

# Broadband Internet Access and the Digital Divide: Federal Assistance Programs

**name redacted**

Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

**name redacted**

Specialist in Telecommunications Policy

April 6, 2016

Congressional Research Service

7-....

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

RL30719

## Summary

The “digital divide” is a term that has been used to characterize a gap between “information haves and have-nots,” or in other words, between those Americans who use or have access to telecommunications and information technologies and those who do not. One important subset of the digital divide debate concerns high-speed Internet access and advanced telecommunications services, also known as broadband. Broadband is provided by a series of technologies (e.g., cable, telephone wire, fiber, satellite, mobile and fixed wireless) that give users the ability to send and receive data at volumes and speeds necessary to support a number of applications including entertainment, telemedicine, distance education, telework, ecommerce, public safety, and energy conservation.

Broadband technologies are currently being deployed primarily by the private sector throughout the United States. While the numbers of new broadband subscribers continue to grow, studies and data suggest that the rate of broadband deployment in urban/suburban and high-income areas is outpacing deployment in rural and low-income areas. Some policymakers, believing that disparities in broadband access across American society could have adverse economic and social consequences on those left behind, assert that the federal government should play a more active role to avoid a “digital divide” in broadband access.

With the conclusion of the grant and loan awards established by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5), there remain two ongoing federal vehicles which direct federal money to fund broadband infrastructure: the broadband and telecommunications programs at the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Universal Service Fund (USF) programs under the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Although the USF’s High Cost Program does not explicitly fund broadband infrastructure, subsidies are used, in many cases, to upgrade existing telephone networks so that they are capable of delivering high-speed services. Additionally, subsidies provided by USF’s Schools and Libraries Program and Rural Health Care Program are used for a variety of telecommunications services, including broadband access. Currently the USF is undergoing a major transition to the Connect America Fund, which is targeted to the deployment, adoption, and utilization of both fixed and mobile broadband.

To the extent that Congress may consider various options for further encouraging broadband deployment and adoption, a key issue is how to strike a balance between providing federal assistance for unserved and underserved areas where the private sector may not be providing acceptable levels of broadband service, while at the same time minimizing any deleterious effects that government intervention in the marketplace may have on competition and private sector investment.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Status of Broadband in the United States .....	1
Broadband Availability .....	2
Broadband Adoption .....	5
Broadband in Rural Areas .....	7
Broadband and the Federal Role .....	9
Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.....	9
The National Broadband Plan .....	10
Federal Broadband Programs .....	12
The Universal Service Concept and the FCC.....	12
Universal Service and Broadband.....	13
Rural Utilities Service Programs.....	16
P.L. 111-5: The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 .....	16
Other Federal Programs and Initiatives.....	17
Broadband Opportunity Council.....	17
BroadbandUSA.....	18
HUD ConnectHome.....	18
Digital Literacy Initiative.....	19
Legislation in the 112 <sup>th</sup> Congress .....	19
Legislation in the 113 <sup>th</sup> Congress .....	19
Legislation in the 114 <sup>th</sup> Congress .....	20
Concluding Observations .....	22

## Tables

Table 1. Percentage of Broadband Technologies by Types of Connection.....	2
Table 2. Percentage of Americans Lacking Access to Fixed Broadband.....	3
Table 3. Americans Without Access to Fixed Broadband by State and U.S. Territory .....	3
Table 4. Estimated Percentage of Americans with Multiple Options for Fixed Broadband.....	5
Table 5. Broadband Adoption.....	6
Table 6. Broadband Availability, Rural vs. Urban Areas .....	7

## Contacts

Author Contact Information .....	22
----------------------------------	----

## Introduction

The “digital divide” is a term used to describe a perceived gap between “information haves and have-nots,” or in other words, between those Americans who use or have access to telecommunications and information technologies and those who do not.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not individuals or communities fall into the “information haves” category depends on a number of factors, ranging from the presence of computers in the home, to training and education, to the availability of affordable Internet access.

Broadband technologies are currently being deployed primarily by the private sector throughout the United States. While the numbers of new broadband subscribers continue to grow, studies and data suggest that the rate of broadband deployment in urban/suburban and high-income areas is outpacing deployment in rural and low-income areas.

## Status of Broadband in the United States

Prior to the late 1990s, American homes accessed the Internet at maximum speeds of 56 kilobits per second by dialing up an Internet Service Provider (such as AOL) over the same copper telephone line used for traditional voice service. A relatively small number of businesses and institutions used broadband or high-speed connections through the installation of special “dedicated lines” typically provided by their local telephone company. Starting in the late 1990s, cable television companies began offering cable modem broadband service to homes and businesses. This was accompanied by telephone companies beginning to offer DSL service (broadband over existing copper telephone wireline). Growth in broadband service has been steep, rising from 2.8 million high-speed lines reported as of December 1999, to 293 million connections as of December 31, 2013.<sup>2</sup> Of the 293 million high-speed connections reported by the FCC, 247 million serve residential users.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1** depicts the relative deployment of different types of broadband technologies. A distinction is often made between “current generation” and “next generation” broadband (commonly referred to as next generation networks or NGN). “Current generation” typically refers to initially deployed cable, DSL, and many wireless systems, while “next generation” refers to dramatically faster download and upload speeds offered by fiber technologies and also by successive generations of cable, DSL, and wireless technologies.<sup>4</sup> In general, the greater the download and upload speeds offered by a broadband connection, the more sophisticated (and potentially valuable) the application that is enabled.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “digital divide” can also refer to international disparities in access to communications and information technology. This report focuses on domestic issues only.

<sup>2</sup> FCC, *Internet Access Services: Status as of December 31, 2013*, released October 2014, p. 17. Available at [http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily\\_Releases/Daily\\_Business/2014/db1016/DOC-329973A1.pdf](http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2014/db1016/DOC-329973A1.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Initially, and for many years following, the FCC defined broadband (or more specifically “high-speed lines”) as over 200 kilobits per second (kbps) in at least one direction, which was roughly four times the speed of conventional dialup Internet access. In recent years, the 200 kbps threshold was considered too low, and on March 19, 2008, the FCC adopted a report and order (FCC 08-89) establishing new categories of broadband speed tiers for data collection purposes. Specifically, 200 kbps to 768 kbps is considered “first generation,” 768 kbps to 1.5 Mbps is “basic broadband tier 1,” and increasingly higher speed tiers are broadband tiers 2 through 7 (tier seven is greater than or equal to 100 Mbps in any one direction). Tiers can change as technology advances.

**Table 1. Percentage of Broadband Technologies by Types of Connection**

	Connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction	Residential connections over 200 kbps in at least one direction	Connections at least 3 Mbps downstream and 768 kbps upstream	Residential connections at least 3 Mbps downstream and 768 kbps upstream
Cable modem	18.4%	20.5%	23.8%	26.3%
DSL	10.5%	11.0%	8.8%	9.3%
Mobile wireless	67.3%	64.5%	63.0%	59.7%
Fiber	2.6%	2.9%	3.5%	3.9%
All other	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%

**Source:** FCC, *Internet Access Services: Status as of December 31, 2013*, pp. 23-26.

## Broadband Availability

The FCC is required by Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) to assess whether broadband is being deployed in a reasonable and timely fashion. Measurements of broadband availability depend on how broadband service is defined in terms of what download and upload speeds it offers. As broadband technology—and the applications that depend on that technology—become more mature and sophisticated, the FCC has raised its broadband speed benchmark. In 2014, the FCC raised its definition of broadband from 4 Mbps (download speed)/1 Mbps (upload speed) to 25 Mbps/3 Mbps.

