

TESTIMONY OF DAVE ROZZELLE

**EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
SUDDENLINK COMMUNICATIONS**

and on behalf of

**THE NATIONAL CABLE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION'S
RURAL AND SMALL SYSTEM OPERATOR COMMITTEE**

before the

**Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Rural Development, Research, Biotechnology, and Foreign Agriculture**

**UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

April 25, 2012

TESTIMONY OF DAVE ROZZELLE

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT SUDDENLINK COMMUNICATIONS

Good morning, and thank you for inviting me to testify today. My name is Dave Rozzelle, and I am an Executive Vice President with Suddenlink Communications. Suddenlink is a leading provider of cable video services, high-speed Internet access (also known as broadband access), wireless home networking, wireline phone, online video, and home security services for communities primarily located in Texas, West Virginia, Louisiana, Arkansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Missouri and Arizona.

Suddenlink provides service to hundreds of communities and approximately 1.4 million households. Suddenlink primarily serves second tier markets, such as Lubbock, TX; Charleston, WV; Jonesboro, AR; Lake Charles, LA; and Greenville, NC. However, we also serve dozens of small, rural communities, some with populations below 500 people.

Since 2009, we have invested over \$350 million—above and beyond our normal capital spending levels—to ensure that our customers can enjoy cutting-edge services, including high-speed Internet service, which we offer to substantially all of our subscribers. Moreover, our investment in industry-leading DOCSIS 3.0 technology has enabled us to provide data transmission speeds up to 107 Mbps to a growing number of our residential customers, some in small communities like Pomeroy, Ohio, and Ripley, West Virginia.

I am also here today as a member of the Rural and Small System Operator Committee of the National Cable & Telecommunications Association (“NCTA”). NCTA is the principal trade association of the cable industry in the United States. NCTA represents cable operators serving more than 90 percent of the nation’s cable television households and more than 200 cable

program networks, as well as equipment suppliers and providers of other services to the cable industry. The cable industry has long been at the forefront of the growth and deployment of broadband service. Since 1996, the cable industry has invested over \$185 billion to upgrade and expand its networks to provide broadband access. The result of this investment is that cable operators today offer high-speed Internet service to more than 93 percent of U.S. households.

Suddenlink and NCTA strongly support the primary goals of rural broadband funding. Quality broadband services should be available to all regions of the country, including the least densely populated areas of the country. Broadband is a crucial driver of economic recovery and global competitiveness. Broadband links rural America to the rest of the country and the world, creates jobs, improves educational opportunities, and delivers health care more efficiently. While Suddenlink has invested an incremental \$350 million in recent years to bring the most advanced services to its customers, we recognize that there are still some rural consumers who lack access to broadband. Rural broadband funding programs should focus on bringing broadband to those rural consumers.

Unfortunately, over the past 10 years the implementation of the rural broadband programs by the Rural Utilities Service (“RUS”) has not maintained that focus. Time and again, the USDA’s Inspector General has found that taxpayer dollars were used to underwrite broadband services in areas that already have broadband from providers that are funded wholly by risk capital. Likewise, a study by Navigant Economics concluded that RUS grants and loans were awarded to areas already served by multiple broadband providers – at the cost of tens of thousands of dollars or more for each unserved household. Misdirecting funds to areas that are already being served means less support for areas without any broadband – and it also puts

existing providers in the untenable position of having to compete against a government-subsidized competitor.

Unlike water or electricity, the broadband market is highly competitive in many areas, including in many rural areas of the country. In the broadband context, misallocated funds not only waste tax dollars, they undermine the goal of fair competition. Particularly in the current budget situation, neither of these outcomes is acceptable. As you consider whether and how to reauthorize the rural broadband program, it is essential that you include clear direction to the RUS to ensure that taxpayer dollars are put to work to extend broadband to unserved areas rather than subsidize competition in communities where service is already available, and that you include mechanisms to ensure transparency and accountability with respect to any projects that the RUS may fund.

My testimony today will address these points in a little more detail, including some specific proposals for targeting rural broadband funds.

