

Georgia Broadband Mapping

Data Submission Methodology Report

April 1, 2014



1935 Jamboree Drive
Colorado Spring CO 80920



47 Trinity Avenue S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30334-3404

Georgia Broadband Mapping

Data Submission Report (April 1, 2014)

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	3
2 OVERALL PROJECT STATUS.....	4
2.1 DATA COLLECTION	4
2.1.1 <i>Broadband Data</i>	4
2.1.2 <i>Community Anchor Institutions Data</i>	6
2.2 DATA PROCESSING	7
2.3 DETAILED DATA PROCESSING.....	10
2.4 DATA VALIDATION.....	10
3 SUBMISSION 9: NTIA DATA MODEL SCHEMA CHANGES	11
4 UNIVERSE OF CONTACTED PROVIDERS/NON-PROVIDERS.....	11
4.1 NON-PROVIDERS	12
4.2 SHELL COMPANIES.....	13
4.3 RESELLERS	14
4.4 NON-PARTICIPATING OR NON-RESPONSIVE PROVIDERS.....	15
4.5 PROVIDERS WITH NO DATA UPDATES	15
4.6 PROVIDERS WITH DATA UPDATES	17

1 Introduction

This report is submitted along with the ninth data submission for the Georgia Broadband Mapping Project. This submission includes all data collected so far per the requirements of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) State Broadband Data and Development Grant Program (Docket No. 0660-ZA29) Notice of Funds Availability (NOFA) and Clarifications to it. Specifically, it includes broadband data collected from broadband providers and Community Anchor Institutions data compiled from various sources for the State of Georgia. The State of Georgia has retained The Sanborn Map Company (Sanborn), supported by Applied Geographics Inc. (AppGeo) to support the Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) with respect to the Mapping Grant for the State of Georgia for Year 2013 and 2014.

This document provides an overview of the Team's progress, processes, assumptions, challenges and improvements needed for each dataset. Section 2 of this document explains the overall project status at the time of this submission. This is followed by a description of each of the processes for data collection, data processing, and data validation. In the submission seven's report we included a detailed section for data processing which we removed for this submission. NTIA can refer back to submission seven's report for that information if so desired. This report also discusses any changes to the data model for the submission. The final section provides a list of providers that fall in various categories of participation.

2 Overall Project Status

Sanborn updated the list of providers and internal provider portals, contact loggers, etc. before sending out letters to the provider. Letters to providers were sent on January 6, 2014.

In this submission, the following high level statistics represent the degree of participation and data updates from existing broadband providers and newly added providers. The breakdown of these providers in different categories is summarized below and detailed lists are provided in the last section of this report (Section 4).

Provider - Data Status - Submission 9	Count
Total Providers Researched/Contacted	236
Non-providers	54
Resellers	24
Total Valid Providers (total participating + non-cooperative but valid providers)	109
Non Responsive Providers	0
Non-cooperative Providers (refused participation)	25
Number of DBAs Represented in Data	48
Number of Providers that Supplied Updates (including new provider)	34
Number of Providers – Confirmed No Updates	25
Number of Providers – No updates and no confirmation	25

2.1 DATA COLLECTION

This section details data collection related to NTIA deliverables which include broadband data and community anchor institution data.

2.1.1 Broadband Data

Sanborn updated the Provider Portal and other internal tracking databases with the Submission 9 data. The Sanborn team then followed up by making calls to all providers identified (including participating providers, those who have refused participation, resellers, and newly identified providers). Sanborn began with the FCC Form 477 Broadband Data Filers from December 31, 2012, as submitted in filings made or revised as of August 16, 2013. We have a total of 88 executed NDAs for the State of Georgia.

According to both our research and lists provided to use by NTIA, there was the potential for Georgia to have up to 236 broadband providers. The breakdown of

these providers in different categories is summarized below and detailed lists are provided in the last section of this report (Section 4).

