gave you an additional minute-and-
1803 a-half.

1804 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. But she didn't answer my

1805 question; you just gave her an opportunity for comment.

1806 *Mr. Hudson. Well, I gave her the opportunity to answer
1807 your question.

1808 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. No, you gave her an
1809 opportunity for commentary.

1810 *Mr. Hudson. Well, the gentleman is not recognized.

1811 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Well, I would ask you to --

1812 *Mr. Hudson. The chair recognizes --

1813 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. -- respectfully answer the
1814 question --

1815 *Mr. Hudson. -- the gentleman from Florida, Mr.
1816 Bilirakis.

1817 *Mr. Carter of Louisiana. -- and not offer commentary.
1818 Thank you.

1819 *Mr. Hudson. The gentleman is not recognized.
1820 Mr. Bilirakis, you recognized for five minutes.

1821 *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate
1822 it very much.

1823 In coordination with the NTIA and the FCC, for the past
1824 several years I have been working on legislation that would
1825 continue to address to our -- tweaks to our
1826 telecommunications networks by the Chinese Communist Party
1827 and other countries of concern. That work has ultimately led
1828 me to the FIREWALL Act, introduced today by myself and
1829 Congressman Soto, who happens to be on the full committee.

1830 The FIREWALL Act would forever ban Federal
1831 telecommunications funding from companies that choose to
1832 purchase fiber optic cable from China. Now is the perfect
1833 time to implement such a ban, since Chinese fiber is only a
1834 small percentage of the United States market today. Let's
1835 not make the same mistake twice. We must end this before we
1836 are struck with another multi-billion-dollar rip-and-replace-
1837 type program.

1838 Assistant Secretary Roth, the question again: Can you
1839 discuss some of the threats that exist and could exist with
1840 the systemic use of Chinese-produced fiber optic cable?

1841 And what are your thoughts on instituting a funding ban
1842 on companies that choose to ignore these risks, please?

1843 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Congressman, for your leadership.

1844 The fiber supply chain is something that NTIA closely
1845 monitors. In our Administration, the BEAD program, fiber is
1846 critical infrastructure and, you know, it is passive, but it
1847 -- we should still be very deliberate in terms of, you know,
1848 whether -- looking at the supply chain and ensuring that
1849 Federal dollars don't deepen reliance on untrusted supply
1850 chains and Chinese influence. I think the broader lesson of
1851 the past decade is that building a trusted supply chain is
1852 less expensive in the long run in terms of unwinding
1853 dependance later.

1854 And I haven't had a chance to look into your legislation

1855 yet, but I look forward to looking into it and would stand
1856 ready to be of assistance, especially as we have looked at
1857 this -- looked at these supply chain issues in the context of
1858 the BEAD program.

1859 *Mr. Bilirakis. Yes, I look forward to the
1860 conversation. Thank you.

1861 As a member of the China Select Committee, I am
1862 concerned about the World Radio Communication Conference
1863 being hosted in Shanghai, and how China is using its position
1864 to undercut American connectivity priorities including WiFi,
1865 satellite, and other technologies. Again, Secretary Roth,
1866 what steps is the Administration taking to ensure that the
1867 United States and our allies will be able to fully
1868 participate in Shanghai?

1869 *Ms. Roth. Thank you. It is such an important question
1870 and an issue that this Administration has prioritized.

1871 One of the things is -- that we need to ensure is that
1872 we build a coalition support around our positions going into
1873 WRC. And so -- and we are actively doing that. NTIA
1874 recently held a training with 27 regulators from 20 different
1875 African countries to work on building support for U.S.
1876 strategic priorities when it comes to commercial space, given
1877 that the WRC agenda is going to be so satellite focused.

1878 And we also equally are working on finalizing our
1879 positions on agenda item 1.7, which focuses on the future of

1880 6G, given that strategic importance to us.

1881 So we are working to finalize our positions in advance
1882 of CTL in the fall. But, you know, it is not just finalizing
1883 positions that is important. Also, ensuring effective
1884 leadership at the ITU. And so we are working to promote U.S.
1885 leadership in ITU elections including through our
1886 participation at the plenipotentiary conference in the fall.
1887 And, you know, we are -- there -- we are working across our
1888 workstreams to advance American leadership at the ITU, as
1889 well as other standards-setting bodies like 3GPP. Telecom is
1890 global in nature, and ensuring that global standards reflect
1891 our strategic priorities is incredibly important to U.S.
1892 economic and national security.

1893 *Mr. Bilirakis. Very good. Thank you, I appreciate
1894 your participation today.

1895 And thank you for holding this hearing, Mr. Chairman. I
1896 yield back.

1897 *Mr. Hudson. I thank the gentleman. The chair
1898 recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan, Representative
1899 Dingell, for five minutes for her questions.

1900 *Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks for
1901 having this hearing, and thank you to the administrator for
1902 being here today.

1903 This committee has a responsibility to conduct oversight
1904 of NTIA and, as many on this committee know, we have made

1905 significant progress under the last administration, and I
1906 hope we can keep moving forward in the right direction on
1907 broadband deployment, affordability, mapping, and spectrum
1908 policy.

1909 I want to talk specifically today about BEAD
1910 implementation in Michigan, which I have discussed with you
1911 before, Madam Administrator, and the importance of continued
1912 coordination between NTIA and the states to ensure that the
1913 projects are moving forward.

1914 Michigan will connect nearly 200,000 locations through
1915 the BEAD program, the third-highest number of eligible
1916 locations in the country. We secured -- Michigan secured 920
1917 million in Federal funding and more than 550,000 million in
1918 private investment, for a total of 1.47 billion. This
1919 funding will support over 31,000 miles of new fiber
1920 infrastructure across our state. However, states are still
1921 awaiting the guidance regarding the allowable uses of BEAD
1922 non-deployment funding. The Infrastructure Investment and
1923 Jobs Act has cleared that these funds can support
1924 complementary efforts like expanding permitting capacity,
1925 workforce development, digital adoption, mapping, and
1926 planning that are necessary to close the digital divide.

1927 You have said that speed is your priority, but since
1928 NTIA paused the use of non-deployment funds in June 2025, and
1929 the revised BEAD policy noticed that -- states have been left

1930 without clear direction on how to move forward. NTIA also
1931 missed your imposed deadline of March 26 to issue updated
1932 guidance, created uncertainty for states attempting to plan
1933 around more than \$20 billion in remaining non-deployment
1934 funding.

1935 I am sure states, including Michigan, are ready -- I
1936 know they are -- to put resources to work alongside
1937 deployment projects to ensure communities can fully access
1938 and benefit from reliable, affordable broadband service.

1939 Administrator Roth, can you provide a timeline on when
1940 NTIA expects to issue updated guidance on non-deployment
1941 funding, and how NTIA is working with states to ensure these
1942 funds can be used effectively and consistent with
1943 congressional intent without further delays?

1944 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Congresswoman Dingell, and thank
1945 you for meeting with me in your office.

1946 You know, these funds were freed up because our benefit
1947 of the bargain reforms were so successful in driving down
1948 costs and ensuring universal connectivity, and we want to
1949 ensure that these remaining funds produce the same measurable
1950 wins for taxpayers, and we are actively working on the
1951 guidance right now to use these dollars responsibly. As you
1952 know, we received an unprecedented amount of feedback on
1953 potential ways the dollars should be used, so we have just
1954 been focused on getting our guidance right at this point,

1955 which has taken us -- which has taken additional time.

1956 And so we are -- and you asked about a timeline. As I
1957 said to Chairman Hudson, we expect to release the guidance
1958 this summer.

1959 *Mrs. Dingell. Okay, I am going to hold you to that.

1960 I have also heard concerns about the process requiring
1961 states to remove locations from BEAD projects when changes
1962 are made to the FCC broadband location fabric, even in
1963 situations where those homes or businesses clearly need
1964 service. Can you tell us how NTIA is working with states to
1965 ensure that technical or mapping revisions do not
1966 unintentionally leave eligible communities behind?

1967 And are you considering additional flexibility for
1968 states to address these situations?

1969 *Ms. Roth. Thank you. So in the BEAD law, the BEAD law
1970 requires us to follow the FCC maps and also run a challenge
1971 process in determining which eligible -- which areas we --
1972 are going to be eligible for BEAD funding. That was
1973 important for two reasons: first of all, we needed to give
1974 bidders the certainty they needed to know what they were
1975 bidding on; and also to ensure that there was a requisite
1976 challenge process to ensure that the program wasn't engaged
1977 in over-building.

1978 And so, you know, maps are constantly changing as
1979 conditions change. We regularly update the FCC with our data

1980 and where BEAD deployments are occurring. And, you know, our
1981 eligible areas, you know, given that, don't -- may not match
1982 up perfectly with the FCC maps, but that is because of the
1983 need to -- that is because we were required to run a
1984 challenge process.

1985 You know, we are -- given that such changes happen over
1986 time, one of the ideas that has been proposed for the
1987 remaining funds has been a clean-up round to address
1988 locations that have, you know, become potentially unserved
1989 after we established eligible areas in the BEAD program.

1990 *Mr. Hudson. The gentlelady's time has expired. The
1991 chair now recognizes the representative from Texas, Mr.
1992 Pfluger, for five minutes for your questions.

1993 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1994 And Assistant Secretary Roth, I want to thank you for
1995 your efforts to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse, specifically
1996 -- and it has been talked about today -- the efforts here on
1997 BEAD-funded projects with, you know, just the wastefulness
1998 that you have uncovered, that you are preventing, and
1999 delivering the intended dollars to rural areas that truly
2000 need it. So thank you for that.

2001 I want to kind of shift gears. I have heard from
2002 domestic manufacturers who invested tens of millions of
2003 dollars in new equipment facilities to supply BEAD projects
2004 with American-made optical fiber, and they did so based on

2005 the assurances that domestic fiber supply would be available
2006 to support them, and that supply hasn't materialized. And
2007 now there is idle equipment and unfilled jobs sitting on the
2008 sidelines.

2009 So just in -- from your perspective, based on what NTIA
2010 is seeing today, are those supply commitments being met?

2011 And if not, can the NTIA act to help that?

2012 And are there examples where NTIA would consider a
2013 targeted waiver to support American manufacturing jobs?

2014 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your question, and thank you
2015 for meeting with me and for your kind words on addressing
2016 waste in the BEAD program. Effective oversight of the
2017 program is so critical to ensure that taxpayer dollars are
2018 used responsibly, and also ensure universal connectivity
2019 because there were projects that were -- if we hadn't done
2020 so, there were -- there had been a risk raised by the OIG
2021 that we would run out of money, which I think no one on this
2022 committee would have wanted.

2023 In terms of fiber and availability, we want to ensure
2024 that projects are deployed expeditiously. So we have
2025 actively monitored the fiber supply chain in the program, and
2026 fiber producers have given us their word that that fiber will
2027 be delivered on time to BEAD projects. And we expect them to
2028 honor their commitments.

