

Tribal Broadband: Status of Deployment and Federal Funding Programs

(name redacted)

Specialist in Science and Technology Policy

March 10, 2016

Congressional Research Service

7-....

www.crs.gov

R44416

Summary

Tribal areas and communities continue to lag behind other areas and segments of American society with respect to broadband and telecommunications services. High poverty rates and low income levels in tribal lands—along with the fact that many tribal communities are located in remote rural areas (often with rugged terrain)—are major factors that may explain why tribal areas have comparatively poor levels of broadband access, and why providers may lack an economic incentive to serve those areas.

Until recently, data on tribal broadband deployment had been scarce. However, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) have begun to collect and compile data on tribal broadband deployment. The most recent data show that, as of December 31, 2014, approximately 41% of Americans living on tribal lands lacked access to broadband at speeds of 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload. This compares unfavorably to 10% of all Americans lacking access to broadband at those speeds. Tribal areas that are the most lacking in broadband service are rural Alaskan villages and rural tribal lands in the lower 48 states.

Because the presence of robust broadband and improved digital connectivity in tribal areas could play a significant role in revitalizing many tribal communities, the federal government continues to provide some financial assistance to tribal lands for broadband deployment. The Government Accountability Office, in its 2016 report, *Challenges to Assessing and Improving Telecommunications for Native Americans on Tribal Lands*, identified programs in two federal agencies that serve as the primary source of funding for deploying broadband infrastructure in tribal lands and communities. These federal agencies are the FCC and the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Tribal entities and projects are eligible for virtually all federal broadband programs. With a few exceptions, however, there are no carve-outs or dedicated funding streams specifically for tribal applicants or non-tribal entities proposing to serve tribal lands. Thus, annual amounts of federal financial assistance vary depending on the number and quality of tribal-related applications received, and the number of tribal-related broadband awards made by the funding agencies.

Debate has centered on whether federal funding for tribal broadband is sufficient, and the extent to which portions of federal funds available for broadband should be specifically targeted for tribal broadband. In the 114th Congress, while there is no legislation that exclusively addresses federal funding for tribal broadband, there are a number of bills that address federal funding for broadband generally. Notwithstanding whether federal broadband funding programs target tribal lands, whether or not tribal lands will receive additional funding for broadband will likely be determined by the ongoing trajectory of overall federal funding for broadband.

Contents

Background	1
Status of Tribal Broadband	2
Federal Funding for Tribal Broadband	5
FCC	6
High Cost/Connect America Fund Program	6
Schools and Libraries (E-Rate) Program	6
Rural Health Care Program/Healthcare Connect Fund	7
RUS Broadband Funding Programs	7
Community Connect Grant Program	7
Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program	7
Stimulus Broadband Grants and Loans	8
Other Federal Funding Programs	8
Broadband Opportunity Council Recommendations	9
Concluding Observations	10

Tables

Table 1. Americans Without Access to Fixed Broadband.....	3
Table 2. Tribal Lands Without Access to Fixed Broadband	3
Table 3. Tribal Lands Without Access to Fixed Broadband by State	4
Table 4. Fixed Broadband Adoption Rates, 2012-2014.....	5

Contacts

Author Contact Information	11
----------------------------------	----

Background

Broadband—whether delivered via fiber, cable modem, copper wire, satellite, or wirelessly—is increasingly the technology underlying telecommunications services such as voice, video, and data.¹ Since the initial deployment of high-speed Internet in the late 1990s, broadband technologies have been deployed primarily by the private sector throughout the United States. While the number of new broadband subscribers continues 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.² In particular, tribal communities stand out as being among the most unserved or underserved populations with respect to broadband deployment.