Of these:

- 54 companies stated that they do not provide any type of broadband service in Georgia. Many of these are either national carriers without a Georgia presence, or they file 477 reports because they provide VOIP or Video Teleconference services (but not broadband).
- 48 company names turned out to be a DBA or legal holding names for another firm that is listed in another category.
- 24 companies are resellers and are not considered part of this program. Note that this number is much higher than previous report because of changes in this category in discussions with NTIA.
- 25 companies may be broadband providers, but either they indicated they are not willing to provide data, or were completely unresponsive to multiple attempts at contacting them.
- 25 broadband providers informed us that there were no changes to their service area so for these providers we downloaded the data that had been submitted as part of the last submission, reprocessed the data, performed validation on it, and we are resubmitting this data:
- 34 broadband providers submitted either entirely new or partially new datasets for this submission.

A total of two new providers have been added to this submission:

- PeachNet
- CalNet

All changes and corrections in provider data are documented in the Change and Correction Document submitted with this submission.

In general, the submission 9 processes followed the same basic approach that was used in previous submissions made for Georgia. This document provides further details on the following topics:

1. Submission 9 Processing Assumptions
2. Reference Data Creation
3. Processing of New Provider Data
4. Quality Control Checks
5. Improved Validation Techniques
6. NTIA Quality Control Scripts
7. NTIA Submission Data Model Schema Changes

Based on NTIA feedback and information provided in NTIA webinar sessions the submission 9 data processing workflow is created with the following assumptions to meet NTIA submission requirements.

1. All census blocks and road segments are mapped based on 2010 census data set.
2. Due to our NDA restrictions, address points and last mile points are not being submitted to NTIA.
3. Terrestrial Mobile Wireless and Terrestrial Fixed Wireless (licensed and unlicensed) were again treated as wireless coverage and were delivered as a shape. In cases where a provider served the same spectrum with different speeds, overlapping areas were removed and the higher speed was assigned. The exception to this rule is where a provider is using the same spectrum, but delivering different underlying technologies such as 3G, 4G, or 4G LTE. In this case a continuous polygon is being created that represents the area that is offered for both 3G and 4G even if these polygons overlap.
4. If a cable based wireline provider can provide both DOCSIS 2.0 and DOCSIS 3.0 service to the same area, the block or road was listed only once, with a technology code of 40.
5. Most providers were only willing to indicate on a general level if they serviced business, residential or both. Not many providers broke down their type of service by block. If the provider stated they only serve business to business customers we fill in the “category of end user” with code 2, or if they told us specifically that they serve only residential, we used code 1. Where companies did not confirm their end user codes we attempted to verify by reference to their online marketing and any company-specific sources available; where we couldn’t verify we entered 5 as a default. In this submission, we continue to mark Megapath as a primarily business provider even though they submitted blocks with residential service. This decision was made in discussions with Georgia and the provider was informed about it.
6. The submission 9 Provider data model is currently based on the NTIA January 24, 2014 data model.
7. If provided, Franchise Area was captured during the ingest process, and kept for use during the validation process. These areas are not being submitted to NTIA.
8. All Provider data and Community Anchor Institutions (CAI) locations were clipped to the state’s boundary.
9. Where providers told us to reuse data from the previous submission or did not respond to our data request, we are resubmitting the data that was last submitted from that provider.
10. This submission is being made based on the NTIA data model as of January 24, 2014 provided by NTIA.

2.1.2 Community Anchor Institutions Data

In this submission, Georgia is supplying a substantially increased and improved CAI dataset. Georgia’s Regional Commission Offices provided updates to the CAI’s for Sanborn to process. Sanborn downloaded the latest NCES and Harvester tables for the schools and libraries. These were used to analyze the schools and library data to identify missing CAIIDs. Records identified as missing were then geocoded. Additionally, the downloaded tables were further used to resolve some blank CAIID entries. Some web searches were performed to verify

facilities and locational information. The school validation tables received from NTIA were reviewed and analysis performed against CAI data. Sanborn also incorporated NTIA's feedback which enhanced the ID's for schools and libraries. This will result in better connectivity to external data. Furthermore, GTA was able to obtain better connectivity and speed information for CAI's across the State and those are provided with this submission.

We have also added any extra schools and libraries from the websites provided by NTIA - ELSi (tableGenerator) <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/elsi> and <https://harvester.census.gov/imsls/data/pls/index.asp> (for libraries). Any CAIIDs that were in these databases but not represented in our data, were added, even if they had the same address, as long as the CAIID was different. This resulted in an additional 35 schools and 66 libraries that were added to the data.