2029 *Mr. Pfluger. Yes, it is unfortunate some of the

2030 companies have not met their contractual requirements. So
2031 would you see a case where, if those domestic manufacturers,
2032 you know, don't do that, and they have a contract with the
2033 government -- with the BEAD program, I mean -- are there
2034 waivers that you all would consider for the -- specifically
2035 for made-in-America-type issues?

2036 *Ms. Roth. NTIA has an ability to -- there is a process
2037 for waiving BABA, but -- or the Buy America provisions, as
2038 you referenced. But we don't anticipate a waiver at this
2039 point, as long as domestic manufacturers step up as they have
2040 promised.

2041 I think it also goes to show the importance of having,
2042 you know, a mix of technologies in the program. You know,
2043 putting our eggs in one basket, I think, would have been --
2044 wouldn't have been a good outcome for ensuring expeditious
2045 and timely deployment of universal broadband.

2046 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, and we will certainly be
2047 watching that and working with you.

2048 One of our top legislative priorities is the Protocol
2049 Act, which would consolidate the FCC's broadband maps and
2050 NTIA's data into a single and consistent and reliable source.
2051 The bill would also require other Federal broadband agencies
2052 to use this unified data. It would work with the states. It
2053 would do the work of trying to consolidate this.

2054 So my question: Currently, more than 130 broadband

2055 programs exist across 15 different agencies. So you can -- I
2056 mean, the -- consolidating it and understanding it and
2057 gleaning the important pieces of vulnerabilities or gaps is
2058 really important on it. From your perspective at NTIA, what
2059 is the benefit of requiring other agencies to coordinate with
2060 NTIA and use a single harmonized broadband data set when
2061 planning and funding infrastructure projects?

2062 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your leadership on this issue
2063 of mapping. It is so important to have accurate data in
2064 order to ensure that Federal dollars are protected.

2065 Given that challenge that you referenced of the multiple
2066 different programs, 100 different broadband programs across
2067 15 different agencies, so that risk is quite real. You know,
2068 we have relied on the FCC maps and run a challenge process in
2069 our administration of BEAD. We work with the FCC, but
2070 definitely welcome the opportunity to work with you, and
2071 thank you for your leadership on potential ways to make
2072 mapping even better.

2073 *Mr. Pfluger. Thank you. Lastly, I am out of time, but
2074 I will submit a question for the record dealing with the BEAD
2075 program and the money that Texas has promised to match, which
2076 is a billion-and-a-half dollars, just to make sure that the
2077 Federal and the state pools of money are de-conflicted.

2078 So I will submit that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

2079 [The information follows:]

2080 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

2081

2082 *Mr. Pfluger. I yield back.

2083 *Mr. Hudson. The gentleman's time has expired. The
2084 chair now recognizes the representative from Ohio, Mr.
2085 Landsman, for five minutes for your questions.

2086 *Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2087 Thank you, Administrator Roth. I want to start with the
2088 cybersecurity work. This is a huge concern of mine. The
2089 current system is a patchwork and across several agencies in
2090 terms of reporting, prevention, mitigation efforts. There
2091 has been some discussion about expanding your role, the
2092 Administration's role, in dealing with -- or the
2093 cybersecurity threats, protecting us. Can you talk a little
2094 bit about what that would look like, whether NTIA's role
2095 would be expanded, what that would look like, your approach,
2096 your thinking on this?

2097 *Ms. Roth. No, thank you, this is a really important
2098 issue.

2099 NTIA, we are not a regulator, but we do play a role in
2100 ensuring secure networks. We -- you know, in BEAD, for
2101 example, states are required to get attestations from BEAD
2102 providers that they have cybersecurity risk management plans
2103 in place, as well as similar plans for supply chain risks,
2104 and NTIA also works on cybersecurity in the context of our
2105 communications supply chain risk information program. We
2106 provide information on latest best practices to companies,

2107 including small and rural communities.

2108 So I think we could -- we do play and could continue to
2109 play a really important role in terms of training and
2110 providing information on best practices and -- as well as on
2111 supply chain risks.

2112 *Mr. Landsman. So you -- you would -- but you would
2113 welcome the role of expanding some of the work that you guys
2114 are doing in cybersecurity if the DHS CIRCIA rule includes an
2115 expanded role for you all.

2116 *Ms. Roth. I haven't had an opportunity to dig in on
2117 that issue.

2118 *Mr. Landsman. Fair enough.

2119 *Ms. Roth. But I would be -- it would be -- I would be
2120 happy to get back to you more in depth on that --

2121 *Mr. Landsman. Yes, I would love to keep the
2122 conversation going because it does seem like additional
2123 leadership is needed that you all could play -- do play, but
2124 could play an even bigger role.

2125 The reporting requirements piece is a challenge as, you
2126 know, folks who experience an attack or believe there is an
2127 issue -- the reporting requirements differ by agencies. And
2128 I -- so I have a bill that would streamline that so there is
2129 just the one reporting protocol. How important do you think
2130 that is, that -- you know, in terms of what you hear and see
2131 on a daily basis?

2132 *Ms. Roth. I think that, generally speaking,
2133 streamlining reporting requirements is a really great way to
2134 advance efficiencies and promote American technology
2135 leadership.

2136 *Mr. Landsman. Yes, thank you. I agree. One last
2137 thing. The -- we have a bill that would make it easier to
2138 get broadband out to communities, our RAIL Act, which I think
2139 we talked about. It takes advantage of the public right of
2140 way, and streamlines the process for getting that broadband
2141 over the railroad tracks, which has become a challenge
2142 because the railroad companies often times take forever and
2143 upcharge these providers.

2144 How important -- that is for the SEC. But obviously,
2145 something similar would apply to what you all are doing. Are
2146 you seeing opportunities to do similar sort of reforms in
2147 terms of getting the broadband out?

2148 *Ms. Roth. Yes, this has been a very strong focus of
2149 NTIA. As you know, permitting is one of the biggest
2150 challenges when it comes to effective and expeditious
2151 deployment of broadband. We have -- we focused on what we
2152 can do at the Federal level to streamline permitting,
2153 particularly through automating certain processes and working
2154 with other agencies.

2155 But as you recognized, state and local and -- challenges
2156 can be even greater, and --

2157 *Mr. Landsman. You may have done this before, but have
2158 you submitted your list of permitting reform recommendations
2159 to this committee?

2160 *Ms. Roth. I have not, but I would welcome the
2161 opportunity.

2162 *Mr. Landsman. I think that would be great. Yes, I --

2163 *Ms. Roth. With this --

2164 *Mr. Landsman. We will follow up.

2165 *Ms. Roth. Great.

2166 *Mr. Landsman. Okay, thank you.

2167 I yield back.

2168 *Mr. Hudson. The gentleman yields back. The chair now
2169 recognizes the representative from Texas, Mr. Goldman, for
2170 five minutes for your questions.

2171 *Mr. Goldman. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you
2172 for being here today, Ms. Roth.

2173 Texas is facing uncertainty around the release of BEAD
2174 funds necessary to manage program changes, rebid 31,000
2175 locations, and keep broadband deployment projects on
2176 schedule. What is causing these funds to be held up?

2177 And how will NTIA ensure that any delays do not make it
2178 harder for Texas to reconnect these vacant locations or leave
2179 Texans with lower-quality service options?

2180 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your question, and thank you
2181 for meeting with me.

2182 Texas was able to submit a very successful final
2183 proposal. They were actually the last state to submit their
2184 initial proposal under the previous rules, but because the
2185 state really did a really amazing job of looking at each
2186 project area by project area closely and, you know,
2187 evaluating every technology in every different area, the
2188 state produced really incredible results and has a really
2189 diverse mix of technologies reflecting the diverse topography
2190 and geography of the state. And, you know, they are
2191 achieving universal access with a 32 percent match, which is
2192 above the statutory requirement and is a really great
2193 indication of the project's sustainability and success.

2194 And so right now the state is signing contracts with
2195 providers. That can be a challenging process, and NTIA has
2196 stood ready to help the state whenever there have been -- and
2197 providers, whenever there have been issues or questions. But
2198 ultimately, thanks to our work to streamline permitting, we
2199 expect to see contracts signed. And I think Texas is one of
2200 the states that already has a contract signed with a LEO
2201 provider enabling instant access to BEAD service.

2202 *Mr. Goldman. Thank you. And following up on that,
2203 Texas being a national leader in wireless innovation,
2204 semiconductor manufacturing, telecommunications, as you know,
2205 NTIA's spectrum decisions will directly affect jobs and
2206 investment across our state. As NTIA implements the spectrum

2207 provisions that we passed last year and evaluates the 2, 4,
2208 and 7 gigahertz bands, can you update us on the progress of
2209 that work, and how would implementing these provisions
2210 advance U.S. and Texas leadership in 5G and 6G and next-
2211 generation community technologies?

2212 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, as you said, Texas is a leader
2213 when it comes to technological innovation. I was -- I
2214 actually recently visited the Ericsson 5G factory, which was
2215 so incredible to see the kind of automation that -- the
2216 factory automation that is bringing next-generation
2217 connectivity to the state and to the country and the world.

2218 I think, you know, as you said, as you mentioned, you
2219 know, getting our spectrum identified under the Working
2220 Families Tax Cut Act is the best way that we can -- is one of
2221 our best ways to promote that continued innovation, increase
2222 economic growth, promote national security, as well as
2223 domestic jobs. And so we are laser focused on completing
2224 that identification and getting more spectrum into the
2225 marketplace as quickly as possible so that the U.S. can
2226 continue to lead in this area.

2227 *Mr. Goldman. Thank you. And since you joined NTIA,
2228 how have you seen the BEAD program change?

2229 And what steps does NTIA need to take to make sure
2230 communities are getting connected?

2231 *Ms. Roth. We have seen incredible success through our

2232 stripping out of red tape, removal of burdensome rules,
2233 allowing the states to determine, like Texas, which
2234 technologies would work in different parts -- in different
2235 project areas.

2236 And, you know, we have seen results from that. We are
2237 getting deployment out the door as -- we have seen deployment
2238 in multiple states already, and that was thanks to our
2239 embracing an all-of-the-above solution to the program,
2240 consistent with how Congress wrote the law. And, you know,
2241 we are very excited about the deployment that we are starting
2242 to see and will continue to see in the months ahead.

2243 *Mr. Goldman. Great. Thank you again. Thanks for
2244 being here.

2245 Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
2246 Thank you, sir.

2247 *Mr. Hudson. Thank you. The gentleman yields back.
2248 The chair now recognizes the representative from New York,
2249 Representative Clarke, for five minutes for your questions.

2250 *Ms. Clarke. Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Chairman,
2251 Ranking Member Matsui, for holding this important hearing
2252 today. It is a long-overdue hearing, given the issues at
2253 NTIA.

