

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
WRNN License Company, LLC	)	MB Docket No. 20-26
	)	CSR 8986-A
For Modification of the Television Market of	)	
Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York	)	
	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

**Adopted: March 2, 2020**

**Released: March 2, 2020**

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

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. WRNN License Company, LLC (WRNN License Co. or Petitioner), licensee of television station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York (Facility ID No. 74156) (WRNN or Station) filed the above-captioned Petition<sup>1</sup> requesting modification of the Station’s television market to include all of the communities located in the New York Designated Market Area (DMA) and served by Altice cable systems<sup>2</sup> in the following counties: Suffolk (NY), Essex (NJ), Hudson (NJ), Monmouth (NJ), Ocean (NJ), and Union (NJ) (Communities).<sup>3</sup> The Petition is unopposed. For the reasons stated below, we grant the Petition.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *WRNN License Company, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York, Facility ID 74156*, Petition for Special Relief, MB Docket 20-26 (filed Jan. 28, 2020) (*WRNN Petition*). The Media Bureau placed the Petition on public notice and sought comment. *Special Relief and Show Cause Petitions*, Public Notice, Report No. 0489 (MB Jan. 31, 2020) (*Public Notice*). WRNN filed a similar petition in 2019. *WRNN License Company, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York, Facility ID 74156*, Petition for Special Relief, MB Docket No. 19-271 (filed Sept. 11, 2019) (*September WRNN Petition*). That petition was dismissed by the Bureau as it was “lacking in one significant area – a map or maps illustrating all of the relevant community locations along with other geographic features relevant to our decision.” *WRNN License Company, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York, Facility ID 74156*, Order, MB Docket No. 19-271, DA 20-61 at 1, para. 1 (rel. Jan. 14, 2020) (*January WRNN Dismissal Order*). As discussed in more detail below, the instant Petition sufficiently rectifies this omission.

<sup>2</sup> The Petitioner states that according to the Commission’s Cable Operations and Licensing System (COALS) database, Altice N.V. does business in the various communities at issue as CSC Holdings LLC, Cablevision Systems East Hampton Corp., CSC Holdings, Inc., CSC Acquisition-NY Inc., Cablevision of Newark, Cablevision of Monmouth LLC, Cablevision of Hudson County LLC, Cablevision of New Jersey LLC, and CSC TKR LLC. For ease of reference, however, the Petitioner states that it refers to the relevant cable systems as “Altice” throughout its pleading. Petition at n.1. We do the same herein.

<sup>3</sup> The Petitioner states that it “is seeking to add the communities identified on Exhibit A [herein] and any additional communities in the same counties or served by the same systems and not presently included in WRNN’s television

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. Market Modification Procedures

2. Pursuant to section 614 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the Act), and implementing rules adopted by the Commission in its *Must Carry Order*, commercial broadcast television stations are entitled to assert mandatory carriage rights on cable systems located within the station's market.<sup>4</sup> A station's default market for this purpose is its DMA as defined by Nielsen Media Research.<sup>5</sup> A DMA is a geographic market designation that defines each television market exclusive of others, based on measured viewing patterns. Essentially, each county in the United States is allocated to a market based on which stations receive a preponderance of total viewing hours in the county.<sup>6</sup>

3. Under the Act, however, the Commission is also directed to consider changes in a station's local market. Section 614(h)(1)(C) provides that the Commission may:

with respect to a particular television broadcast station, include additional communities within its television market or exclude communities from such station's television market to better effectuate the purposes of this section.<sup>7</sup>

In considering such requests, the Act provides that:

the Commission shall afford particular attention to the value of localism by taking into account such factors as –

- (I) whether the station, or other stations located in the same area, have been historically carried on the cable system or systems within such community;
- (II) whether the television station provides coverage or other local service to such community;
- (III) whether modifying the market of the television station would promote consumers' access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence;<sup>8</sup>

---

(...continued from previous page)

market.” Petition at n.2. The Communities submitted by the Petitioner are listed in the attached Addendum.

<sup>4</sup> *Implementation of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Broadcast Signal Carriage Issues*, 8 FCC Rcd 2965, 2976-77, paras. 42-47 (1993) (*Must Carry Order*).