2.2 DATA PROCESSING

We started with the following base data:

Census Blocks:

For Submission 9, Census 2010 data was utilized. The data was set up as follows:

- Block size (AREA) is calculated combining the 2010 land area (ALAND) and water area (AWATER).
- AREA is converted from square meters to square miles to calculate square mileage (SMI).
- If the SMI of a block is less than or equal to 2, then the less than or equal to 2 square mile indicator (LE2SMI) is set to true.
- In addition, we looked at the water area in comparison to the total block area, and if the block was 100% water, it was excluded from our reference data.

Road Segments:

2010 Tiger Line ID (TLID) was used for data processing for this submission. The data was set up as follows:

- The GT2SMI (Greater Than 2 Square Mile) indicator is set to True when:
- The 2010 road segment is completely within a block that is NOT less than 2 square miles
- Only minimum and maximum address ranges and a single zip code for each road segment is maintained.

All data received went through the following processing steps:

Triage: All new data was quickly reviewed to understand what was received, and in what format. We also made sure we had all the required components for

NTIA's data model, such as their FRN and advertised speed information. We also screened for any known issues that we might have seen before (such as Excel 2003 spreadsheets that cut off at 32k rows.)

Ingest: At this time the data is actually brought into our systems. Each provider is set up with a unique file geodatabase to store their information. Record counts of what was received is logged so that we can validate we did not drop anything in processing.

Data Processing: This is where the data goes through a number of ETL routines to convert the raw proprietary information into a format similar to the NTIA format. The exact routine utilized depends on how the data is received:

1. When a wireline provider submits a service boundary, we select all the blocks and roads that are within and cross that shape.
2. If a wireline provider submits a customer address list, the points are geocoded, and then the appropriate block or road segment is selected. In this submission, we created a better geocoding routine for addresses missing zip codes.
3. If a wireline provider submits block and road information using Census data, we make sure everything is formatted to the appropriate specifications.
4. If the wireline provider submits any type of road or line data that does not directly correlate to the TIGER data set, we convert the lines to TIGER by selecting the road centroid and spatially selecting the closed segment in our data set. If the road is in a block less than 2sqmi, then the block is selected. Some manual cleanup is also applied to make sure we do not accidentally drop any road segments that should have been processed.
5. Wireless provider data is formatted to ensure that there are no overlapping polygons with the same technology type unless the provider is offering different speeds such as 3G and 4G over the same area. In addition the data is cropped to the state boundary.
6. After each round of processing, we make sure that we only keep unique records. A unique record is defined as having a one of a kind combination of FRN, Block/Road ID, and technology type. If there are multiple records with different speeds, but all else is equal, we select the maximum advertised speeds.
7. In this submission, we have some blocks that are served by multiple providers but because they are providers who did not have an FRN, the blocks show up as duplicate. We are providing an explanation on the ReadMe document.

QC Review: All data is then sent to a different analyst to perform a thorough quality control review on the processed data set. Record counts are compared to what was submitted. The QC staff also makes sure the ETL scripts and routines populated all of the right fields.

QC Change Detection Review: Data is then sent to another team for a second Quality Control Review. In this step the data is not only double checked against what was originally submitted, but it is also brought up inside standardized MXD templates that allow us to make sure our results make sense. This step involves comparing the new data set with prior submissions, developing change maps, and looking for any possible technology or speed anomalies. At this stage we also begin our validation process. This includes looking at the provider data in comparison to things such as speed test results, franchise boundaries, siting information, and feedback from the planning surveys.

Provider Review: Processed data is posted to a customized web application we refer to as our Provider Portal. All providers were notified once their data was available in the site, and given a specified period for review of the data and to respond. In this site, providers can log on and visually see their processed data in a map format. It also allows them to overlay their raw data (boundaries or addresses provide in any format) to help them validate that we did indeed process things correctly. In this submission we continued to use our enhancements to this tool that provided the ability to highlight changes between submission 8 and submission 9. The provider portal also has a suite of markup tools that will allow the providers to edit their data, including adding or removing service areas, and making changes to the data attributes.