2254 Access to affordable, reliable, high-speed broadband is
2255 no longer a luxury; it is an absolute necessity for economic
2256 survival, education, even health care in our increasingly

2257 digital society. When Congress passed the Bipartisan
2258 Infrastructure Law, we made an historic \$42 billion
2259 investment in the BEAD program, with a clear statutory
2260 mandate to build sustainable future-proof networks and close
2261 the digital divide once and for all.

2262 Unfortunately, under Administrator Roth's leadership,
2263 the NTIA has systematically undermined those goals. By
2264 spending 18 months restructuring the program to the benefit
2265 of the President's political benefactor, NTIA has created a
2266 chaotic environment where states are forced to stall
2267 deployment and taxpayers are left wanting longer for inferior
2268 service.

2269 Most alarmingly, NTIA has effectively abandoned its
2270 statutory commitment to priority broadband projects using
2271 high-quality fiber infrastructure, aggressively shifting
2272 focus towards temporary satellite options while refusing to
2273 enforce statutory low-cost service options for struggling
2274 families. To rush to subsidize billionaires and now a
2275 trillionaire has led to the abandonment of public interest by
2276 this Administration, and may only serve to solidify a new era
2277 of digital redlining.

2278 Administrator Roth, historical redlining in the analog
2279 age is sadly being directly mirrored today by digital
2280 redlining in broadband accessibility during your tenure at
2281 NTIA. The BEAD program was structured so that the states

2282 would propose the affordable, low-cost service options for
2283 low-income families. Congress wrote that into law, and yet
2284 your agency is prohibiting the states from having any say in
2285 what the low-cost options should be, and letting the ISPs set
2286 the option themselves.

2287 If NTIA refuses to let the states ensure that the low-
2288 cost option internet service providers are offering is
2289 actually at an affordable rate, how can you claim that you
2290 are fulfilling your mission?

2291 Is there any cost for a low-cost option that would --
2292 you would consider to be too high?

2293 Or what tools do states have to ensure that low-cost
2294 options is, in fact, affordable?

2295 What specific guardrails is the NTIA utilizing right now
2296 to ensure that low-income and minority communities are not
2297 digitally redlined out of this historic infrastructure build-
2298 out?

2299 *Ms. Roth. I agree with you that broadband should be
2300 affordable. Our job is to implement the law, and Congress is
2301 precluded from regulating rates. And I think that is
2302 attributable to a broad recognition in data that rate
2303 regulation harms investment.

2304 In contrast, competition has been hugely successful in
2305 promoting broadband affordability. And, you know, even just
2306 take fixed wireless, one of the greatest and fastest sources

2307 of broadband competition and affordability in home broadband
2308 markets. You know, I think that that is why we focus so much
2309 on clearing the runway to innovation, ensuring that BEAD
2310 isn't putting its thumb on the scale. After all, one of the
2311 most competition -- as competition has been the most
2312 effective source in bringing down prices.

2313 I know that, you know, sometimes, you know, subsidies
2314 can be one way of looking at it, but we take a more broad
2315 approach. One of the best ways that we can use our
2316 authorities to promote affordability is through expanding
2317 access to spectrum, getting -- and getting better services
2318 into the marketplace. And I think that that -- our nation's
2319 historic approach to innovation and facilities-based
2320 competition is just evident in the amount of incredible
2321 innovation --

2322 *Ms. Clarke. Well, Administrator, I have only got,
2323 like, 30 seconds left. I would like to discuss that further
2324 with you. That sounds great, but in the practical
2325 application of it, it does not, it does not pan out that way.

2326 Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

2327 *Mr. Hudson. I thank the gentlelady for yielding back.
2328 The chair now recognizes the representative from California,
2329 Mr. Obernolte, for five minutes for your questions.

2330 *Mr. Obernolte. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
2331 Administrator Roth, thank you for your testimony today.

2332 I think you have heard some bipartisan frustration with
2333 the slowness of the roll-out of BEAD funding. And to be
2334 clear, this frustration pre-dates your tenure in the agency,
2335 it pre-dates this Administration. It has been frustration
2336 across the aisle with both Democrat and Republican
2337 administrations, and this is in red and blue states. So I
2338 hope that you are taking this to heart. This is an
2339 indication when you hear this kind of frustration across the
2340 aisle that it is not a problem with one state or another
2341 state; it is a problem with the system.

2342 And this critical -- this funding is critical to getting
2343 broadband connectivity rolled out to our constituents, and I
2344 am hoping that you will take this to heart and try and
2345 eliminate some of the bottlenecks so that we can get this
2346 funding flowing, because that was our intent when we
2347 appropriated it.

2348 I was very happy to hear you talk about freeing up 500
2349 megahertz of spectrum in your opening testimony. We all know
2350 the strain that spectrum is under. I have seen some very
2351 alarming projections that say that, if nothing is done by the
2352 year 2030, just 4 years from now, that over 50 percent of
2353 peak traffic will not have spectrum available, particularly
2354 as AI puts more and more demands on that. So I am very happy
2355 that NTIA has focused on that.

2356 I wanted to ask specifically about the 2.7 gigahertz

2357 band. In H.R. 1 last year we directed NTIA to work with
2358 stakeholders to clear that spectrum, and gave you auction
2359 authority for that. Could you tell us a little bit about
2360 when you think that that auction might occur?

2361 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your question, and I agree
2362 that we need to get the 2.7 gigahertz band identified as
2363 quickly as possible so that it can get -- that providers can
2364 -- and that it can benefit the commercial marketplace.

2365 We are working around the clock on our -- to do our part
2366 to get spectrum identified. I am grateful that soon the
2367 incumbent agencies will have access to their spectrum
2368 relocation funds so that we can complete our critical
2369 engineering work to have a successful auction. And we are
2370 working closely with the FCC on timelines and figuring out
2371 ways to expedite the process of getting it -- of seeing that
2372 spectrum auction just as soon as possible.

2373 *Mr. Obernolte. Do you think that that might occur by
2374 the end of your tenure in the agency?

2375 *Ms. Roth. We are certainly -- we are working towards
2376 that outcome.

2377 *Mr. Obernolte. Okay. I am glad to hear it.

2378 I was also very happy to hear you talk about FirstNet
2379 reauthorization in your opening testimony. That is something
2380 that is critically important to me, as someone with a very
2381 rural district with the critical need for first responders to

2382 be able to communicate.

2383 One of the things that I have been a little frustrated
2384 by is the fact that FirstNet does not currently interface
2385 with any of the low Earth orbit satellite operators. As you
2386 know, Starlink, for example, already has direct-to-cell-phone
2387 operational capability, and others will soon have that
2388 capability. It seems crazy that we are not enabling our
2389 first responders to use that.

2390 Can you talk a little bit about what NTIA and Congress
2391 can do to make sure that new commercial satellite systems are
2392 available to first responders through FirstNet?

2393 *Ms. Roth. I agree that first responders should have
2394 access to the best technology available. That is FirstNet's
2395 mission, to maximize public safety outcomes for the public
2396 and for first responders. And I think part of that is really
2397 empowering the FirstNet board to determine which investments
2398 are needed to maximize public safety safe safety outcomes,
2399 and I applaud this committee's work on FirstNet.

2400 One of the things that the legislation that you have
2401 advanced does is clarify roles and responsibilities, and
2402 really empower public safety's role in, you know, increasing
2403 public safety seats on the board, improving institutional
2404 expertise through staggered terms, as well as really
2405 clarifying that public safety is responsible for identifying
2406 the strategic use of funding and in ensuring that it is

2407 public safety that drives the budget and the setting of
2408 priorities.

2409 And then NTIA can conduct its contract oversight and
2410 performance accountability to ensure that those priorities
2411 are being carried out. So -- and thanks to our work,
2412 Secretary Lutnick was able to -- our oversight, we were able
2413 to secure an additional \$2 billion in value for FirstNet
2414 under the contract.

2415 *Mr. Obernolte. Well, we will keep working with you on
2416 that.

2417 My time is expired, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

2418 *Mr. Hudson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.
2419 The chair now recognizes the representative from California,
2420 Representative Barragan, for five minutes for your questions.

2421 *Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2422 Administrator Roth, you are nominated by the President,
2423 correct?

2424 *Ms. Roth. Correct.

2425 *Ms. Barragan. And the President can fire you, correct?

2426 *Ms. Roth. Correct.

2427 *Ms. Barragan. So you serve at the pleasure of the
2428 President and work for the President.

2429 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2430 *Ms. Barragan. Is it safe to say that, since you have
2431 been confirmed by the Senate, you have spoken to the

2432 President?

2433 *Ms. Roth. I am not going to get into --

2434 *Ms. Barragan. I am not asking you to get into the
2435 conversation.

2436 *Ms. Roth. -- the internal --

2437 *Ms. Barragan. I am asking you if you have had a
2438 conversation with the President since you have been
2439 confirmed. That is it. That is a yes or no. You are a
2440 lawyer, you know this.

2441 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, I think that it would be
2442 inappropriate for me to, you know, speak to internal
2443 deliberations. Obviously, we speak to --

2444 *Ms. Barragan. I am not asking for --

2445 *Ms. Roth. -- White House --

2446 *Ms. Barragan. -- an internal deliberation. It is a
2447 simple question. Whether you have spoken to the President is
2448 a yes or no. Asking you about the content of that is a
2449 different question.

2450 Have you spoken to the President?

2451 *Ms. Roth. I have met the President, I --

2452 *Ms. Barragan. Okay. For whatever reason, you are
2453 afraid to say whether you have actually spoken to the
2454 President. That is actually concerning, because it is a very
2455 simple yes or no. You, as an attorney, know if I am asking
2456 about the content of a conversation, that could be attorney-

2457 client privilege. That is a different question, and you
2458 would instruct your client not to answer whether you have
2459 even spoken to a lawyer. So it is extremely frustrating that
2460 this hearing you have just been talking through answers, not
2461 answering questions, but kind of like avoiding some of them.

2462 Okay, so you may or you have not spoken to the
2463 President. Has anybody asked you to hold up the California
2464 application for BEAD money?

2465 *Ms. Roth. No, and we are working actively to get
2466 California's application approved.

2467 *Ms. Barragan. Okay, I know you are working actively.
2468 I have heard that. But I find it a little hard to believe
2469 that the two states that haven't been approved are some of
2470 the bluest -- the two bluest states that we have got, and you
2471 have 54 other states and territories that have already met
2472 the requirements.

2473 Is California being held to a different standard than
2474 the other states you have already approved?

2475 *Ms. Roth. No. In fact, that is precisely what we are
2476 working on, is ensuring that California gets held to the same
2477 standards that we have held other states to.

2478 *Ms. Barragan. Okay. Is -- has the NTIA communicated
2479 their concerns to California in writing?

2480 *Ms. Roth. We have certainly communicated our concerns
2481 to California, and I can't speak to the -- I can't speak to

2482 our deliberations with the state, but we have certainly
2483 communicated those --

2484 *Ms. Barragan. So you are unaware --

2485 *Ms. Roth. -- those concerns to California.