According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), “[b]y virtually any measure, communities on tribal lands have historically had less access to telecommunications services than any other segment of the population.”³ According to Census data, about 28.3% of Native Americans live in households below the poverty level (compared to 15.5% nationally), and tribal communities often lack basic infrastructure such as water and sewer systems, and telecommunications.⁴

High poverty rates and low income levels in tribal lands—along with the fact that many tribal communities are located in remote rural areas (often with rugged terrain)—are major factors that explain why tribal areas have comparatively poor levels of broadband access, and why providers may lack an economic incentive to serve those areas. According to the FCC’s Office of Native Affairs and Policy (ONAP):

Understanding the complexity of the digital divide in Indian Country requires an appreciation of the unique challenges facing Tribal Nations, which include deployment, adoption, affordability, and access to spectrum, as well as lack of investment dollars and access to credit and start-up or gap financing. Barriers to the deployment of communications services include rural, remote, rugged terrain, areas that are not connected to a road system, and difficulty in obtaining rights-of-way to deploy infrastructure across some Tribal lands—all of which increase the cost of installing, maintaining, and upgrading infrastructure. Affordability of communications services is affected by often endemic levels of poverty. Because Tribal Nations cannot easily collateralize assets that are held in trust by the federal government, and cannot easily access investment dollars, the ability to obtain credit and financing is limited.⁵

¹ The term “broadband” is typically used interchangeably with “high speed Internet” or “advanced telecommunications.” Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) defined advanced telecommunications capability as “high-speed, switched, broadband telecommunications capability that enables users to originate and receive high-quality voice, data, graphics, and video telecommunications using any technology.”

² See for example Federal Communications Commission, *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, FCC 16-6, released January 29, 2016, available at <https://www.fcc.gov/document/fcc-releases-2016-broadband-progress-report>. Also see John B. Horrigan and Maeve Duggan, Pew Research Center, *Home Broadband 2015*, December 21, 2015, available at <http://www.pewinternet.org/files/2015/12/Broadband-adoption-full.pdf>.

³ Federal Communications Commission, “In the Matter of Extending Wireless Telecommunications Services to Tribal Lands,” *Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, WT Docket No. 99-266, FCC 00-209, Adopted June 8, 2000, p. 5, available at <http://wireless.fcc.gov/auctions/general/releases/fc000209.pdf>.

⁴ Government Accountability Office, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, GAO-16-222, January 2016, p. 5, available at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/680/674906.pdf>.

⁵ Federal Communications Commission, Office of Native Affairs and Policy, *2012 Annual Report*, released March 19, 2013, p.7, available at <http://transition.fcc.gov/cgb/onap/ONAP-AnnualReport03-19-2013.pdf>.

The presence of robust broadband and improved digital connectivity in tribal areas could play a significant role in revitalizing many tribal communities. The FCC's 2010 National Broadband Plan⁶ identified broadband as a basic infrastructure necessary for improving economic growth, job creation, global competitiveness, and a better way of life. According to ONAP, "[t]he lack of robust communications services presents serious impediments to Tribal Nations' efforts to preserve their cultures and build their internal structures for self-governance, economic opportunity, health, education, public safety, and welfare."⁷

Status of Tribal Broadband

Until recently, data on tribal broadband has been scarce. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted in 2006 that "[t]he rate of Internet subscribership for Native American households on tribal lands is unknown because neither the Census Bureau nor FCC collects this data at the tribal level."⁸

The FCC and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) have begun to collect and compile data on tribal broadband deployment.⁹ The most recent data are available in the FCC's *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, which has data on fixed (non-wireless) broadband availability and adoption in tribal lands.¹⁰ According to the FCC, as of December 31, 2014, approximately 41% of Americans living on tribal lands¹¹ lacked access to broadband at speeds of 25 Mbps download/3 Mbps upload.¹² This is an improvement over 2013 data (63% without broadband) and 2012 data (68%).¹³

Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of Americans without fixed broadband service with respect to tribal lands and the United States as a whole. In particular, the data show a significant gap between rural tribal lands (68% of population without broadband) versus urban tribal lands (14% without broadband).

⁶ Federal Communications Commission, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*, March 2010, 360 pages, available at <https://transition.fcc.gov/national-broadband-plan/national-broadband-plan.pdf>.

⁷ FCC, Office of Native Affairs and Policy, *2012 Annual Report*, p. 6.

⁸ Government Accountability Office, *Challenges to Assessing and Improving Telecommunications for Native Americans on Tribal Lands*, GAO-06-189, January 2006, p.4, available at <http://www.gao.gov/assets/250/248920.pdf>.

⁹ According to GAO, the Census Bureau began collecting Internet adoption data beginning in 2013. Five years of these data are required to accurately profile areas with small populations. Data will be released in late 2018, and will contain an estimate for Internet adoption in Native American populations. See GAO, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, p. 25.

