INFINITY
COMMUNICATIONS AND CONSULTING

Received & Inspected

DEC 14 2016

FCC Mailroom

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

December 5, 2016

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comment on Petitions Separately Filed by Boulder Valley School District and Microsoft Corporation Regarding Off-Campus Use of Existing E-Rate Supported Connectivity (CC Docket No. 02-6; WC Docket No. 10-90; WC Docket No. 13-184)

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Infinity Communications & Consulting, Inc (Infinity) is an E-rate consultant representing approximately 300 E-rate Applicants ranging from large statewide consortiums, large, medium and small public school districts, libraries, and small private schools. We have been privileged to work with E-rate Applicants since 2003 and have seen massive changes in the E-rate program since that time. One of these changes was to allow offsite access to an Applicant's ISP connection but that offsite usage must be cost allocated before Erate funding was applied for.

While it's not the primary focus of this letter, I did want to mention, taking away E-rate support for voice service has had a devastating financial impact on almost every Applicant we work with, many of which now can't afford to purchase higher speed data circuits because they need to transfer those monies that would have been used to purchase high speed data circuits to pay for their voice services no longer funded by E-rate. And, because many small schools and libraries are only getting Erate funding, now on only undersized data circuits (that's all they can afford) and no other Erate Category One provided services, given the time and manpower it takes to apply for the funding, many are leaving the program entirely. The full impact on this loss won't be felt until the voice phasedown is complete however this does have an impact on why we support the petitions filed by Boulder Valley School District and Microsoft Corporation.

Years ago, many of our Applicants discovered, by not providing some sort of solution to allow low income students to work from home to complete their homework caused those students to start lagging behind their more affluent counterparts who had Internet access at home or at least away from school.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

P.O. Box 999 • Bakersfield, CA 93302 • 661-716-1840 • Fax 661-716-1841 • Infinitycomm.com

Current USAC rules require, if a student wants to take a district owned wireless device home to do homework, (1) we must cost allocate that portion of the current high speed data circuit at our District office for that time that those who are offsite access this data circuit and (2) those that access our Internet connection from home or away from school must still stay in compliance with CIPA rules. This assumes, when the student turns on their wireless device or computer at home, that ISP feed does not directly out to the Internet but to the school through the school router and CIPA compliant firewall before it gets out to the Internet. I.e., if the school district is now paying $1,000 per month for their ISP service and 10% of the usage now happens off campus, then the district would only apply for $900 in Erate discounts and current rules limit us from asking for additional bandwidth if additional bandwidth is required because of off campus usage. As I understand the Boulder City School District and Microsoft petitions, they aren't asking for USAC to pay for the actual cost of the device or the circuit between the student's home and the school district, just that they don't have to deduct (cost allocate) this $100 (see example above) before we apply for our Erate funding for our current Internet connection.

Furthermore, we find that a high percentage of this homework is done in the evening or on weekends when the school is ***not*** in session and when the Internet connection at the school is typically ***not is use or barely in use***. If it's not in use, why should we then have to cost allocate portions our Internet connection? If we think of this Internet connection at the District Office as a 1" water hose with 10lbs of pressure and, during the day, most of the water is used is in the faucets (computers in classrooms) closest to the hose but at night some of that water pressure is used by faucets (computers at home), it's still a 1" water hose with 10lbs of pressure. Just as long as the students on the school campus aren't adversely affected by the offsite use, why would the FCC care if parts of the service are offsite? The cost is the same from the Internet provider either way.

Thank you for allowing Infinity to pass on these comments from our Applicants.

Sincerely,

Fred Brakeman

Fred Brakeman RCDD, CSI, CEMP
President