

## Economic Policy Vignette

# Will Ideology Block Opportunity? Regulatory Reform in the Infrastructure Industries

**John W. Mayo\***

November 2017

\*John W. Mayo is Professor of Economics, Business and Public Policy, McDonough School of Business, Georgetown University, and Executive Director of the Georgetown Center for Business and Public Policy.

The Georgetown Center for Business and Public Policy produces and issues papers and publications subject to the quality of the author's methods and analysis. The Center's work is independent of the policy positions of current, previous, and prospective Center supporters including those whose financial interests may be affected by the results or opinions expressed therein. A complete list of financial supporters is available at [cbpp.georgetown.edu](http://cbpp.georgetown.edu)

**GEORGETOWN  
UNIVERSITY**

**McDonough**  
SCHOOL *of* BUSINESS

**CENTER FOR BUSINESS  
& PUBLIC POLICY**



## Will Ideology Block Opportunity? Regulatory Reform in the Infrastructure Industries

John W. Mayo

### Abstract

Although the country is deeply divided ideologically and this divide nominally may seem to halt opportunity for policy advances, this need not necessarily be the case. Notwithstanding our *ideological* differences, a number of *practical* opportunities for policymakers to improve economic welfare have emerged and for which there is considerable agreement, if not complete political consensus, that allow policy progress. These opportunities create the potential for practicality to forge agreement even in the face of more widespread ideological discord across our society.

This basic thesis is no more evident than in the set of infrastructure industries that policymakers across the political spectrum have identified as crucial for U.S. competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As a case in point, I focus on broadband technologies (both wired and wireless), which policymakers of all political stripes have identified as crucial for economic growth. In this *Economic Policy Vignette*, I first identify the practical, as opposed to ideological, case for regulatory reform in the broadband sector. I then identify a number of specific measures that present themselves at this moment which create opportunities for meaningful and beneficial regulatory reform.

## I. Introduction

It is no secret that the country is politically fractured. Citizens have increasingly retreated to, or been drawn to, information streams that identify different profound problems facing the country and which offer vastly different solutions. This tendency acts to create and reinforce knee-jerk resistance to policy proposals from the opposition political camp. Democrats reflexively reject Republican proposals, and Republicans similarly and with equal speed reject out-of-hand policy proposals offered by Democrats.

In some cases this political polarization is based on fundamental and substantive grounds. In such cases, proposals for policy change fail to gain traction or end in stalemate. Even in the rare instances where the roughshod politics of the stronger party prevail to advance a policy, the results remain vulnerable to the likelihood of reversal in the event that the influence of the politically stronger group falters.

While this ideologically-based standoff is disheartening, it need not necessarily bring policy progress to a halt in all areas. Indeed, in the realm of regulatory reform, a number of specific steps can be identified for which *practical* opportunities for improving economic welfare exist, and for which careful consideration points toward considerable agreement, if not consensus. These opportunities create the potential for practicality to forge agreement even in the face of more widespread ideological discord across our society.

This basic thesis is no more evident than in the set of infrastructure industries that policymakers across the political spectrum have identified as crucial for U.S. competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As a case in point, I focus on broadband technologies (both wired and wireless), which policymakers of all political stripes have identified as crucial for economic growth.<sup>1</sup> In the specific case of broadband, there is little to no disagreement that numerous regulatory policies touch upon, and may be constraining, the deployment and adoption of broadband in the United States.

---

<sup>1</sup> In political discussions of the policy imperatives for the broadband sector, some have to this point chosen to emphasize the need to remove artificial impediments to greater deployment while others have tended to emphasize the need for affordable broadband. See <http://www.multichannel.com/news/telco-tv/house-digs-broadband-infrastructure/411648>. While creating a nominal difference, these different points of emphasis are, from an economic perspective, not distinct. Specifically, policy measures designed to enhance the supply of broadband will inevitably put downward pressure on price, which, in turn, promotes the affordability of broadband services. To the extent that even with generally affordable broadband some households may find broadband too expensive to purchase, an efficient policy of targeted subsidies to enhance demand (such as through the Connect America Program) can supplement policies designed to enhance supply.

