

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

In the Matter of)
CoxCom, Inc. d/b/a Cox Communications)
Phoenix) CSR 7812-E, CSR 7813-E & CSR 7814-E
Petition for Determination of Effective)
Competition in Various Arizona Communities)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: November 29, 2010

Released: November 29, 2010

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

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. CoxCom, Inc., d/b/a Cox Communications Phoenix, 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 the "Communities." Petitioner alleges that its cable system serving the Communities is subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("Communications Act") and the Commission's implementing rules, 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 community listed on Attachment B 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, as that term is defined by Section 623(1) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission's rules. 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. 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 A and B.

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 the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association that identified the number of subscribers

⁶47 U.S.C. § 543(1)(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 5-6.

⁹*Mediacom Illinois LLC*, 21 FCC Rcd 1175, 1176, ¶ 3 (2006).

¹⁰47 C.F.R. § 76.905(e)(2).

¹¹*See* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g). *See also* Petition at 4 and Exhibit 2.

¹²*See* Petition at 6 and Exhibit 3.

¹³*See* Petition at 3.

¹⁴*Id.*

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 A, 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 A.

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 franchise area as listed on Attachment B.

10. Based upon the subscriber penetration level calculated by Petitioner, as reflected in Attachment B, 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 community listed on Attachment B. Therefore, the low penetration test is also satisfied as to the community listed on Attachment B.

¹⁵*Id.* at 8-13.

¹⁶*Id.* at 10-11. In compiling its petition, Cox realized that a number of the Communities at issue had experienced extraordinary growth subsequent to the 2000 Census. Consequently, in many of the Communities, the aggregate MVPD penetration exceeded the number of 2000 Census households. To rectify the problem, Cox used 2008 Census Population Estimates for the Communities involved, applied a growth rate based upon the population growth estimate for the period 2000-2008, and derived an update population figure that recognized the substantial growth without the aggregate MVPD penetration exceeding the 2000 Census data population. However, Cox was unable to use this formula for Unincorporated Pinal County because its franchise area only covers a portion of the County. To generate an updated household figure for Unincorporated Pinal County, Cox used the 2008 population estimates, determined the county growth rate, and applied the growth rate to the households located within Cox’s franchise area. *See* Petition at 6-8 and Exhibits 2, 3, and 4.

¹⁷47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(A).

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

11. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petition for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by CoxCom, Inc., d/b/a Cox Communications Phoenix **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 and B **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

¹⁸47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

ATTACHMENT A

CSR-7812-E, CSR 7813-E & CSR 7814-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY COXCOM, INC., D/B/A COX COMMUNICATIONS PHOENIX

Communities	CUIDs	CPR*	2000 Census Households	Estimated DBS Subscribers
Wickenburg	AZ0143	47.94%	2985	1431
Gila Bend	AZ0117	74.11%	622	461
Coolidge	AZ0113	47.42 %	3279	1555
Florence	AZ0144	51.44%	4341	2233
Pinal County (Unincorporated)	AZ0378	42.28%	22756	9623
Queen Creek	AZ0315	23.69%	7764	1839

*CPR = Percent of competitive DBS penetration rate.

ATTACHMENT B

CSR -7813-E

COMMUNITY SERVED BY COXCOM, INC., D/B/A COX COMMUNICATIONS PHOENIX

Community	CUID	Franchise Area Households	Cable Subscribers	Penetration Percentage
Gila Bend	AZ0117	622	149	23.95%