

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

In the Matter of)	
)	CSR 8511-E
Time Warner Cable Inc.)	CSR 8512-E
)	CSR 8513-E
Petitions for Determination of Effective)	CSR 8514-E
Competition in 19 Texas Communities)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: October 6, 2011

Released: October 11, 2011

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

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Time Warner Cable Inc., hereinafter referred to as “Petitioner,” has filed with the Commission petitions pursuant to Sections 76.7, 76.905(b)(2), 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 “Attachment A Communities.” Petitioner alleges that its cable system serving the Attachment A Communities is subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(l)(1)(B) 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 those Communities because of the competing service provided by two direct broadcast satellite (“DBS”) providers, DIRECTV, Inc. (“DIRECTV”), and DISH Network (“DISH”). Petitioner additionally claims to be exempt from cable rate regulation in the Communities listed on Attachment B and hereinafter referred to as Attachment B Communities, pursuant to Section 623(l)(1)(A) of the Communications Act³ and Section 76.905(b)(1) of the Commission’s rules,⁴ because the Petitioner serves fewer than 30 percent of the households in the franchise area. The petitions are unopposed.

2. In the absence of a demonstration to the contrary, cable systems are presumed not to be subject to effective competition,⁵ as that term is defined by Section 623(l) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission’s rules.⁶ 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.⁷ For the reasons set forth below, we grant the petitions based on our finding that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachments A and B.

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(B).

² 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2).

³ See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(1)(A).

⁴ 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(1).

⁵ 47 C.F.R. § 76.906.

⁶ See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l); 47 C.F.R. § 76.905.

⁷ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 76.906-907(b).

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 (“MVPDs”) 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.⁸ This test is 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.⁹ It is undisputed that the Attachment A 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ We further find that Petitioner has provided sufficient evidence to support its assertion that potential customers in those Communities are reasonably aware that they may purchase the service of these MVPD providers.¹² 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 programming,¹³ and is supported in this petitions with citations to the channel lineups for both DIRECTV and DISH.¹⁴ Also undisputed is Petitioner’s assertion that both DIRECTV and DISH offer service to at least “50 percent” of the households in the Attachment A Communities because of their national satellite footprint.¹⁵ Accordingly, we find that the first prong of the competing provider test is satisfied.

5. 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 Attachment A Communities.¹⁶ Petitioner sought to determine the competing provider penetration there by purchasing a subscriber tracking report from the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association that identified the number of subscribers

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

⁹ 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(2)(i).

¹⁰ *See, e.g.*, Petition in CSR 8511-E at 3-5.

¹¹ *Mediacom Illinois LLC*, 21 FCC Rcd 1175, 1176, ¶ 3 (2006).

¹² 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(e)(2).

¹³ *See* 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g); *see also, e.g.*, Petition in CSR 8512-E at 6.

¹⁴ *See, e.g.*, Petition in CSR 8513-E at 5 n.12; *id.* at 6.

¹⁵ *See, e.g.*, Petition in CSR 8514-E at 7.

¹⁶ *See, e.g.*, Petition in CSR 8511-E at 7; *id.*, Declaration of Susan Patten, Time Warner Vice President of Government Relations for Central Texas, at ¶ 3 (Aug. 1, 2011).

attributable to the DBS providers within the Attachment A Communities on a zip code plus four basis.¹⁷

6. Based upon the aggregate DBS subscriber penetration levels that were calculated using Census 2010 household data,¹⁸ 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 Attachment A Communities. Therefore, the second prong of the competing provider test is satisfied for each of the Attachment A Communities. 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 Attachment A Communities.

B. The Low Penetration Test

7. Section 623(I)(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 referred to as the “low penetration” test.¹⁹ 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 Attachment B Communities.

8. 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 Attachment B Communities. Therefore, the low penetration test is satisfied as to the Attachment B Communities.

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

9. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petitions for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by **Time Warner Cable Inc. ARE GRANTED**.

10. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the certification to regulate basic cable service rates granted to or on behalf of any of the Communities set forth on Attachments A and B **IS REVOKED**.

11. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Section 0.283 of the Commission’s rules.²⁰

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

¹⁷ See, e.g., Petition in CSR 8512-E at 8.

¹⁸ See, e.g., Petition in CSR 8513-E at Exh. B.

¹⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 543(I)(1)(A).

²⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

ATTACHMENT A

CSRs 8511-E, 8513-E, 8514-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY TIME WARNER CABLE INC.

Communities	CUIDs	CPR*	2010 Census Households	Estimated DBS Subscribers
CSR 8511-E				
City of Burnett	TX2446	35.67	2,041	728
City of Lakeway	TX0323	22.21	4,629	1,028
City of Marble Falls	TX2444	32.66	2,486	812
City of Pflugerville	TX2484	26.31	15,789	4,154
Village of Point Venture	TX2298	36.90	355	131
Village of San Leanna	TX1180	23.41	205	48
City of Sunset Valley	TX0781	18.09	304	55
Village of Volente	TX0779	29.75	242	72
CSR 8513-E				
Fort Hood	TX0764 TX0765	26.84	6,282	1,686
City of Robinson	TX0286	23.14	3,764	871
CSR 8514-E				
City of Woodcreek	TX2314	26.97	712	192

*CPR = Percent of competitive DBS penetration rate.

ATTACHMENT B

CSR 8511-E, 8512-E, 8513-E, 8514-E

COMMUNITIES SERVED BY TIME WARNER CABLE INC.

Communities	CUIDs	Franchise Area Households	Cable Subscribers	Penetration Percentage
CSR 8511-E				
City of Niederwald	TX2482	193	23	11.92
Hays County (unincorporated)	TX1298 TX1342 TX2160 TX2154	23,484	5,802	24.71
CSR 8512-E				
Gillespie County (unincorporated)	TX2157	5,868	725	12.36
CSR 8513-E				
McLennan County (unincorporated)	TX0408	18,974	3,177	16.74
Bell County (unincorporated)	TX0476 TX1012	5,668	1,360	23.99
Coryell County (unincorporated)	TX2509	5,487	42	.77
CSR 8514-E				
Caldwell County (unincorporated)	TX2075	12,301	818	6.65
Guadalupe County (unincorporated)	TX2324	15,689	557	3.55