The FCC's *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, adopted on January 28, 2016, contains broadband availability data for fixed broadband (e.g., wireline technologies such as cable modem or fiber optic). According to the *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, as of December 31, 2014, approximately 10% of Americans (34 million) lack access to fixed 25 Mbps/3 Mbps broadband. Additionally, 6% of Americans lack access at 10 Mbps/1 Mbps, and 5% lack access at 4 Mbps/1 Mbps.<sup>5</sup> **Table 2** shows the percentage of Americans lacking access at 25 Mbps/3Mbps over the past three years. The FCC has not yet set a mobile speed benchmark, so deployment of mobile broadband is not reflected in these data.

<sup>5</sup> Federal Communications Commission, *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, FCC 16-6, released January 29, 2016, p. 33, available at <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-releases-2016-broadband-progress-report>.

**Table 2. Percentage of Americans Lacking Access to Fixed Broadband**  
(at 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload)

	2014	2013	2012
United States	10%	17%	20%
Rural Areas	39%	53%	55%
Urban Areas	4%	8%	11%
Tribal Lands	41%	63%	68%
Rural Areas	68%	85%	89%
Urban Areas	14%	41%	47%
U.S. Territories	66%	63%	100%

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, p. 39.

Table 3 shows the percentage of Americans without access to fixed broadband by state and U.S. territory.

**Table 3. Americans Without Access to Fixed Broadband by State and U.S. Territory**  
(access to speeds of at least 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload)

	% of population without access, all areas	% of population without access, urban areas	% of population without access, rural areas
United States	10%	4%	39%
Alabama	20	6	41
Alaska	26	5	67
Arizona	13	8	63
Arkansas	25	7	48
California	5	2	61
Colorado	10	4	53
Connecticut	1	1	1
Delaware	3	2	10
District of Columbia	2	2	—
Florida	7	4	29
Georgia	9	4	25
Hawaii	2	0	22
Idaho	18	4	55
Illinois	9	4	56
Indiana	17	5	52
Iowa	15	4	37
Kansas	15	5	49
Kentucky	16	3	34

	% of population without access, all areas	% of population without access, urban areas	% of population without access, rural areas
Louisiana	19	8	50
Maine	12	4	17
Maryland	4	3	13
Massachusetts	3	2	10
Michigan	12	3	37
Minnesota	12	1	43
Mississippi	34	9	60
Missouri	20	5	61
Montana	31	9	61
Nebraska	16	6	51
Nevada	8	5	65
New Hampshire	7	3	15
New Jersey	3	2	21
New Mexico	20	9	61
New York	2	0	17
North Carolina	7	1	20
North Dakota	14	2	37
Ohio	8	2	31
Oklahoma	27	9	61
Oregon	10	5	37
Pennsylvania	6	3	20
Rhode Island	2	2	2
South Carolina	18	8	38
South Dakota	11	2	26
Tennessee	13	2	34
Texas	11	5	46
Utah	6	3	39
Vermont	17	2	27
Virginia	11	3	38
Washington	3	1	14
West Virginia	30	10	48
Wisconsin	13	1	43
Wyoming	23	3	63
U.S. Territories	<b>66</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>98</b>
American Samoa	100	100	100
Guam	99	99	100

	% of population without access, all areas	% of population without access, urban areas	% of population without access, rural areas
Northern Marianas	100	100	100
Puerto Rico	62	50	98
U.S. Virgin Islands	100	100	100

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, Appendix D. pp. 66-67.

Another important broadband availability issue is the number of providers available. Typically, more available providers lead to greater competition and more consumer choice. **Table 4** indicates the percentage of Americans with fixed broadband available from more than one provider.

**Table 4. Estimated Percentage of Americans with Multiple Options for Fixed Broadband**

	No Provider	One Provider	More than One Provider
United States	10%	51%	38%
Rural Areas	39%	48%	13%
Urban Areas	4%	52%	44%

Source: FCC, 2015 Broadband Progress Report, p. 48.

## Broadband Adoption

In contrast to broadband *availability*, which refers to whether or not broadband service is offered, broadband *adoption* refers to the extent to which American households actually subscribe to and use broadband. According to the latest Census data released by the Department of Commerce, *Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2013*, 73.4% of American households have a paid broadband subscription.<sup>6</sup> The Census data show that Americans increasingly are connecting to the Internet through other devices in addition to desktop computers: 52% of Americans used two or more devices to connect, including tablets, laptops, mobile phones, and TV connected boxes (gaming consoles and streaming video players).<sup>7</sup>

The FCC's 2016 Broadband Progress Report found that 73% of households have a subscription to fixed broadband service of at least 200 kbps in at least one direction. For the benchmark speed of 25 Mbps/3 Mbps, the FCC reported an overall adoption rate of 37%.<sup>8</sup> Adoption rates are lower

<sup>6</sup> Thom File and Camille Ryan, U.S. Census Bureau, Economics and Statistics Administration, Department of Commerce, *Computer and Internet use in the United States: 2013*, American Community Survey Reports, November 2014, p. 3, available at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/computer/publications/>.

<sup>7</sup> Guila McHenry, NTIA, "Majority of Americans Use Multiple Internet-Connected Devices, Data Shows," December 7, 2015, available at <https://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2015/majority-americans-use-multiple-internet-connected-devices-data-shows>.

<sup>8</sup> 2016 Broadband Progress Report, pp. 45-46.



in counties with the lowest median household income, in areas outside of urban areas, on tribal lands, and in U.S. territories.<sup>9</sup>

The Pew Research Center's *Home Broadband 2015* found that 67% of Americans had broadband at home in 2015, down from 70% in 2013.<sup>10</sup> According to Pew, the modest decline in broadband adoption is accompanied by an increase in smartphone adoption, including 13% of adults who rely on their smartphone for online access at home.<sup>11</sup> Pew also found that cost (monthly subscription costs and/or cost of a computer) is the major reason why people do not subscribe to broadband,<sup>12</sup> and that disparities in broadband adoption persist among demographic groups such as people with low incomes, seniors, minorities, the less-educated, non-family households, and the non-employed (see **Table 5**).

**Table 5. Broadband Adoption**  
(percentage of adults who have home broadband service)

	2013	2015
All	70%	67%
Male	70	66
Female	70	67
Parents	77	73
Non-parents	67	64
White	74	72
African American	62	54
Hispanic	56	50
18-29	81	75
30-49	77	74
50-64	68	65
65+	47	45
Less than \$20K	46	41
\$20K-\$50K	67	63
\$50K-\$75K	85	80
\$75K-\$100K	88	88
\$100K+	93	90
High school grad or less	50	47
Some college/Assoc. deg.	80	75
College +	90	87
Rural	60	55

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, pp. 46-47.