¹⁰ Broadband availability refers to whether or not broadband service is offered, while broadband adoption refers to the extent to which American households actually subscribe to and use broadband.

¹¹ The FCC assessed census blocks that have been identified by the Census Bureau as federally recognized tribal lands for the 2010 Census. For more information, see *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, pp. 64-65.

¹² FCC, *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, p. 34.

In 2015, the FCC raised its minimum broadband benchmark speed from 4 Mbps/1 Mbps to 25 Mbps/3 Mbps. The level at which the minimum broadband threshold speed should be set has been controversial, see CRS Insight IN10438, *Is Broadband Deployment Reasonable and Timely?*, by (name redacted) .

¹³ FCC, *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, p. 39.

Table 1. Americans Without Access to Fixed Broadband
(25 Mbps/3 Mbps)

	Population	Percentage of Population
United States	33,982,000	10%
- Rural Areas	23,430,000	39%
- Urban Areas	10,552,000	4%
Tribal Lands	1,574,000	41%
- Rural Areas	1,291,000	68%
- Urban Areas	283,000	14%

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, p. 34.

Table 2 shows broadband availability within the various categories of tribal lands. Areas that are the most lacking in broadband service are rural Alaskan villages and rural tribal lands in the lower 48 states. **Table 3** shows tribal lands without access to fixed broadband by state.

Table 2. Tribal Lands Without Access to Fixed Broadband
(25 Mbps/3 Mbps)

	Population	Percentage of Population
Tribal Lands	1,573,925	41%
- Rural Areas	1,291,330	68%
- Urban Areas	282,595	14%
Alaskan Villages	128,638	49%
- Rural Areas	113,706	70%
- Urban Areas	14,932	15%
Hawaiian Home Lands	367	1%
- Rural Areas	307	7%
- Urban Areas	60	0%
Tribal Lands in the Lower 48 States	588,324	58%
- Rural Areas	469,818	72%
- Urban Areas	118,506	33%
Tribal Statistical Areas	856,596	34%
- Rural Areas	707,499	66%
- Urban Areas	149,097	10%

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, p. 35.

Table 3. Tribal Lands Without Access to Fixed Broadband by State
(25 Mbps/3 Mbps)

	Population Without Access	% of Population on Tribal Lands
All Tribal Lands	1,573,925	41%
Tribal Lands in the Lower 48 States and an Alaskan Reservation	588,324	58%
Alabama	188	67%
Alaska	1,375	100%
Arizona	162,382	95%
California	29,052	51%
Colorado	11,875	87%
Connecticut	119	36%
Florida	1,762	51%
Idaho	27,666	95%
Iowa	126	13%
Kansas	4,955	100%
Louisiana	725	95%
Maine	1,310	52%
Massachusetts	2	2%
Michigan	4,265	13%
Minnesota	12,047	33%
Mississippi	2,895	38%
Montana	40,944	65%
Nebraska	6,393	85%
Nevada	7,563	72%
New Mexico	108,604	80%
New York	5,472	41%
North Carolina	8,910	99%
North Dakota	19,295	80%
Oklahoma	36,739	42%
Oregon	5,517	64%
South Dakota	19,261	32%
Texas	615	32%
Utah	24,919	78%
Washington	17,104	13%
Wisconsin	13,042	33%
Wyoming	13,202	48%

	Population Without Access	% of Population on Tribal Lands
Tribal Statistical Areas	856,596	34%
California	54	2%
New York	1,168	46%
Oklahoma	855,350	34%
Washington	24	0%
Alaskan Villages	128,638	49%
Hawaiian Home Lands	367	1%

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, pp. 72-73.

Finally, **Table 4** shows 2012-2014 fixed broadband adoption rates for tribal lands and the United States as a whole. Broadband adoption in this table reflects the percentage of households that actually subscribe to broadband service offering speeds of at least 25 Mbps/3 Mbps. While broadband adoption in tribal lands has risen significantly since 2012, it should be noted that adoption rates in tribal lands declined by 5% between 2013 and 2014.