## II. The Practical Need for Regulatory Reform in the Broadband Communications Sector

Any discussion of forward-looking regulatory policies governing broadband infrastructure should begin with three widely agreed-to facts. First, broadband deployment creates the prospect of enhancing Americans' personal lives and stimulating productivity and economic growth.<sup>2</sup> Second, next-generation broadband networks will require massive capital investments.<sup>3</sup> Third, the investments necessary to produce widely-deployed next-generation broadband infrastructure in the United States will necessarily be provided almost exclusively by the private sector.<sup>4</sup>

Given these basic facts, regulatory policies governing the broadband sector take on additional importance. Specifically, in addition to the traditional role of consumer protections afforded by regulation, it is essential that modern regulation be fashioned to complement and accelerate the deployment of next-generation broadband networks. Indeed, with the rapid growth in demand for mobile and fixed broadband services, the economic fact is that failure to enable infrastructure buildout will produce an array of maladies ranging from elevated prices to

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Accenture Strategy, "Smart Cities: How 5G Can Help Municipalities Become Vibrant Smart Cities" (2017, <https://www.ctia.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/how-5g-can-help-municipalities-become-vibrant-smart-cities-accenture.pdf>). See also, David Sunding, Martha Rogers, and Coleman Bazelon, "The Farmer and the Data: How Wireless Technology is Transforming Water Use in Agriculture" (April 2016, <http://www.brattle.com/news-and-knowledge/news/report-by-brattle-economists-highlights-adoption-of-wireless-technology-to-effectively-manage-water-use-for-u-s-farmers>) showing how farmers can leverage advanced wireless technology to preserve resources in droughts and optimize watering levels, and Jeffrey T. Macher, John W. Mayo, and Olga Ukhaneva, "Does the Internet Improve Health Behaviors and Outcomes? Evidence from the National Health Interview Survey" (March 2016, <http://cbpp.georgetown.edu/publications/does-internet-improve-health-behaviors-and-health-outcomes-evidence-national-health>) showing the effect of the internet on health behavior and outcomes.

<sup>3</sup> According to USTelecom, total broadband industry capital investments for wireline, wireless, and cable totaled \$1.6 trillion between 1996 and 2016. In 2016, broadband investments totaled \$76 billion (October 2017, <https://www.ustelecom.org/sites/default/files/documents/Broadband%20Investment%20Trending%20Down%20in%202016.pdf>). Looking forward, Accenture Strategy estimates that telecommunications firms may invest \$275 billion over the next seven years to deploy next generation wireless broadband facilities. See *supra* note 2, "Smart Cities: How 5G Can Help Municipalities Become Vibrant Smart Cities."

<sup>4</sup> Despite the widespread embrace of a public infrastructure initiative to contribute to the deployment of next-generation broadband infrastructure, it is apparent that the Trump administration will not be allotting substantial federal funds toward this goal: "Providing more Federal funding, on its own, is not the solution to our infrastructure challenges. Rather, we will work to fix underlying incentives, procedures, and policies to spur better infrastructure decisions and outcomes, across a range of sectors" (2017, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/fact\\_sheets/2018%20Budget%20Fact%20Sheet\\_Infrastructure%20Initiative.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/fact_sheets/2018%20Budget%20Fact%20Sheet_Infrastructure%20Initiative.pdf)). See also "Improving Infrastructure Outcomes through Better Capital Allocation," McKinsey & Company (November 2017, <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/capital-projects-and-infrastructure/our-insights/improving-infrastructure-outcomes-through-better-capital-allocation?cid=other-eml-alt-mip-mck-oth-1711>).

reduced quality. These realities, in turn, compel a careful review of the regulatory structure governing the broadband communications sector especially as these regulations impact or pertain to broadband infrastructure. It is important to note, however, that such a review and consequent reforms should be driven not by the ideological distaste for regulation so often championed in political discourse but rather by the practical possibilities that regulatory reforms could accelerate our efforts to deploy and adopt 21<sup>st</sup> century broadband to the betterment of both individuals' personal lives and our nation's competitiveness.