<sup>10</sup> John B. Horrigan and Maeve Duggan, Pew Research Center, *Home Broadband 2015*, December 21, 2015, p. 8, available at <http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/12/Broadband-adoption-full.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

	2013	2015
Urban	70	67
Suburban	74	70

**Source:** Pew Research Center Surveys, Pew Research Center, *Home Broadband 2015*, p. 8.

Finally, GAO released a report in June 2015 (*Intended Outcomes and Effectiveness of Efforts to Address Adoption Barriers Are Unclear*) which found that affordability, lack of perceived relevance, and lack of computer skills are the principal barriers to broadband adoption.<sup>13</sup> GAO examined adoption efforts by NTIA and the FCC, and identified three key approaches used to address broadband adoption barriers: discounts on computer equipment and broadband subscriptions; outreach efforts to promote broadband availability and benefits; and training to help people develop skills in using computers and broadband.<sup>14</sup>

## Broadband in Rural Areas<sup>15</sup>

While the number of new broadband subscribers continues to grow, the rate of broadband deployment in urban areas appears to be outpacing deployment in rural areas. While there are many examples of rural communities with state of the art telecommunications facilities,<sup>16</sup> recent surveys and studies have indicated that, in general, rural areas tend to lag behind urban and suburban areas in broadband deployment.

The National Broadband Map, which is composed of state broadband data and compiled by NTIA and the FCC, provides data on where broadband is and is not available. According to the latest National Broadband Map data, higher download speeds are less available to Americans in rural areas than in urban areas (see **Table 6**).

**Table 6. Broadband Availability, Rural vs. Urban Areas**  
% of population

Download speed	Nationwide	Urban	Rural
3 Mbps	99.8%	100%	98.7%
25 Mbps	86.7%	94.0%	54.6%
100 Mbps	65.1%	72.5%	32.3%

**Source:** NTIA and FCC, National Broadband Map, *Broadband Statistics Report: Broadband Availability in Urban vs. Rural Areas*, data as of June 2014, published March 2015,

<sup>13</sup> Government Accountability Office, *Intended Outcomes and Effectiveness of Efforts to Address Adoption Barriers Are Unclear*, GAO-15-473, June 2, 2015, p. 11, available at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/680/670588.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>15</sup> For more information on rural broadband and broadband programs at the Rural Utilities Service, see CRS Report RL33816, *Broadband Loan and Grant Programs in the USDA's Rural Utilities Service*, by (name redacted).

<sup>16</sup> See for example: National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA), *Trends: A Report on Rural Telecom Technology*, 20 p., available at [https://www.neca.org/Trends\\_Report.aspx](https://www.neca.org/Trends_Report.aspx).

Other data also indicate the disparity between urban and rural broadband. For example:

- According to 2015 survey data from the Pew Research Center, 67% of adults in urban areas said they have a high-speed broadband connection at home, as opposed to 55% of adults in rural areas.<sup>17</sup>
- According to the FCC's *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, there is a "significant disparity between rural and urban areas, with more than 39 percent of Americans living in rural areas lacking access to 25 Mbps/3 Mbps advanced telecommunications capability, as compared to 4 percent of Americans living in urban areas."<sup>18</sup>
- A study commissioned by the National Agricultural & Rural Development Policy Center noted a persistent 13 percentage point gap in broadband adoption between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas between 2003 and 2010.<sup>19</sup>
- The Department of Commerce report, *Exploring the Digital Nation: Embracing the Mobile Internet*, found that while the digital divide between urban and rural areas has lessened since 2007, it still persists with 75% of urban households adopting broadband service in 2012, compared to 63% of rural households.<sup>20</sup>

The comparatively lower population density of rural areas is likely the major reason why broadband is less deployed than in more highly populated suburban and urban areas. Particularly for wireline broadband technologies—such as cable modem and DSL—the greater the geographical distances among customers, the larger the cost to serve those customers. Thus, there is often less incentive for companies to invest in broadband in rural areas than, for example, in an urban area where there is more demand (more customers with perhaps higher incomes) and less cost to wire the market area.<sup>21</sup>

Some policymakers believe that disparities in broadband access across American society could have adverse consequences on those left behind, and that advanced telecommunications applications critical for businesses and consumers to engage in e-commerce are increasingly dependent on high-speed broadband connections to the Internet. Thus, some say, communities and individuals without access to broadband could be at risk to the extent that connectivity becomes a critical factor in determining future economic development and prosperity. A February 2006 study done by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce marked the first attempt to quantitatively measure the impact of broadband on economic growth. The study found that "between 1998 and 2002, communities in which mass-market broadband was available by December 1999

---

<sup>17</sup> *Home Broadband 2015*, p. 9.

<sup>18</sup> *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, pp. 33-34.

<sup>19</sup> Brian Whiteacre, Roberto Gallardo, and Sharon Strover, National Agricultural & Rural Development Policy Center, *Rural Broadband Availability and Adoption: Evidence, Policy Challenges, and Options*, March 2013, p. 13, available at [http://www.nardep.info/Broadband\\_2.html](http://www.nardep.info/Broadband_2.html).

<sup>20</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *Exploring the Digital Nation: Embracing the Mobile Internet*, October 2014, p. 16, available at [https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring\\_the\\_digital\\_nation\\_embracing\\_the\\_mobile\\_internet\\_10162014.pdf](https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring_the_digital_nation_embracing_the_mobile_internet_10162014.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> The terrain of rural areas can also be a hindrance to broadband deployment because it is more expensive to deploy broadband technologies in a mountainous or heavily forested area. An additional added cost factor for remote areas can be the expense of "backhaul" (e.g., the "middle mile") which refers to the installation of a dedicated line which transmits a signal to and from an Internet backbone which is typically located in or near an urban area.

experienced more rapid growth in employment, the number of businesses overall, and businesses in IT-intensive sectors, relative to comparable communities without broadband at that time.”<sup>22</sup>

A June 2007 report from the Brookings Institution found that for every one percentage point increase in broadband penetration in a state, employment is projected to increase by 0.2% to 0.3% per year. For the entire U.S. private non-farm economy, the study projected an increase of about 300,000 jobs.<sup>23</sup>

Subsequently, a July 2009 study commissioned by the Internet Innovation Alliance found net consumer benefits of home broadband on the order of \$32 billion per year, up from an estimated \$20 billion in consumer benefits from home broadband in 2005.<sup>24</sup>

## Broadband and the Federal Role

### Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) addressed the issue of whether the federal government should intervene to prevent a “digital divide” in broadband access. Section 706 requires the FCC to determine whether “advanced telecommunications capability [i.e., broadband or high-speed access] is being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion.”

Since 1999, the FCC has adopted and released 10 reports pursuant to Section 706. The first five reports formally concluded that the deployment of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans is reasonable and timely. Unlike the first five 706 reports, the sixth, seventh, eighth, tenth, and eleventh reports concluded that broadband is not being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion.<sup>25</sup>

A key factor in determining whether broadband is being deployed in a reasonable and timely fashion is how broadband service is defined with respect to download and upload speeds. In 2015 the FCC, in its tenth 706 report, raised the broadband threshold speed from 4 Mbps/1 Mbps to 25 Mbps/3 Mbps. This benchmark speed upgrade was controversial. The FCC argued that 25 Mbps/3 Mbps is reflective of advanced telecommunications capability, while many providers asserted that the new benchmark is too high, excessive, or aspirational.<sup>26</sup>

The FCC’s *2016 Broadband Progress Report* was adopted on January 28, 2016. According to the report:

We find that advanced telecommunications capability is not being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion.... [W]hile our efforts have helped increase

---

<sup>22</sup> Gillett, Sharon E., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, *Measuring Broadband’s Economic Impact*, report prepared for the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, February 28, 2006, p. 4.