Table 4. Fixed Broadband Adoption Rates, 2012-2014
(25 Mbps/3 Mbps)

	2014	2013	2012
United States	37%	29%	11%
- Non-Urban Core Areas	33%	28%	11%
- Urban Core Areas	40%	30%	11%
Tribal Lands	28%	33%	7%
- Non-Urban Core Areas	25%	29%	7%
- Urban Core Areas	33%	36%	7%

Source: FCC, 2016 Broadband Progress Report, p. 46.

Federal Funding for Tribal Broadband

A precise accounting of federal funding for tribal broadband is problematic. A comprehensive listing of all federal funding programs for broadband is found in the publication, *Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Projects*, compiled by NTIA.¹⁴ Tribal entities or projects are eligible for virtually all of these programs; but with a few exceptions,¹⁵ there are no carve-outs or dedicated funding streams *specifically* for tribal applicants or non-tribal entities proposing to serve tribal lands. Thus, annual amounts of federal financial assistance vary depending on the number and

¹⁴ U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *BroadbandUSA: Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Projects*, September 2015, 28 p., available at http://www2.ntia.doc.gov/files/broadband_fed_funding_guide.pdf.

¹⁵ Most notably, the Tribal Mobility Fund, which is part of the FCC's Universal Service/Connect America Fund.

quality of tribal-related applications received, and the number of tribal-related broadband awards made by the funding agencies. Compounding the challenge in assessing federal funding for tribal broadband, some programs may not formally track funding to tribal areas, making it difficult to come up with an accurate overall number from year to year.

The Government Accountability Office, in its 2016 report, *Challenges to Assessing and Improving Telecommunications for Native Americans on Tribal Lands*, identified programs in two federal agencies that serve as the primary source of funding for deploying broadband infrastructure in tribal lands and communities. These federal agencies are the FCC and the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

FCC

The FCC has established a Universal Service Fund (USF) which provides financial support to ensure that telecommunications services are available to all Americans.¹⁶ The USF currently administers four programs: the High Cost/Connect America Fund Program; the Schools and Libraries Program; the Rural Health Care Program/Health Connect Fund; and the Low Income Program.¹⁷ In its report, GAO identified three of those programs as subsidizing telecommunications carriers providing broadband to areas that include tribal lands.

High Cost/Connect America Fund Program

The High Cost Fund Program, which is transitioning into the Connect America Fund (CAF), provides subsidies to telecommunications providers offering broadband in rural areas. According to GAO, “the High Cost and Connect America Fund distributed about \$20 billion in subsidies to providers between 2010 and 2014, portions of which went to providers that serve tribal lands.”¹⁸ Of the total, GAO was unable to determine the amount of funding that went to tribal lands.

As part of the CAF, the FCC established a Mobility Fund which consists of two phases. Phase I of the Mobility Fund (\$300 million) includes \$50 million for a Tribal Mobility Fund to extend wireless voice and broadband infrastructure into tribal lands. On February 28, 2014, the FCC announced completion of the Tribal Mobility Fund Phase I auction, with five wireless providers becoming eligible to receive a total of up to approximately \$50 million in one-time support. Since July 2014, \$16.6 million in initial disbursements have been made.¹⁹ As yet unscheduled, Phase II of the Mobility Fund (\$500 million per year) will designate \$100 million per year for Phase II of the Tribal Mobility Fund.

Schools and Libraries (E-Rate) Program

The E-rate Program subsidizes discounts to providers offering telecommunications services, Internet access, and internal connections to schools and libraries. According to the GAO report, “the E-rate program provided about \$13 billion in discounts to schools and libraries between 2010

¹⁶ For more information on the USF, see CRS Report RL30719, *Broadband Internet Access and the Digital Divide: Federal Assistance Programs*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted) .

¹⁷ The Low Income Program (which includes the Lifeline and Link-Up programs) subsidizes telephone service for low-income residents, including those in tribal lands. Currently, the FCC is considering how to modernize the Lifeline program in order to re-orient it towards broadband services.

¹⁸ GAO, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, p. 17.

