



## State of North Carolina

ROY COOPER  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Department of Justice  
PO Box 629  
Raleigh, North Carolina  
27602

Phone: (919) 716-6400  
Fax: (919) 716-6750

April 1, 2016

North Carolina Senate President Pro Tempore Phil Berger  
North Carolina House of Representatives Speaker Tim Moore  
Co-Chairs, Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations

Senator Bob Rucho  
Representative William Brawley  
Representative Jason Saine  
Co-Chairs, Revenue Study Laws Committee

North Carolina General Assembly  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601-1096

Re: Video Services Competition Act

Dear Members:

Pursuant to Session Law 2006-151, Section 18, titled the 'Video Services Competition Act', please find the enclosed report concerning cable service complaints the Consumer Protection Division has received from cable customers under NC Gen. Stat. §66-356.

If you have any questions or I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me at (919) 716-6400.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kristi Jones". The signature is written in a cursive style with a vertical line extending upwards from the start of the name.

Kristi Jones  
Chief of Staff

KH:ml

cc: Kristine Leggett, NCGA Fiscal Research Division

**NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION DIVISION**

**2015-16 REPORT REGARDING CABLE COMPLAINTS**

The Video Services Competition Act (Session Law 2006-151) enacted a number of changes that impact cable television companies, video service providers, and consumers. Among other things, the law allows such companies and providers to obtain State-issued franchises from the Secretary of State's office to provide cable TV service, rather than local franchises from local units of government, under certain circumstances. Section 17 of the law designates the Consumer Protection Division of the Attorney General's Office (CPD) as the agency to "receive and respond to unresolved customer complaints about cable service provided by the holder of a State-issued franchise."

Section 18 requires the CPD to report to the Revenue Laws Study Committee the following information regarding complaints about cable service received by the CPD: number of complaints, types of complaints, and the means for resolving them. Pursuant to Section 18, the Attorney General's Office makes the following report.

As of March 11, 2016, one thousand four hundred and forty-seven (1,447) State-issued franchises have been accepted by the Secretary of State's office, according to that office's website. For the time period of March 10, 2015 to March 10, 2016, the CPD received eight hundred and twenty-eight (828) written complaints against companies with a State-issued franchise. Out of those eight hundred and twenty-eight (828) complaints:

- Two hundred and fifty-eight (258) involved allegations of unsatisfactory service or repair;
- One hundred ninety-two (192) involved allegations of billing errors;
- Sixty-two (62) involved allegations of unsatisfactory sales practices;
- Forty-one (41) involved allegations related to the cancelation of services;
- Forty (44) involved allegations of improper charges related to equipment;
- Thirty-five (35) involved allegations related to failure to complete installations;
- Thirty-two (32) involved allegations of damages to property; and
- The remaining complaints involved discrete or miscellaneous issues.

For the same time period, the CPD received nine (9) written complaints against companies with a local franchise from consumers who incorrectly believed that the 2006 law directed the CPD to handle all consumer complaints against all cable companies as of January 1, 2007. CPD referred these complaints to the locality still holding local franchise agreements with the company.

The CPD treats cable complaints like other consumer complaints it receives and attempts to mediate resolutions by sending the complaints to the cable company for a response. The CPD tracks responses to see if consumers are satisfied and to determine if the complaints show patterns that may warrant further investigation.