

1 TIMOTHY A. GUSTAFSON (CA BAR NO. 234674)  
2 timgustafson@eversheds-sutherland.us  
3 EVERSHEDES SUTHERLAND (US) LLP  
4 500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1750  
5 Sacramento, CA 95814  
6 Telephone: (916) 844-2826  
7 Facsimile: (916) 241-0501

8 ERIC TRESH (*Pro Hac Vice* Pending)  
9 ALLA RAYKIN (*Pro Hac Vice* Pending)  
10 erictresh@eversheds-sutherland.us  
11 allaraykin@eversheds-sutherland.us  
12 EVERSHEDES SUTHERLAND (US) LLP  
13 999 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 2300  
14 Atlanta, GA 30309  
15 Telephone: (404) 853-8033

16 *Attorneys for Amici Curiae*

17 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

20 ASSURANCE WIRELESS USA, L.P., et al.,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 ALICE B. REYNOLDS, et al.,

24 Defendants.

25 Case No. 3:23-cv-00483

26 **BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE***  
27 **MULTICULTURAL MEDIA,**  
28 **TELECOM AND INTERNET**  
**COUNCIL, ALLVANZA, AND**  
**CALIFORNIA HAWAII STATE**  
**CONFERENCE OF THE**  
**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR**  
**THE ADVANCEMENT OF**  
**COLORED PEOPLE IN SUPPORT**  
**OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A**  
**PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Before the Honorable Laurel Beeler  
Complaint Filed: February 1, 2023

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1

2 I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....1

3 II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....2

4 III. ARGUMENT .....4

5 A. Accessible and Affordable Wireless Services Are Essential to Bridging the

6 Digital Divide.....4

7 B. The CPUC’s Access Line Surcharge Will Undermine the Progress from

8 Affordable Wireless Service .....5

9 C. The Access Line Surcharge Would Disproportionately Hurt Low-Income

10 Individual and Communities of Color .....6

11 D. Unfairly Burdening Wireless Services Harms Consumers .....9

12 E. The CPUC Should Address Funding Issues through Less Harmful Means .....10

13 IV. Conclusion .....11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Mobil Oil Corp. v. Comm’r of Taxes of Vt.</i> , 445 U.S. 425 (1980).....	9
<i>Trinova Corp. v. Mich. Dep’t of Treasury</i> , 498 U.S. 358 (1991).....	9
<b>Statutes</b>	
47 U.S.C. § 254(f).....	8
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Andrew Perrin, Pew Research Center, <i>Mobile Technology and Home Broadband 2021</i> (June 3, 2021), <a href="https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/06/03/mobile-technology-and-home-broadband-2021/">https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/06/03/mobile-technology-and-home-broadband-2021/</a> .....	4
California Public Utilities Commission Staff Report – Part 1, R.21-03-002 (Cal. P.U.C. June 2021), <a href="https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M389/K957/389957174.pdf">https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M389/K957/389957174.pdf</a> .....	8
Comments of the Utility Reform Network on the Proposed Decision Updating the Mechanism for Surcharges to Support Public Purpose Programs, R.21-03-22 (Cal. P.U.C. Sept. 22, 2022), <a href="https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M497/K247/497247121.pdf">https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M497/K247/497247121.pdf</a> .....	3, 7
FCC, <i>Report on the State of the Lifeline Marketplace</i> (June 2021), <a href="https://www.fcc.gov/document/bureau-releases-report-state-lifeline-marketplace">https://www.fcc.gov/document/bureau-releases-report-state-lifeline-marketplace</a> .....	7
<i>In re FCC Releases Open Internet R&amp;O, Declaratory Ruling, &amp; Order</i> , 30 FCC Rcd. 5601 (2015).....	5
<i>In re Inquiry Concerning Deployment of ATC to All Americans</i> , 35 FCC Rcd. 8986 (2020).....	3
<i>In re Restoring Internet Freedom</i> , 33 FCC Rcd. 311 (2018).....	5
<i>In re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service</i> , 12 FCC Rcd. 8776 (1997).....	9
Legislative Analyst’s Office, <i>A Review of LifeLine Budget Estimates and Enrollment Process</i> (Apr. 3, 2019), <a href="https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3995">https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3995</a> .....	10