¹⁹ FCC, *2016 Broadband Progress Report*, p. 55.

and 2014, portions of which went to schools and libraries on tribal lands.”²⁰ Of that total, “at least \$1 billion of that amount supports tribal institutions.”²¹

Rural Health Care Program/Healthcare Connect Fund

The Rural Health Care Support Mechanism provides discounts to rural care providers for broadband connectivity. According to GAO, “[a]lthough the Healthcare Connect Fund does not specifically target tribal institutions, assistance may be provided to a service provider (or group of providers) that serve tribal lands.”²² The Healthcare Connect Fund provided \$52 million in 2014, “a portion of which went to tribal lands.”²³

RUS Broadband Funding Programs

The Rural Utilities Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture maintains a portfolio of programs to finance broadband deployment and infrastructure in rural areas.²⁴ GAO identified two RUS grant programs that provide funding for tribal broadband: the Community Connect Grant Program and the Distance Learning and Telemedicine (DLT) Program.

Community Connect Grant Program

The Community Connect Program²⁵ provides grant money to applicants proposing to provide broadband on a “community-oriented connectivity” basis to currently unserved rural areas. Federally-recognized tribes are eligible to apply for Community Connect grants. According to the GAO report, “the Community Connect program provided about \$53 million in grants between 2010 and 2014, almost \$3 million of which went to tribal lands.”²⁶ Additionally, \$6 million was awarded for tribal broadband in 2015.²⁷

Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program

Distance Learning and Telemedicine (DLT) grants²⁸ serve as initial capital assets for equipment (e.g., video conferencing equipment, computers) that operate via telecommunications to rural end-users of telemedicine and distance learning. Federally-recognized tribes are eligible to apply for DLT grants. According to GAO, “the Distance Learning and Telemedicine program provided about \$128 million in grants and loans between 2010 and 2014, almost \$3 million of which went

²⁰ GAO, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, p. 17.

²¹ Ibid., p. 27.

²² Ibid., p. 17.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ See CRS Report RL33816, *Broadband Loan and Grant Programs in the USDA’s Rural Utilities Service*, by (name redacted) .

²⁵ For more information, see <http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/community-connect-grants>.

²⁶ GAO, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, pp. 20-21.

²⁷ Two \$3 million projects were awarded to establish broadband service in the Fond du Lac Reservation in Minnesota. For a list of all 2015 projects (totaling \$11 million), see <http://www.rd.usda.gov/files/UTP-CCProjectSummaries2015.pdf>.

²⁸ For more information, see <http://www.rd.usda.gov/programs-services/distance-learning-telemedicine-grants>.

to tribal lands.”²⁹ In 2015, RUS awarded a total of \$23.4 million for DLT, of which approximately \$3.5 million went to either tribal entities or projects that predominantly serve tribal areas.³⁰

Stimulus Broadband Grants and Loans

Broadband provisions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA, P.L. 111-5) provided a total of \$6.9 billion for broadband grants, loans, and loan/grant combinations. The total consisted of \$4.4 billion to NTIA/DOC for a newly established Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP grants) and \$2.5 billion to the RUS/USDA Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP grants, loans, and grant/loan combinations).³¹ In 2009 and 2010, NTIA awarded funding for 233 projects and RUS awarded funding for 297 broadband infrastructure projects.³² Virtually all projects are now completed and closed; no new funding is available.

While there was no set-aside for tribal broadband, a number of ARRA broadband awards were made to tribal entities or providers serving tribal lands. According to RUS, awarded BIP projects overlapped with 31 tribal lands, and nine awards were made to Indian Tribes.³³ According to NTIA, six tribal authorities received BTOP grants and at least 65 BTOP projects will directly benefit tribal communities.³⁴

Other Federal Funding Programs

Aside from the programs listed above, the NTIA report, *Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Projects*, cites several other federal funding programs as relevant to tribal broadband.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) contains an Office of Native American Programs (ONAP). According to NTIA, ONAP has three programs that could potentially be used to fund broadband projects:

- Indian Community Development Block Grant (ICDBG)—“Awarded under an annual competition, ICDBG provides funds to eligible grantees for housing rehabilitation, land acquisition, community facilities, infrastructure construction, and economic development activities that benefit primarily low and moderate income persons.”³⁵ As an example, in 2005 the Coquille Tribe of Oregon received an ICDBG grant of \$421,354 for broadband infrastructure deployment.³⁶

²⁹ GAO, *Additional Coordination and Performance Measurement Needed for High-Speed Internet Access Programs on Tribal Lands*, p. 20.