2486 *Ms. Barragan. You are unaware if they are in writing.

2487 What does California need now? What they need now
2488 really is certainty. Communities can't plan broadband
2489 projects around uncertainty, and they can't connect families
2490 with funds that haven't been approved. So I would urge you
2491 and the NTIA to move quickly to resolve any of these
2492 remaining issues that you are saying California has had.

2493 So, Administrator, I want to move on to another topic.
2494 The Digital Equity Act created two major grant programs: the
2495 State Capacity Grant program, which helps states expand
2496 digital access for local libraries, schools, and non-profits;
2497 and the competitive grant program which awards grants
2498 directly to community organizations. Last year the Trump
2499 Administration canceled both.

2500 Now the Justice Department says in court the competitive
2501 grant program can move forward if a race-related provision of
2502 the law is severed. Does NTIA believe the State Capacity
2503 Grant program can also move forward?

2504 *Ms. Roth. On the advice of my legal -- at the advice
2505 of my legal counsel, I can't discuss the digital equity
2506 program, as it is currently in active litigation. I can

2507 speak to the native entities grant program funding that we
2508 recently provided guidance on in a new NOFO.

2509 *Ms. Barragan. Okay, I am going to -- I am just -- you
2510 know, California was awarded more than \$70 million in State
2511 Capacity Grant funding to help more people afford access and
2512 use high-speed internet before the Trump Administration
2513 canceled the program. And Republican-led states like Texas,
2514 Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana also had millions. The
2515 communities across the country deserve a clear answer and a
2516 path forward for all of the digital equity and grants
2517 programs.

2518 It has been extremely frustrating at some of the
2519 responses and non-responses, and it has been extremely
2520 frustrating at the lack of speed in the -- deploying the BEAD
2521 dollars. Now, it was said, you know, people were frustrated
2522 in the last administration, but then this Administration came
2523 in and just took even longer and made it more delay.

2524 And with that I yield back.

2525 *Mr. Goldman. [Presiding.] The gentlelady yields. The
2526 chair recognizes the gentlelady from Florida, Representative
2527 Cammack --

2528 *Mrs. Cammack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2529 *Mr. Goldman. -- for five minutes.

2530 *Mrs. Cammack. I appreciate it, and thank you to our
2531 guests for being here today. I am just going to jump right

2532 into it.

2533 I know we have had several conversations and, you know I
2534 am the wife of a first responder back in Florida, so this
2535 issue is near and dear to me.

2536 So chairing the NextGen 911 Caucus, I know firsthand how
2537 critical our reliable emergency communications are and where
2538 so many of our gaps exist. So I noted in your testimony that
2539 updated NTIA estimates show nationwide next-gen 911
2540 implementation costs have fallen significantly, down to
2541 between 5.8 and 9.27 billion, which is, candidly, a major
2542 shift from prior estimates. Given that lower cost estimate,
2543 what do you see is the biggest barrier to nationwide
2544 deployment right now?

2545 And how can we make sure that our states and localities
2546 have the flexibility and support that they need in order to
2547 finish the job?

2548 *Ms. Roth. Thank you so much, Congresswoman Cammack,
2549 and it was so great to meet with you in your office. And I
2550 applaud your leadership on public safety issues which are
2551 obviously near and dear to your heart.

2552 And so, you know, I have visited 911 centers firsthand.
2553 I have seen the benefits of AI tools and modernization of
2554 technology to improve location data, and dispatch, and
2555 ultimately better outcomes for public safety.

2556 I think that some of the obstacles that we have seen

2557 are, you know, obstacles that come to interoperability and
2558 ensuring that different jurisdictions are able to talk to
2559 each other, that data is able to flow with calls, and
2560 ultimately get better resilience and response times.

2561 You know, and also the other -- one of the other
2562 challenges is that some states have invested significantly in
2563 NG911 and others have not. I know that the legislation that
2564 the committee has advanced takes account of that reality.
2565 But we are -- we stand ready to help the committee in its
2566 efforts to advance this critical priority, and we did that
2567 through our recently-released study on nationwide
2568 implementation costs.

2569 *Mrs. Cammack. Well, and let me jump to the -- kind of
2570 dovetailing into that. So we have obviously seen that there
2571 are challenges. You highlighted interoperability just now,
2572 and how it can be fragmented across different agencies and
2573 programs. And we talked about the legislation that we had
2574 introduced, the Public Safety Communications Act, which would
2575 create a dedicated office of public safety communications
2576 within NTIA. And we did that because currently it is not
2577 codified, we want to see this codified so we can streamline a
2578 lot of the efforts that are being undertaken at the moment,
2579 and also strengthen accountability.

2580 So from your perspective, yes or no, would creating a
2581 permanent dedicated office within NTIA improve coordination,

2582 accountability, and long-term strategic planning for public
2583 safety communications? Yes or no?

2584 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2585 *Mrs. Cammack. And what would you say is the biggest
2586 gap within the current structure?

2587 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, I appreciate your focus on this.

2588 I think that elevating -- public safety communications
2589 is obviously a core responsibility of ours, and so codifying
2590 the office would certainly put increased emphasis and focus
2591 on this area, especially as we enhance our oversight of
2592 FirstNet and engage in NG911 improvements. And so I would
2593 welcome the opportunity to work with you on this legislation
2594 and strengthening our public safety role.

2595 *Mrs. Cammack. Absolutely. Well, and just for the
2596 record, if this legislation were to be signed into law, it
2597 would help ensure that our first responders have access to
2598 resilient, reliable communications, especially when lives are
2599 on the line. Correct?

2600 *Ms. Roth. Certainly, yes.

2601 *Mrs. Cammack. Excellent. Well, that about does it on
2602 my end. You answered all my questions. So thank you again
2603 for your time today. And thank you for appearing before the
2604 committee.

2605 With that I yield.

2606 *Ms. Roth. Thank you.

2607 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady yields. The chair
2608 recognizes the gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Castor, for five
2609 minutes of questioning.

2610 *Ms. Castor. Well, thank you.

2611 Welcome, Madam Administrator. You know, inflation is
2612 high and everything costs so much these days. And one of the
2613 ways that we can help our neighbors back home is with more
2614 affordable internet service. That was part of the intention
2615 of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and all of the BEAD
2616 funding, to get out quickly. And I have to tell you, I am
2617 very disappointed.

2618 I have heard your testimony today. I disagree that what
2619 has happened has not been timely and effective at all. In
2620 fact, it was very troubling you could not answer
2621 Representative Soto's direct question on when Florida would
2622 receive money after all of these years, and it has also been
2623 very troubling what Representative Barragan touched on, the
2624 cancellation of the digital equity competitive grants.

2625 The City of Saint Petersburg back home won a \$6.9
2626 million grant. It was the only one in the State of Florida.
2627 That was to pay for hot spots and equipment for people who
2628 need internet access to for jobs and training. That grant
2629 was arbitrarily and illegally canceled by the Administration.
2630 It has now been challenged in Federal court. Would you
2631 commit that, if the Federal court determines that the

2632 Administration did act arbitrarily and illegally, to restore
2633 those grant funding -- that grant funding?

2634 *Ms. Roth. Oh, well, following the law is of utmost
2635 importance. We would absolutely abide by the law.

2636 *Ms. Castor. Okay. I will --

2637 *Ms. Roth. I --

2638 *Ms. Castor. Thank you for that.

2639 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2640 *Ms. Castor. And the law also requires that internet
2641 service providers provide a low-cost option for consumers.
2642 Certainly then you would agree that it is helpful for
2643 customers to know what the low-cost service option will be in
2644 their location, right?

2645 *Ms. Roth. Yes, the low-cost option is a programmatic
2646 requirement.

2647 *Ms. Castor. Good, thank you. Because I think
2648 transparency is important. That is why the law requires NTIA
2649 to publicly disclose each state's low-cost service option
2650 after you approve the final proposal, before funds are
2651 disbursed.

2652 So here is a -- here is kind of a lightning round of yes
2653 or no. Do you commit to abiding by this provision of the law
2654 and publishing the low-cost service option so that customers
2655 know upfront what they will be paying?

2656 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2657 *Ms. Castor. Great. Do you think that it is helpful
2658 for customers to know when their provider is going to change
2659 the price of their broadband subscriptions? Yes or no?

2660 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2661 *Ms. Castor. Do you commit to allowing states to
2662 require sub-recipients to tell the state and their customers
2663 they are changing the low-cost service option, and what that
2664 new cost will be?

2665 *Ms. Roth. We -- I agree with price transparency. I
2666 think that we also have to abide by our requirement which is
2667 that we are not allowed, according to the law, to engage in
2668 rate regulation. And so --

2669 *Ms. Castor. But here is the problem. Under NTIA's
2670 BEAD restructuring policy, you are prohibiting states from
2671 setting the low-cost service option, and instead you have
2672 decided that ISPs should propose their own low-cost service
2673 option. Even though you stated numerous times during your
2674 confirmation hearing that you would follow the law, this
2675 appears to be a flagrant violation of the statute which
2676 specifically requires the states to define and submit to NTIA
2677 for approval a low-cost service option that will apply to
2678 sub-recipients.

2679 What authority do you have that authorizes you to ignore
2680 the plain statute?

2681 *Ms. Roth. We are not ignoring the statute. We are

2682 abiding by our requirement to ensure the timely and effective
2683 deployment of broadband projects, and we agree that
2684 affordability is important and we are promoting affordability
2685 across our workstreams. And one of those --

2686 *Ms. Castor. All right. Then Madam Administrator,
2687 under your new policy, then, which again is in violation of
2688 the law that you swore to uphold, would it be acceptable for
2689 an ISP to charge \$1,000 a month as the low-cost option? Yes
2690 or no?

2691 *Ms. Roth. Yes, so I think that if you are an ISP you
2692 have -- you want people on your network, and competition --

2693 *Ms. Castor. But yes or no, would --

2694 *Ms. Roth. -- is the best regulator of prices.

2695 *Ms. Castor. Would you agree that they can --

2696 *Ms. Roth. I just --

2697 *Ms. Castor. -- say, we are going to charge \$1,000 per
2698 month as the low-cost option?

2699 *Ms. Roth. I don't -- I think that would be at odds
2700 with getting customers on their network.

2701 I also don't -- if I could just respond, I think, you
2702 know, I think that it is also important to keep in mind data
2703 that we have -- this is a very competitive, dynamic
2704 marketplace, especially with the entry of new competitors,
2705 including two satellite providers coming online, and the data
2706 just shows that --

2707 *Ms. Castor. And on that point, this is -- I wonder,
2708 you know, it is widely known that fiber is more affordable.
2709 Now, I will grant that Starlink in remote areas can be -- it
2710 can be important for access. But overall, when you look at
2711 all the data, fiber has a lower monthly cost than Starlink.
2712 Starlink requires a lot of upfront equipment that is very
2713 expensive.