1 Mark DiCamillo, Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley,  
2 *Internet Connectivity and the “Digital Divide” in California – 2019*, Table 4a,  
3 <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rj7p5vw>..... 5

4 Decision Updating the Mechanism for Surcharges to Support Public Purpose Programs,  
5 *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update Surcharge Mechanisms to Ensure Equity &*  
6 *Transparency of Fees, Taxes & Surcharges Assessed on Customers of Telecommc ’ns*  
7 *Servs. in Cal.*, D. 22-10-021, 2022 WL 16782574 (Cal. P.U.C. Oct. 20, 2022) ..... 1, 7, 9

8 Public Comments on the Proposed Decision Updating the Mechanism for Surcharges to  
9 Support Public Purpose Programs, R.21-03-22 (Cal. P.U.C.) ..... 8

10 Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D. & Julian V. Luke, Nat’l Center for Health Statistics,  
11 *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview*  
12 *Survey, January-June 2022* (Dec. 2022),  
13 <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless202212.pdf>. .... 3, 4

14 Universal Service Administrative Co, *Lifeline Program Data*,  
15 <https://www.usac.org/lifeline/resources/program-data/> ..... 10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

2 Multicultural Media, Telecom and Internet Council (“MMTC”) was established in 1986  
3 as a national nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting and preserving equal opportunity and  
4 civil rights in the mass media, telecommunications, and broadcast industries. MMTC performs  
5 civil rights advocacy; conducts research and analysis, particularly in the area of broadband  
6 access and broadband adoption for people of color and other vulnerable populations; and  
7 regularly participates in agency rulemaking proceedings affecting these issues. Consistent with  
8 its mission, MMTC supports efforts to close the digital divide and bring broadband access to  
9 more people of color and other vulnerable populations.

10 In the instant proceeding, MMTC believes that the California Public Utilities  
11 Commission’s (“CPUC” or “Commission”) decision is bad policy and violates well-established  
12 law. Decision Updating the Mechanism for Surcharges to Support Public Purpose Programs,  
13 *Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update Surcharge Mechanisms to Ensure Equity &*  
14 *Transparency of Fees, Taxes & Surcharges Assessed on Customers of Telecomm’s Servs. in*  
15 *Cal.*, D. 22-10-021, 2022 WL 16782574 (Cal. P.U.C. Oct. 20, 2022) (the “Decision”).

16 The Decision would change the way that the CPUC calculates surcharges for its  
17 Universal Service Surcharge from a revenue-based methodology to a connection or “access  
18 lines” methodology. This change of methodology significantly increases the cost of the  
19 surcharge for most wireless customers. The change will substantially increase the portion of the  
20 total CPUC funding costs borne by lower-income, minority communities. Thus, the CPUC’s new  
21 methodology will harm the many Americans who remain on the wrong side of the digital divide.  
22 MMTC has a demonstrated interest in the outcome of this case to protect the interests of those  
23 citizens, mostly minorities and economically disadvantaged persons who have limited or no  
24 access to broadband services at home and therefore rely heavily on internet-enabled mobile  
25 devices.

26 Also signing onto this brief is Allvanza, a non-partisan, forward-thinking, policy and  
27 action nonprofit organization that advocates for the success of Latinxs, and other underserved  
28 communities, in our innovation- and technology-based society. It advocates for regulatory



1 per access-line approach, the CPUC places the same burden on a low-income individual who  
2 buys the minimal option for connectivity as a business or a millionaire who purchases every  
3 possible service for connectivity. Ultimately, this disproportionate and unfair price change will  
4 force low-income individuals that rely mobile wireless services to access broadband to lose that  
5 access.

6 Over the past several years, affordable and varying wireless options have helped bridge  
7 the digital divide that prevents low-income and communities of color from accessing broadband  
8 services in the same proportion as people in more affluent communities. The CPUC’s shift to  
9 flat-fee access-line surcharges threatens that progress by increasing the price of wireless services  
10 and decreasing carriers’ ability to offer options accessible to a variety of consumers. The flat-fee  
11 access-line approach has the effect of unlawfully discriminating against wireless services as  
12 compared to other services. This discrimination stifles competition, which will prevent carriers  
13 from offering new, flexible, and cost-effective wireless options necessary to further bridge the  
14 digital divide.

