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Applicant Name: TTM Operating Corporation, Inc.

Public Notice Submissions

-----Service Area: Last Mile Extension of TTM's Middle Mile Network

Submitter: Crystal Communications, Inc. dba HickoryTech

Comment: Respondent Crystal Communications, Inc. dba HickoryTech ("Crystal") is a competitive local exchange carrier in the following communities contained in Applicant's proposed service area: Ellendale, Faribault, Janesville, Nicollet, New Richland, Waseca and St. Peter. Crystal advertises and provides broadband services with a 25% take rate. Applicant's service area does not qualify as underserved and the application should be denied.

Submitter: Enventis Telecom, Inc.

Comment: The TTM application, covering 7000 square miles of southern Minnesota, proposes to install a "Middle Mile" fiber network connecting cell sites for TTM’s wireless carrier customers using fiber and microwave facilities. The TTM proposal does NOT address a market area that is either unserved or underserved. The southern Minnesota area identified in its application is now served by no less than 13 companies with extensive “Middle Mile” fiber networks that, today, serve the same market area TTM proposes to build. These companies are: Paetec, KDL, Level 3, Global Crossing, AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Enventis, Jaguar, Sprint/Nextel, 360 Networks, Charter Cable and Zayo Bandwidth. Additionally, the TTM proposal also covers markets that are well served by over a dozen incumbent telephone and cable companies with extensive fiber networks of their own, including respondent.

The data submitted below will show that MCTC’s service area does not qualify as “underserved.”

Submitter: Charter Communications

Comment: Charter Communications (‘Charter’), a broadband service provider, has invested capital to provide a full range of Broadband services, including High Speed Internet services, in this service area. The applicant’s request in the proposed under-served service area would create an overlap in Charter’s service area. Charter’s response includes the necessary information to validate the overlapping condition as a result of this applicant’s request.
Submitter: Sleepy Eye Telephone Company

Comment: Sleepy Eye Telephone Company serves the communities and surrounding areas of Sleepy Eye, Hanska, Goodhue, Bellechester, White Rock and Mazeppa in south central and southeast Minnesota. Sleepy Eye Telephone is the incumbent local exchange carrier and by the NOFA definitions of broadband is not considered unserved nor underserved. Due to the satisfaction of these definitions, no ARRA funds should be awarded to the applicant in this area.

Submitter: US Cable of Coastal-Texas, L.P.

Comment: US Cable of Coastal-Texas, L.P. provides high speed broadband internet service in communities that are within the applicant's proposed service area.

Submitter: Winnebago Cooperative Telecom Assn.

Comment: The information contained in this response supports the fact that customers within our service territory, which overlaps portions of the applicant’s proposed service area, have access to high quality, facilities-based broadband service as defined by the RUS/NTIA Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA).

Submitter: Mid-Communications, Inc. dba HickoryTech

Comment: The TTM application, covering 7000 square miles of southern Minnesota, proposes to install a “Middle Mile” fiber network connecting cell sites for TTM’s wireless carrier customers using fiber and microwave facilities. The TTM proposal does NOT address a market area that is either unserved or underserved. The southern Minnesota area identified in its application is now served by no less than 13 companies with extensive “Middle Mile” fiber networks that, today, serve the same market area TTM proposes to build. These companies are: Paetec, KDL, Level 3, Global Crossing, AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Enventis, Jaguar, Sprint/Nextel, 360 Networks, Charter Cable and Zayo Bandwidth. Additionally, the TTM proposal also covers markets that are well served by over a dozen incumbent telephone and cable companies with extensive fiber networks of their own, including respondent.

The data submitted below will show that Mid-Communications’ service area which is covered by TTM’s application does not qualify as “underserved.”
Submitter: Lonsdale Telephone Company

Comment: The service area of Lonsdale Telephone Company is NOT underserved as defined by the ARRA rules and definitions. LTC offers at least 3 mbs internet service to 100% of the LTC service area. The TTM applicant is incorrect in stating that LTC is underserved and the application should not be approved. LTC customers are served by a 100% FTTH system providing triple play.