2714 So I wonder, is -- has that gone -- as you have sought
2715 to kind of restructure things and push Starlink and favor
2716 them, did you not take into account the affordability piece
2717 for consumers?

2718 *Ms. Roth. I --

2719 *Ms. Castor. And then here is my second --

2720 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady's time has expired.

2721 *Ms. Roth. May I just respond to that?

2722 *Mr. Goldman. Yes, ma'am.

2723 *Ms. Roth. So we require that satellite providers in
2724 the program defray the upfront costs. That is -- they are
2725 required to provide customer premises equipment to providers
2726 free of charge, and we have also structured our rules to
2727 promote affordability in adoption, particularly through our -
2728 - through states' milestone payments, structuring contracts
2729 that encourage providers to add consumers to their network,
2730 as well as --

2731 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady's time has expired.

2732 *Ms. Roth. Okay.

2733 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady yields. The chair
2734 recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Fry, for
2735 his five minutes of questioning.

2736 *Mr. Fry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this
2737 hearing today, and thank you, Administrator, for being here.
2738 I am going to talk about BEAD for a second.

2739 Administrator, I hear my colleagues on the other side of
2740 the aisle say that this Administration is acting illegally
2741 with regard to BEAD, but we know that the last administration
2742 failed to follow that statute. Can you tell us the ways in
2743 which the last administration did not follow BEAD as written,
2744 and in what ways are you correcting that?

2745 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your question, and thank you
2746 for meeting with me earlier this year.

2747 So the -- we -- abiding by the law is of utmost
2748 importance to us. You know, under the previous
2749 administration we saw red tape and hostile mandates that
2750 drove away participation from the program, raising costs.

2751 Another way that we saw, you know, a departure from the
2752 law that was written by Congress was through an extreme
2753 technology mandate that was forced on the states that didn't
2754 take into account the way that the law was written. The law
2755 set out performance requirements. Each provider, no
2756 exceptions, must meet those performance requirements to

2757 participate under BEAD. You know, there are only excellent
2758 broadband options in our program, no inferior services.
2759 Every provider must meet the requirements in the law, and
2760 there are no exceptions to that.

2761 And by course-correcting our approach in that way, we
2762 were able to not only save \$21 billion, but we were able to
2763 ensure universal broadband availability, and there was a
2764 significant risk identified by the OIG in 2025 that under the
2765 previous unlawful approach certain states would have run out
2766 of money. I think everyone can agree that that would have
2767 been a bad outcome.

2768 *Mr. Fry. Thank you for that. I am going to switch
2769 gears real quick. We have got a World Radio Conference
2770 coming up next year in Shanghai, China. China will
2771 undoubtedly try to undermine U.S. positions and flood the
2772 zone with their proxies. I think a lot is at stake in our
2773 technology race with the CCP at the World Radio Conference,
2774 particularly our leadership in 6 gigahertz band and the
2775 growth of our unlicensed WiFi ecosystem that is really the
2776 envy of the world. Almost 100 countries have followed the
2777 United States' lead in making all or a portion of their 6
2778 gigahertz band available for unlicensed use.

2779 What steps is NTIA taking to protect the success of our
2780 approach and encourage additional countries to adopt
2781 unlicensed use in 6 gigahertz at the World Radio Conference?

2782 *Ms. Roth. Ensuring that we lead the world at the 2027
2783 WRC is front and center to our agenda. And as you
2784 identified, one of our priorities is protecting the American
2785 position when it comes to the 6 gigahertz band. That is an
2786 area that China has identified for its approach to 6G. And
2787 ensuring that we promote our strategic interests when it
2788 comes to 6G is very important, and one of the ways we can do
2789 that is by providing -- building a coalition of support
2790 around alternative bands, and we are working actively to
2791 identify bands for agenda item 1.7 which is the agenda item
2792 that covers -- that is going to cover next-generation 6G
2793 bands.

2794 I think it is also -- you know, tying back to your first
2795 question, I think it is also very, you know, important to
2796 recognize that the agenda is going to be very satellite-
2797 focused. And one of the things that we have tried to do at
2798 NTIA is ensure that our domestic policies and international
2799 policies are working in concert. And one of the, I think,
2800 the real drawbacks to the previous tech bias approach was
2801 that it sends a message to the rest of the world. At a time
2802 when we are actively promoting our leadership in commercial
2803 space to the rest of the world and we are so strategically
2804 important, it sends a very counterproductive message that
2805 these -- certain technologies are -- technologies where we
2806 lead are inferior, especially when the actual data shows that

2807 not to be the case.

2808 *Mr. Fry. Switching gears again, what does NTIA doing
2809 -- what steps is it taking to maintain U.S. competitiveness
2810 in 5G and future development of 6G?

2811 I wasn't in here for some of this, so you may have
2812 already covered it, but other nations are obviously
2813 aggressively pursuing leadership in that. And so what are we
2814 doing ourselves to maintain that competitive edge?

2815 *Ms. Roth. The most important way to do that is
2816 increasing access to spectrum. We are aggressively
2817 identifying 500 megahertz under our requirements under the
2818 Working Families Tax Cut Act.

2819 And the other component that I would focus on is our
2820 participation in international standards, and ensuring that
2821 international standards reflect our priorities for 6G.

2822 *Mr. Fry. Thank you, Administrator.

2823 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

2824 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. The chair now
2825 recognizes the gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Kelly, for five
2826 minutes of questioning.

2827 *Ms. Kelly. Thank you to Chair Hudson and Ranking
2828 Member Matsui for holding this morning's hearing, and thank
2829 you, Administrator Roth, for being here.

2830 Your testimony reports that 54 -- 56 states and
2831 territories have approved BEAD final proposals. Illinois is

2832 one of the two left out. The state submitted its proposal in
2833 September 2025, revised it by early April 2026, and built a
2834 plan that connects every eligible location in the state,
2835 nearly 157,000 in total, and more than 135,000 of them in
2836 rural or underserved areas. It does this on budget while
2837 leveraging over \$575 million in private funding.

2838 Then on May 26 this year NTIA told the state that
2839 approval depends on cutting another 100 million from
2840 deployment, and denied Illinois a short extension before
2841 today's deadline with no stated reason beyond supposed cost
2842 savings.

2843 I know these are just numbers on a press release to you,
2844 but to me these are households that will lose out on more
2845 reliable broadband that will be cheaper for us all in the
2846 long run. In my district that cut runs over 2.2 million,
2847 money set aside to connect homes and farms with no service
2848 today. Illinois did the work, and I want to know why it is
2849 still waiting. They met every standard and -- met every
2850 standard your own testimony praises. And will NTIA approve
2851 its final proposal? And by what date?

2852 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we have communicated changes to
2853 Illinois that we need to see. Illinois's proposal that was
2854 submitted to us just didn't meet the mark in terms of finding
2855 efficiencies and meeting the principles in the benefit of the
2856 bargain reforms. But we remain eager to get Illinois across

2857 the finish line, and we are working with the state to ensure
2858 that happens. We are looking to the totality of the
2859 circumstances and we are -- we look forward -- the ball is
2860 currently in Illinois's court, and we look forward to seeing
2861 their revised proposal.

2862 *Ms. Kelly. I hope that is true, because they met every
2863 standard your own testimony praises. Can you assure this
2864 committee that LEO satellite providers receiving BEAD funds
2865 will be held to the same speed and service standards as every
2866 other technology receiving BEAD funding?

2867 *Ms. Roth. Absolutely. In this -- in administering the
2868 BEAD program, our focus has been on ensuring that we abide by
2869 the same performance requirements for every technology and
2870 every provider participating in the program.

2871 We -- Congress established fair rules for participation,
2872 and our role is to allow innovators to compete, especially
2873 when the government just doesn't have a great track record
2874 for predicting the course of technology and this field is
2875 just so dynamic. We judge technologies according to
2876 objective performance standards, rather than government
2877 preferences, and the result has been better outcomes for
2878 consumers and on a more -- and deployment on a more
2879 expeditious basis.

2880 *Ms. Kelly. Okay, thank you.

2881 No more questions, I yield back.

2882 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady yields. The chair now
2883 recognizes the gentlelady from Indiana, Mrs. Houchin, for her
2884 five minutes of questioning.

2885 *Mrs. Houchin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2886 Administrator Roth, welcome. It is great to see you. I
2887 want to spend my time on a couple of things that matter
2888 enormously to families and communities that I represent, and
2889 one in particular that I think matters to parents across the
2890 country, and that is protecting kids in a digital world. And
2891 I also want to talk about expanding access to broadband. And
2892 the NTIA sits at the center of both of those. I want to
2893 thank you for your work on screen time recommendations that
2894 you have worked on in a past role.

2895 But Administrator Roth, empowering parents over their
2896 children's technology is one of my top priorities as a member
2897 of this committee. What role can the NTIA play in addressing
2898 this very important issue?

2899 *Ms. Roth. Thank you so much, Congresswoman Houchin,
2900 and it was great to meet with you to discuss this issue. And
2901 thank you for your leadership on the issue of children's
2902 online protection, I know an issue that you have -- is very
2903 near and dear to your heart and that you have tremendous
2904 expertise on.

2905 You know, I think NTIA has -- this is something that is
2906 near and dear to my heart, as well, as a mother of six. You

2907 know, I can tell you that when I speak to parents across the
2908 country, I think there is a feeling that they have little
2909 visibility, particularly into their children's screen time,
2910 particularly during the school day.

2911 And, you know, and at the same time there is this
2912 growing body of evidence that suggests that we have digitized
2913 classrooms faster than we have evaluated educational
2914 consequences. And ensuring that our -- that Federal policy
2915 reflects positive educational outcomes for children is very
2916 important.

2917 One book that I recently read on this issue is, "The
2918 Digital Delusion," by Dr. Jared Cooney Horvath, a
2919 neuroscientist who really shows that screen-based instruction
2920 can undermine learning, including memory retention and
2921 comprehension. And so we shouldn't -- we need to grapple
2922 with this data, and one way we have done that is by hosting
2923 listening sessions on this topic.

2924 *Mrs. Houchin. And that brings me to my question, my
2925 note that you recently held a listening session on excessive
2926 screen time use and you heard from parents and researchers
2927 during that session. I think you have alluded that there
2928 were concerns that were extended beyond simply cell phone
2929 time and limiting cell phones in schools. You identified
2930 some broader issues with the classroom educational technology
2931 itself, a concern that I share: the laptops, the devices,

2932 the digital curricula that are in front of kids much of the
2933 school day.

2934 Where do you go from here, from the listening session,
2935 and how can Congress be helpful?

2936 *Ms. Roth. Thank you. So, as you know, there is --
2937 addressing parental empowerment is a priority across this
2938 Administration. HHS is active on this. So is the FCC. They
2939 are currently reviewing a program called E-Rate, and I think
2940 this is an example of where we have all seen that, you know,
2941 well-intended programs can potentially create unintended
2942 consequences, and it is important to ensure that Federal
2943 programs operate in the interest of children and support
2944 healthy outcomes, you know, not just focused on pushing money
2945 out the door.