15 While the current revenue-based surcharge imposes fees on only intrastate voice services  
16 proportionate to their use, the flat-fee access-line surcharge would be the same regardless of use.  
17 Without proportionality of use, multi-line wireless customers who rely on their smart phones as  
18 their families’ only means of broadband access will bear the bulk of the burden of funding the  
19 public purpose programs. Thus, the low-income individuals who are the intended beneficiaries of  
20 the surcharge-funded program will be hardest hit.

21 Under the CPUC’s new per-line approach, the average monthly surcharge a California  
22 wireless subscriber pays would jump from \$0.27 to \$1.11. *Comments of the Utility Reform*  
23 *Network on the Proposed Decision Updating the Mechanism for Surcharges to Support Public*  
24 *Purpose Programs* at 6 (Sept. 22, 2022) [hereinafter “TURN Sept. 22, 2022 Comments”].<sup>2</sup> That  
25 would mean a typical family of four would bear an additional, new and unexpected, expense of  
26

27  
28  

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M497/K247/497247121.pdf>.

1 \$3.36 per month or \$40.32 per year. The shock of such a new expense would hit communities of  
2 color and other marginalized groups the hardest and endanger their ability to access wireless and  
3 broadband service.

### 4 5 **III. ARGUMENT**

#### 6 **A. Accessible and Affordable Wireless Services Are Essential to Bridging the Digital 7 Divide**

8 The CPUC’s new per access line surcharge will make wireless service more expensive  
9 and therefore, less affordable and accessible to those who need it most. Since the 1990s, a gap in  
10 ownership and adoption of digital technology between the “haves” and “have nots” has been  
11 coined the “digital divide.” Due to a mix of factors, communities of color have historically and  
12 disproportionally fallen on the wrong side of this divide. In 2020, the Federal Communications  
13 Commission (“FCC”) reported that over 18 million Americans still lack fixed high-speed  
14 terrestrial broadband. *In re Inquiry Concerning Deployment of ATC to All Americans*, 35 FCC  
15 Rcd. 8986, 9034 (2020). However, as wireless broadband has become more affordable and  
16 accessible, it has served as a major factor in bridging the digital divide.

17  
18 According to the National Center for Health Statistics, low-income consumers are  
19 significantly more likely to rely on mobile wireless as their sole connection to broadband and  
20 other communications services. Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D. & Julian V. Luke, Nat’l Center for  
21 Health Statistics, *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health  
22 Interview Survey, January-June 2022* (Dec. 2022).<sup>3</sup> About 74% of all low-income adults lived in  
23 wireless-only households, compared to 69% of all adults. *Id.* While only 15% of adults solely use  
24 their smartphones for broadband internet access, this number increases to 25% for Latinx adults  
25 and 17% for African American adults. Andrew Perrin, Pew Research Center, *Mobile Technology  
26 and Home Broadband 2021* (June 3, 2021).<sup>4</sup> Today, wireless internet connects more previously

27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>3</sup> <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/wireless202212.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/06/03/mobile-technology-and-home-broadband-2021/>.

1 unserved and underserved groups than ever before—91% of adults in the U.S. are now connected  
2 to wired or wireless broadband, and 85% own a smartphone. *Id.*

3 This increase in connectivity has largely been driven by affordable mobile broadband  
4 offerings. Wireless addresses some of the greatest barriers to broadband adoption: providing both  
5 widespread access and affordable pricing structures that attract people of color, low-income  
6 households, rural populations, and other unserved and underserved groups. Over time, the price  
7 of wireless has decreased as compared with inflation. As wireless technology has continued to  
8 evolve, it has both increased access to these connections and enhanced the ways lives can be  
9 transformed. Major wireless companies, including Plaintiffs, offer low-cost and flexible  
10 offerings that are highly attractive to communities of color and low-income households.

11 For communities of color in particular, which have historically faced inequities in access  
12 to resources for advancement, a connection to the internet means a connection to opportunity.  
13 Connecting families to high-speed internet connects them to a vastly improved quality of life,  
14 including economic empowerment, improved healthcare outcomes for chronic illnesses, broader  
15 opportunities for advanced education, safer workplaces, and much more.