Submitter: Scott Rice Telephone Company dba Integra Telecom

Comment: TTM Operating Corporation, Inc. proposed Middle Mile project covers approximately 100% of the exchange served by Scott Rice Telephone Company dba Integra Telecom. We currently serve the exchange by an existing fiber-to-the-node network that extends from our corporate headquarters in Prior Lake, MN. In the public notice response Integra Telecom is providing; 1) a map of the overlapping area Integra Telecom provides broadband services, 2) Integra Telecom's DSL high speed internet advertising 3) the number of residential households and business establishments capable of receiving broadband services, 4) the number of residential households and business establishments subscribing to our broadband, 5) the advertised download and upload speeds and service rates, and 6) comments addressing the existing services offered within the proposed funded service area.

Submitter: Mankato Citizens Telephone Company dba HickoryTech

Comment: The TTM application, covering 7000 square miles of southern Minnesota, proposes to install a “Middle Mile” fiber network connecting cell sites for TTM’s wireless carrier customers using fiber and microwave facilities. The TTM proposal does NOT address a market area that is either unserved or underserved. The southern Minnesota area identified in its application is now served by no less than 13 companies with extensive “Middle Mile” fiber networks that, today, serve the same market area TTM proposes to build. These companies are: Paetec, KDL, Level 3, Global Crossing, AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Enventis, Jaguar, Sprint/Nextel, 360 Networks, Charter Cable and Zayo Bandwidth. Additionally, the TTM proposal also covers markets that are well served by over a dozen incumbent telephone and cable companies with extensive fiber networks of their own, including respondent.

The data submitted below will show that MCTC's service area does not qualify as “underserved.”

Submitter: Zumbrota Telephone Company
Comment:  Zumbrota Telephone Company has been providing telecommunications service to the community of Zumbrota since 1915. Since 1996, the Company began providing broadband service to the community and the surrounding area.

We disagree with the Applicant’s assertion the area is underserved. At no time did the Applicant contact us to determine areas that presently have broadband services. In fact, they apparently did not conduct research with the FCC to determine if a service provider was in the area. Had they checked, they would have found that our FCC form 477 indicates our Company provides broadband service to 100% of our end users and of those 100% are above download speeds greater than 768 kbps.

Submitter:  Pine Island Telephone Company

Comment:  Respondent serves a portion of applicant's proposed service area with fiber and middle mile transport facilities which Respondent uses to provide broadband internet services, as defined by the FCC and the NOFA to 100% of Respondent's service territory. Approximately 80% of Respondent's internet customers receive internet service of 768 kbps download and 256 kbps upload speeds or greater. In addition, there are other fiber and middle mile fiber network providers within applicant's and Respondent's service area capable of providing broadband service to the area.

Submitter:  Frontier Communications of Minnesota, Inc.

Comment:  A portion of the applicant's territory is already served by the respondent. 3MG speed or higher is available and advertised.

Submitter:  Eckles Telephone Company d/b/a BEVCOMM

Comment:  Respondent contends that it has fiber facilities and middle mile transport facilities in a portion of applicant's proposed service territory. Respondent uses these facilities to provide broadband service to 100% of its service territory and that 81% of Respondent's internet customers receive broadband service as defined by the FCC and the NOFA. Respondent contends that providing broadband stimulus funds to applicant would not be in the public interest, as middle mile fiber networks already exist within applicants proposed service territory. Respondent contends that there are other locations in the country that are in much greater need of broadband stimulus funds.

Submitter:  Qwest
Comment: As authorized by the BIP and BTOP Notice of Funds Availability and the Public Notice associated with the publication of BIP and BTOP broadband infrastructure project funding applications found on the BroadbandUSA.gov website, Qwest responds with broadband service data to the application of TTM Operating Corporation, Inc for funding for an area represented as “underserved” that is located, in whole or in part, in Qwest’s broadband service area.