

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA  
CHAIRMAN

JOHN D. DINGELL, MICHIGAN  
CHAIRMAN EMERITUS  
EDWARD J. MARKEY, MASSACHUSETTS  
RICK BOUCHER, VIRGINIA  
FRANK PALLONE, Jr., NEW JERSEY  
BART GORDON, TENNESSEE  
BOBBY L. RUSH, ILLINOIS  
ANNA G. ESHOO, CALIFORNIA  
BART STUPAK, MICHIGAN  
ELIOT L. ENGEL, NEW YORK  
GENE GREEN, TEXAS  
DIANA DeGETTE, COLORADO  
VICE CHAIRMAN  
LOIS CAPPS, CALIFORNIA  
MIKE DOYLE, PENNSYLVANIA  
JANE HARMAN, CALIFORNIA  
JAN SCHAKOWSKY, ILLINOIS  
CHARLES A. GONZALEZ, TEXAS  
JAY INSLEE, WASHINGTON  
TAMMY BALOWIN, WISCONSIN  
MIKE ROSS, ARKANSAS  
ANTHONY D. WEINER, NEW YORK  
JIM MATHESON, UTAH  
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, NORTH CAROLINA  
CHARLIE MELANCON, LOUISIANA  
JOHN BARROW, GEORGIA  
BARON P. HILL, INDIANA  
DORIS O. MATSUI, CALIFORNIA  
DONNA CHRISTENSEN, VIRGIN ISLANDS  
KATHY CASTOR, FLORIDA  
JOHN SARBANES, MARYLAND  
CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, CONNECTICUT  
ZACHARY T. SPACE, OHIO  
JERRY McNERNEY, CALIFORNIA  
BETTY SUTTON, OHIO  
BRUCE BRALEY, IOWA  
PETER WELCH, VERMONT

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

# Congress of the United States

## House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

MAJORITY (202) 225-2927  
FACSIMILE (202) 225-2525  
MINORITY (202) 225-3641

[energycommerce.house.gov](http://energycommerce.house.gov)

JOE BARTON, TEXAS  
RANKING MEMBER

RALPH M. HALL, TEXAS  
FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN  
CLIFF STEARNS, FLORIDA  
NATHAN DEAL, GEORGIA  
ED WHITFIELD, KENTUCKY  
JOHN SHIMKUS, ILLINOIS  
JOHN B. SHADEGG, ARIZONA  
ROY BLUNT, MISSOURI  
STEVE BUYER, INDIANA  
GEORGE RADANOVICH, CALIFORNIA  
JOSEPH R. PITTS, PENNSYLVANIA  
MARY BONO MACK, CALIFORNIA  
GREG WALDEN, OREGON  
LEE TERRY, NEBRASKA  
MIKE ROGERS, MICHIGAN  
SUE WILKINS MYRICK, NORTH CAROLINA  
JOHN SULLIVAN, OKLAHOMA  
TIM MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA  
MICHAEL C. BURGESS, TEXAS  
MARSHA BLACKBURN, TENNESSEE  
PHIL GINGREY, GEORGIA  
STEVE SCALISE, LOUISIANA

### Opening Statement of Rep. Henry A. Waxman Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce Universal Service: Reforming the High-Cost Fund Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet March 12, 2009

I am pleased that the Subcommittee is beginning its review today of the nation's Universal Service Fund. I suspect we all agree that the program is in need of repair and that the High-Cost Fund is a good place to start.

I would like to outline a few principles that will guide me during this process.

First, I believe the goals of universal service are as important now — in the age of broadband — as they have ever been. Simply put, we cannot allow any part of the country — urban or rural — to be left behind.

Second, we need to modify the program by looking forward, not by looking back. We need a Universal Service Fund that supports the broadband networks of the future, uses public money wisely and efficiently, and spreads responsibility for the program as broadly and equitably as possible.

Third, we must recognize that public obligations accompany public money. The \$7 billion Universal Service Fund is financed by consumers. Service providers are simply conduits that transfer to the Fund an 11% fee on top of ordinary charges for long distance and international calls.

We should ensure that recipients of these public funds meet certain obligations that benefit the consumers who pay these fees.

For example, last Congress, I introduced legislation to require wireless companies that receive USF subsidies to open their networks to other carriers for roaming purposes. I plan to reintroduce that measure shortly. Going forward, this Committee will look closely at whether additional public interest conditions are appropriate.

Fourth, we must ensure full accountability and transparency in this program. As GAO concluded in a June 2008 report, despite the investment of over \$30 billion in the High-Cost Fund over the last 12 years, there are no data to show what this massive investment has produced.

I know Ranking Member Barton feels strongly about this point, and I look forward to working with him and other Committee members who share our concern about performance measures and potential waste, fraud, and abuse.

As Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during the last Congress, I asked the FCC to provide a list of the ten largest recipients of High-Cost Program subsidy dollars for 2006 through 2008, as well as a list of the ten largest per-line subsidies by location for 2006 and 2007.

This was not secret information, but it had not been collected or released in this format before. The results of this inquiry raise additional questions about the High-Cost Program.

For instance, three companies in Hawaii — Sandwich Isle Communications, Sprint Nextel, and Mobi PCS — each receive a subsidy of close to \$13,000 a year per line to serve the same insular area. Over the past three years, these three companies received a total of more than \$120 million in support.

Under current rules, a single household in this part of Hawaii might have a landline phone connection from Sandwich Isle Communications, a wireless phone from Sprint Nextel, and a wireless phone from Mobi PCS, resulting in a federal subsidy of \$39,000 per year.

As we consider reforms to the High Cost Fund, we should ask tough questions and be open to creative solutions. For example:

- Where is the money going and to whom?
- Is this really the best use of public dollars?
- Are companies adequately demonstrating that funds are being used for their intended purposes?
- Are there less expensive ways to provide service by using different technologies?
- Should we consider competitive bidding for what are, in effect, government contracts?
- For how long and at what level should carriers be supported after they build facilities?
- Should we consider requiring state matching grants?
- Now that over 90 % of American households have access to wireline broadband, should we consider shifting the Fund to also support consumer adoption of broadband?

I know Universal Service legislation is a priority for Chairman Boucher. I look forward to working with him, Ranking Members Stearns and Barton, and the other members of the Committee to figure out the best way forward.