16 **B. The CPUC’s Access Line Surcharge Will Undermine the Progress from Affordable**  
17 **Wireless Service**

18 The CPUC’s per access-line surcharge would undermine the progress in bridging the  
19 digital divide, by imposing a significantly higher and disproportionate fee on those least able to  
20 afford it. Increasing the cost of wireless service through the surcharge could prevent people on  
21 the wrong side of the digital divide from initiating or continuing to access wireless services. For  
22 example, in 2015, the high cost of home internet was the primary reason households did not  
23 subscribe to home internet. In California, communities of color were more likely to not be  
24 connected to the internet or were connected only via a smartphone. Mark DiCamillo, Institute of  
25 Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, *Internet Connectivity and the “Digital*  
26 *Divide” in California – 2019*, Table 4a, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rj7p5vw>. Nearly 50%  
27 of the most vulnerable smartphone-dependent populations have had to allow their phones to  
28 lapse based on financial hardship. *Id.* Since the flat access-line surcharge, which will

1 disproportionately be collected from wireless customers, it will disproportionately impact  
2 communities of color.

3 The CPUC's access-line surcharge also operates as a tax on broadband access for  
4 disproportionately low-income and minority individuals, who rely on wireless services as their  
5 sole means of broadband access. This new tax burden is not only illegal, but would prevent more  
6 and continued access to wireless broadband by people on the wrong side of the digital divide.  
7 The FCC preempts states from subjecting broadband to charges such as the CPUC surcharge. *In*  
8 *re FCC Releases Open Internet R&O, Declaratory Ruling, & Order*, 30 FCC Rcd. 5601, 5803,  
9 5837 [¶¶ 431-32, 490 & n.1477] (2015); *In re Restoring Internet Freedom*, 33 FCC Rcd. 311,  
10 429 [¶ 196 & n.736, ¶¶ 199-200] (2018). While the CPUC purports to avoid directly imposing a  
11 tax on broadband, the practical effect of the increased surcharge would be to impose an  
12 additional tax on individuals who rely on their wireless phone primarily, if not exclusively, for  
13 non-taxable broadband access. Meanwhile, higher-income individuals that can afford to purchase  
14 a home broadband subscription do not pay the surcharge on that service. The result is not a fee  
15 proportionate with use, but instead an effective higher tax rate on individuals least able to afford  
16 it. The access-line surcharge results in an end run around the preemption on taxing broadband  
17 services, but only for those often lower-income and people in communities of color, that do not  
18 have stand-alone broadband.

19 **C. The Access Line Surcharge Would Disproportionately Hurt Low-Income Individual**  
20 **and Communities of Color**

21 The change in surcharge calculation would exacerbate the digital divide problem by  
22 disproportionately shifting the burden of the CPUC surcharges to residential consumers,  
23 particularly those who rely on wireless services as their sole means of broadband access. With  
24 the flat access-line surcharge method, wireless customers will pay a surcharge disproportionate  
25 to their use of taxable telecommunications service. By eliminating the proportionality of the fees  
26 to the services, the bulk of the burden of funding the public purpose programs will be borne by  
27 the multi-line wireless customers who rely on their smart phones as their only means of  
28 broadband access.

1 The CPUC staff's report shows that if the new approach goes into effect, it "will  
2 dramatically increase the recovery of surcharge revenues from non-business customers." TURN  
3 Sept. 22 Comments at 6. Business customers, unlike low-income wireless customers, rely on  
4 broadband access from their business accounts. As The Utility Reform Network ("TURN")  
5 noted, wireless mobility customers' contribution will increase by nearly \$455 million, an  
6 especially large increase compared to traditional telecommunications service: VoIP customers  
7 will experience a surcharge assessment increase of \$21 million, and Plain Old Telephone Service  
8 ("POTS") customers will experience a decrease of \$77 million. *Id.* Thus, the CPUC's new  
9 methodology for assessing the surcharge shifts the burden to wireless customers without regard  
10 to the services they are using.

11 Imposing the bulk of the burden on wireless customers operates as a regressive tax. All  
12 customers would pay the same fee per-line regardless of income, so the per-line impact on lower  
13 income earners would be proportionally higher than for higher-income earners. Rather than  
14 seeking to transfer wealth from better-off, higher-income service plans, the regressive surcharge  
15 would transfer the burden for the public benefit programs to the economically disadvantaged  
16 individuals those programs seek to support.