<sup>5</sup> Section 614(h)(1)(C) of the Act, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, provides that a station's market shall be determined by the Commission by regulation or order using, where available, commercial publications which delineate television markets based on viewing patterns. See 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C). Section 76.55(e) requires that a commercial broadcast television station's market be defined by Nielsen Media Research's DMAs. 47 CFR § 76.55(e); see *Definition of Markets for Purposes of the Cable Television Broadcast Signal Carriage Rules*, Order on Reconsideration and Second Report and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 8366 (1999) (*Modification Final Report and Order*).

<sup>6</sup> For purposes of Nielsen's calculation, both over-the-air and cable television viewing are included. For a more complete description of how counties are allocated, see Nielsen Media Research's *Nielsen Station Index: Methodology Techniques and Data Interpretation*.

<sup>7</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C).

<sup>8</sup> The STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014, Pub. L. No. 113-200, 128 Stat. 2059 (2014), enacted December 4, 2014, added a new statutory factor, denominated as factor III above. See also *Amendment to the Commission's Rules Concerning Mkt. Modification, Implementation of Section 102 of the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014*, Report and Order, 30 FCC Rcd 10406 (2015) (*STELAR Market Mod. Order*).

(IV) whether any other television station that is eligible to be carried by a cable system in such community in fulfillment of the requirements of this section provides news coverage of issues of concern to such community or provides carriage or coverage of sporting and other events of interest to the community; and

(V) evidence of viewing patterns in cable and noncable households within the areas served by the cable system or systems in such community.<sup>9</sup>

4. In order to establish a station's relationship to the community at issue as required by the Act, section 76.59(b) of the Commission's rules requires requests for market modification to be supported by the following evidence:

(1) A map or maps illustrating the relevant community locations and geographic features, station transmitter sites, cable system headend locations, terrain features that would affect station reception, mileage between the community and the television station transmitter site, transportation routes and any other evidence contributing to the scope of the market;

(2) Noise-limited service contour maps (for full-power digital stations) or protected contour maps (for Class A and low power television stations) delineating the station's technical service area and showing the location of the cable system headends or satellite carrier local receive facilities and communities in relation to the service areas;<sup>10</sup>

(3) Available data on shopping and labor patterns in the local market;

(4) Television station programming information derived from station logs or the local edition of the television guide;

(5) Cable system channel line-up cards or other exhibits establishing historic carriage, such as television guide listings;

(6) Published audience data for the relevant station showing its average all day audience (*i.e.*, the reported audience averaged over Sunday-Saturday, 7 a.m.-1 a.m., or an equivalent time period) for both cable and noncable households or

<sup>9</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(I)-(V). The legislative history of the provision states that:

where the presumption in favor of [DMA] carriage would result in cable subscribers losing access to local stations because they are outside the [DMA] in which a local cable system operates, the FCC may make an adjustment to include or exclude particular communities from a television station's market consistent with Congress' objective to ensure that television stations be carried in the area in which they serve and which form their economic market.

\* \* \* \*

[This subsection] establishes certain criteria which the Commission shall consider in acting on requests to modify the geographic area in which stations have signal carriage rights. These factors are not intended to be exclusive, but may be used to demonstrate that a community is part of a particular station's market.

H.R. Rep. 102-628, 102d Cong., 2d Sess. 97 (1992). In adopting rules to implement section 614(h)(1)(C), the Commission indicated that requested changes should be considered on a community-by-community basis rather than on a county-by-county basis, and that they should be treated as specific to particular stations rather than applicable in common to all stations in the market. *Must Carry Order*, 8 FCC Rcd at 2977 n.139.

