

## Broadband USA Applications Database

**Applicant Name:** KeyOn Communications, Inc.

---

### Public Notice Submissions

---

-----**Service Area:** Arkansas

**Submitter:** Allegiance Communications LLC,

**Comment:** Allegiance Communications (Allegiance) currently provides a wide array of broadband offerings within the proposed funded service area. Allegiance has offered broadband services in excess of the 3 MB bandwidth requirement as set forth in the ARRA, NOFA and BIP/BTOP guidelines, all prior to the ARRA approval. Allegiance's service area already provides for "sufficient access to broadband service to facilitate rural economic development", as well as allows for choice of service providers through competing with Local Exchange Carriers, and allows for leasing of services through our own facilities. Allegiance's opinion of the proposed funded service area is that of excess spending where funds could be better used in other portions of the country to deploy broadband service in accordance with the ARRA, NOFA and BIP/BTOP programs. Through funding the proposed service area, excessive competition will be created for all, which may create a short term economic boost, but have severe long term ramifications which may force service providers out of business.

**Submitter:** CenturyLink

**Comment:** CenturyLink is submitting data that shows the application's proposed service area is not underserved or unserved, under program guidelines. Accordingly, the application must be denied as ineligible. With limited funding and a large pool of applications, program grants and loans must be directed only to areas that are truly underserved or unserved, as stipulated in the program guidelines.

CenturyLink can certify that its affiliates currently offer broadband service in some or all of the applicant's proposed service areas. Attached is a state map that is a representative sample of areas where the application overlaps our existing broadband deployment. CenturyLink also provides data showing broadband availability in our local telephone exchanges within the proposed service areas. We will provide additional information on request if that will further assist the agency's review.

This data is not exhaustive; the application may include other areas also currently served with broadband by other providers, which should be considered in the assessment of the application. Our

data combined with that of other broadband providers would likely show further duplication and overlap of broadband services in the proposed service areas.

**Submitter:** Allegiance Communications LLC,

**Comment:** Allegiance Communications (Allegiance) currently provides a wide array of broadband offerings within the proposed funded service area. Allegiance has offered broadband services in excess of the 3 MB bandwidth requirement as set forth in the ARRA, NOFA and BIP/BTOP guidelines, all prior to the ARRA approval. Allegiance's service area already provides for "sufficient access to broadband service to facilitate rural economic development", as well as allows for choice of service providers through competing with Local Exchange Carriers, and allows for leasing of services through our own facilities. Allegiance's opinion of the proposed funded service area is that of excess spending where funds could be better used in other portions of the country to deploy broadband service in accordance with the ARRA, NOFA and BIP/BTOP programs. Through funding the proposed service area, excessive competition will be created for all, which may create a short term economic boost, but have severe long term ramifications which may force service providers out of business.

**Submitter:** Rice Belt Telephone Company

**Comment:** In the Weiner, Waldenburg, and Fisher exchanges- Rice Belt Telephone Company objects to the classification of the proposed area being designated as underserved. Rice Belt provides access to consumers of facilities-based broadband transmission speeds of up to and over 768K to 100% of the Proposed Funded Service Area. Not only does Rice Belt provide services to this area, but two wireless broadband service providers and one satellite broadband service provider also compete and advertise broadband services of speeds of at least 3 megabits and over in the proposed funded service area. Rice Belt believes that, when coupled with the other broadband wireless providers, the penetration rate of broadband access is over 40% in the proposed service area. Rice Belt has invested extensively in the proposed funded service area to bring consumers the latest broadband technologies. Therefore this application should be rejected based on the above statements.

**Submitter:** Ritter Communications

**Comment:** Ritter responds to the filed application of KeyOn Communications in Arkansas. Ritter, through its affiliates E. Ritter Telephone and Ritter Cable, provides broadband access to 100% of its customers and service area, portions of which overlap the KeyOn PFSA. Because Ritter offers such broadband availability, portions of the PFSA do not qualify for the underserved designation.

**Submitter:** Windstream

**Comment:** Windstream's data strongly suggest that the proposed funded service area likely does not qualify as an underserved area. Windstream offers facilities-based, terrestrial broadband service (meeting the definition set forth in the Notice of Funds Availability) to some of the households in the proposed funded service area, and such households can readily subscribe to Windstream's broadband service upon request. Windstream also has reason to believe that competitive broadband offerings are available in exchanges overlapping the proposed funded service area. Given this information, agency officials should further investigate existing broadband offerings within the proposed funded service area, so that officials can be sure that the area, in fact, qualifies as underserved.

Windstream is a communications and entertainment company with more than 1 million broadband customers in 16 states. Investing more than \$200 million in broadband deployment over the last several years, Windstream now offers approximately 89% of its 3 million voice customers access to quality and affordable broadband service.

The agencies define an "underserved area" as follows: "Underserved area means a proposed funded service area, composed of one or more contiguous census blocks meeting certain criteria that measure the availability of broadband service and the level of advertised broadband speeds. These criteria conform to the two distinct components of the Broadband Infrastructure category of eligible projects- Last Mile and Middle Mile. Specifically, a proposed funded service area may qualify as underserved for last mile projects if at least one of the following factors is met, though the presumption will be that more than one factor is present: 1. No more than 50 percent of the households in the proposed funded service area have access to facilities-based, terrestrial broadband service at greater than the minimum broadband transmission speed (set forth in the definition of broadband above); 2. No fixed or mobile broadband service provider advertises broadband transmission speeds of at least three megabits per second ("mbps") downstream in the proposed funded service area; or 3. The rate of broadband subscribership for the proposed funded service area is 40 percent of households or less. A proposed funded service area may qualify as underserved for Middle Mile projects if one interconnection point terminates in a proposed funded service area that qualifies as unserved or underserved for Last Mile projects."

**Submitter:** Suddenlink Communications

**Comment:** This response conclusively demonstrates that Suddenlink and its competitors already offer robust broadband service within the mapped area of the applicant's proposed funded service area and that this mapped area is neither unserved nor underserved. Additional information is provided in the uploaded document, including (1) sample marketing material; (2) a guide on how to read the data we entered in the "Existing Broadband Subscribers" section of this response; (3) a summary of the vendor and methodology used for estimating competitive-service subscribers in the mapped area; (4) Suddenlink contact information, should one or more federal agencies have questions or require additional information; and (5) a summary of concerns with the response process and the limitations that process has placed on our ability to provide NTIA/RUS with relevant, timely data.