17 The CPUC's flat-fee per-line surcharge of \$1.11 per-line will adversely impact low-  
18 income consumers, especially communities of color, who are still financially struggling after the  
19 Covid-19 pandemic and record-high levels of inflation. The average monthly surcharge a  
20 California wireless subscriber pays would jump from \$0.27 to \$1.11. TURN Sept. 22, 2022  
21 Comments at 6. With the new flat-rate surcharge, that would mean a typical family of four would  
22 bear an additional, new and unexpected, expense of \$3.36 per month or \$40.32 per year.<sup>5</sup> This is  
23 a dramatic increase. Although \$40.32 may not seem like much to some, the reality is that low-  
24 income consumers "frequently have to choose between broadband service and basic necessities  
25 such as food." FCC, *Report on the State of the Lifeline Marketplace* at 30 (June 2021) (citing the  
26  
27

---

28 <sup>5</sup> As TURN explained, the surcharge burden would jump to \$1.11 per month (or \$4.44 for a family of four). TURN  
Sept. 22 Comments at 6, 8.

1 Benton Institute’s comments).<sup>6</sup> For struggling families, this price charge will be acutely felt: the  
2 decision between a week of groceries and a year of broadband is an easy one. The shock of this  
3 new expense will cause struggling families to cut back on multiple lines for families if not all  
4 their lines. Not only will the additional \$40.32 expense deter low-income individuals from  
5 obtaining broadband, but the CPUC reserves the right to increase the surcharge amount from  
6 \$1.11, making it difficult for consumers to budget how much a new connection will cost them  
7 annually. Decision at 62, 76.

8 Undoubtedly, this unpredictable price increase will hit communities of color and other  
9 marginalized groups the hardest. In comments from the public to the CPUC prior to its decision,  
10 members of the public noted their opposition to the negative impact that the CPUC’s change will  
11 have on them. Specifically, commenters stated that cell phone owners with fixed incomes will be  
12 directly and severely impacted by this substantial increase and will make wireless unaffordable  
13 and they depend on wireless communications for essential services such as communicating with  
14 doctors or international family. Public Comments on the Proposed Decision Updating the  
15 Mechanism for Surcharges to Support Public Purpose Programs, R.21-03-22 (Cal. P.U.C.).

16 Under the status quo, the CPUC’s revenue-based surcharge was calculated based on  
17 revenues from intrastate voice service or information services. Under this revenue-based  
18 methodology, wireless customers pay a surcharge on the portion of their service from intrastate  
19 voice services, but not the interstate and broadband services, which are prohibited from being  
20 taxed. With the revenue approach, all types of customers—wireless and wireline are paying the  
21 same percentage fees on their intrastate telecommunications usage. *See Cal. Public Utilities*  
22 *Comm’n Staff Report – Part 1*, R.21-03-002 at 9 (June 2021).<sup>7</sup> The progressive revenue-based  
23 surcharge allows a consumer that needs to reduce expenses to make spending changes to  
24 decrease the surcharge. In contrast, a flat-fee per access-line surcharge will stay the same such  
25 that the low-income consumer’s only option to avoid the newly quadrupled surcharge would be  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>6</sup> <https://www.fcc.gov/document/bureau-releases-report-state-lifeline-marketplace>.

<sup>7</sup> <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M389/K957/389957174.pdf>.

1 to cancel a phone line. That effect will be multiplied when a family has multiple lines for  
2 multiple users, some of whom may not use the line for anything other than broadband.

3 **D. Unfairly Burdening Wireless Services Harms Consumers**

4 California’s Universal Service programs may not be “inconsistent with” the FCC’s  
5 Universal Service rules and the rules require that contributions be made on an “equitable and  
6 nondiscriminatory basis.” 47 U.S.C. § 254(f). Federal law therefore recognizes that the CPUC  
7 may not implement rules which unfairly favor or disfavor one type of technology in unfair ways.  
8 (See Pl.’s Mot. for Preliminary Injunction at 6, ECF No. 4.) The FCC explained that this  
9 technological neutrality principle is consistent with the congressional intent to promote a pro-  
10 competitive framework and “will allow the marketplace to direct the advancement of technology  
11 and all citizens to benefit from such development.” *In re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal*  
12 *Service*, 12 FCC Rcd. 8776, 8801-02 [¶¶ 48–49] (1997) (“1997 FCC Order”). Moreover the FCC  
13 wanted to avoid limiting providers’ service offering, when more cost-effective and relevant  
14 services were available. *Id.* Thus, the technological neutrality principle benefits consumers by  
15 fostering a marketplace where consumers can choose affordable communications options that are  
16 best for them, without being penalized by state policies for that choice.