Comment Processing: All comments and feedback received from the provider portal, is then reviewed and applied to the processed data set. This updated data set goes back through our QA and QC processes, and if time allows, back out to the Provider Portal, for the provider to review and sign off on.

Data Append: After all of the individual data sets are processed and approved, we run an append process which merges all of the individual provider data sets into one geodatabase. This is also the point where our team will do any final transformations to get our working data model into the latest NTIA publishing format.

Submission Comparison Check: An application was written that compares this submission to the previous submission. We review any variations and assure that the changes found can be documented as being requested by the provider. We also review statewide data with clients to see changes in service areas, technologies, speeds, etc. across the state to make sure it aligns with their local knowledge and expectations.

Final QA/QC: A series of quality checks are run on the final appended data sets to ensure it is ready for submission to NTIA. We also run the latest version of the NTIA receipt tool at this time. If any issues are flagged as failing they are reviewed and corrected. All warnings are also reviewed and either corrected or documented in the attached document which explains that we have validated this data and it should be accepted. Any last issues are corrected, and the data is sent to the state for their review.

Deliver to NTIA and Publish to Web Applications: A copy of the Append File Geodatabase is generated to be used in the provider portal web-based

application. When verification feedback is received, the individual provider geodatabases are updated. After verification is complete, the Append process, including QA steps, is executed again and then submitted to NTIA.

2.3 DETAILED DATA PROCESSING

Detailed data processing information was provided in the methodology report submitted with Submission 7. There have been no major changes to our methodology since then.

2.4 DATA VALIDATION

Sanborn has validated data using the following steps:

1. QC of the data at various steps – this includes when data is received (triage), when it is processed through the various processing steps discussed above, etc.
2. Spatial checks against public and commercial datasets
 - a. If a provider gave us data updates, we verified it using the Pitney Bowes exchange boundaries data. Any wireline providers whose areas fell outside the exchange boundaries were marked up in an issues database and the information about this was relayed to the provider. We will continue improving the data where providers did not respond in the next submission.
3. Speedtest data
 - a. For this submission there were no FCC speed test data for validation. Therefore we could not use this data.
4. GTA provided a huge amount of local and previous knowledge in validating data. Sanborn and GTA continued to use the Online Data Verification Tool for review of the data. Issues identified by Sanborn through the above methods were already available for GTA to review and further feedback from GTA was reported to providers and data corrections were made where possible. All providers who provided changes to their data were reviewed by GTA and inquiries were opened on these data submissions after GTA's review. These inquiries were resolved as best as possible through conversations with the providers. In some cases, providers were non-responsive and we tabled some changes for next submissions. We feel that we addressed most of the major issues that came up from the previous submission in this submission. Some examples of these verification discussions include:
 - a. Zayo Group, LLC - This is a fiber provider and their service was marked as business only. They were providing data about subscription speeds, not what they could truly provision – in discussions with them; we increased their speeds to fiber speeds of Tier 11.

- b. TW Telecom: This is another business only provider that uses fiber and other copper to provide service. They were also reporting speeds that current subscribers were subscribing to rather than speeds that are maximum advertised speeds. We worked with them to upgrade all their service area with fiber to speed tier 11.
 - c. We verified all providers who were providing at speed tiers 10 and 11, by requiring them to show either some type of marketing material advertising such high speeds or to provide confirmation of these high speeds. If they did not respond, we downgraded their speeds to be in line with the typical offerings of each technology of transmission and informed them about our actions.
 - d. Local planning meetings revealed that Charter was not providing service in a few towns that were reported as served by Charter for many previous submissions. We worked with Charter to remove service in those areas.
5. Verification by providers – processed data is uploaded on our Provider Portal for providers to review both the outcome of data processing and any issues that we found in the third-party and GTA validation. Issues pertaining to a particular provider are highlighted and shown in the portal for those providers only. Issues that are global and cannot be assigned to a particular provider are shown to all providers (e.g. there are no providers in this area, or we tried to get service here and heard x from A provider, y from B provider, etc.).

3 Submission 9: NTIA Data Model Schema Changes

The latest data model released was released in January 2014 and was very similar to the previous data model.