³⁰ A complete list of 2015 awards is available at http://www.rd.usda.gov/files/DLTAwardDees_2015.pdf. The 2015 \$3.5 million total for tribal lands includes grants awarded to tribal entities or to projects *predominantly* serving tribal areas. Not included are grants for projects that may include some tribal areas among all the other areas the project serves.

³¹ 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) .

³² A small portion of these project awards were ultimately rescinded; see *ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

³³ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Broadband Initiatives Program, Awards Report, *Advancing Broadband: A Foundation for Strong Rural Communities*, January 2011, p. 3, available at <http://www.rd.usda.gov/files/reports/RBBReportV5ForWeb.pdf>.

³⁴ Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, *The Broadband Technology Opportunities Program: Expanding Broadband Access and Adoption in Communities Across America, Overview of Grant Awards*, December 14, 2010, p. 16, available at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/reports/2010/NTIA_Report_on_BTOP_12142010.pdf.

³⁵ *BroadbandUSA: Guide to Federal Funding of Broadband Project*, p. 17.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

As part of the Broadband Opportunity Council recommendations (see section below), HUD is seeking to expand broadband eligibility for community development in the ICDBG Program. ONAP will issue guidance to ICDBG recipients that broadband is an eligible infrastructure expense.³⁷

- Indian Housing Block Grant (IHBG)—“Eligible activities include housing development, assistance to housing developed under the Indian Housing Program, housing services to eligible families and individuals, crime prevention and safety, and model activities that provide creative approaches to solving affordable housing problems.”³⁸ There is also a Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant program.
- Tribal Housing Activities Loan Guarantee Program (Title VI)—the program “assists IHBG recipients (borrower) who want to finance eligible affordable housing activities, but are unable to secure financing without the assistance of a federal guarantee.”³⁹

Another broadband-related source of funding specifically targeted to Native Americans is the Native American and Native Hawaiian Library Services Grant programs at the Office of Library Services, Institute of Museum and Library Services. Programs include Native American Library Services Basic Grants, Native American Library Services Enhancement Grants, and Native Hawaiian Library Services Grants.⁴⁰

Broadband Opportunity Council Recommendations

On September 21, 2015, the Administration released the *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*.⁴¹ The interagency Broadband Opportunity Council (BOC) was created by the March 23, 2015, Presidential Memorandum, “Expanding Broadband Deployment and Adoption by Addressing Regulatory Barriers and Encouraging Investment and Training.” Specifically, the Council was tasked to produce recommendations to increase broadband deployment, competition, and adoption through executive actions within the scope of existing federal agency programs, missions, and budgets without additional appropriated funding.

BOC recommendations encompass 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.

One of the recommendations is to “Address Broadband Challenges on Tribal Lands.” As part of this recommendation, the BOC reported the following action items:

³⁷ Department of Commerce and Department of Agriculture, *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*, August 20, 2015, p. 15.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 17.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 18.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁴¹ 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. For a summary of the BOC report, see CRS Insight IN10367, *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*, by (name redacted) .

- In the fourth quarter of FY2016, the Department of the Interior (DOI) will convene a Native American Broadband Summit to review the current status of broadband in tribal lands and discuss approaches to improve broadband access and adoption. Other federal agencies and tribes will participate, and a report will be developed to include intended next steps.⁴²
- The DOI Bureau of Indian Education will work with the White House Council on Native American Affairs, other federal agencies, and the Educational Native American Network to launch an interagency tribal schools technology initiative designed to increase broadband connectivity and educational support in schools throughout Indian Country. By the fourth quarter of FY2016, DOI says they will develop a three-year plan to provide higher speed broadband to designated schools.⁴³
- As part of an effort to expand technology-based job training in tribal communities, the Department of Labor and the Institute for Museum and Library Services will provide information to Indian and Native American Program grantees on the Distance Learning and Telemedicine and Community Connect grant programs within the RUS.⁴⁴

Concluding Observations

With respect to broadband and telecommunications access and adoption, tribal areas and communities continue to lag behind other areas and segments of American society. Many contend that without federal assistance, tribal lands will continue to be on the wrong side of the digital divide. At issue is what role the federal government can play to most effectively and efficiently support broadband deployment on tribal lands.