Rural Broadband Support Programs Should Focus on Unserved Areas

Bringing service to unserved areas is an important and appropriate objective for rural broadband programs. It is widely acknowledged that broadband is a crucial driver of economic recovery and global competitiveness. By facilitating economic development, broadband will add jobs to the economy. Broadband is also central to improving educational opportunities and delivering health care more efficiently, important benefits that also contribute to economic growth.

As the Department of Agriculture has noted, “broadband Internet access is becoming essential for both businesses and households” and “many compare its evolution to other

technologies now considered common necessities”^{1/} Broadband Internet access would benefit businesses as well as provide “rural residents access to goods and services that may not otherwise be available locally or via dial-up Internet.”^{2/}

Unfortunately, these considerable benefits are still unavailable to some rural and remote areas of our Nation where market forces have proved insufficient to encourage investment in broadband networks and service. These are the areas that should be the focus of the rural broadband loan program.

In recognition of this priority, Congress has tried to focus rural broadband programs on unserved areas. For instance, in response to findings that the broadband loan program enacted in the 2002 Farm Bill included funding for suburban areas, Congress enacted reforms to the program in 2008. The 2008 Farm Bill prioritized funds for unserved areas and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to “give the highest priority to applicants that offer to provide broadband service to the greatest proportion of households that, prior to the provision of the broadband service, had no incumbent service provider.”^{3/}

The 2008 Farm Bill also established revised project eligibility standards, requiring, with certain exceptions, that at least 25% of the households in the proposed service territory be unserved or served by only one broadband provider, and that no portion of the proposed service

^{1/} U.S. DEP’T. OF AGRICULTURE, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, *Rural Broadband at a Glance*, at 1 (Feb. 2009), available at http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/EIB47/EIB47_SinglePages.pdf.

^{2/} *Id.* at 4.

^{3/} Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-246, § 601(c)(2) (2008) (“2008 Farm Bill”); see also CONF. REP. NO. 110-627, at 832 (2008). And the House Report indicated that eligibility requirements were tightened for the broadband loan program in order “to refocus on both rural and unserved areas of the country and provide[] additional criteria to USDA to prevent entities from receiving loans to serve only markets already sufficiently served with highspeed and affordable broadband service.” See HOUSE REP. NO. 110-256, at 232 (2008).

territory be served by three or more providers in order for a project to be eligible for funding.^{4/}

The law also improved the transparency of the loan process by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to publish a notice for each loan or loan guarantee application describing the content of the application, including the identity of the applicant; each area proposed to be served by the applicant; and the estimated number of households without terrestrial-based broadband service in those areas.^{5/}

Likewise, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (the “Recovery Act”) – which included \$7.2 billion to subsidize broadband deployment, the largest federal subsidies ever provided for broadband construction in the U.S.–targeted funding to areas “without sufficient access to high speed broadband service to facilitate rural economic development” and gave priority to projects that provide service to the highest proportion of rural residents that do not have access to broadband service.^{6/}

RUS Has Consistently Failed To Keep Its Focus on Unserved Areas

Despite some successes and prior efforts at reform, however, RUS’s implementation of rural broadband programs has consistently fallen short. In two separate reports, the USDA’s Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) criticized the RUS for failing to focus on unserved areas. In 2005, the OIG found that the rural broadband program enacted as part of the 2002 Farm Bill had “not maintained its focus on rural communities without preexisting service” and was instead subsidizing competition in suburban areas and in communities already served by one or more

^{4/} 2008 Farm Bill, §§ 601(d)(2)(A)(i)-(ii).

^{5/} *Id.* § 601(d)(5).

^{6/} American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Pub. L. No. 111-5, 123 Stat. 115, 118 (2009).

existing broadband providers.^{7/}

OIG “question[ed] whether the Government should be providing loans to competing rural providers when many small communities might be hard pressed to support even a single company. In these circumstances, the RUS may be setting its own loans up to fail by encouraging competitive service; it may also be creating an uneven playing field for preexisting providers operating without Government assistance.”^{8/}

In March 2009, OIG released a second report evaluating implementation of the 2002 Farm Bill, concluding that “the key problems identified in our 2005 report – loans being issued to suburban and exurban communities and loans being issued where other providers already provide access – have not been resolved.”^{9/} It found that despite OIG’s 2005 initial findings, “RUS continued to make loans to providers in areas with preexisting service, sometimes in close proximity to urban areas.”^{10/} Of “37 applications approved by RUS since September 2005, 34 were granted to applicants in areas where one or more private broadband providers *already offered service.*”^{11/}