The primary changes that were made to the data model for this submission were:

- a. Technology type Code 60 (Satellite) increased in both Max Advertised Download Speed and Max Advertised Upload Speed
 - i. Max advertised download acceptable range is now Code 3 - Code 7
 - ii. Max advertise upload acceptable range is now Code 2 - Code 5
- b. Added ZZ as default value for road segments
- c. Removed codes 3 and 4 from End User Category in Address feature class.

4 UNIVERSE OF CONTACTED PROVIDERS/NON-PROVIDERS

According to both our research and lists provided to use by NTIA, there was the potential for Georgia to have up to 236 broadband providers. Of these:

- 54 companies stated that they do not provide any type of broadband service in Georgia. Many of these are either national carriers without a Georgia presence, or they file 477 reports because they provide VOIP or Video Teleconference services (but not broadband).
- 48 company names turned out to be a DBA or legal holding names for another firm that is listed in another category.
- 24 companies are resellers and are not considered part of this program. Note that this number is much higher than previous report because of changes in this category in discussions with NTIA.
- 25 companies may be broadband providers, but either they indicated they are not willing to provide data, or were completely unresponsive to multiple attempts at contacting them.
- 25 broadband providers informed us that there were no changes to their service area so for these providers we downloaded the data that had been submitted as part of the last submission, reprocessed the data, performed validation on it, and we are resubmitting this data:
- 34 broadband providers submitted either entirely new or partially new datasets for this submission.

4.1 Non-providers

54 companies stated that they do not provide any type of broadband service in Georgia. Many of these are either national carriers without a Georgia presence, or they are out of business or have been purchased by other companies or they file 477 reports because they provide VOIP or Video Teleconference services (but not broadband).

- 1 360 Networks
- 2 Airespring, Inc.
- 3 American Fiber Network, Inc.
- 4 Baldwin County
- 5 Bellsouth Long Distance, Inc.
- 6 Bluebird Wireless Broadband Services, LLC
- 7 Broadcore, Inc.
- 8 BroadRiver, Inc. & BroadRiver Communications Corp
- 9 Broadstar, LLC d/b/a PrimeCast
- 10 BullsEye Telecom, Inc.
- 11 CIMCO Communications, Inc.
- 12 City of Augusta
- 13 City of Cordele
- 14 City of Manchester
- 15 City of Milledgeville
- 16 City of Statesboro
- 17 Coastal Broadband
- 18 CoBank

- 19 Convergence Technologies, Inc.
- 20 Deliberant LLC
- 21 DirecPath
- 22 EagleNet
- 23 EnerSphere Communications LLC
- 24 Enventis Telecom Inc.
- 25 eVolve Business Solutions LLC
- 26 FPL FiberNet LLC
- 27 Harbor Communications
- 28 HCE Media, LLC / Ridge Networks
- 29 Light Tower Fiber Long Island LLC
- 30 LightEdge Solutions, Inc.
- 31 Lintel, Inc.
- 32 MainStreet Broadband
- 33 Netlogic, Inc.
- 34 Quitman Wireless
- 35 Qwest Communications International, Inc.
- 36 Reliance Globalcom Services, Inc.
- 37 REYNOLDS CABLE TV INC.
- 38 RGW Communications, Inc.
- 39 Shentel Converged Services, Inc.
- 40 Signal Point Telecommunications Corp.
- 41 SkyWay USA
- 42 Smartresort Co., LLC d/b/a/ Beyond Communications
- 43 Stratos Offshore Services Company
- 44 Suburban Cable Inc.
- 45 Tata Communications (America) Inc.
- 46 Telovations, Inc.
- 47 The Edge Group Inc.
- 48 VectorLink
- 49 Verizon Communications d/b/a Verizon Business Glob
- 50 Wandering WiFi
- 51 Washington County
- 52 Wave2Wave Communications, Inc. & RNK
- 53 WDT World Discount Telecommunications Co., Inc.
- 54 Windjammer Communications LLC

4.2 Shell Companies

The following 48 company names turned out to be a DBA or legal holding names for another firm that is listed in another category.