<sup>10</sup> Section 76.59(b)(2) contains the following note: "Service area maps using Longley-Rice (version 1.2.2) propagation curves may also be included to support a technical service exhibit." 47 CFR § 76.59(b)(2).

other specific audience indicia, such as station advertising and sales data or viewer contribution records; and

(7) If applicable, a statement that the station is licensed to a community within the same state as the relevant community.<sup>11</sup>

5. In the *Incentive Auction Report and Order*, the Commission recognized that “relocations made to implement a channel sharing arrangement may have [impacts] on a station’s MVPD carriage rights.”<sup>12</sup> It noted that the carriage rights of a station moving within its DMA “will not be expanded or diminished through this process, although its ability to exercise these rights may change based upon the facts of its specific channel sharing arrangement.”<sup>13</sup> In particular, the Commission noted,

a full power commercial station that relocates within its DMA may gain carriage on some cable systems, but lose carriage on others, as a result of market modification requests. A broadcaster may seek to add communities to its market which it can now reach from its new location, and, conversely, a cable system may seek to exclude communities from the broadcaster’s market that the station no longer serves as a result of its move. Because full power commercial stations have market-wide carriage rights, their movements within their assigned DMA should not automatically result in modification petitions, but unique factual situations may arise... [and] it is thus possible that some cable operators may see a change in the local stations they must carry as a result of channel sharing agreements.<sup>14</sup>

The instant Petition involves a station that has recently relocated its facilities pursuant to a channel sharing arrangement arising from the incentive auction.<sup>15</sup> Thus, as contemplated by the Commission, WRNN seeks to “add communities to its market which it can now reach from its new location,”<sup>16</sup> which in this case were removed from its market in earlier market modification proceedings.<sup>17</sup>

## **B. The Station**

6. WRNN License Co. states that WRNN is an independent television station that has served the New York DMA for decades.<sup>18</sup> The Station was formerly licensed to Kingston, New York, and broadcast from a transmitter site located in Woodstock, New York, ten miles northwest of Kingston.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> 47 CFR § 76.59(b). Petitions for special relief to modify television markets that do not include the above evidence may be dismissed without prejudice and may be re-filed at a later date with the appropriate filing fee. *STELAR Market Mod Order*, 30 FCC Rcd at 10424, para. 22. The Bureau may waive the requirement to submit certain evidence for good cause shown, particularly if it is in a position to resolve the petition without such evidence. *Tobacco Valley Communications*, 31 FCC Rcd 8972, 8976 n.22 (MB 2016); 47 CFR § 1.3. Parties may submit whatever additional evidence they deem appropriate and relevant. *Tobacco Valley Communications*, 31 FCC Rcd 8972, 8976 n.22 (MB 2016).

<sup>12</sup> *Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auction*, Report and Order, 29 FCC Rcd 6567, 6857, para. 708 (2014) (*Incentive Auction Report and Order*).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 6857, para. 709 (internal citations omitted).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* (internal citations omitted).

<sup>15</sup> *See infra* para. 6 (discussing WRNN’s channel sharing transition).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> *See infra* paras. 7-8 (discussing WRNN’s prior market modifications that excluded the relevant New York and New Jersey Communities).

<sup>18</sup> Petition at 2. Petitioner states that WRNN signed on the air as WTZA in 1985. *Id.* at n.3.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

Petitioner states that WRNN's change in circumstance is the result of its successful bid to relinquish spectrum in the broadcast incentive auction<sup>20</sup> and a channel sharing arrangement with WWOR-TV, Secaucus, New Jersey (Facility ID No. 74197) (WWOR), pursuant to which WRNN is a channel sharee.<sup>21</sup> As a result of that channel sharing arrangement, WRNN now broadcasts from an antenna that is located on top of One World Trade Center in lower Manhattan and has changed its community of license to New Rochelle, New York.<sup>22</sup>

### C. The Petition

7. The Petitioner claims that the evidence presented in this proceeding weighs in favor of the requested market modification, and that the considerations that previously resulted in the deletion of the Communities from WRNN's market no longer apply.<sup>23</sup> The Cable Services Bureau issued a decision in 1996 removing certain of the Communities, as well as other cable communities, from WRNN's local market.<sup>24</sup> The Bureau's decision focused on the Station's geographic distance from several of the Communities and its failure to place a Grade B contour over those Communities, finding "that WRNN, because of its location and Grade B contour, more aptly serves Albany and its environs, rather than New York City and the cable communities on the far side of it."<sup>25</sup> The Bureau also noted that "the majority of the New York . . . stations have transmitters located atop of the World Trade Center in lower Manhattan and provide a Grade B contour covering almost every County in the New York market involved in this proceeding."<sup>26</sup>

