1. When there are competing programs that offer financial assistance to obtain connectivity to services the recipient will always choose the one that provides the greatest benefit to the organization they represent. This being the case in rural Alaska where the users obtain services through the USAC Telecommunications program. This is far more beneficial than the fund created authorizing $400M in subsidy currently called the “Healthcare Connect Fund”.

2. Increasing the covered entities beyond healthcare, schools, and libraries would increase the adoption and broaden the interested parties to increase Broadband access.

3. I do not feel that the paperwork process is that onerous and is not too cumbersome to complete. In our situation all the major vendors have representatives in their companies that know the process, the paperwork, and are willing to assist in completing the necessary forms initially and annually. In addition, the FCC has teams of people that are also willing to assist. I do not feel that this a barrier to people participating in the programs.

4. Annual recertification should be a requirement. All too often people that are not paying for a service have no interest in disconnecting it if they are no longer using it and recertification is not required.

5. Offer tax incentives or grant opportunities to expand and operate equipment required to deliver Broadband access in areas where population census is too low to make this a viable business expansion. Many companies will not build out infrastructure in areas that either are not likely to purchase at the ROI rate or where there is not enough market opportunity that would make this a sound investment by any company, let alone several where competition can occur.