Although the 2008 Farm Bill did not explicitly prohibit granting loans to preexisting service areas, OIG expressed its concern that “the overwhelming majority of communities (77 percent) receiving service through the broadband program already have access to the technology, without the RUS’s loan program. Moreover, the legal ramifications of subsidizing some

^{7/} OIG AUDIT REPORT 09601-4-TE, RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE BROADBAND GRANT AND LOAN PROGRAMS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, SOUTHWEST REGION, at ii (Sept. 2005) (“OIG 2005 Report”).

^{8/} *Id.*

^{9/} OIG AUDIT REPORT NO. 09601-8-TE, RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE BROADBAND LOAN AND LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM, AUDIT REPORT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, at 9 (Mar. 2009) (“OIG 2009 Report”).

^{10/} *Id.* at 2.

^{11/} *Id.* at 5 (emphasis added).

providers in a given area, but not others, have proved problematic.”^{12/}

The Inspector General also voiced concerns about the RUS’s ability to disburse Recovery Act funds going forward:

We remain concerned with RUS’ current direction of the Broadband program, particularly as they receive greater funding under the [Recovery Act], including its provisions for transparency and accountability. As structured, RUS’ Broadband program may not meet the Recovery Act’s objective of awarding funds to projects that provide service to the most rural residents that do not have access to broadband service.^{13/}

OIG concluded that “[w]e remain concerned that the majority of RUS’ program funds have not been utilized in expanding broadband service to rural areas where no prior service exists.”^{14/}

At a February 2011 House Energy and Commerce Communications Subcommittee hearing, the Inspector General reiterated her concerns about the RUS Broadband Loan Program.

In particular, she noted that:

- The RUS had a history of “not maintain[ing] its focus on rural communities lacking preexisting service;”
- The RUS had devoted “significant portions of its resources to funding competitive service in areas with preexisting broadband access rather than expanding service to communities without existing access;” and
- “RUS’ decision to fund certain providers in rural communities, but not others...could create an unlevel playing field for providers already operating without Government subsidies.”^{15/}

The RUS’s New “Interim Final” Rules Perpetuate the Problems Identified by OIG

Despite the RUS’s persistent failure to focus on unserved areas, confirmed by OIG, we

^{12/} *Id.* at 6.

^{13/} *Id.* at 2.

^{14/} *Id.* at 10.

^{15/} See Statement of the Honorable Phyllis K. Fong, Inspector General, before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, Committee on Energy and Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, at 2-3 (Feb. 10, 2011), available at http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/image_uploads/Fong_Testimony.pdf.

were hopeful that the RUS would address these problems through the adoption of rules to implement the reforms of the 2008 Farm Bill. Unfortunately, the RUS's new "interim final" rules for the Broadband Loan Program, despite being three years in the making, perpetuate the problems that have plagued the program from the outset.

The new rules *still* allow the agency to fund complete overbuilds without reaching any households with no broadband service. They also allow loans to be made in an area where two existing private providers are already offering competing service, as long as 25% of the households in the proposed service area are unserved *or* underserved (defined to mean an area where service is offered by 0 or 1 incumbent providers). This means that a valid proposed service area could already have two competing private providers offering service to 75% of the households and one provider offering service to 25% of the households and still get a loan. An award could be made even though the loan recipient *would not be reaching a single household that lacked broadband service*.

In addition, the new rules allow the RUS to fund upgrades in areas that are served, without regard to the number of households that do not have service and without regard to whether the service area is already served by any number of providers. (Loans for upgrades are restricted in areas with multiple providers only if an applicant is eligible to receive funding through another Rural Electrification Act funding program.) This results in bringing *new service to no new households* and, again, has the government subsidizing a competitor and picking winners and losers in the market.

The Failure to Prioritize Unserved Areas Imposes Substantial Costs on the Economy and Deters Private Investment

The impact of funding duplicative broadband networks has resulted in an extremely high cost to reach a small number of unserved households, all at taxpayer expense. According to an

economic analysis and three case studies of funding under the Recovery Act's Broadband Initiatives Program, commissioned by NCTA and prepared by Jeffrey A. Eisenach and Kevin W. Caves of Navigant Economics,^{16/} that cost, if imposed nationwide, would nearly triple the price of extending broadband to every U.S. home.