2946 And so one of the ways that we are building on our
2947 previous convening is we are planning -- we are hosting an
2948 additional listening session really focused on ensuring that
2949 those voices that we want to see in this proceeding --
2950 parents, teachers, researchers, students -- really are able
2951 to contribute because sometimes, you know, when it comes to
2952 Federal policy-making, agency proceedings, you know, tend to
2953 -- don't always enable those stakeholders to contribute their
2954 voices. They can be dominated by more corporate interests.

2955 *Mrs. Houchin. I want to turn to broadband. I have
2956 about a minute left. Where we are talking about deployment

2957 times and permitting, how is the NTIA working with states to
2958 improve transparency and predictability with local
2959 permitting?

2960 Are you encouraging best practices like consolidated
2961 applications or shot clocks to keep projects on track?

2962 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we were working with the states on all
2963 different types of ways to expedite permitting at the state
2964 and local level including roundtables, single points of
2965 contact, elevating issues to NTIA when there is a challenge
2966 that providers or states are facing. And so we have been
2967 working closely with the states including on, as you said,
2968 expediting timelines so that we can have expeditious
2969 deployment in the BEAD program.

2970 *Mrs. Houchin. And in my remaining 20 seconds, several
2971 states -- Kentucky, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas -- have
2972 established pole replacement funds to address the high cost
2973 of replacement. Does the NTIA view these state-led
2974 initiatives as useful models for breaking down pole barriers
2975 within the BEAD program?

2976 *Ms. Roth. Certainly, I think addressing access to
2977 poles, as we have discussed, is critically important, and it
2978 is something that we are certainly looking at as one of the
2979 proposals for the remaining BEAD funding.

2980 *Mrs. Houchin. Thank you so much.

2981 I yield back.

2982 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady yields. The chair
2983 recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Menendez, for
2984 his five minutes of questioning.

2985 *Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman.

2986 Administrator Roth, thank you for being here today.
2987 Your agency is responsible for implementing a once-in-a-
2988 generation broadband investment known as the BEAD program,
2989 which would connect American families and small businesses to
2990 reliable and affordable internet.

2991 You testified at your Senate confirmation hearing on
2992 March 27, 2025, and you responded to questions for the record
2993 from that hearing as part of your confirmation process. Is
2994 that correct?

2995 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

2996 *Mr. Menendez. You were asked whether New Jersey would
2997 keep its full BEAD funding of more than \$260 million, to
2998 which you answered, "If confirmed, I will work to release
2999 allocated funds to the states consistent with NTIA's
3000 statutory authority.'" Is that correct?

3001 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3002 *Mr. Menendez. But your agency is now calling more than
3003 \$200 million in New Jersey's approved funding "savings.'"

3004 Administrator Roth, yes or no, will New Jersey receive
3005 the full \$260 million in BEAD funding that NTIA allocated?

3006 *Ms. Roth. Yes, we will abide by the law which

3007 allocates funding to each state according to a formula.

3008 *Mr. Menendez. So -- because what you are communicating
3009 publicly is that there have been savings, but you are also
3010 telling me that New Jersey will get the full \$260 million.
3011 And I just want to make sure that -- because that seems to be
3012 a disconnect between what would be savings, but if we are
3013 getting the full 260 there is not really a savings.

3014 *Ms. Roth. Sir, can you repeat your question?

3015 *Mr. Menendez. You are saying there is \$200 million in
3016 "savings," but you just told me that New Jersey will get the
3017 full \$260 million. That seems to be inconsistent.

3018 *Ms. Roth. No, as I said, we are operating that under
3019 the -- we are proceeding with the assumption that every state
3020 will be able to get access to their remaining funds. We are
3021 very proud of the savings that we were able to achieve in the
3022 program, thanks to our benefit of the bargain reforms, and we
3023 are working to ensure that that savings can be used in an
3024 effective manner.

3025 *Mr. Menendez. Okay. And you would agree that there is
3026 a difference between savings and the illegal impoundment of
3027 millions of dollars appropriated by Congress?

3028 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, we are not impounding any money.

3029 *Mr. Menendez. Okay. You also told Congress you would
3030 follow the law and release all BEAD funding to the states,
3031 which would include funding for broadband adoption. But for

3032 months your agency has kept states waiting for broadband
3033 guidance they need to submit full BEAD plans, forcing them to
3034 submit proposals that don't include non-deployment funding.

3035 Originally, the first deadline, I believe, was March 11,
3036 2026. But that deadline passed. Is that correct?

3037 *Ms. Roth. I --

3038 *Mr. Menendez. For non-deployment guidance.

3039 *Ms. Roth. We have not issued the guidance yet, but we
3040 are working on it.

3041 *Mr. Menendez. And then Secretary Lutnick testified to
3042 Congress at the end of April that it would be released in the
3043 next two months. That has not happened. You are saying this
3044 summer?

3045 And you also, I believe, testified earlier that you want
3046 to get the guidance right. Is that correct?

3047 *Ms. Roth. Yes, certainly, getting the guidance right
3048 is critical. Rushing it out the door without --

3049 *Mr. Menendez. Sure.

3050 *Ms. Roth. -- careful planning would be irresponsible.

3051 *Mr. Menendez. Can you share what the remaining items
3052 are that need to be resolved before the guidance can be
3053 issued?

3054 *Ms. Roth. You know, it is -- I can't speak to our
3055 internal deliberations and work product, but we are working
3056 actively to complete our work on the guidance.

3057 As you know, there was an unprecedented amount of
3058 interest and ideas floated as to how the funding should be
3059 used, and we need to do our due diligence to ensure that the
3060 guidelines are effective in and outcome-driven in the same
3061 way that the --

3062 *Mr. Menendez. At some point, right, the criticism of
3063 the last administration could be the same criticism levied
3064 against this administration, which is at some point we need
3065 to go, right? And there have been multiple deadlines, self-
3066 imposed deadlines that now have passed, and states are
3067 looking for this guidance because the law says that each
3068 state can submit only one final BEAD plan for that state's
3069 full broadband funding to help people get online, yet NTIA
3070 isn't enabling states to develop full BEAD plans or allowing
3071 them to spend their entire broadband allocation upon final
3072 review. So I am curious how that is consistent with the law.

3073 *Ms. Roth. You know, we have a duty to conduct
3074 oversight of the BEAD program. Just to give you an example,
3075 there were a few examples during the previous administration
3076 where I think that NTIA's oversight was really -- was not
3077 adequate. Like, for example, there was one project approved
3078 at \$228,391 per location. I don't --

3079 *Mr. Menendez. But you have also said --

3080 *Ms. Roth. Yes?

3081 *Mr. Menendez. You have also criticized the last

3082 Administration for red tape and hostile mandates. So it was
3083 -- they were not doing a good job of administering the
3084 program, but then they were also, you know, making it harder
3085 for the program to be administered.

3086 And I am really focused on what we do going forward
3087 because what we spend a lot of our time here, unfortunately,
3088 is going back and forth between prior administrations. And
3089 my focus is on what we are doing now, and we need to go
3090 because, you know, we represent -- I represent a densely
3091 populated area. There are people that represent rural areas.
3092 We need connectivity, and we need to have an assurance that
3093 states like New Jersey will get the full \$260 million so we
3094 can start getting to work. I look forward to continuing to
3095 work with you, and I thank you for your time.

3096 I yield back.

3097 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. The chair now
3098 recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia, Ms. McClellan, for
3099 her five minutes of questioning.

3100 *Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,
3101 Director Roth.

3102 Congress created the BEAD program to ensure every
3103 American has access to reliable, affordable, high-speed
3104 internet. And in Virginia alone over 133,000 homes and
3105 businesses are expected to be connected through this historic
3106 investment. Every day these projects are delayed, however,

3107 is another day that families can't access telehealth,
3108 students struggle to complete homework, small businesses
3109 can't compete, and public safety agencies remain without the
3110 connectivity that they need.

3111 Administrator Roth, it has now been more than 100 days
3112 since NTIA's self-imposed deadline to issue updated guidance
3113 to -- on allowable uses of non-deployment BEAD funding. And
3114 at that same time, uncertainty throughout the economy has
3115 made planning broadband projects even more challenging for
3116 states and providers. So I have a number of questions and,
3117 in the interest of time, I am going to ask yes-or-no
3118 questions. If you think you need more than a yes or no, just
3119 say it is not a yes or no, and I will come back to it if I
3120 have time.

3121 So first, do you agree that the sections of the country
3122 that still need to be connected are among the most expensive
3123 to connect?

3124 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3125 *Ms. McClellan. Do you agree that every month BEAD
3126 deployment is delayed means millions more Americans remain
3127 without access to broadband for longer?

3128 *Ms. Roth. Yes, and we have worked on expediting build-
3129 out --

3130 *Ms. McClellan. I am going to come back to that. I
3131 just want to set a baseline.

3132 Do you agree that prolonged uncertainty may make it
3133 harder for states and broadband providers to plan and execute
3134 projects?

3135 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3136 *Ms. McClellan. Do you agree that states and localities
3137 know their communities best and should have a say in how they
3138 develop and deploy broadband networks?

3139 *Ms. Roth. Yes, and that is precisely why we empowered
3140 the states to determine which technology would work best
3141 under -- for -- under -- pursuant to the law.

3142 *Ms. McClellan. Thanks. Do you agree that states need
3143 clear guidance from the NTIA to move forward?

3144 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3145 *Ms. McClellan. Can you commit that NTIA will provide
3146 states with timely guidance so they can continue deploying
3147 broadband without unnecessary delays?

3148 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3149 *Ms. McClellan. Can you commit that NTIA will work with
3150 states to resolve implementation questions as quickly as
3151 possible, rather than allowing projects to sit idle?

3152 *Ms. Roth. Yes. Expediting the deployment of projects
3153 is front and center in our oversight of BEAD.

3154 *Ms. McClellan. And can you assure me that the OMB
3155 proceeding on grant administration is not an effort to claw
3156 back non-deployment funds?

3157 *Ms. Roth. I have -- I am not familiar. I don't -- no,
3158 I do not -- we are operating under the assumption that states
3159 will be able to use their non-deployment funds.

3160 *Ms. McClellan. Okay. So I want to thank you for that,
3161 because Congress created this historic investment to connect
3162 everyone with affordable, reliable, high-speed internet
3163 service. And as we both agreed, this funding is necessary
3164 because the locations left unconnected are among the most
3165 expensive to connect and NTIA plays a critical role in
3166 connecting them.

3167 I want to turn to broadband mapping. Now, I know there
3168 has been a lot of discussion around why it took BEAD so long,
3169 but we both -- would you agree that the first step was we
3170 needed to know where current networks were deployed so we
3171 didn't over-build?