<sup>23</sup> Crandall, Robert, William Lehr, and Robert Litan, *The Effects of Broadband Deployment on Output and Employment: A Cross-sectional Analysis of U.S. Data*, June 2007, 20 pp. Available at <http://www3.brookings.edu/views/papers/crandall/200706litan.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> Mark Dutz, Jonathan Orszag, and Robert Willig, *The Substantial Consumer Benefits of Broadband Connectivity for U.S. Households*, Internet Innovation Alliance, July 2009, p. 4, [http://internetinnovation.org/files/special-reports/CONSUMER\\_BENEFITS\\_OF\\_BROADBAND.pdf](http://internetinnovation.org/files/special-reports/CONSUMER_BENEFITS_OF_BROADBAND.pdf).

<sup>25</sup> An archive of notices of inquiry and released broadband progress reports are available at <https://www.fcc.gov/general/archive-released-broadband-progress-notices-inquiry>. The ninth notice of inquiry was concluded without releasing a report.

<sup>26</sup> See Federal Communications Commission, *2015 Broadband Progress Report*, FCC 15-10, February 4, 2015, pp. 29-34.

deployment, many Americans still lack access to advanced telecommunications capability, especially in rural areas and on Tribal lands. The disparity between advanced telecommunications capabilities available to rural and urban Americans persists. We also find that many schools, particularly those in rural areas, continue to lack access to advanced telecommunications capabilities, necessary to meet the shorter and long term goals we established for the E-rate program (more formally known as the Schools and Libraries universal service support program).... We find today that the availability of advanced telecommunications capability requires access to both fixed and mobile services.<sup>27</sup>

FCC Commissioner Michael O'Reilly issued a dissenting statement, maintaining that there is insufficient justification for the conclusion that broadband is not being deployed in a reasonable and timely fashion. According to the dissent, the data show "steady progress in connecting unserved Americans," with "the number of unserved Americans [dropping] from approximately 55 million (17 percent of the population) to approximately 34 million Americans (10 percent of the population) in just one year."<sup>28</sup> Commissioner Ajit Pai concurred with the FCC's report, but argued the finding that broadband is not being deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion is an indication that "this Administration's policies to encourage and accelerate broadband deployment over the last seven years just haven't worked."<sup>29</sup>

## The National Broadband Plan

As mandated by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), on March 16, 2010, the FCC released its report, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*.<sup>30</sup> The National Broadband Plan (NBP) sought to "create a high-performance America," which the FCC defined as "a more productive, creative, efficient America in which affordable broadband is available everywhere and everyone has the means and skills to use valuable broadband applications."<sup>31</sup> In order to achieve this mission, the NBP recommended that the country set six goals for 2020:

- Goal No. 1: At least 100 million U.S. homes should have affordable access to actual download speeds of at least 100 megabits per second and actual upload speeds of at least 50 megabits per second.
- Goal No. 2: The United States should lead the world in mobile innovation, with the fastest and most extensive wireless networks of any nation.
- Goal No. 3: Every American should have affordable access to robust broadband service, and the means and skills to subscribe if they so choose.
- Goal No. 4: Every American community should have affordable access to at least 1 gigabit per second broadband service to anchor institutions such as schools, hospitals, and government buildings.

---

<sup>27</sup> 2016 Broadband Progress Report, pp. 2-3.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 85.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 81.

<sup>30</sup> Available at <http://www.broadband.gov/plan/>. For more information on the National Broadband Plan, see CRS Report R41324, *The National Broadband Plan*, by (name redacted) et al.

<sup>31</sup> Federal Communications Commission, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*, March 17, 2010, p. 9.

- Goal No. 5: To ensure the safety of the American people, every first responder should have access to a nationwide, wireless, interoperable broadband public safety network.
- Goal No. 6: To ensure that America leads in the clean energy economy, every American should be able to use broadband to track and manage their real-time energy consumption.

The National Broadband Plan was categorized into three parts:

- **Part I (Innovation and Investment)**, which “discusses recommendations to maximize innovation, investment and consumer welfare, primarily through competition. It then recommends more efficient allocation and management of assets government controls or influences.”<sup>32</sup> The recommendations address a number of issues, including spectrum policy, improved broadband data collection, broadband performance standards and disclosure, special access rates, interconnection, privacy and cybersecurity, child online safety, poles and rights-of-way, research and experimentation (R&E) tax credits, and R&D funding.
- **Part II (Inclusion)**, which “makes recommendations to promote inclusion—to ensure that all Americans have access to the opportunities broadband can provide.”<sup>33</sup> Issues include reforming the Universal Service Fund, intercarrier compensation, federal assistance for broadband in tribal lands, expanding existing broadband grant and loan programs at the Rural Utilities Service, enabling greater broadband connectivity in anchor institutions, and improved broadband adoption and utilization especially among disadvantaged and vulnerable populations.
- **Part III (National Purposes)**, which “makes recommendations to maximize the use of broadband to address national priorities. This includes reforming laws, policies and incentives to maximize the benefits of broadband in areas where government plays a significant role.”<sup>34</sup> National purposes include health care, education, energy and the environment, government performance, civic engagement, and public safety. Issues include telehealth and health IT, online learning and modernizing educational broadband infrastructure, digital literacy and job training, smart grid and smart buildings, federal support for broadband in small businesses, telework within the federal government, cybersecurity and protection of critical broadband infrastructure, copyright of public digital media, interoperable public safety communications, next generation 911 networks, and emergency alert systems.

The release of the National Broadband Plan was seen by many as a precursor toward the development of a national broadband policy—whether comprehensive or piecemeal—that will likely be shaped and developed by Congress, the FCC, and the Administration.<sup>35</sup> Congress will likely play a major role in implementing the National Broadband Plan, both by considering

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> See for example, Office of Science and Technology Policy and National Economic Council, The White House, *Four Years of Broadband Growth*, June 2013, 26 pp., available at [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/broadband\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/broadband_report_final.pdf).



legislation to implement NBP recommendations, and by overseeing broadband activities conducted by the FCC and executive branch agencies.

## Federal Broadband Programs

With the conclusion of grant and loan awards established by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5),<sup>36</sup> there remain two ongoing major federal vehicles which direct federal money to fund broadband: the Universal Service Fund (USF) programs under the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the broadband and telecommunications programs at the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In September 2015, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration released a comprehensive *Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Projects*.<sup>37</sup> The guide provides a summary and contact information for a variety of federal programs that may fund projects involving broadband infrastructure, adoption, access, planning, or research. The guide is available at [http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/files/broadband\\_fed\\_funding\\_guide.pdf](http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/files/broadband_fed_funding_guide.pdf).

### The Universal Service Concept and the FCC<sup>38</sup>

Since its creation in 1934 the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been tasked with “mak[ing] available, so far as possible, to all the people of the United States ... a rapid, efficient, Nation-wide, and world-wide wire and radio communications service with adequate facilities at reasonable charges.”<sup>39</sup> This mandate led to the development of what has come to be known as the universal service concept.