Among the key findings in the study are the following:

- Of the three projects analyzed, more than 85 percent of households were already passed by existing broadband providers, and in one project area, more than 98 percent of households were already passed by at least one provider.^{17/}
- Based on the cost of the direct grants and subsidizing the loans, the study estimated that the cost per unserved household passed would be \$30,104 if existing coverage by mobile broadband providers is ignored, and \$349,234 if mobile broadband coverage is taken into account.
- The RUS approach of funding duplicative coverage is directly at odds with the National Broadband Plan's recommendations and would massively increase the cost of extending broadband to all unserved homes. The FCC's Omnibus Broadband Initiative estimated that the cost of extending broadband to every unserved household in the U.S. is approximately \$23.5 billion, so long as duplicative service is not funded. But funding duplicative service – as the RUS did under BIP – increased the cost of a nationwide buildout by \$63.7 billion, to \$87.2 billion.^{18/}

The Navigant study examined three large BIP subsidy awards which totaled \$231.7 million, or about seven percent of the total BIP \$3.5 billion combined loan and grant program:

- \$101.2 million in northwestern Kansas;
- \$66.4 million for Lake and St. Louis counties in northeastern Minnesota;
- \$64.1 million to cover a portion of Gallatin County in southwest Montana.

^{16/} Jeffrey A. Eisenach and Kevin W. Caves, "Evaluating The Cost-Effectiveness of RUS Broadband Subsidies: Three Case Studies" (Apr. 13, 2011), available at <http://www.ncta.com/DocumentBinary.aspx?id=966>.

^{17/} *Id.* at 4.

^{18/} *Id.* at 16.

In northwestern Kansas, the Rural Telephone Service Company (“RTS”) and its wholly-owned subsidiary NexTech were awarded \$101.2 million in loans and grants to deploy and upgrade broadband services. Although the project area covered 4,247 square miles and contained 14,588 households, the majority of those households were in one city – Hays, Kansas – which covers less than eight square miles. Hays, however, was already served by RTS, AT&T and Eagle Communications. Only 2,442 households in the entire project area were unserved using the RUS’s definition – and if 3G wireless broadband service was taken into account, all but 25 households – 0.2% – were already served. Indeed, the majority of the unserved area was also *uninhabited*.

On average, across all the principal counties that comprise the proposed service area, 95 percent of the households already had high-speed broadband service. The taxpayer cost per unserved household for this project – for which the RUS benchmark is \$10,000 and the FCC benchmark is \$6,350 – was **\$30,329** based on the RUS’s definition. If wireless 3G broadband was taken into account, the cost rose to **\$2,954,920** per unserved household.^{19/}

In northeastern Minnesota, the Lake County Fiber Network (“LCFN”) was awarded \$66.4 million in loans and grants to develop last mile FTTP infrastructure in an area comprising Lake County and portions of eastern St. Louis County. The proposed service area covered 2,675 square miles and included 11,637 households.^{20/} Of those households, only 2,669 – about 23% – were unserved using the RUS’s definition, and only 421 households were unserved by any terrestrial broadband provider – meaning that only 3.6 percent of households were unserved when mobile broadband service is taken into account.

^{19/} *Id.* at 23-32.

^{20/} LCFN’s proposal asserts a substantially greater number of households passed, which appears to stem from its inclusion of unoccupied housing units within the total. *Id.* at 33-34 n.72.

As in Kansas, much of the area that was unserved was also uninhabited. In the served areas, there were at least eight facilities-based broadband providers, and the majority of households in the proposed service area had a choice among multiple providers and 68% of those households were served by three or more providers. The taxpayer cost per unserved household for this project – against the RUS’s benchmark of \$10,000 and the FCC benchmark of \$6,250 – was **\$13,746** based on the RUS’s definition. If wireless 3G broadband was taken into account, the cost rose to **\$87,231** per unserved household.^{21/}

In southwest Montana, Montana Opticom, LLC received \$64.1 million to deploy last mile FTTP infrastructure in Gallatin County, Montana. The proposed service area covered 154 square miles and included 9,035 households – and was considered one of the most densely populated, rapidly growing and prosperous counties in Montana, with more extensive broadband coverage than most other areas of the state. Of the 9,035 households covered by the project, only 136 – **1.5%** – were unserved using the RUS’s definition. Only 7 households – 0.1% – were unserved when mobile broadband service is taken into account.