3172 *Ms. Roth. Yes, absolutely.

3173 *Ms. McClellan. So that mapping project was critically
3174 important to the success of BEAD.

3175 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3176 *Ms. McClellan. And Virginia invested significant time
3177 and resources in validating the broadband coverage area. And
3178 I know a number of states did, and some it was harder than
3179 others. How is NTIA ensuring that state-identified
3180 corrections are incorporated quickly so that BEAD dollars
3181 reach the communities that remain unserved rather than over-

3182 building?

3183 *Ms. Roth. So as you said, we followed the FCC maps and
3184 ran a challenge process which was critical to preventing
3185 over-building in the BEAD program, and we continue to work
3186 with the FCC on ways to ensure that the maps reflect the
3187 reality on the ground. That was evident also in our work to
3188 conduct oversight over D.C.'s broadband proposal which would
3189 have directed funding to locations that either weren't
3190 broadband-serviceable or already had broadband.

3191 So, you know, conducting oversight and really looking --
3192 drilling down into proposals and asking questions is really
3193 critical to ensuring that taxpayer dollars are used
3194 effectively.

3195 *Ms. McClellan. Okay. Now, during your Senate
3196 confirmation hearing you testified that you would abide by
3197 the law in implementing the Digital Equity Act. If the
3198 Federal courts uphold that statute, including the provisions
3199 identifying covered populations such as individuals who are
3200 members of racial or ethnic minority groups, will you commit
3201 to implementing the law consistent with both the court's
3202 decision and Congress's intent?

3203 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3204 *Ms. McClellan. All right. With that, I yield back and
3205 I thank you.

3206 *Mr. Goldman. The gentlelady yields. The chair now

3207 recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carter, for five
3208 minutes of questioning.

3209 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
3210 thank you, Secretary Roth, for enduring this long hearing. I
3211 appreciate it. You are almost there, so hang in there.

3212 Secretary, I have got the honor -- I have the honor and
3213 privilege of representing the State of Georgia, the coast of
3214 Georgia, over 100 miles of pristine coastline, a beautiful
3215 area. But I am very proud of my state. We received \$1.3
3216 billion in BEAD funds, and that was to, obviously, to help us
3217 in the unserved and underserved communities.

3218 I don't know how familiar you are with Georgia, if at
3219 all, but there really are two Georgias. There is Atlanta and
3220 everywhere else, and I represent everywhere else. And south
3221 Georgia really does need this. We need broadband and we need
3222 it to be extended there.

3223 Two of the major drivers of broadband deployment are
3224 permitting reform and then the access to spectrum. I
3225 sponsored a piece of legislation, the American Broadband
3226 Deployment Act. Are you familiar with that?

3227 *Ms. Roth. Yes, and I applaud you on your leadership to
3228 address permitting through congressional oversight.

3229 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay. How would the permitting
3230 reform contemplated by my American Broadband Deployment Act
3231 help with the BEAD program?

3232 *Ms. Roth. So permitting is certainly something that we
3233 have really thought creatively on addressing in our reforms
3234 to the BEAD program. You know, we have -- as you know, we
3235 have focused both on state barriers, Federal barriers --
3236 which can be a little bit easier to address for us; state and
3237 local barriers can be a little bit more challenging. We have
3238 worked with the states to streamline processing and expedite
3239 permitting timelines, as well as minimize permitting costs,
3240 really, with the goal of ensuring that BEAD projects are
3241 successful and aren't subject to defaults.

3242 But we would welcome, you know, further assistance from
3243 Congress on this effort, as it is -- as it has -- as it is so
3244 challenging.

3245 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Well, as you know, we passed it
3246 out of subcommittee and committee and it went to the floor.
3247 It was scheduled to be voted on. Unfortunately, we had to
3248 pull it at the last minute because we did get some
3249 opposition, particularly to the shot clocks. Are you
3250 familiar with that part of it as well?

3251 *Ms. Roth. Yes.

3252 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay. Any opinion on that?

3253 I mean, you know, I had a lot of feedback from local
3254 officials. And listen, I was a mayor in another life, and I
3255 get it. I never liked the Federal Government or the state
3256 government telling me what I was supposed to be doing. But

3257 at the same time, that has proven, I think, to be a problem
3258 and a hurdle that a lot of the companies are trying to get
3259 passed. So any opinion on that?

3260 *Ms. Roth. Yes. No, I think it is -- I applaud your
3261 leadership. I think that, you know, that often you see the
3262 -- that, you know, opposition to efforts like that or -- can
3263 be, you know, not necessarily consistent with the goals of
3264 BEAD. The goals of BEAD are universal broadband deployment.
3265 We have really tried to address overhead costs that not only
3266 make permitting slower but also add costs to companies. So I
3267 think addressing permitting is also an important way to
3268 address some of the affordability challenges that members on
3269 the committee have identified.

3270 You know, sometimes you see localities treating some of
3271 these projects like a piggy bank. And that is, you know,
3272 counterproductive, I think --

3273 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Right, right.

3274 *Ms. Roth. -- to getting better connectivity in some of
3275 these places.

3276 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. What has NTIA done to encourage
3277 state and local governments to streamline their permitting
3278 processes in order to expedite deployment for BEAD?

3279 *Ms. Roth. We have terms and conditions in the BEAD
3280 program that are critical to preventing defaults and
3281 promoting the effective deployment of projects, and those

3282 requirements focus on, you know, a 90-day approval timeline,
3283 minimizing costs, and really working together to address
3284 local barriers, including access to poles. And we are
3285 working with the states to implement those requirements, and
3286 -- but we would, you know, appreciate the opportunity to work
3287 with Congress as we address these challenges.

3288 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Well, let me ask you this, just
3289 an open-ended question: What -- how should we in Congress
3290 structure this to make permitting reform -- to make sure that
3291 spectrum policy translates into real broadband deployment?
3292 Because that is what we -- that is what this is for, as you
3293 well know. We want to have deployment.

3294 *Ms. Roth. Absolutely, and I welcome the opportunity to
3295 work with you and -- on this really critical issue that is
3296 not only important for, you know, better connectivity and
3297 better broadband affordability, but also our national
3298 leadership when it comes to next-generation technologies. We
3299 certainly don't want an inhospitable permitting environment
3300 to result in America -- American technology being left
3301 behind.

3302 *Mr. Carter of Georgia. Great. Well, thank you very
3303 much again for being here, and I appreciate it.

3304 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

3305 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. The chair now
3306 recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko, for his

3307 five minutes of questioning.

3308 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome,
3309 Assistant Secretary Roth.

3310 This hearing is long overdue, and over the past year it
3311 has been deeply disappointing to watch the NTIA's
3312 implementation of the BEAD program. I have worked for years
3313 to expand broadband access throughout New York's capital
3314 region and across the country, and I am concerned that this
3315 Administration's actions are putting our goal of universe --
3316 of universal, reliable, and accessible, and affordable
3317 broadband at risk.

3318 So Secretary Roth, you mentioned in your testimony that
3319 NTIA is focused on returning the BEAD program to its
3320 statutory objective. And in your confirmation hearing you
3321 stated you would follow the law. Yet NTIA is now prohibiting
3322 states from setting the low-cost service option as the law
3323 requires. And instead, you have decided that service
3324 providers have the sole discretion to propose their own low-
3325 cost service option.

3326 If your goal is to faithfully implement the statute, can
3327 you explain what authority you have to ignore that statutory
3328 language?

3329 *Ms. Roth. The low-cost service option remains a
3330 statutory requirement and remains in place. What we have
3331 done is we have made clear that rate regulation according to

3332 the law is prohibited. You know, the -- that is how Congress
3333 wrote the law, and our job is to implement the law. I think
3334 a bipartisan Congress, you know, recognized that rate
3335 regulation drives up costs and undermines participation in
3336 the program. We saw that from the history of the BEAD
3337 program, and we have really restored the program to its
3338 statutory mission.

3339 But we have taken -- but we -- I agree that
3340 affordability is important, and there are many levers that we
3341 have pulled in order to promote affordability, particularly
3342 through expanding -- clearing the runway for innovation,
3343 expanding access to spectrum, and --

3344 *Mr. Tonko. Well --

3345 *Ms. Roth. -- minimizing permitting costs, which have
3346 actually -- are actually more effective in promoting
3347 broadband affordability.

3348 *Mr. Tonko. Well, reclaiming my time here, just again I
3349 am concerned about ignoring the statutory language.

3350 So is it your view that a statutory condition that
3351 applies only to providers voluntarily accepting Federal grant
3352 funds is really the same as regulating rates in the broader
3353 marketplace?

3354 *Ms. Roth. The low-cost service option remains a legal
3355 requirement, and it is up to the states to, you know, enforce
3356 its contracts with providers. But NTIA is not -- is

3357 prohibited by the law from regulating or setting rates.

3358 *Mr. Tonko. In your testimony you also claimed to be
3359 aiming for universal connectivity. How can you make that
3360 claim if there are households that cannot afford to
3361 subscribe?

3362 *Ms. Roth. I agree that affordability is incredibly
3363 important, and we have structured the BEAD program in a
3364 manner that I think promotes affordability in a much better
3365 manner than previously, including by promoting competition
3366 and not scaring away participation.

3367 You know, one of the things -- one of the trends that we
3368 have seen in the last years is actually that broadband prices
3369 are coming down and real prices adjusted for inflation have
3370 come down more than seven percent per year between 2020 and
3371 2026. That is thanks to a competitive, facilities-based
3372 competition environment. We want to promote that
3373 environment. And part of the way that we did that was by
3374 ensuring that we took a technology-neutral approach to the
3375 program, as Congress intended, while ensuring that each
3376 project meets the standards of priority broadband service.

3377 *Mr. Tonko. Yes, I still see it as walking away from
3378 the statutory language and not really regulating rates in the
3379 broader marketplace.

3380 Now, to make matters worse, NTIA went beyond non-
3381 enforcement of the law's low-cost provision with term 50 of

3382 the BEAD general terms and conditions. NTIA is attempting to
3383 preempt state laws like New York's Affordable Broadband Act
3384 that requires providers operating in New York to offer
3385 specific low-cost options for qualifying households. Despite
3386 this, I am proud that New York has remained committed to
3387 enforcing its affordable Broad Act -- Broadband Act to ensure
3388 low-income households have access to affordable internet
3389 service.

3390 Interestingly, just days after New York Governor Hochul
3391 announced that New York BEAD -- New York's BEAD program would
3392 move forward alongside the affordable Broad Act [sic], NTIA
3393 began circulating a document, this document, "BEAD Sub-
3394 grantees, Protect Your Rights."

3395 I ask, Mr. Chair, that -- for unanimous consent to enter
3396 the guidance, this guidance, into the record.

3397 *Mr. Goldman. Without objection.