The potential for practical regulatory reform is especially promising in the modern broadband sector. This is for several reasons. First, the regulatory apparatus governing the communications sector was largely established within an environment of monopolistic provision of communications services which is starkly different from the marketplace in which we find ourselves in 2017. Beginning with the 1993 amendments to the Communications Act of 1934 authorizing the allocation of spectrum through auctions and the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (hereafter, Telecommunications Act), the industry has evolved rapidly into an ecosystem in which effective competition, not monopoly, is the norm.<sup>5</sup>

Competition among broadband providers has increasingly taken on characteristics in which firms race to deploy next-generation facilities that have more bandwidth and provide higher quality at greater speeds and at lower prices.<sup>6</sup> In such a Schumpeterian environment, it is especially important to be aware of the potential for existing regulations to retard innovation and slow the accelerating time-to-market deployments of next-generation broadband facilities.<sup>7</sup> More fundamentally, where consumers are protected by competition (and the general protections afforded by the nation's competition policy agencies), regulations that would otherwise be necessary for consumer protection are no longer required.

Second, in some, perhaps many, cases, regulations and regulatory processes that govern the communications sector were designed to be congruent with particular point-in-time technologies. But the technologies that provide modern communications are stunningly different than those employed only a few years ago. Consequently, it would seem

---

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed discussion of the evolution of "effective competition" in general and in the industries governed by the Federal Communications Commission, see Amanda B. Delp and John W. Mayo, "The Evolution of 'Competition': Lessons for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Telecommunications Policy," *Review of Industrial Organization*, Vol 50, June 2017, pp. 393-416.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., Testimony of Larry Downes, *Hearing on "Investing in America's Broadband Infrastructure: Exploring Ways to Reduce Barriers to Deployment" Before the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, U.S. Senate* (May 3, 2017, <http://cbpp.georgetown.edu/publications/investing-america%E2%80%99s-broadband-infrastructure-exploring-ways-reduce-barriers-deployment>).

<sup>7</sup> For a background discussion of Schumpeterian competition, see Herbert Hovenkamp, "Schumpeterian Competition and Antitrust," *Competition Policy International*, Vol 4, October 2008. Available at: <https://www.competitionpolicyinternational.com/schumpeterian-competition-and-antitrust>.

incontrovertible that regulations that were established to govern the wireline provision of plain-old-telephone service are unlikely to continue to advance economic welfare in a world in which consumers increasingly turn to wireless smartphones for handling a full array of voice, data, and video communications services. Similarly, arduous regulations governing the siting of large macro-cell antennas to support cellular service become deterrents to the rapid deployment of much more densely-packed, but substantially smaller, micro-cell antennas that are required to provide next-generation 5G wireless services. Quite simply put, such regulations are ripe for reform.

Third, given the overwhelming need for capital investments to expand and enhance the broadband platform in the United States, regulations which can be identified that retard investment also become candidates for reform. In some cases the investment-retarding effects of regulation are offset by countervailing and significant consumer protections afforded by the existing regulation. In other cases, however, regulatory reforms may be identified that can ensure consumer protections while removing the investment-detering effects of the regulation. It is important to note that these considerations provide a compelling *practical* – not ideological – basis for reviewing extant regulations with an eye toward preserving consumer protections while simultaneously promoting private sector investment in this crucial sector of the economy. Importantly, by circumventing ideologically-driven policy actions, this more practical approach creates the real possibility of policy progress and agreement among parties that may in ideological matters find themselves in stark disagreement.

Evidence of such bipartisan potential abounds at the city, state, and federal levels of government as well as among regulators. A number of cities have embraced the need to adopt rules and regulations that accelerate and complement the private sector’s push to deploy modern broadband. For example, the city of Chicago has adopted a “Tech Plan” that encourages the development of “world-class broadband infrastructure and increased digital access across the city” and has adopted initiatives “to foster a regulatory and policy-based environment in which businesses can flourish and grow by reviewing current business-related requirements and processes, such as permits and procurement, updating where appropriate.”<sup>8</sup>

At the state level to date, twelve states, in bipartisan efforts, have adopted legislation designed to remove archaic regulatory barriers to streamlining the deployment of fixed and mobile broadband. For example, in August 2017, Delaware adopted the Advanced Wireless Infrastructure Investment Act to accelerate investment in mobile broadband infrastructure.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See <http://techplan.cityofchicago.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/cityofchicago-techplan.pdf>. While cities like Chicago have been proactive in reforming local regulations that are acting to impede the deployment of next-generation broadband facilities, other localities have to this point failed to act. Section III below addresses some of practical steps that can be taken to remove these impediments.