As with the other two areas, much of the area that was unserved was also uninhabited. In fact, none of the census blocks in the areas the RUS claims were “unserved” contained more than a single occupied housing unit. In the served areas, there were at least nine facilities-based broadband providers, and 93% of those households already were served by five or more broadband providers. Ninety-eight percent of households had a choice among four or more broadband providers. The taxpayer cost per unserved household for this project was **\$346,032** based on the RUS’s definition. If wireless 3G broadband was taken into account, the cost rose to

^{21/} *Id.* at 33-39.

\$7,112,422 per unserved household.^{22/}

Navigant concluded that “[w]hile it may be too early for a comprehensive assessment of the [Recovery Act]’s broadband programs, it is not too early to conclude that, at least in some cases, millions of dollars in grants and loans have been made in areas where a significant majority of households already have broadband coverage, and the costs per incremental home passed are therefore far higher than existing evidence suggests should be necessary.”^{23/}

This type of waste has a tremendous impact on broadband deployment throughout our nation. Facing a government-subsidized competitor creates tremendous difficulties for rural and smaller market companies, and creates a disincentive for companies like ours to invest. As I noted earlier, Suddenlink has invested over \$350 million in private capital in the last three years alone to bring cutting-edge broadband to our communities. A robust broadband strategy inevitably depends on this continued private investment – government subsidies cannot fund all the broadband deployment needed for the country to become truly broadband-accessible. But using scarce federal resources to skew the playing field will discourage and undermine this investment. It threatens the jobs of employees of the private enterprises who live in the very communities the awards are intended to benefit, offsetting new jobs created by the project, and undermining one or more broadband providers in the area to benefit another.^{24/} Moreover, devoting funds to already-served areas creates a greater risk that loans may not be repaid because borrowers will face pre-existing competition.

Rural and smaller market operators like Suddenlink are ready and willing to face competition from other providers. We have competed with large corporations like DISH

^{22/} *Id.* at 17-23.

^{23/} *Id.* at 6.

^{24/} *See also id.* at 16-17.

Network, AT&T, Verizon, and DirecTV for many years. That type of competition, however, differs from government-backed investment in particular companies. Companies that have taken the financial risk of serving a rural market, and serving it well, without government assistance cannot realistically be expected to continue to do so if they must face a government-subsidized competitor. Moreover, wasting valuable dollars to overbuild well-served communities at the expense of unserved residents does not make sense, particularly in the current economic environment.

RUS Must Be Given Clear and Unambiguous Direction to Ensure That Broadband Loan Dollars Are Appropriately Directed to Unserved Areas

The new Farm Bill should take strong steps to direct taxpayer dollars where they are most needed. Specifically, as this Subcommittee considers reauthorization of the legislation, we respectfully urge you to consider the following four proposals.

First, limit funding to substantially unserved areas. To ensure available funds are used effectively, the RUS broadband support loans, loan guarantees, or grants should be limited to areas where at least 75% of residential households lack access to broadband service of at least 4 Mbps downstream and 1 Mbps upstream – the target basic access speed defined in the Federal Communications Commission’s National Broadband Plan.

Second, seek additional information. To ensure compliance with this proposed eligibility requirement for the RUS broadband support loan, loan guarantees, or grant programs, the Secretary of Agriculture should be required to give existing providers an opportunity to voluntarily submit information about their service areas that may overlap areas proposed to be served by the applicant, for subsequent due diligence review by the RUS. Similar requirements were adopted by USDA and the Department of Commerce in connection with BIP and the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (“BTOP”).

Third, prioritize support to areas most in need of it. To ensure funds are used where they are most needed, the Secretary should continue to give priority to the RUS broadband loans, loan guarantees, or grants that will extend broadband service to areas with the greatest proportion of households that do not currently have broadband at basic access speeds available from any provider. This would simply extend a provision in current law.

