

Broadband USA Applications Database

Applicant Name: Central Park Systems Corporation; DBA Fortis Telecom

Public Notice Submissions

-----**Service Area:** Sacramento County

Submitter: SureWest Communications

Comment: Respondent disputes herein that some of the service area proposed for funding by Central Park Systems Corporation; DBA Fortis Telecom is neither underserved nor unserved. Putting aside the issue of other existing providers, for alleged unserved area, respondent shows that in the proposed funded service area, it currently advertises and provides fixed broadband service with transmission speeds of at least 768 kbps downstream and 200 kbps upstream, and that more than 10 percent of the households in the proposed funded service area currently have access to that service for alleged underserved area. Respondent also shows that in the proposed funded service area, 1) it currently advertises and provides fixed broadband service with transmission speeds of at least 3 mbps downstream, 2) that more than 50 percent of the households in the proposed funded service area currently have access to that service, and 3) that more than 40% of the households in the proposed funded service area currently subscribe to broadband service. The wireline broadband service providers in the area are AT&T, SureWest, and Comcast and various wireless broadband providers.

The applicant crosses as specified above in an area that is neither un-served or underserved. The CBGs are portions of north Elk grove, Sacramento, and Citrus Heights too numerous to delineate here.

-----**Service Area:** Placer County

Submitter: SureWest Communications

Comment: Respondent disputes herein that some of the service area proposed for funding by Central Park Systems Corporation; DBA Fortis Telecom is neither underserved nor unserved. Putting aside the issue of other existing providers, for alleged unserved area, respondent shows that in the proposed funded service area, it currently advertises and provides fixed broadband service with transmission speeds of at least 768 kbps downstream and 200 kbps upstream, and that more than 10 percent of the

households in the proposed funded service area currently have access to that service for alleged underserved area. Respondent also shows that in the proposed funded service area, 1) it currently advertises and provides fixed broadband service with transmission speeds of at least 3 mbps downstream, 2) that more than 50 percent of the households in the proposed funded service area currently have access to that service, and 3) that more than 40% of the households in the proposed funded service area currently subscribe to broadband service. The wireline broadband service providers in the area are AT&T, SureWest, WaveBroadband and Comcast and various wireless broadband providers.

The applicant crosses as specified above in an area that is neither un-served or underserved. The specific CBGs are 0206011-0206013, 0206024, 0206041-0206044, 0206051-0206052, 0211091, 0211071-0211072, 0211082, 0213031-0213032, 0221301, 0221303-0221304, 0221401-0221402, 0209011-0209012.

Submitter: WaveDivision Holdings, LLC

Comment: WaveDivision Holdings, LLC (“Wave”) is a facilities-based, terrestrial provider of high speed Internet, cable television and telephone services. Wave challenges the application of Central Park Systems Corporation; DBA Fortis Telecom (“Applicant”) for last mile funding because Applicant’s proposed funded service area does not meet the requirement set forth in the Notice of Funds Availability to qualify as an “Underserved Area”. The current aggregate broadband penetration in Applicant’s proposed funded service area is approximately 87%, significantly greater than the 40% standard set forth in the NOFA. Additionally, in the portion of Applicant’s proposed service area that is served by Wave more than 50% of the households have access to facilities-based, terrestrial broadband service. Essentially 100% of the households in the areas Wave serves in the proposed funded service area have access to Wave’s broadband services. Accordingly, NTIA and/or RUS must deny Applicant’s funding proposal.