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In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 05-337; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45

Five years ago I dissented to a recommendation by a different Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service that concluded advanced services should not be eligible for Universal Service support and that broadband, specifically, should not be included in the definition of Universal Service. Today, the Joint-Board happily reverses course and finds that broadband does indeed meet the statutory criteria of section 254 for inclusion as a supported service and that it is in the public interest to do so. I am enormously pleased to approve of this historic finding by the Joint Board because it establishes for the first time the right mission for Universal Service in the 21st century. This may well be the most important single action a Joint Board has ever taken.

Universal Service is a critical pillar of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Congress concluded many years ago that a core principle of federal telecommunications policy is that all Americans, no matter who they are or where they live, should have access to reasonably comparable services at reasonably comparable rates. Congress wisely anticipated that the definition of Universal Service would evolve and advance over time. The Joint Board’s recommendation to include broadband in the definition of Universal Service finally puts the program in sync with the intent of the Act.

I must express disappointment, however, that once the initial decision to include broadband was made, councils of caution found their way to the fore. Instead of bold recommendations to implement our historic decision, the Joint Board only suggests that $300 million of federal dollars be dedicated to this challenge. And none of this would be new money, but rather a mere reshuffling of dollars among different pots.

That’s like fighting a bear with a fly swatter. Bringing broadband to the far corners of the nation is the central infrastructure challenge our country confronts right now. It is no different than the challenges previous generations of Americans faced to build the essential infrastructures of their times—the roads, turnpikes, bridges, canals, railroads and highways of centuries past. Broadband is our generation’s infrastructure challenge, but we have fallen behind other nations in getting high-speed services out to our people. We have put ourselves in an untenable competitive position by denying the tools of high-speed opportunity to most Americans. Our challenge, then, is to think, plan and act boldly. I am disappointed that the Joint Board did not go farther in its recommendation.

To put it in context, in the mid-1950s Congress looked to complete the interstate highway system in 10 years at a cost of $27 billion, which in 2005 dollars amounts to $196 billion. While no one is suggesting that such a level of government support be invested here, I believe the Joint Board has basically closed its eyes to the level of challenge we face1. It should have struck a better balance between our collective interest in having a sustainable fund for the future and the desire to ensure that high-speed broadband reaches all Americans. By recommending a cap of the fund at current levels, the Board cripples the ability of USF to support broadband in a credible manner. Nonetheless, today’s recommendation to include broadband is important in and of itself. It’s more than a small step forward, but it’s not the giant leap for mankind that we need.

With regard to comprehensive reform, I believe there are a variety of ways to promote Universal Service and at the same time ensure the sustainability and integrity of the fund. I continue to believe that much would be accomplished if the Commission were to include broadband on both the distribution and contribution side of the ledger; eliminate the Identical Support rule; and increase its oversight and auditing of the high-cost fund. Additionally, Congressional authorization to permit the assessment of Universal Service contributions on intrastate as well as interstate revenue would be a valuable tool for
supporting broadband. Today the Joint Board makes an assortment of recommendations of its own. Some I agree with, some I do not, and some merit further discussion. For example, the Joint Board recommends three funds that are tailored to supporting the missions of voice, mobility and broadband. This seems a creative and reasonable approach. The Joint Board also recommends the elimination of the Identical Support rule, places renewed emphasis on the federal-state partnership in administering the Fund, and suggests that the FCC’s current definition of broadband is antiquated. I agree with all of these decisions.

At the other end of the spectrum, the Joint Board focuses almost exclusively on supporting unserved areas, without sufficiently taking into account the fact that there are many underserved areas of the country where residents receive little service and, very often, service at levels that are the laughing stock of the rest of the world. The Joint Board also concludes that reverse auctions may be the appropriate method for distributing funds, despite the many unanswered questions regarding such a bidding approach on quality of service and provider of last resort obligations, not to mention many other concerns that have been raised about this type of bidding.

I concur in part because of the concerns I have enumerated here, plus others that I will discuss more fully during the pendency of these recommendations before the FCC. But it is time to get on with fixing Universal Service. While I have made clear that I do not agree with all of the recommendations that have been made, it is crucial to get a Joint Board recommendation to the Commission. This alone is a signal accomplishment, one many years in the making, and one that I have pushed for since becoming a Joint Board member. At least and at last we have tackled many of the issues, charted a direction for the future, and moved a recommendation to the Commission for follow-through action. While we may have been deflected from our important work for a time by disputes over a CETC cap and reverse auctions, in the end we decided to act in a more appropriately comprehensive fashion.

A new chapter begins now. I hope the FCC will deal with this recommendation expeditiously and comprehensively. This is no place for piecemeal actions. We need to think expansively and creatively about implementing the path-breaking broadband decision that has now been presented to us. This country desperately needs a comprehensive broadband strategy. The Joint Board recommendation provides the opportunity for the FCC to move toward such a strategy, working with our own rules and making suggestions to Congress in those areas where legislative action may be required to ensure such a strategy.

I wish to thank my Joint Board colleagues for their hard work on this proceeding. Chairwoman Tate and Chairman Baum should take merited pride in actually sending a recommendation forward. All of my state colleagues worked with tireless energy and determination to get this job done, and their expertise, experience and vision make today’s action possible. The Commission and the country are fortunate to have such people to call upon. The Joint Board’s staff worked long and hard to bring this recommendation to fruition, and their creativity and perseverance often made the critical difference. A final bow to our recently-retired colleague, Billy Jack Gregg, who stayed long enough to get us on-course. His ability to see both the forest and the trees of Universal Service is perhaps unmatched, and his imprint is writ large in our recommendation to bring Universal Service into the twenty-first century.