The universal service concept, as originally designed, called for the establishment of policies to ensure that telecommunications services are available to all Americans, including those in rural, insular, and high cost areas, by ensuring that rates remain affordable. Over the years this concept has evolved and expanded, fostering the development of various FCC policies and programs that target both providers of and subscribers to telecommunications and, more recently, broadband services. Passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) codified the long-standing commitment by U.S. policymakers to ensure universal service in the provision of telecommunications services, and the FCC established, in 1997, a federal Universal Service Fund (USF) to meet the expanded objectives and principles contained in the act. The USF is administered by the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC), an independent not-for-profit organization, under the direction of the FCC. The USF is being transformed in stages, over a multi-year period, from a mechanism to support voice telecommunications services to one that supports the deployment, adoption, and utilization of both fixed and mobile broadband. The USF currently administers four programs: the High Cost/Connect America Fund Program, the Schools and Libraries Program, the Rural Health Care Program, and the Low Income Program. The USF

---

<sup>36</sup> See CRS Report R40436, *Broadband Infrastructure Programs in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act*, by (name redacted) .

<sup>37</sup> U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *BroadbandUSA: Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Projects*, September 2015, 28 pp.

<sup>38</sup> The section on universal service was prepared by Angele Gilroy, Specialist in Telecommunications, Resources, Science and Industry Division. For more information on universal service, see CRS Report RL33979, *Universal Service Fund: Background and Options for Reform*, by (name redacted) .

<sup>39</sup> Communications Act of 1934, As Amended, Title I §1 (47 U.S.C. 151).

approved for disbursement \$8.4 billion in 2015 with all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and all territories receiving some benefit.<sup>40</sup>

## Universal Service and Broadband

One of the major policy debates surrounding universal service in the last decade was whether access to advanced telecommunications services (i.e., broadband) should be incorporated into universal service objectives. The 1996 Telecommunications Act tasked the federal-state Joint Board with defining the services which should be included in the definition of services to be eligible for universal service support. The Joint Board's recommendation, which was adopted by the FCC in May 1997, largely limited the definition to voice telecommunications services. Some policymakers expressed concern that the FCC-adopted definition was too limited and did not take into account the importance and growing acceptance of advanced services such as broadband and Internet access. They pointed to a number of provisions contained in the universal service principles of the 1996 act to support their claim. Universal service principles contained in Section 254(b)(2) state that "Access to advanced telecommunications services should be provided to all regions of the Nation." The subsequent principle (b)(3) calls for consumers in all regions of the nation, including "low-income" and those in "rural, insular, and high cost areas," to have access to telecommunications and information services including "advanced services" at a comparable level and a comparable rate charged for similar services in urban areas. Such provisions, they state, dictate that the FCC expand its universal service definition.

The 1996 act does take into consideration the changing nature of the telecommunications sector and allows, if future conditions warrant, for the modification of the universal service definition. Section 254(c) of the act states that "universal service is an evolving level of telecommunications services" and that the FCC is tasked with "periodically" reevaluating this definition "taking into account advances in telecommunications and information technologies and services." Furthermore, the Joint Board is given specific authority to recommend "from time to time" to the FCC modification in the definition of the services to be included for federal universal service support. The Joint Board, on November 19, 2007, concluded such an inquiry and recommended that the FCC change the mix of services eligible for universal support. The Joint Board recommended, among other things, that "the universal availability of broadband Internet services" be included in the nation's communications goals and hence be supported by federal universal service funds.<sup>41</sup>

This debate was put to rest when provisions contained in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) called for the FCC to develop, and submit to Congress, a national broadband plan to ensure that every American has "access to broadband capability."<sup>42</sup> The FCC in its national broadband plan, *Connecting America: the National Broadband Plan*, recommended that access to and adoption of broadband be a national goal. Furthermore the national broadband plan proposed that the Universal Service Fund be restructured to become a vehicle to help reach this goal. The FCC, in an October 2011 decision, adopted an Order that calls

---

<sup>40</sup> 2015 Annual Report, *Universal Service Administrative Company*, p. 51. Total funding approved for disbursement for the months of January-December 2015. Available at [http://www.usac.org/\\_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf](http://www.usac.org/_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf).

<sup>41</sup> The Joint Board recommended that the definition of those services that qualify for universal service support be expanded and that the nation's communications goals include the universal availability of: mobility services (i.e., wireless); broadband Internet services; and voice services at affordable and comparable rates for all rural and non-rural areas. For a copy of this recommendation see [http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-07j-4A1.pdf](http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-07j-4A1.pdf).

<sup>42</sup> American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, P.L. 111-5, Section 6001 (k)(2)(D).



for the USF to be transformed, in stages, over a multi-year period, from a mechanism to support voice telephone service to one that supports the deployment, adoption, and utilization of both fixed and mobile broadband. This transformation includes the phaseout of the USF's legacy High Cost Program and the creation of a new fund, the Connect America Fund, to replace it as well as an expansion and modification of the Schools and Libraries, Rural Health Care programs, and the Low Income program.<sup>43</sup>

### ***The High Cost/Connect America Fund Program***

The High Cost Program provides support for eligible telecommunications carriers to help offset the higher-than-average costs of providing voice telephone service in rural, insular, or other high cost areas. This mechanism has been the largest USF program based on disbursements and has been particularly important to rural areas due to the lack of subscriber density often combined with higher costs. The High Cost Program is undergoing a transition from one that primarily supports voice communications to one that supports a broadband platform that enables multiple applications, including voice. The High Cost program is being phased out in stages and is being replaced by the Connect America Fund (CAF), which will support the provision of affordable voice and broadband services, both fixed and mobile, in high cost areas. The CAF, which contains a Mobility Fund and a Remote Areas Fund, will eventually replace all of the existing support mechanisms in the High Cost Program. According to data released by program administrators, from 1998 to 2015 a total of approximately \$64.1 billion in funding has been approved for disbursement.<sup>44</sup>

### ***The Schools and Libraries, and Rural Health Care Programs***

Congress, through the 1996 act, not only codified, but also expanded the concept of universal service to include, among other principles, that elementary and secondary schools and classrooms, libraries, and rural health care providers have access to telecommunications services for specific purposes at discounted rates. (See §§254(b)(6) and 254(h) of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, 47 U.S.C. 254.)

1. The Schools and Libraries (E-Rate) Program. Under universal service provisions contained in the 1996 act, elementary and secondary schools and classrooms and libraries are designated as beneficiaries of universal service discounts. Universal service principles detailed in Section 254(b)(6) state that “Elementary and secondary schools and classrooms ... and libraries should have access to advanced telecommunications services.” The act further requires in Section 254(h)(1)(B) that services within the definition of universal service be provided to elementary and secondary schools and libraries for education purposes at discounts, that is at “rates less than the amounts charged for similar services to other parties.”