<sup>9</sup> Delaware House Bill 189 (2017).

The bill had 11 Democratic sponsors and 10 Republican sponsors, passed both the Delaware legislative chambers with overwhelming bipartisan majorities, and was signed into law by the state’s Democratic governor, John Carney.<sup>10</sup>

And as detailed in the next section, bipartisan bills in both the United States House of Representatives and the Senate are making their way through the legislative process. These bills do not promote removal of existing regulations on ideological grounds, but instead are designed to remove practical impediments that currently act to retard the deployment of highly sought after broadband services.

Similarly, among federal regulators, agreement exists that streamlining deployment and removing bottlenecks is central to efforts to promote affordability for consumers. For example, Mignon Clyburn, a Democratic commissioner at the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), has observed that “Lack of affordability remains one of the largest barriers to connected communities...Streamlining deployment is central to this effort. We must ensure that all providers are able to deploy and upgrade their infrastructure at the lowest costs and quickest pace.”<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Chairman Ajit Pai, the Republican head of the FCC has noted that

“we have to focus on bringing high-speed broadband to economically deprived areas. And to do that, we must recognize that deploying broadband isn’t easy. The Internet isn’t an abstraction. It’s a physical network of networks that requires massive investment to deploy and constant adjustment to manage. Internet service providers (ISPs) must trench conduit, lay cable, install electronics, attach antennas, and stitch together a seamless communications network from aging copper and brand-new fiber, legacy switches and modern routers.”<sup>12</sup>

Finally, beyond these compelling economic motivations to embark on regulatory reform designed to stimulate the expansion of broadband infrastructure in the United States, the governing legislation similarly compels this review and reform. For example, the Telecommunications Act provides that “no state or local regulation ... may prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the ability of any entity to provide any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service.”<sup>13</sup> The statute goes on to state that if the FCC determines that “a State or local government has permitted or imposed any statute, regulation, or legal requirement that [acts to prohibit or has the effect of prohibiting the ability of firms to provide

<sup>10</sup> See <https://legiscan.com/DE/bill/HB189/2017>.

<sup>11</sup> See remarks of FCC Commissioner at the #Solutions2020 Policy Forum, Georgetown University Law Center (October 19, 2016, [https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/DOC-341824A1.pdf](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-341824A1.pdf)), p. 4.

<sup>12</sup> Remarks of FCC Commissioner Ajit Pai at the Brandery, “A Digital Empowerment Agenda,” Cincinnati, Ohio (September 13, 2016, [https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/DOC-341210A1.pdf](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-341210A1.pdf)).

<sup>13</sup> 47 U.S. Code §253 (a).

interstate or intrastate services], the Commission shall preempt the enforcement of such statute, regulation, or legal requirement to the extent necessary to correct such violation or inconsistency.”<sup>14</sup>

Together both practical economic necessity and statutory guidance act to compel federal regulators to assess the extent to which federal, state, or local regulations and processes may act to retard the ability of broadband service providers to expand services and capabilities. Where such regulations can be identified and reformed to remove the expansion-detering impediments, they become prime and practical opportunities for otherwise politically disparate parties to work collectively to advance economic welfare. It is to such low-hanging fruit that I now turn.

### III. Low-Hanging Fruit

The practical case for review and reform of existing regulations to remove barriers to efficient infrastructure investment is not new. Indeed, as early as the scrutiny offered in the National Broadband Plan of 2010, it was observed that gaining regulatory approval to access rights-of-way “is often a difficult and time-consuming process that discourages private investment.”<sup>15</sup> To mitigate this barrier, the FCC suggested that the “government should take steps to improve utilization of existing infrastructure to ensure that network providers have easier access to poles, conduits, ducts and rights-of-way” as “[t]he cost of deploying a broadband network depends significantly on the costs that service providers incur to access [them] on public and private lands.”<sup>16</sup>

Yet while the need for this review and reform is not new, the overwhelming growth in the demand for broadband services is increasingly creating situations in which local and state regulations either explicitly or implicitly are acting to retard the ability of broadband firms to efficiently and quickly respond to that demand through broadband investment and infrastructure growth. This creates the opportunity for practical policy solutions to reduce or remove economic impediments to expansion.