- 1 Accucom Telecommunications
- 2 AGL Networks , LLC
- 3 Airimba and Windchannel Communications
- 4 Alltel/ Allied Wireless Communications Corp
- 5 American Fiber Systems, Inc.
- 6 ATC Broadband LLC
- 7 Birch Telecom, inc.
- 8 Blue Ridge Telephone Company
- 9 Board of Water, Light & Sinking Fund Commissioners
- 10 Broadwing Communications, LLC

- 11 Business Telecom, Inc.
- 12 Camden Telephone & Telegraph Co., Inc.
- 13 Cellco Partnership
- 14 City of Monroe
- 15 City of Tifton
- 16 Clearwire
- 17 ComSouth Telenet, Inc.
- 18 Covad Communications Company
- 19 Depot Street Communications, Inc.
- 20 DoveTel Communications, LLC
- 21 DSLnet Communications, LLC
- 22 Dycom Holding, Inc.
- 23 ETC Communications, LLC
- 24 Flint Cable TV, Inc.
- 25 GEORGIA RSA # 8 PARTNERSHIP Limited Partnership d/
- 26 Habersham Electric Membership Corporation
- 27 ITC Globe, Inc.
- 28 James Cable LLC
- 29 JamesCable (Waycross Cable) d/b/a MediaStream
- 30 KLiP, LLC
- 31 Madison River Communications, LLC
- 32 Mediastream
- 33 Nelson-Ball Ground Telephone Company
- 34 New Cingular Wireless Services, Inc.
- 35 Northland Cable Properties Seven Limited Partnersh
- 36 Northland Cable Properties, Inc.
- 37 Northland Cable Television, Inc.
- 38 NuVox Communications, Inc.
- 39 Plant Tifnet
- 40 Quincy Telephone Company
- 41 South GA Governmental Services Authority
- 42 US LEC of Georgia Inc.
- 43 Valley Cable TV, Inc.
- 44 VALLEY TEL CO, LLC
- 45 ViaSat Inc.
- 46 Waycross
- 47 Wideopenwest
- 48 WiTel Communications, LLC

4.3 Resellers

The following 24 companies are resellers and are not considered part of this program.

- 1 Access One, Inc.
- 2 American Telephone Company LLC
- 3 BCN Telecom Inc.
- 4 Birch Communications, Inc.
- 5 Broadview Networks, Inc.
- 6 Cbeyond Communications, LLC
- 7 CONEXIZ Corporation
- 8 Digital Agent, LLC

- 9 Georgia Business Net
- 10 Global Crossing North American Networks, Inc.
- 11 Greenfly Networks, Inc.
- 12 Intelletrace, Inc.
- 13 Interglobe Communications, Inc.
- 14 Metropolitan Telecommunications of Georgia, Inc.
- 15 Net2Atlanta
- 16 Network Billing Systems LLC/Fusion
- 17 Network Innovations, Inc.
- 18 New Edge
- 19 Reallinx, Inc.
- 20 Smart Choice Communications, LLC
- 21 SoX
- 22 Stage 2 Networks, LLC
- 23 Telefonica USA, Inc.
- 24 Wholesale Carrier Services

4.4 Non-Participating or Non-Responsive Providers

25 companies may be broadband providers, but either they indicated they are not willing to provide data, or were completely unresponsive to multiple attempts at contacting them.

- 1 Albany, Water, Gas and Light Commission
- 2 Appalachian Broadband Technologies, LLC
- 3 Brightlan LLC
- 4 City of Covington
- 5 City of Forsyth/ Forsyth CableNet
- 6 City of Griffin
- 7 City of Sandersville
- 8 City of Washington
- 9 Electric Power Board
- 10 Georgia Public Web, Inc.
- 11 Gosuto Wireless Internet
- 12 Gunby Communications Inc.
- 13 Hotwire Communications, Ltd.
- 14 Netlink IP Communications
- 15 One Ring Networks
- 16 Parker Fibernet
- 17 Rocketcomm WIFI
- 18 Sunesys
- 19 SyncGlobal
- 20 The Seimitsu Corporation
- 21 Time Warner/ former Dukenet
- 22 Transbeam Inc.
- 23 University Corporation for Advanced Internet Dev
- 24 UNSi/ was airBand Communications, Inc.
- 25 Wireless Hometown LLC