The FCC established the Schools and Libraries Division within USAC to administer the schools and libraries or “E (education)-rate” program to comply with these provisions. Under this program, eligible schools and libraries receive discounts ranging from 20% to 90% for telecommunications services depending on the poverty level of the school's (or school district's) population and its location in a high cost (i.e., rural) telecommunications area. Two categories of

---

<sup>43</sup> For a detailed discussion of this Order and USF transition see CRS Report R42524, *Rural Broadband: The Roles of the Rural Utilities Service and the Universal Service Fund*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

<sup>44</sup> For additional information and data on this program see *2015 Annual Report, Universal Service Administrative Company*, available at [http://www.usac.org/\\_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf](http://www.usac.org/_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf).

services are eligible for discounts: category one services (telecommunications, telecommunications services, and Internet access), and category two services that deliver Internet access within schools and libraries (internal connections, basic maintenance of internal connections, and managed internal broadband services). The current funding year cap is \$3.9 billion. According to data released by program administrators, from 1998 to 2015 a total of approximately \$31.2 billion in funding has been approved for disbursement.<sup>45</sup>

2. The Rural Health Care Program. Section 254(h) of the 1996 act requires that public and nonprofit rural health care providers have access to telecommunications services necessary for the provision of health care services at rates comparable to those paid for similar services in urban areas. Subsection 254(h)(1) further specifies that “to the extent technically feasible and economically reasonable” health care providers should have access to advanced telecommunications and information services. The FCC established the Rural Health Care Division (RHCD) within USAC to administer the universal support program to comply with these provisions. The Rural Health Care Program provides funding through three programs: the Telecommunications Program, the Healthcare Connect Fund, and the rural Health Care Pilot Program. The goal of these programs is to improve the quality of healthcare for those living in rural areas by ensuring access to broadband and telecommunications services. Under FCC established rules only public or nonprofit health care providers are eligible to receive funding.

The Telecommunications Program, established in 1997, provides discounts for telecommunications services to ensure that eligible rural health care providers pay no more than urban providers for telecommunications services. The primary use of the funding is to provide reduced rates for telecommunications and information services necessary for the provision of health care.<sup>46</sup>

The Rural Health Care Pilot Program was established in 2006, to help public and nonprofit health care providers build state and region-wide broadband networks dedicated to the provision of health care services. The program provides funding up to 85% of eligible costs. No new funding is available under this program and current participants that need additional support will transfer to the most recently created program, the Healthcare Connect Fund.

The FCC in December 2012 created the Healthcare Connect Fund,<sup>47</sup> a program to expand health care provider access to broadband, particularly in rural areas, and replace the Rural Health Care Pilot Program with a permanent program. The Healthcare Connect Fund program supports high-capacity broadband connectivity and encourages the development of state and regional networks. This program provides a 65% discount on eligible expenses related to broadband connectivity and is available to individual rural health care providers and consortia. Consortia can include non-rural providers but at least 50% of providers must be located in a rural area.

The total annual funding cap for all of the above mentioned USF rural health care programs is \$400 million.<sup>48</sup> According to data released by program administrators, from 1998 to 2015 a total of approximately \$1.3 billion in funding has been approved for disbursement.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> For additional information and data on this program see *2015 Annual Report, Universal Service Administrative Company*, p. 49, available at [http://www.usac.org/\\_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf](http://www.usac.org/_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf).

<sup>46</sup> For additional information on this program see the RHCD website: <http://www.universalservice.org/rhc/>.

<sup>47</sup> The FCC also established, as part of the Healthcare Connect Fund, a pilot program, to expand broadband connections to skilled nursing facilities. However this program was never established and funding has been postponed indefinitely.

<sup>48</sup> For more details on the USF rural health care support mechanism and the Healthcare Connect Fund see *In the Matter of Rural Health Care Support Mechanism*, WC Docket No. 02-60, Federal Communications Commission, adopted (continued...)

### ***The Low Income Program***

As initially designed the Low Income Program provided a discount for voice telephony service for eligible low-income consumers. The Low Income program has two sub-programs, Lifeline and Link Up,<sup>50</sup> with the Lifeline Program providing the vast majority of support. The Lifeline Program traditionally supported access to either fixed or mobile voice services to assist eligible subscribers to cover the recurring monthly service charges associated with telephone subscribership. In most cases a monthly discount of \$9.25 for one connection, either wired or wireless, per eligible household is available.<sup>51</sup> Support is not given directly to the subscriber but to the designated service provider. On March 31, 2016, the FCC adopted an Order to, among other things, expand the scope of the Lifeline program to provide subsidies for broadband adoption. Citing the need to close the digital divide, the FCC voted (3-2) to extend Lifeline program subsidies to cover high-speed broadband access. The program will now be expanded to support mobile and fixed broadband Internet access services on a stand-alone basis, or with a bundled voice service. The FCC established a non-binding yearly funding ceiling of \$2.25 billion.<sup>52</sup>

### **Rural Utilities Service Programs**

RUS implements three programs specifically targeted at providing assistance for broadband infrastructure deployment in rural areas: the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program (also referred to as the Farm Bill Broadband Loans), the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loans and Loan Guarantees (previously the rural telephone loan program dating back to 1949), and the Community Connect Grant Program.<sup>53</sup> The 113<sup>th</sup> Congress reauthorized and reformed the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee program as part of the 2014 farm bill (P.L. 113-79 Agricultural Act of 2014). Additionally, RUS houses the Distance Learning and Telemedicine Grant Program, which supports broadband-based applications.

### **P.L. 111-5: The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009**

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed P.L. 111-5, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Broadband provisions of the ARRA provided a total of \$7.2 billion, for broadband grants, loans, and loan/grant combinations. The total consisted of \$4.7 billion to NTIA/DOC for a newly established Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (grants) and

---

(...continued)

December 12, 2012. Available at [http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-12-150A1.pdf](http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-12-150A1.pdf).

<sup>49</sup> For additional information and data on this program see *2015 Annual Report, Universal Service Administrative Company*, p. 48, available at [http://www.usac.org/\\_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf](http://www.usac.org/_res/documents/about/pdf/annual-reports/usac-annual-report-interactive-2015.pdf).

<sup>50</sup> The Link Up program assists eligible low-income subscribers to pay the costs associated with the initiation of telephone service and is no longer available except for on Tribal Lands.

<sup>51</sup> Tribal Lands Lifeline provides an additional discount of up to \$25 for eligible low-income consumers living on Tribal Lands for a total discount of up to \$34.25.

<sup>52</sup> For additional information on the Order see CRS Insight IN10470, *Federal Lifeline Program: Modernization and Reform*, by (name redacted) .

<sup>53</sup> For more information on these programs, see CRS Report RL33816, *Broadband Loan and Grant Programs in the USDA's Rural Utilities Service*, by (name redacted) .

\$2.5 billion to the RUS/USDA Broadband Initiatives Program (grants, loans, and grant/loan combinations).<sup>54</sup>

Regarding the \$2.5 billion to RUS/USDA broadband programs, the ARRA specified that at least 75% of the area to be served by a project receiving funds shall be in a rural area without sufficient access to high-speed broadband service to facilitate economic development, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Priority was given to projects that provide service to the most rural residents that do not have access to broadband services. Priority was also given to borrowers and former borrowers of rural telephone loans.