Consider, for example, the Broadband Conduit Deployment Act of 2017.<sup>17</sup> This bill advances the cause of accelerating broadband deployment and adoption by requiring states to evaluate

<sup>14</sup> 47 U.S. Code §253 (d).

<sup>15</sup> Federal Communications Commission, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan* (2010), <https://www.fcc.gov/general/national-broadband-plan>), p. 109.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> Available at: <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/IF/IF16/20170321/105740/BILLS-115pih-BroadbandConduitDeploymentActof2017.pdf>.

the need for broadband conduit as they expand their highway systems. In particular, the bill requires state governments, in concert with broadband firms, to evaluate the 15-year-ahead anticipated need for broadband conduit deployment beneath the state's new and expansion highway projects. If the evaluation reveals an anticipated need for additional broadband deployment, the bill requires that the conduit necessary to support that broadband deployment be installed at the time of construction. By establishing this "dig-once" policy, the cost of broadband deployment will fall precipitously. While the precise cost savings associated with dig-once deployment depends on a variety of factors including population density and the topography of the relevant terrain, it has been estimated that the cost savings derived from the coordination of conduit and fiber installation with highway projects ranges from 25-33 percent, with higher cost savings in more densely populated parts of urban areas.<sup>18</sup> Cost savings in rural areas, while lower, have been estimated to be in excess of 15 percent.<sup>19</sup>

Additionally, this dig-once legislation not only seeks to promote the speedy deployment of broadband infrastructure, but also has the ancillary benefit of minimizing traffic disruptions that would necessarily occur in the event of multiple trenching efforts. The practical, cost-saving reform also blunts ideologically-driven fears that policymakers seeking to facilitate deployment are turning a blind eye to the important goal of promoting competition by locking in monopolies.<sup>20</sup> Specifically, by explicitly compelling that conduit be provided "on a competitively neutral and non-discriminatory basis," the legislation would protect competition.<sup>21</sup> Finally, consistent with sound economic principles, the bill smartly requires that access to conduit be at a charge not to exceed a cost-based rate.<sup>22</sup> In short, this legislation provides exactly the sort of practical reform that is necessary to accelerate the deployment of broadband. And importantly, this practical reform is supported by members of both political parties.<sup>23</sup>

Just as the Broadband Conduit Deployment Act of 2017 addresses the deployment of wireline broadband facilities, the "Making Opportunities for Broadband Investment and Limiting Excessive and Needless Obstacles to Wireless Act" (MOBILE NOW Act) seeks to facilitate deployment of mobile broadband facilities.<sup>24</sup> This bipartisan bill<sup>25</sup> contains a variety of

---

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Planning and Flexibility are Key to Effectively Deploying Broadband Conduit through Federal Highway Projects*, GAO-12-687R (June 2012, <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-687R>), p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> For an example of such fears, see Susan Crawford, "Handcuffing Cities to Help Telcom Giants," *Backchannel* (March 2017, <https://www.wired.com/2017/03/handcuffing-cities-to-help-telecom-giants>).

<sup>21</sup> *Supra* note 17 at §331 (f).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> See <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2017/03/nationwide-fiber-proposed-law-could-add-broadband-to-road-projects>.

<sup>24</sup> Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/s19/BILLS-115s19es.pdf>.

<sup>25</sup> The bill was introduced by Senators John Thune (R-South Dakota) and Bill Nelson (D-Florida).

commonsense practical measures designed to facilitate the deployment of infrastructure necessary to deploy mobile broadband services. For instance, the bill addresses buildings owned by the federal government in which parties seek to install, construct, modify, or maintain a communications facility installation. In these situations, the bill requires that federal agencies develop a common application for entities applying for easements, rights-of-way, and leases and requires that applications be approved or denied within 270 days of the application. The bill also requires the states to identify a broadband utility coordinator who would be tasked with facilitating the broadband infrastructure right-of-way efforts within the state. Additionally, the bill addresses the glaring need for additional spectrum to be made available to support the rapidly growing demand for mobile voice, data, and video services by directing the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the FCC to make at least 255 megahertz of new spectrum available for licensed and unlicensed use by 2020.<sup>26</sup> Quite apart from ideological differences among policymakers, the practical proposals in the bill are widely appealing, with the bill passing the Senate through a unanimous consent vote in August 2017.