Aside from providing funding for broadband deployment, other approaches are available to the federal government for supporting tribal broadband. These include mechanisms for effective coordination and consultation with tribes on broadband issues;⁴⁵ spectrum policies to promote wireless broadband deployment on tribal lands;⁴⁶ addressing permitting and environmental review issues for deploying broadband infrastructure on tribal lands;⁴⁷ and rights-of-way policies to enable broadband infrastructure deployment on public lands.⁴⁸

⁴² *Broadband Opportunity Council Report and Recommendations*, p. 20.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 20-21.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁴⁵ The FCC's Office of Native Affairs and Policy (ONAP) was established in 2010 and was charged with "ensuring robust government-to-government consultation with Federally-recognized tribal governments and other native organizations; working with Commissioners, Bureaus, and Offices, as well as with other government agencies and private organizations, to develop and implement policies for assisting native communities; and ensuring that Native concerns and voices are considered in all relevant Commission proceedings and initiatives." FCC, *In the Matter of Establishment of the Office of Native Affairs and Policy in the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau*, Order, FCC 10-141, released August 12, 2010, p. 1, available at https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-10-141A1.pdf. Subsequently in 2011, the FCC-Native Nations Broadband Task Force was established, see https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-14-1558A1.pdf.

⁴⁶ See, for example, FCC Tribal Lands Bidding Credit Program, http://wireless.fcc.gov/auctions/default.htm?job=tribal_bidding&page=1.

⁴⁷ See, for example, Broadband Deployment on Federal Property Working Group, *Implementing Executive Order 13616: Progress on Accelerating Broadband Infrastructure Deployment*, A Progress Report to the Steering Committee on Federal Infrastructure Permitting and Review Process Improvement, August 2013, pp. 12-14, available at (continued...)

Regarding funding, debate has centered on whether federal funding for tribal broadband is sufficient, and the extent to which portions of federal funds available for broadband generally should be specifically targeted for tribal broadband. The 2010 National Broadband Plan (NBP) found that “[t]ribes need substantially greater financial support than is presently available to them, and accelerating tribal broadband deployment will require increased funding.”⁴⁹ The NBP recommended that Congress establish a Tribal Broadband Fund, which would be administered by NTIA in consultation with the FCC and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. To date, no legislation has been introduced in Congress that would establish a Tribal Broadband Fund.⁵⁰

Currently, the largest overall source of federal funding for telecommunications services is the FCC’s Universal Service Fund programs. As these programs transition towards a broadband-centric orientation (e.g., the Connect America Fund), the issue for tribal broadband is how this transition will affect broadband funding to tribal lands, and to what extent these programs might be configured towards addressing the relatively low levels of broadband deployment and adoption in tribal lands.⁵¹ In the 114th Congress, while there is no legislation that exclusively addresses federal funding for tribal broadband, there are a number of bills that address federal funding for broadband generally.⁵² Notwithstanding whether federal broadband funding programs target tribal lands, whether or not tribal lands will receive additional funding for broadband will likely be determined by the ongoing trajectory of overall federal funding for broadband.

Author Contact Information

(name redacted)
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov7-....

(...continued)

https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/broadband_eo_implementation.pdf.

⁴⁸ See FCC, “In the Matter of Acceleration of Broadband Deployment: Expanding the Reach and Reducing the Cost of Broadband Deployment by Improving Policies Regarding Public Rights of Way and Wireless Facilities Siting,” Notice of Inquiry, WC Docket No. 11-59, FCC 11-51, April 7, 2011. Also see FCC, “In the Matter of Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies,” *Report and Order*, FCC 14-153, October 21, 2014.

⁴⁹ *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*, p. 152.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ See, for example, the proposal of the National Tribal Telecommunications Association for a “Tribal Broadband Factor” as part of USF reform. National Tribal Telecommunications Association, Ex Parte Communication to the FCC, *In the Matter of Connect America Fund, WC Docket No. 10-90; NTTA Proposal for a Tribal Broadband Factor*, June 19, 2015, available at <https://prodnet.www.neca.org/publicationsdocs/wwpdf/62215ntta.pdf>. There is also concern that parts of the CAF transition could reduce tribal broadband funding; see NTTA Ex Parte comments filed on February 23, 2016, available at <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/view?id=60001516284>.

⁵² See CRS Report RL30719, *Broadband Internet Access and the Digital Divide: Federal Assistance Programs*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

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.