Of the \$4.7 billion appropriated to NTIA:

- \$4.35 billion was directed to a competitive broadband grant program, of which not less than \$200 million shall be available for competitive grants for expanding public computer center capacity (including at community colleges and public libraries); not less than \$250 million to encourage sustainable adoption of broadband service; and \$10 million transferred to the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General for audits and oversight; and
- \$350 million was directed for funding the Broadband Data Improvement Act (P.L. 110-385) and for the purpose of developing and maintaining a broadband inventory map, which shall be made accessible to the public no later than two years after enactment. Funds deemed necessary and appropriate by the Secretary of Commerce may be transferred to the FCC for the purposes of developing a national broadband plan, which shall be completed one year after enactment.

Final BTOP and BIP program awards were announced by September 30, 2010. With a few exceptions, all ARRA broadband projects were concluded as of September 30, 2015. For more information on implementation of the broadband provisions of the ARRA, see CRS Report R40436, *Broadband Infrastructure Programs in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act*, by (name redacted). For information on the distribution and oversight of ARRA broadband grants and loans, see CRS Report R41775, *Background and Issues for Congressional Oversight of ARRA Broadband Awards*, by (name redacted).

## **Other Federal Programs and Initiatives**

### **Broadband Opportunity Council**

On March 23, 2015, the President signed a Presidential Memorandum, “Expanding Broadband Deployment and Adoption by Addressing Regulatory Barriers and Encouraging Investment and Training.”<sup>55</sup> The memorandum established an interagency Broadband Opportunity Council (BOC) chaired by the Department of Commerce (DOC) and the USDA, and consisting of 25 other member agencies. The Council’s objectives were to engage with industry and other stakeholders to understand ways the government can better support the needs of communities seeking to expand broadband access and adoption; identify regulatory barriers unduly impeding broadband deployment, adoption, or competition; survey and report back on existing programs that currently support or could be modified to support broadband competition, deployment, or

---

<sup>54</sup> For information on existing broadband programs at RUS, see CRS Report RL33816, *Broadband Loan and Grant Programs in the USDA’s Rural Utilities Service*, by (name redacted).

<sup>55</sup> Available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/03/23/presidential-memorandum-expanding-broadband-deployment-and-adoption-addr>.

adoption; and take all necessary actions to remove these barriers and realign existing programs to increase broadband competition, deployment, and adoption. On April 29, 2015, DOC and USDA put out a notice and request for public comment in the *Federal Register*.<sup>56</sup>

On September 21, 2015, the Administration released the *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*.<sup>57</sup> In its report, the Council issued nine recommendations encompassing 36 immediate actions that federal agencies have committed to undertake. Each of the 36 immediate agency actions is accompanied by key milestones for completion. Most of these milestones occur during FY2016, with a few stretching into FY2017.

The Council recommendations emphasize actions that federal agencies can take under existing authority, and without additional appropriated funding. This encompasses such measures as making broadband projects eligible for funding from other existing federal grant and loan programs; modifying agency rules and regulations in order to maximize broadband-related uses of federal assets such as highways and federal lands; upgrading public dissemination of broadband information, data, and best practices; and researching new broadband technologies and applications.

## BroadbandUSA

BroadbandUSA is housed at the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). Using the expertise gained during administration of the ARRA Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP), BroadbandUSA program offers one-to-one technical assistance to communities seeking to plan and implement broadband initiatives. BroadbandUSA will leverage knowledge of federal funding and its network of contacts to help communities identify and leverage funding opportunities; provide support to communities seeking public-private partnerships; review, analyze, and provide recommendations and guidance associated with community-level reports, studies, and procurements; and provide background information and training to organizations that need assistance navigating the broadband landscape.<sup>58</sup> BroadbandUSA also organizes regional events and workshops bringing together broadband stakeholders and publishes guides and tools<sup>59</sup> that can serve as resources for communities seeking to launch broadband initiatives.

## HUD ConnectHome

On July 15, 2015, the White House announced a new Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) initiative with communities called ConnectHome. An initial pilot program is being launched in 27 cities and one tribal nation where regional and local partnerships will be built whereby Internet Service Providers, non-profits, and the private sector will offer broadband

---

<sup>56</sup> Department of Commerce and Department of Agriculture, "Broadband Opportunity Council Notice and Request for Comment," *Federal Register*, Vol. 80, No. 82, April 29, 2015, pp. 23785-23787, available at [http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/fr\\_boc\\_notice\\_and\\_rfc\\_4-29-15.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/fr_boc_notice_and_rfc_4-29-15.pdf).

<sup>57</sup> Department of Commerce and Department of Agriculture, *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*, August 20, 2015, available at [https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/broadband\\_opportunity\\_council\\_report\\_final.pdf](https://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/broadband_opportunity_council_report_final.pdf). For a summary of the BOC report, see CRS Insight IN10367, *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*, by (name redacted) .

<sup>58</sup> For more information on the types of technical assistance BroadbandUSA offers, see [http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/technical\\_assistance](http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/technical_assistance).

<sup>59</sup> See <http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/publications>.



access, technical training, digital literacy, programs, and devices for residents in assisted housing units.<sup>60</sup>

Additionally, as part of ConnectHome, HUD will pursue regulatory changes and modifications that promote broadband availability and adoption in public and assisted housing, including beginning a rulemaking process that requires HUD-funded new residential construction and substantial rehabilitation projects to support broadband Internet connectivity.<sup>61</sup>

### **Digital Literacy Initiative**

Using the experience gained running the BTOP program, NTIA created the web portal [DigitalLiteracy.gov](http://DigitalLiteracy.gov) in cooperation with the Department of Education and other federal agencies. The website is intended to serve as a resource to practitioners who are delivering digital literacy training and services in their communities. The portal “organizes content conveniently, enables valuable discussion and collaboration among users and elevates best practices to improve the quality of digital literacy offerings.”<sup>62</sup>

## **Legislation in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress**

The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress examined the efficacy of federal broadband assistance programs and how they may fit into the context of a national broadband policy. Enacted legislation included:

P.L. 112-10. Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011. Rescinds existing unobligated past-year funding for the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program and the Community Connect Grants at the Rural Utilities Service. For FY2011, appropriates \$22.3 million to the Rural Broadband Access Loan and Loan Guarantee Program for the cost of broadband loans, and \$13.4 million to Community Connect Grants. Signed by President, April 15, 2011.

P.L. 112-55. Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012. Provides FY2012 appropriations for Rural Utilities Service broadband loan program and broadband community connect grants: \$6 million for the broadband loan program (subsidizing a loan level of \$212 million) and \$10.372 million for Community Connect grants. Introduced June 3, 2011; referred to Committee on Appropriations. Reported by Committee on Appropriations June 3, 2011 (H.Rept. 112-101). Passed House June 16, 2011. Reported by Senate Appropriations Committee September 7, 2011 (S.Rept. 112-73). Signed by President, November 18, 2011.

## **Legislation in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress**

Enacted legislation directly related to the issue of federal assistance for broadband deployment in unserved areas included:

---

<sup>60</sup> The White House, *Fact Sheet*, “Connect Home: Coming Together to Ensure Digital Opportunity for All Americans,” July 15, 2015, available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/07/15/fact-sheet-connecthome-coming-together-ensure-digital-opportunity-all>.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> See <http://www.digitalliteracy.gov/about>.

P.L. 113-6. Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013. Funds the broadband loan program at \$4 million (supporting a loan level of approximately \$42 million) and the Community Connect grant program at \$10.372 million. Signed by President March 26, 2013.

