

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Comcast Cable Communications, LLC)	CSR 7156-E
)	
Petition for Determination of Effective)	
Competition in 9 Washington Franchise Areas)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: April 18, 2008

Released: April 21, 2008

By the Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, hereinafter referred to as “Petitioner,” has filed with the Commission a petition pursuant to Sections 76.7, 76.905(b)(2), 76.905(b)(1) and 76.907 of the Commission’s rules for a determination that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in those communities listed on Attachment A and hereinafter referred to as “Communities.” Petitioner alleges that its cable system serving the Communities listed on Attachment B is subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (“Communications Act”)¹ and the Commission’s implementing rules,² and is therefore exempt from cable rate regulation in the Communities because of the competing service provided by two direct broadcast satellite (“DBS”) providers, DirecTV, Inc. (“DirecTV”) and Dish Network (“Dish”). Petitioner alternatively claims to be exempt from cable rate regulation in the Communities listed on Attachment C because the Petitioner serves fewer than 30 percent of the households in the franchise area. The petition is unopposed.

2. In the absence of a demonstration to the contrary, cable systems are presumed not to be subject to effective competition,³ as that term is defined by Section 623(1) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission’s rules.⁴ The cable operator bears the burden of rebutting the presumption that effective competition does not exist with evidence that effective competition is present within the relevant franchise area.⁵ For the reasons set forth below, we grant the petition based on our finding that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachments (B and C).

¹See 47 U.S.C. § 543(a)(1).

²47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2) and 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(1).

³47 C.F.R. § 76.906.

⁴See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l) and 47 C.F.R. § 76.905.

⁵See 47 C.F.R. §§ 76.906 & 907.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Competing Provider Test

3. Section 623(l)(1)(B) of the Communications Act provides that a cable operator is subject to effective competition if the franchise area is (a) served by at least two unaffiliated multi-channel video programming distributors (“MVPD”) each of which offers comparable video programming to at least 50 percent of the households in the franchise area; and (b) the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs other than the largest MVPD exceeds 15 percent of the households in the franchise area;⁶ this test is otherwise referred to as the “competing provider” test.

4. The first prong of this test has three elements: the franchise area must be “served by” at least two unaffiliated MVPDs who offer “comparable programming” to at least “50 percent” of the households in the franchise area.⁷

5. Turning to the first prong of this test, it is undisputed that these Communities are “served by” both DBS providers, DIRECTV and Dish, and that these two MVPD providers are unaffiliated with Petitioner or with each other. A franchise area is considered “served by” an MVPD if that MVPD’s service is both technically and actually available in the franchise area. DBS service is presumed to be technically available due to its nationwide satellite footprint, and presumed to be actually available if households in the franchise area are made reasonably aware of the service’s availability.⁸ The Commission has held that a party may use evidence of penetration rates in the franchise area (the second prong of the competing provider test discussed below) coupled with the ubiquity of DBS services to show that consumers are reasonably aware of the availability of DBS service.⁹ We further find that Petitioner has provided sufficient evidence of DBS advertising in local, regional, and national media that serve the Communities to support their assertion that potential customers in the Communities are reasonably aware that they may purchase the service of these MVPD providers.¹⁰ The “comparable programming” element is met if a competing MVPD provider offers at least 12 channels of video programming, including at least one channel of nonbroadcast service programming¹¹ and is supported in this petition with copies of channel lineups for both DIRECTV and Dish.¹² Also undisputed is Petitioner’s assertion that both DIRECTV and Dish offer service to at least “50 percent” of the households in the Communities because of their national satellite footprint.¹³ Accordingly, we find that the first prong of the competing provider test is satisfied.

6. The second prong of the competing provider test requires that the number of households subscribing to MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceed 15 percent of the households in a franchise area. Petitioner asserts that it is the largest MVPD in the Communities.¹⁴ Petitioner sought to determine the competing provider penetration in the Communities by purchasing a subscriber tracking report from

⁶47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(B); *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

⁷47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2)(i).