Two new legislatively-based regulatory reform measures have recently emerged, both of which are designed to remove existing regulatory impediments to rapid broadband deployment. In October 2017, Senators Wicker (R-MS) and Cortez Masto (D-NV) introduced the Streamlining Permitting to Enable Efficient Deployment of Broadband Act of 2017 (SPEED Act). This Act seeks to fast-track the deployment of next-generation broadband technologies by exempting communications providers from duplicative environmental and historical reviews. The bill also would exempt certain new small-cell facilities from environmental review.<sup>27</sup> A complementary bipartisan effort has recently surfaced from Senators Thune (R-SD) and Schatz (D-HI) which similarly seeks to accelerate broadband deployment. In particular, the discussion draft of this legislation would require state and local governments to act on wireless facilities applications within a certain timeframe (viz., a shot clock) and would limit the grounds for denying such sitings. Additionally, while acknowledging the rights of local authorities to charge for access to poles and local rights-of-way, the proposed legislation would require that such rates be “fair and reasonable,” “competitively neutral,” “technologically neutral,” “nondiscriminatory,” publicly disclosed, and “based on actual and direct costs.”<sup>28</sup>

Akin to the commonsensical measures identified in proposed legislation, other practical regulatory reforms have been identified by the FCC. In November 2017, the FCC adopted a pair of measures designed to facilitate and accelerate the deployment of next-generation

---

<sup>26</sup> See “Making Opportunities for Broadband Investment and Limiting Excessive and Needless Obstacles to Wireless Act,” *Report of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on S.19*, Report 115-4 (March 21, 2017, <https://www.congress.gov/115/crpt/srpt4/CRPT-115srpt4.pdf>), p. 13.

<sup>27</sup> Such exempt facilities must lie within a public right-of way and not be higher (or substantially higher as determined by the FCC) than existing structures in the right-of-way. S. 1988, §4 (1) (A).

<sup>28</sup> OLL17609 Staff Discussion Draft, 115<sup>th</sup> Congress (2017), p. 8.

broadband. Specifically, the Commission unanimously adopted a commonsensical Report and Order that will implement steps to streamline the ability of firms to replace certain utility poles with more modern ones that are capable of hosting next-generation, small-cell technologies.<sup>29</sup> At the same time, the Commission also adopted rules that bar utility pole owners from charging companies for certain costs that they have already recouped from others, adopted a policy of allowing local providers equal access to each other's poles, and imposed a 180 day "shot clock" for approval of pole attachments.<sup>30</sup>

Collectively, these proposals before Congress and the FCC provide policymakers the opportunity to adopt numerous subtle regulatory reforms that collectively have the potential to substantially remove important barriers to expansion that are currently impeding the deployment of highly demanded broadband infrastructure. These range from measures to expand spectrum availability to the adoption of dig-once policies, to adopting shot clocks for expediting small cell sitings and removal of redundant regulatory siting reviews. These commonsense, practical reforms offer the low-hanging fruit to be picked to advance the nation's 21<sup>st</sup> century infrastructure.

#### IV. Conclusion

There are, to be sure, some areas of strident disagreement about regulatory policies that should govern the broadband sector. To date, these disagreements have consumed a massive amount of energy with little progress to show for it. At the same time, there are simple, less visible reforms to regulations which govern this sector that create the prospect for both accelerated investment in and adoption of new broadband technologies. These reforms create the real prospect of improving consumers' lives and enhancing the nation's competitiveness without sacrificing necessary consumer protections. In the matter of regulatory reform the practicality of these benefits should provide a platform that trumps our broader ideological differences.

---

<sup>29</sup> See FCC, *Report and Order in the Matter of Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment (WT Docket 17-79)*, FCC 17-153 (November 2017), [http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily\\_Releases/Daily\\_Business/2017/db1117/FCC-17-153A1.pdf](http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2017/db1117/FCC-17-153A1.pdf).

<sup>30</sup> See [http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily\\_Releases/Daily\\_Business/2017/db1116/DOC-347790A1.pdf](http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2017/db1116/DOC-347790A1.pdf).