P.L. 113-79. Agricultural Act of 2014. Reauthorizes the broadband loan and loan guarantee program through FY2018 at \$25 million per year. Signed by President February 7, 2014.

P.L. 113-235. Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015. Provides \$4.5 million to subsidize a broadband loan level of \$24.077 million, and \$10.372 million to Community Connect broadband grants. Signed by President December 16, 2014.

## **Legislation in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress**

The following is a listing of introduced and enacted broadband legislation directly related to the issue of federal assistance for broadband deployment in unserved areas.

P.L. 114-94. Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. Section 1436 authorizes \$10 million per year through FY2020 for a high-speed broadband development initiative conducted by the Appalachian Regional Development Program of the Appalachian Regional Commission. Signed by President December 4, 2015.

P.L. 114-113. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. Provides \$4.5 million to subsidize a broadband loan level of \$20.576 million, and \$10.372 million to Community Connect broadband grants. Signed by President December 18, 2015.

H.R. 266 (Scott, A.). End Taxpayer Funded Cell Phones Act of 2015. Prohibits universal service support of commercial mobile service and commercial mobile data service through the Federal Communications Commission Lifeline program. Introduced January 9, 2015; referred to Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2410 (DeFazio). GROW America Act. Establishes a Broadband Infrastructure Deployment program at the Department of Transportation to expand the use of rights-of-way on federal-aid highways to accommodate broadband infrastructure. Introduced May 19, 2015; referred to multiple committees.

H.R. 2638 (Matsui). Broadband Adoption Act of 2015. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to reform and modernize the Universal Service Fund Lifeline Assistance Program. Introduced June 3, 2015; referred to Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3049 (Aderholt). Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016. Provides \$5.265 million to subsidize a loan level of \$24.077 million for the broadband loan program and \$10.372 million for the Community Connect grant program. Introduced July 14, 2015; reported by House Committee on Appropriations (H.Rept. 114-205).

H.R. 3064 (Van Hollen). GROW America Act. Establishes a Broadband Infrastructure Deployment program at the Department of Transportation to expand the use of rights-of-way on federal-aid highways to accommodate broadband infrastructure. Introduced July 15, 2015; referred to multiple committees.

H.R. 3152 (Nolan). Rural Broadband Initiative Act. Would amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to establish an Office of Rural Broadband within the USDA. The new office would administer all rural broadband-related grant and loan programs previously administered by the RUS. Introduced July 22, 2015; referred to Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3337 (DeLauro). National Infrastructure Development Bank Act of 2015. Includes broadband and telecommunications projects as eligible for financing under a newly established national Infrastructure Development Bank. Introduced July 29, 2015; referred to multiple committees.

H.R. 3805 (Eshoo). Broadband Conduit Deployment Act of 2015. Provides for the inclusion of broadband conduit installation in certain highway construction projects. Introduced October 22, 2015; referred to Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 4111 (Lance). Rural Health Care Connectivity Act of 2015. Includes skilled nursing facilities as a type of health care provider under Section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934. Introduced on November 19, 2015; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4160 (Huffman). Rural Broadband Infrastructure Investment Act. Would amend Section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) to establish a broadband grant program to accompany the Rural Broadband Loan program. The bill would also make changes to the Telecommunications Infrastructure Loan and Loan Guarantee program—specifically raising the threshold for an eligible rural area from 5,000 to 20,000 population, and permitting USDA to give preference to loan applications that support regional telecommunications development. Introduced on December 2, 2015; referred to Committee on Agriculture and Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4884 (Scott, Austin). Controlling the Unchecked and Reckless Ballooning of Lifeline Act of 2016. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to place an annual cap, beginning with calendar year 2017, of no more than \$1.5 billion for the Lifeline program; prohibits Lifeline program support for voice-only mobile service two years after the date of enactment; prohibits, beginning on the date of enactment, Lifeline program support for the provision of a mobile telephone or a similar device. Introduced March 23, 2016; referred to Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 56 (Vitter). Ending Mobile Phone Welfare Act of 2015. Prohibits a provider of commercial mobile service from receiving universal service support under the Federal Communications Commission Lifeline program. Introduced on January 7, 2015; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 268 (Sanders). Rebuild America Act of 2015. Would appropriate \$2.5 billion per year through FY2019 for the broadband initiatives program established under title VI of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb et seq.) to expand the access and quality of broadband service across the rural United States. Introduced on January 27, 2015; referred to Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

S. 734 (Ayotte). USF Equitable Distribution Act of 2015. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to require that not less than 75% of all amounts collected by providers of interstate telecommunications from consumers in a rural state for the purpose of making contributions to preserve and advance universal service shall be allocated to the provision of universal service in that rural state. Introduced on March 12, 2015; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1472 (Murphy). Broadband Adoption Act of 2015. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to reform and modernize the Universal Service Fund Lifeline Assistance Program. Introduced June 1, 2015; referred to Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 1621 (Vitter). Ending Mobile and Broadband Welfare Act of 2015. Prohibits universal service support of commercial mobile service and Internet access service through the Lifeline program. Introduced June 18, 2015; referred to Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.



S. 1800 (Moran). Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016. Provides \$4.5 million to subsidize a loan level of \$20.576 million for the broadband loan program, and \$10.372 million for the Community Connect grant program. Introduced July 16, 2015; reported by Senate Committee on Appropriations (S.Rept. 114-82).

S. 1916 (Thune). Rural Health Care Connectivity Act of 2015. Includes skilled nursing facilities as a type of health care provider under Section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934. Introduced August 3, 2015; ordered to be reported, without amendment, by Senate Commerce Committee on November 18, 2015.

S. 2116 (Shaheen). Small Business Broadband and Emerging Information Technology Enhancement Act of 2015. Seeks to improve certain programs of the Small Business Administration to better assist small business customers in accessing broadband technology. Introduced October 1, 2015; referred to Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

S. 2163 (Klobuchar). Directs the Secretary of Transportation to require that broadband conduits be installed as a part of certain highway construction projects. Also streamlines telecommunications facilities deployment on federal lands and properties. Introduced October 7, 2015; referred to Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## Concluding Observations

To the extent that Congress may consider various options for encouraging broadband deployment and adoption, a key issue is how to strike a balance between providing federal assistance for unserved and underserved areas where the private sector may not be providing acceptable levels of broadband service, while at the same time minimizing any deleterious effects that government intervention in the marketplace may have on competition and private sector investment.

In addition to loans, loan guarantees, and grants for broadband infrastructure deployment, a wide array of policy instruments are available to policymakers, including universal service reform, tax incentives to encourage private sector deployment, broadband bonds, demand-side incentives (such as assistance to low-income families for purchasing computers), regulatory and deregulatory measures, and spectrum policy to spur roll-out of wireless broadband services. In assessing federal incentives for broadband deployment, Congress may consider the appropriate mix of broadband deployment incentives to create jobs in the short and long term, the extent to which incentives should target next-generation broadband technologies, the extent to which “underserved” areas with existing broadband providers should receive federal assistance, and whether broadband stimulus projects are being efficiently managed and how they may fit into the context of overall goals for a national broadband policy.

## Author Contact Information

(name redacted)  
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy  
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov....

(name redacted)  
Specialist in Telecommunications Policy  
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov....

## EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.