4.5 Providers with No Data Updates

25 broadband providers informed us that there were no changes to their service area so for these providers we downloaded the data that had been submitted as

part of the last submission, performed validation on it, and we are resubmitting this data:

- 1 AL-GA Wireless Broadband, LLC
- 2 BCI Broadband/MediaStream
- 3 Brantley Telephone Company, Inc.
- 4 Bright House Networks Information Services (Alaba
- 5 Cavalier Telephone LLC or Talk America
- 6 Cricket Comm/Leap Wireless International, Inc.
- 7 Dalton Utilities
- 8 ELBERTON , City of
- 9 Ellijay Telephone Company
- 10 Kennedy Cablevision Inc.
- 11 KitePilot Wireless Internet
- 12 Knology, Inc.
- 13 MetroPCS Georgia, LLC
- 14 Nextlink Wireless, Inc.
- 15 Northland Cable Properties Eight Limited Partnersh
- 16 Plant Telephone Company
- 17 Planters Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc.
- 18 Public Service Data Wireless
- 19 Skycasters
- 20 South Georgia Regional Information Technology Auth
- 21 Southeastern Services, Inc.
- 22 StarBand Communications, Inc.
- 23 Unite Private Networks, LLC
- 24 Viasat/WildBlue Communications, Inc.
- 25 XO Communications, LLC

In addition, 23 broadband providers did not respond to us about changes in data and for these providers also we downloaded the data that had been submitted as part of the last submission, performed validation on it, and we are resubmitting this data.

- 1 Appalachian Valley Fiber Network
- 2 Bulldog Cable Georgia
- 3 Bulloch Telephone Cooperative
- 4 Citizens Telephone Company, Inc.
- 5 City of Cairo, GA
- 6 City of Camilla d/b/a South Georgia Gov't Svcs.
- 7 City of Dublin
- 8 City of Thomasville Utilities
- 9 ComSouth
- 10 DeltaCom, Inc./EarthLink Business
- 11 FiberLight, LLC
- 12 Fort Valley Utility Commission
- 13 Glenwood Telephone Company
- 14 Hughes Communications/HNS License Sub, LLC
- 15 Kings Bay Communications, Inc.
- 16 MonroeAccess.net
- 17 North Georgia Network Cooperative, Inc.
- 18 NuLink Digital

- 19 Pembroke Telephone Company, Inc.
- 20 Plantation Cablevision, Inc.
- 21 Public Service Telephone Company/Flint Cable
- 22 Waverly Hall Telephone, LLC
- 23 Wilkes Telephone & Electric Company

4.6 Providers with Data Updates

A total of 34 Broadband providers submitted either entirely new or partially new datasets for this submission:

- 1 AI-CALL, Inc./ATC
- 2 AT&T Mobility LLC
- 3 AT&T of Georgia
- 4 CenturyLink/CenturyTel
- 5 Charter Communications
- 6 Chickamauga Telephone Corporation
- 7 City of LaGrange
- 8 Cogent Communications Group
- 9 Comcast Corporation
- 10 Cox Communications, Inc.
- 11 Frontier Communications of Georgia, Inc.
- 12 Hargray of Georgia, Inc.
- 13 Hart Telephone Company
- 14 iWispr LLC
- 15 Level 3 Communications, LLC
- 16 Mediacom Communications Corp & MCC Georgia LLC
- 17 MegaPath
- 18 PeachNet
- 19 Pineland Telephone Cooperative, Inc.
- 20 Progressive Rural Telephone Co-op., Inc.
- 21 Ringgold Telephone Company
- 22 Sprint Corporation
- 23 TDS Telecomm
- 24 T-Mobile
- 25 TruVista
- 26 TW Telecom of Georgia L.P.
- 27 Verizon Wireless
- 28 Windstream Georgia Telephone bought Accucomm Telec
- 29 Zayo Group, LLC
- 30 ATG Communications, LLC
- 31 City of Calhoun/CALNET
- 32 Darien Telephone Co., Inc.
- 33 Fairpoint/GTC, Inc.
- 34 Trenton Telephone Company