3398 [The information follows:]

3399

3400 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

3401

3402 *Mr. Tonko. Now, this document advises BEAD sub-
3403 grantees that they should raise concerns directly with NTIA
3404 if they believe state-imposed requirements conflict with
3405 Federal bid conditions, including those related to costs.
3406 Did you approve the release of this document?

3407 Were there any outside organizations involved in any
3408 part of this production?

3409 *Ms. Roth. Ensuring that rate regulation is not
3410 hampering BEAD projects and undermining the timely and
3411 effective deployment of BEAD projects is part of our
3412 statutory responsibility. And we were -- we think that this
3413 guidance is critical to ensuring the success of the BEAD
3414 program.

3415 *Mr. Tonko. What about the outside organizations
3416 involved?

3417 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman's time has expired.

3418 *Ms. Roth. No, we have -- our rules apply the law, and
3419 there are lots of outside organizations -- recently, you
3420 know, there is -- that have published ample data showing the
3421 significant negative costs of rate regulation on the
3422 deployment of broadband projects. So if we -- we have the
3423 statutory responsibility to ensure timely and effective
3424 deployment of broadband projects. It is critical that we
3425 don't -- that projects are not put at risk.

3426 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman's time has expired.

3427 *Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I have other questions that I
3428 will get to the subcommittee to have answered by the
3429 Assistant Secretary.

3430 [The information follows:]

3431

3432 *****COMMITTEE INSERT*****

3433

3434 *Mr. Tonko. Thank you, I yield back.

3435 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. The chair now
3436 recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Joyce, for
3437 his five minutes of questioning.

3438 *Dr. Joyce. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member
3439 Matsui, for holding this important hearing. And thank you to
3440 Secretary Roth for being here with us.

3441 As I have said before and I will say again, rural
3442 communities cannot be left behind as technology develops at
3443 such a rapid pace. This includes broadband infrastructure.
3444 And thanks to the work that is being done at NTIA, we are
3445 closer to connecting every rural community in America, closer
3446 than we have ever been before. Under President Trump and
3447 your leadership, BEAD program reform under NTIA has led to
3448 less red tape and more connections, streamlining the program
3449 and accelerating deployment. That is what matters. It
3450 matters to my constituents, it matters in getting rural
3451 communities the connectivity that they deserve.

3452 In the district that I represent in Pennsylvania,
3453 connection sometimes, at best, can be spotty. Geographic
3454 challenges like mountains create real-life barriers when it
3455 comes to connectivity. My constituents rely on broadband
3456 power. Precision agriculture is part of that. Telehealth is
3457 part of that. Education is part of that. And my
3458 constituents desperately need that.

3459 This Congress I introduced the Broadband and
3460 Telecommunications RAIL Act with my colleague from
3461 California, Mr. Peters, and my colleague from Ohio, Mr.
3462 Landsman, to provide a necessary and reasonable framework to
3463 allow broadband deployment along railroad rights of way.
3464 This bill prioritizes safety and efficiency, and I look
3465 forward to continuing my work in Congress to increase
3466 broadband coverage in rural communities without burdensome
3467 red tape and unnecessary delays. Placing our rural
3468 communities at the center of our work to deploy broadband is
3469 essential to ensuring that universal broadband availability
3470 is there for all Americans.

3471 Administrator Roth, in your written testimony you
3472 mentioned that you are focused on ensuring universal
3473 broadband availability. Would you please describe how the
3474 benefit of the bargain can achieve this, and how this is
3475 critical reform that is so necessary and will ultimately
3476 benefit rural communities?

3477 *Ms. Roth. Thank you, Congressman Joyce, and it was a
3478 real pleasure to meet with you a few months ago.

3479 You know, BEAD's mission is clear. It is to close
3480 broadband gaps. And that has been our central focus. One of
3481 the ways that we did that was by removing red tape, which
3482 increased participation in the program across all
3483 technologies. I think that -- and, you know, our role is to

3484 implement the law and not add, you know, extraneous mandates
3485 that don't -- that divert from the goal of universal
3486 broadband access.

3487 In applying the law we have also been clear that, you
3488 know, government can set the -- government set the benchmarks
3489 in the law for what defines a priority broadband service, and
3490 it is up to each technology provider to prove to each state
3491 that they could meet those requirements. But it wasn't --
3492 there was no technology preference in the law, and it also
3493 doesn't reflect the current state of technology to freeze
3494 technology in place.

3495 As a result of our providing -- of eliminating these
3496 burdens and getting the -- our program in line with
3497 congressional language, we were able to see not just
3498 increased participation, but universal broadband
3499 availability. Every last community connected, whereas there
3500 was a real risk under the previous rules that over-spending
3501 would cause some communities to be left behind. And we can
3502 all agree that that would have been a bad outcome.

3503 And each technology in the program, each provider needs
3504 to play by our rules. They need to meet the performance
3505 requirements in the law, but it is up to each state to
3506 determine what technologies work for different areas, not for
3507 Washington to impose and shove down their throats a one-size-
3508 fits-all solution.

3509 *Dr. Joyce. In light of the BEAD reforms that you have
3510 been overseeing at NTIA, under these reforms and your
3511 leadership during the past year, would you please speak about
3512 how broadband deployment has been accelerated across the
3513 country, from state proposal submissions to funds being
3514 released?

3515 Talk to us about the timeline and how you have expedited
3516 that.

3517 *Ms. Roth. Yes. So just in one year from our release
3518 of our restructuring notice, we have already seen deployments
3519 in several states. One of those states was Ogallala -- was
3520 Nebraska. I was -- I visited Ogallala, Nebraska to witness
3521 one of the first BEAD projects. And one of the things that
3522 was so significant was that the project was delivering
3523 gigabit service to the community through a fixed wireless
3524 service, unlicensed fixed wireless that was precluded from
3525 even participating during the previous administration. I
3526 think that goes to show the importance of letting the market
3527 and market innovators work, rather than putting our thumb on
3528 the scale on a single technology, especially when that
3529 technology was able to deliver such high-quality service to
3530 the community in such an expeditious manner.

3531 I think consumers -- and speaking to the American who
3532 got the service through that technology, she was so thrilled.
3533 She didn't care how she was getting her broadband service,

3534 she just wanted it to work.

3535 And another way --

3536 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman's time has expired.

3537 *Ms. Roth. Oh, okay.

3538 *Dr. Joyce. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

3539 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. The chair now
3540 recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Balderson, for his
3541 five minutes of questioning.

3542 *Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And
3543 Secretary, thank you for being here today. And I am the last
3544 one, so I think you are done.

3545 Since the Administration issued its updated BEAD
3546 guidance last year, states have moved much more quickly
3547 through the approval process. Based on what NTIA has learned
3548 from working with states and providers, what additional
3549 improvements do you think could help accelerate broadband
3550 deployment and encourage even greater participation from
3551 rural providers?

3552 *Ms. Roth. So I think that one of the things that we
3553 focused on at NTIA has been really clearing the path to
3554 innovation. We have seen, thanks to our histories --
3555 facilities-based intermodal history of competition, that
3556 competition has been the most effective way not just of
3557 promoting better access to communications, but really
3558 innovating in a manner that helps rural America. As I have

3559 said, some of the biggest, the most -- this most significant
3560 progress that we have seen in connecting rural Americans
3561 haven't come from subsidies, they have come from innovation
3562 itself.

3563 And so what NTIA can do is pull certain levers to
3564 promote that. One of the best ways we can do that is by
3565 expanding access to spectrum, which we are currently doing
3566 through our mandate under the Working Families Tax Cut Act,
3567 and another way that we are doing that is by, you know,
3568 trying to address overhead costs. I think any efforts that
3569 we can take to address permitting obstacles are really
3570 helpful in increasing broadband deployment, as well as
3571 innovation.

3572 *Mr. Balderson. Okay. Thank you very much.

3573 In the congressional district that I represent, electric
3574 co-ops are a major source of essential services, and many are
3575 working to expand broadband access in rural communities. We
3576 have heard that certain BEAD requirements may affect their
3577 longstanding statutory frameworks and financial models.
3578 Could you share how NTIA is approaching these concerns, and
3579 what flexibility might exist to ensure cooperatives can
3580 participate successfully in the program?

3581 *Ms. Roth. Thank you for your question.

3582 So just in line with that goal of expediting and
3583 increasing broadband deployment, the law requires that we

3584 issue rules governing the program to ensure that BEAD
3585 projects are deployed in a timely and effective manner. And
3586 one of the things that we have learned from history and other
3587 -- and broadband programs past, like the RDOF, is that pole
3588 access can be one of the most challenging areas that can
3589 affect the timely and effective deployment of broadband
3590 projects, and especially as, you know, you have seen pole
3591 owners enter broadband markets, their incentives may not
3592 always be aligned with the goals of the BEAD program.

3593 So what we have done in our rules is ensure that there
3594 is a cop on the beat, that this -- that to the extent that
3595 there is a gap in regulation of timely and -- of timely
3596 access to poles in order to serve that goal of timely and
3597 effective deployment of broadband projects.

3598 *Mr. Balderson. Okay.

3599 *Ms. Roth. And, you know, to the extent that there are
3600 pole owners that don't want to participate in the program, we
3601 have a process in place to ensure that every last area is
3602 served. And if necessary, they can -- we can use a different
3603 provider.

3604 *Mr. Balderson. Okay, thank you. A follow-up on that:
3605 As states move from planning into construction, what role
3606 does NTIA see itself playing in helping states resolve
3607 implementation challenges that arise from provider feedback,
3608 particularly from smaller broadband companies, electric

3609 cooperatives, and local fiber providers?

3610 *Ms. Roth. One of the things that we really pride
3611 ourselves on is ensuring that we are overseeing the program
3612 actively and, you know, seeing what challenges providers are
3613 facing. We wanted to see -- you know, we have seen a diverse
3614 mix of providers in the program, and I think that was thanks
3615 to our rules that really refocus the program on its core
3616 mission.

3617 You know, one -- when it comes to smaller providers, one
3618 of the things that we have focused on is monitoring the fiber
3619 supply chain and, you know, which is something that, you
3620 know, we know that some providers are concerned about, but we
3621 are grateful that they are -- that major fiber producers have
3622 made promises that BEAD providers will get their supply on
3623 time.

3624 And I think additionally, you know, really focusing on
3625 working with states on permitting obstacles through things
3626 like permitting roundtables, single points of contact,
3627 elevating challenges to NTIA is another way that we are
3628 really working to ensure effective and expeditious
3629 deployment.

3630 *Mr. Balderson. Okay. Thank you very much.

3631 Mr. --

3632 *Mr. Goldman. The gentleman yields. Seeing there is no
3633 further members wishing to be recognized, I would like to

3634 thank our witness for being here today.

3635 I remind members that they have 10 business days to
3636 submit questions for the record, and I ask the witness to
3637 respond to the questions promptly.

3638 Members should submit their questions by the close of
3639 business on July 15, 2026.

3640 Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.

3641 [Whereupon, at 1:11 p.m., the subcommittee was
3642 adjourned.]