17 To assess whether something is competitively neutral, the appropriate inquiry is whether  
18 the fee has the “practical effect” of burdening something Congress intended to prevent. *See*  
19 *Trinova Corp. v. Mich. Dep’t of Treasury*, 498 U.S. 358, 373 (1991) (quoting *Mobil Oil Corp. v.*  
20 *Comm’r of Taxes of Vt.*, 445 U.S. 425, 443 (1980)) (discussing a preemption of taxes). As  
21 explained above, the CPUC’s flat-fee access-line surcharge disproportionately burdens wireless  
22 customers who rely on that service for broadband access. Meanwhile, individuals who can afford  
23 stand-alone terrestrial internet service do not pay the fee for the same service.<sup>8</sup> The CPUC’s  
24 access-line method of calculation puts its thumbs on the scale in favor of one identical service  
25 over another, penalizing those individuals whose only affordable means of accessing the internet  
26 is wireless.

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>8</sup> The CPUC’s definition of “access line” applies only to a “telephone line” and associated with a telephone number,  
and therefore does not include stand-alone internet service. Decision at 40.

1 By imposing a discriminatory surcharge that is not proportionate to the services used, the  
2 CPUC would also limit the competitive market's ability to offer new dynamic options to fit  
3 consumers' needs. Plaintiffs note that they will have to absorb the financial impact of the new  
4 surcharge for their popular and consumer-friendly tax-inclusive wireless plans. (Compl. at 3 n.4,  
5 26, ECF No. 1.) Penalizing carriers making different kinds of plans available, like the tax-  
6 inclusive wireless plan, is anti-competitive and bad for consumers by limiting carriers' ability to  
7 innovate. If a carrier offering transparent and popular options is penalized, that will deter carriers  
8 from coming up with new cost-effective options. But these flexible and cost-effective options are  
9 exactly what is necessary to help bridge the digital divide.

10 **E. The CPUC Should Address Funding Issues through Less Harmful Means**

11 The CPUC surcharges are intended to help needy Californians access communications  
12 services—in other words, to help bridge the digital divide. The CPUC's change in surcharge  
13 calculation methods would run contrary to that very policy. The FCC has recognized the threat to  
14 competitive neutrality an access-line surcharge poses, since it has considered, but never  
15 authorized an access-line charge.

16 As discussed above, the change will make it less likely that new users would subscribe to  
17 wireless services, more expensive for existing customers, and harder for carriers to offer flexible  
18 options to customers who need wireless service. The flat-fee surcharge would cause low-income  
19 wireless consumers to be a disproportionately large contributor to the fund, rather than a  
20 progressive model which is based on use and cost. The CPUC's exception to the surcharge for  
21 Lifeline customers does not encompass all the low-income wireless customers, or potential  
22 wireless customers, who will be affected by the surcharge. In 2022, only 29% of Californians  
23 eligible for Lifeline participated. Universal Service Administrative Co, *Lifeline Program Data*,  
24 <https://www.usac.org/lifeline/resources/program-data/>.<sup>9</sup> The CPUC's efforts to increase funding  
25 for these programs should favor policies which are consistent with the mission on increasing  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>9</sup> Similarly, the California equivalent of the federal Lifeline program estimates about 40% participation by eligible households. Legislative Analyst's Office, *A Review of LifeLine Budget Estimates and Enrollment Process* (Apr. 3, 2019), <https://lao.ca.gov/Publications/Report/3995>.

1 access to essential communications services, rather than the route the CPUC has taken here. The  
2 CPUC’s new surcharge methodology is antithetical to this mission by making access to wireless  
3 broadband less affordable and accessible.

4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 *Amici* respectfully urge the Court to issue a preliminary injunction against enforcement of  
6 the CPUC’s Decision and new connections-based surcharge rule that will increase costs for low-  
7 income communities of color and prevent access to broadband.

8  
9 Dated: February 17, 2023

EVERSHEDS SUTHERLAND (US) LLP

10  
11  
12 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
13 Timothy A. Gustafson  
14 Attorney for *Amici Curiae*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28