September 16, 2013

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St. SW, Room TW-A325
Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 13-184; FCC 13-100

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On behalf of the undersigned members of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (“The Leadership Conference”), we write to offer our comments on the Federal Communications Commission’s (“the Commission”) proposed modernization of E-Rate.

The Leadership Conference is a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 200 national organizations to promote and protect the rights of all persons in the United States. The Leadership Conference’s Media/Telecommunications Task Force is committed to ensuring that all communities, particularly those that are underserved, have access to essential telecommunications services, including high-capacity broadband. Without access to high-speed Internet at schools, libraries, and in the home, children in the communities we represent will be left further and further behind.

A more detailed discussion of our views is set forth below, but in brief, we urge the Commission to:

- Modernize and fully fund E-rate to provide high-capacity broadband to underserved communities.
- Protect funding for the neediest schools.
- Proceed cautiously in any phase-out of eligible services.
- Protect broadband access at home while ensuring access for schools and libraries.
- Allow schools, especially those who receive the highest discount rates, the flexibility to provide hotspot services to surrounding students and other residents.

At the outset, we emphasize our strong support for President Obama’s ConnectED initiative. We agree that a modernized and fully funded E-Rate program would be a crucial step in realizing his vision of providing 99 percent of all American students with access to next generation, high-capacity broadband services and high-speed wireless.

It is an ambitious and necessary endeavor. As President Obama said when announcing the initiative, “We are living in a digital age, and to help our students get ahead, we must make sure they have access to cutting-edge technology.” And, as Commissioner Rosenworcel noted in support of the initiative, “[i]t is time to answer the President’s call to upgrade the E-Rate program for the 21st Century. It is time for E-Rate 2.0.” We wholeheartedly agree.

We further agree with the president and the Commission that high-capacity broadband is
transforming education. It provides students, teachers and parents with new individualized and interactive learning opportunities and innovative analytical tools to track student progress. It also enables high-quality distance learning for resource-strapped rural and low income schools and districts. But these benefits require proper broadband capacity, and we share the Commission’s concern over survey results suggesting that only 1 in 10 schools and libraries enjoy minimally robust capacity.

A failure to modernize E-Rate will further entrench the digital divide. For many of our under-represented and underserved communities, high-capacity broadband access at schools and libraries is absolutely essential for educational, economic, and health attainment, and reducing the number of technological “have-nots” in America. Unfortunately, under the current state of the program, demand is far outstripping available funding, certain inefficiencies may be artificially limiting available resources, and a lack of technological neutrality may be depriving certain schools of funding for important services.

We agree with commenters who suggest adopting a technology neutral policy that would allow schools and libraries the flexibility to determine how best to allocate their E-Rate funding among various services. The primary problem driving underfunding is demand that greatly exceeds the cap. We emphasize that funding for the neediest schools should not be jeopardized.

We urge the Commission to proceed cautiously in any phase-out of eligible services. Our repeated experience within the civil rights community has been that low-income and minority Americans tend to be later adopters of advanced technology. This would be all the more true in many under-resourced rural or low-income schools, or schools that serve predominantly children of color. The Commission should be attentive to comments suggesting that certain ostensibly “outdated” services do in fact still serve important educational purposes.

Additionally, while we support increasing the E-Rate funding cap, we note that education takes place at schools, libraries, and at home. The Commission is already working on expanding Lifeline to include support for broadband, and it must ensure it can achieve both goals. Lifeline-supported broadband would provide crucial Internet connectivity for students at home, who increasingly need to use the Internet for assignments. Expanding access at school while cutting access to broadband at home would be deeply counterproductive.

We urge the Commission to focus on increasing efficiencies in E-Rate and identify where E-Rate funding may be duplicative of other subsidies, but we counsel strong caution in repurposing Lifeline savings. The Commission should remember that the Lifeline program remains woefully undersubscribed, and thus, if it were to reach its full potential, all of the Lifeline savings resulting from recent reforms will be needed for the Lifeline program. We also continue to oppose any cap on the Lifeline program, and one should not be imposed to provide additional funds to increase the E-Rate cap.

Finally, we very much support the proposal to allow schools to provide wireless hotspot services both on school grounds after hours and in surrounding communities. Allowing schools, especially those who receive the highest discount rates, the flexibility to provide hotspot services to surrounding students and other residents would prove a formidable and innovative tool to further combat the broadband access and adoption gap.

We look forward to working with the Commission as this important review and update of the E-Rate program continues. Please contact Leadership Conference Media/Telecommunications Task Force Co-Chairs Cheryl Leanza, United Church of Christ, OC Inc., at 202-841-6033; Gabe Rottman, American
Civil Liberties Union, at 202-675-2325; or Corrine Yu, Leadership Conference Managing Policy Director, at 202-466-5670, if you would like to discuss the above issues or any other issues of importance to The Leadership Conference.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union
Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC
Common Cause
Communications Workers of America (CWA)
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
NAACP
National Consumer Law Center, on behalf of its low-income clients
National Hispanic Media Coalition
NCLR
United Church of Christ, OC Inc.

---
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