Finally, increase accountability. To ensure transparency and accountability, each entity receiving RUS broadband support loans, loan guarantees, or grants should be required to report quarterly on its use of the funds and its progress in fulfilling the objectives for which the funding was provided. The reports should be made available to the public on the RUS website, along with a database of information about each award made by an RUS broadband program. Congress adopted similar requirements when it established the BTOP program under the Recovery Act.

* * *

Suddenlink and NCTA share your goal of bringing broadband to every rural household. A well-administered broadband loan program is an important part of reaching that goal. Including our four proposals will help ensure that the program stays focused and on track to do so. Thank you for the opportunity to speak here today, and I appreciate your willingness to consider ways to ensure that broadband funds are spent in the most effective way possible for all Americans.

Committee on Agriculture
U.S. House of Representatives
Required Witness Disclosure Form

House Rules* require nongovernmental witnesses to disclose the amount and source of Federal grants received since October 1, 2009.

Name: David Rozzelle

Organization you represent (if any): _____

Suddenlink Communications/NCTA

1. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) you have received since October 1, 2009, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract. House Rules do NOT require disclosure of federal payments to individuals, such as Social Security or Medicare benefits, farm program payments, or assistance to agricultural producers:

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

2. If you are appearing on behalf of an organization, please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants and subcontracts) the organization has received since October 1, 2009, as well as the source and the amount of each grant or contract:

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Source: _____ Amount: _____

Please check here if this form is NOT applicable to you:

Signature: [Signature]

* Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5) of the U.S. House of Representatives provides: *Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by any entity represented by the witness.*

PLEASE ATTACH DISCLOSURE FORM TO EACH COPY OF TESTIMONY.

David G. Rozzelle

Mr. Rozzelle is a lawyer by training and was a partner at Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, the nation's oldest communications law firm. Mr. Rozzelle's practice areas included cable television regulation, technical litigation at the trial level and appellate litigation involving technical and non-technical cases.

Mr. Rozzelle left his law firm in 1988 to co-found InterMedia Partners, a cable television limited partnership. At InterMedia, he was a general partner and was the Chief Executive Officer, Cable Operations. During his tenure, the company grew from a start-up to 750,000 subscribers, owned and managed, in 30 months. In the same period, the company grew from a handful of employees to over 1,500 employees located throughout the United States. While at InterMedia, Mr. Rozzelle represented the partnership's investment interests in several competitive local exchange carriers and oversaw the upgrade of InterMedia's major cable systems using a hybrid fiber coaxial architecture.

In 1994, Rozzelle left InterMedia Partners to co-found Media Connections Group, a consulting firm specializing in telecommunications. MCG assisted a number of the nation's largest companies as they sought to provide services and equipment to the emerging, advanced broadband industry. Clients of MCG included Nortel, AT&T, Lucent Technologies, Hewlett-Packard and Intel. In addition, MCG provided technical and management consulting to clients located in Latin America, Europe and Asia. MCG also provided telecommunications planning and support for a number of cities including San Francisco, San Jose, Beverly Hills and Pasadena.

In 2000, Rozzelle and his partners in MCG formed Altrio Communications, Inc. where he was the President and CEO. Altrio was a telecommunications company which provided high speed data, telephone, audio and video entertainment services to residential customers and small businesses in the Los Angeles market. The company grew to 46,000 homes passed by the network and almost 10,000 customers. At the peak of construction, the company employed over 200 people and it successfully integrated the software and hardware systems needed to offer the "triple play" of voice, video and data over its advanced network.

In late 2004, Rozzelle joined Cebridge Connections in St. Louis, Missouri as COO and served in that capacity until July, 2006, when he moved from the operating company to the management company, Cequel III, as Executive Vice President and Assistant to the CEO, Jerry Kent. In January, 2010, Mr. Rozzelle moved back to the operating company, Suddenlink Communications, where he serves as Chief Compliance Officer, EVP of Government Relations, and Assistant to the CEO. Suddenlink primarily serves smaller markets in 16 states, with major areas of operation in Texas, West Virginia, North Carolina, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri and California.

Mr. Rozzelle resides in Wildwood, Missouri, with his wife Nancy.