⁸*See Petition at (paragraph number/s and Exhibit reference as may be appropriate).*

⁹Mediacom Illinois LLC et al., *Eleven Petitions for Determination of Effective Competition in Twenty-Two Local Franchise Areas in Illinois and Michigan*, 21 FCC Rcd 1175 (2006).

¹⁰47 C.F.R. § 76.905(e)(2).

¹¹*See* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g). *See also* Petition at 4-5.

¹²*See* Petition at Exhibit 2.

¹³*See* Petition at 3.

¹⁴*See* Petition at 5.

the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association (“SBCA”) that identified the number of subscribers attributable to the DBS providers within the Communities on a zip code plus four basis.¹⁵

7. Based upon the aggregate DBS subscriber penetration levels that were calculated using Census 2000 household data,¹⁶ as reflected in Attachment B, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated that the number of households subscribing to programming services offered by MVPDs, other than the largest MVPD, exceeds 15 percent of the households in the Communities. Therefore, the second prong of the competing provider test is satisfied for each of the Communities.

8. Based on the foregoing, we conclude that Petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating that both prongs of the competing provider test are satisfied and Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachment B.

B. The Low Penetration Test

9. Section 623(l)(1)(A) of the Communications Act provides that a cable operator is subject to effective competition if the Petitioner serves fewer than 30 percent of the households in the franchise area; this test is otherwise referred to as the “low penetration” test.¹⁷ Petitioner alleges that it is subject to effective competition under the low penetration effective competition test because it serves less than 30 percent of the households in the Lewis County and Mason County, Washington franchise areas.

10. Based upon the subscriber penetration level calculated by Petitioner, as reflected in Attachment C, we find that Petitioner has demonstrated the percentage of households subscribing to its cable service is less than 30 percent of the households in the Communities listed on Attachment C. Therefore, the low penetration test is also satisfied as to the Communities.

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

11. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petition for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by Comcast Cable Communications, LLC **IS GRANTED**.

12. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the certification to regulate basic cable service rates granted to any of the Communities set forth on Attachment A **IS REVOKED**.

13. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Section 0.283 of the Commission’s rules.¹⁸

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Steven A. Broeckaert
Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau

¹⁵*Id.*

¹⁶Petition at 7.

¹⁷47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(A).

¹⁸47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

ATTACHMENT A

CSR 7156-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

Communities	CUIDS
Chehalis	WA0147
Lewis County	WA0263
Mason County	WA0335
Rainier	WA0404
Shelton	WA0240
Tenino	WA0201
Thurston County	WA0007
	WA0297
	WA0407
	WA0451
	WA0513
Yelm	WA0405

ATTACHMENT B

CSR 7156-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

Communities	CUIDS	CPR*	2000 Census Household	Estimated DBS Subscribers
Centralia, WA	WA 0146	28.69%	5943	1705
Chehalis, WA	WA 0147	54.95%	2671	1468
Rainier, WA	WA 0404	61.95%	530	328
Shelton, WA	WA 0240	44.87%	3191	1432
Tenino, WA	WA 0201	45.73%	575	263
Thurston County, WA	WA 0007	25.04%	42297	10591**
	WA 0297			
	WA 0407			
	WA 0451			
	WA 0513			
Yelm, WA	WA 0405	56.16%	1216	683

*CPR = Percent of competitive DBS penetration rate.

**Comcast operates 5 cable systems in Thurston County and therefore each has its own CUID number. The systems operate pursuant to one franchise, however, and therefore Comcast reports a common set of numbers for these systems.

ATTACHMENT C

CSR 7156-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

Communities	CUIDS	Franchise Area Households	Cable Subscribers	Penetration Percentage
Lewis County	WA 0263 WA 0556	15483	1724	11.13%*
Mason County	WA 0335	15721	2527	16.07%

*Comcast operates 2 cable systems in Lewis County and therefore each has its own CUID number. The systems operate pursuant to one franchise, however, and therefore Comcast reports a common set of numbers for these systems.