



[email](#)

[website](#)

[twitter](#)

1. Chair Manning, Vice-Chair Thatcher, and Members of the Committee,
2. My name is Malena Lechon-Galdos, I use she/her pronouns, and I am here on behalf of the digital justice non-profit, suma, in support of HB 3201A.
3. Suma works to build an inclusive technology future with low-income people, people of color and other frontline communities. We believe that responsive technology investments and institutions can build community power to address climate change, poverty and racial injustice.
4. In 2021, suma programs served 9700 people: 9200 were people of color, 3500 were immigrant/refugee, 1250 were living with a disability and 4500 were low-income.
5. We served them because these were urban communities on the wrong side of the digital divide, like far too many Oregonians. In fact, approx. 100,000 Oregonian households lack internet service, alongside 30,000 rural Oregonian households.
6. Our experiences demonstrate clearly – broadband investments are needed in rural, frontier *and* in historically underserved communities- which we know reside in urban areas.
7. HB 3201A has changes to the Oregon Broadband Fund developed by a broad group of public and private stakeholders, that included frontline organizations, which were not at the table when SB1603 was created and passed. We worked for months, in good faith, to develop legislation that serves all Oregonians on the wrong side of the digital divide.
8. Since the bill has come to the Senate side, however, the inclusive process of developing language that supports a wide range of stakeholder interests, has been lost. The development of the amendment language that is going to be proposed is the work of industry and government up to” business as usual” conduct, with the interests of a powerful few being adhered to.
9. We flatly reject this approach because it’s proven time and time again as a recipe for bad policy. Instead, we strongly support HB 3201A as passed by the House.
10. Why? Because we know who that bill serves – every Oregonian on the wrong side of the digital divide. Rural households, urban households, low-income households, limited English households.
11. The changes proposed to HB 3201A, in contrast, restrict our urban and suburban communities from being able to fill in their broadband infrastructure as needed; the result of this could be a lot of communities, particularly frontline communities impacted by digital redlining, from benefiting from these federal dollars.
12. For those who would advance amendments to 3201A, we ask simply: show us the map - show us the communities your amendments include and those you’re choosing to leave out. Which Oregon towns are you leaving behind, from A-Z – Albany? Astoria? Aloha? Wood Village? Yachats? Yamhill? Charbonneau, King City, Metzger, Sherwood, Tigard, Wilsonville? We know

*...suma creates platforms for digital organizing, enterprise and justice*



[email](#)

[website](#)

[twitter](#)

who 3201A serves, show us the map of who these amendments will serve, and those it will not, and put it on the record.

13. Our investments as a state should not be subsidizing certain industry folks who clearly have not had all communities' interest at heart. Our future broadband investments must be different from the private and profitable methods that in the past, that left too many communities in our state behind. We believe HB 3201A, supports this goal.
14. Thank you for your continued leadership in working towards closing the digital divide and ensuring all Oregonians have access to quality, affordable, reliable and accessible broadband. We urge you to pass HB 3201A as is.