8. Additionally, a separate petition filed in 2001 by Cablevision Systems Corporation (CSC), Altice's predecessor company, seeking to remove the communities served by its Elizabeth and Hamilton, New Jersey systems from WRNN's market was granted by the Cable Services Bureau.<sup>27</sup> With regard to these communities, the Bureau again focused on the Station's geographic distance from several of the Communities and its then-failure to place a Grade B contour over them.<sup>28</sup> However, the Petitioner points out regarding all of the Communities, that as a result of its current channel sharing arrangement, "[n]ot only are the Communities either within the Station's recently-modified noise-limited service contour or not far outside the contour, but the Station is also geographically proximate to them."<sup>29</sup>

9. The Petitioner cites the 2018 market modification decision involving Entravision, in which certain communities were added to television station WJAL's market.<sup>30</sup> WJAL, like WRNN, was a

---

<sup>20</sup> See Section 6403 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act (Pub. L. No. 112-96, § 6403, 126 Stat. 156, 225-230 (2012), codified at 47 U.S.C. § 309(j)(8)(G)) (enacting the incentive auction channel sharing process).

<sup>21</sup> See LMS File No. 0000042455.

<sup>22</sup> Petition at 4-5.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at 2-4.

<sup>24</sup> See *Petition of Cablevision Systems Corp. for Modification of the ADI of Television Stations WTBV, WRNN, WMBC-TV, and WHAI-TV*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 6453 (CSB 1996).

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 6480, para. 66. All of the Communities served by the noted cable systems found to be outside of the Station's Grade B contour were located between 83 and 130 miles from WRNN. *Id.* at para. 67.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 6475, para. 49.

<sup>27</sup> See *Petition of CSC TKR, Inc. For Modification of the New York DMA*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 12577 (CSB 2001).

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at 12583-84, paras. 14, 15.

<sup>29</sup> Petition at 4.

<sup>30</sup> *Entravision Holdings, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WJAL(TV), Silver Spring*,

successful bidder in the incentive auction and entered into a channel sharing arrangement as a sharee that resulted in a transmitter site relocation and a change in community of license within the same DMA.<sup>31</sup> Based on these changed circumstances, Entravision sought to add certain communities in the Washington, DC DMA served by Comcast and CoxCom to WJAL's market.<sup>32</sup> Many of these communities had been deleted from WJAL's market as a result of earlier market modification petitions filed by Comcast and CoxCom or their predecessors.<sup>33</sup> In granting Entravision's Petitions, the Media Bureau found that the historic carriage of WJAL's channel sharing partner weighed in favor of the requested modification.<sup>34</sup> The Bureau further found that evidence regarding WJAL's signal coverage, geographic proximity, and shopping and labor patterns weighed strongly in favor of a grant of the Petitions.<sup>35</sup> WRNN License Co. argues that these same factors weigh in favor of a grant of the instant Petition.<sup>36</sup>

10. The Petitioner also points to a recently granted petition that it filed to add communities served by Spectrum's Bergen County, New Jersey cable system to WRNN's market.<sup>37</sup> In that case, the Petitioner notes that the Media Bureau recognized Spectrum's carriage of WRNN's channel sharing partner in the subject Communities along with Spectrum's carriage of other co-located and nearby stations, and weighed it in WRNN's favor in analyzing the historic carriage factor.<sup>38</sup> The Bureau similarly concluded that the second factor in that case weighed in WRNN's favor, finding that signal coverage, geographic proximity, and shopping and labor patterns in relation to the Communities overcame the absence of local programming in WRNN's channel lineup.<sup>39</sup>

### III. DISCUSSION

11. As discussed in more detail below, we grant the Petition in full. As the Bureau explained in the *Entravision Order*, every market modification must be based on "the specific facts and circumstances presented in [the] proceeding."<sup>40</sup> The Bureau further stated that the *Entravision Order* "should not be interpreted as prejudging future market modifications filed by relocated channel sharing

---

(...continued from previous page)

*Maryland*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 33 FCC Rcd 2215 (MB 2018) (*Entravision Order*).

<sup>31</sup> Petition at 7.

<sup>32</sup> *Id.* See *Entravision Holdings, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WJAL(TV), Silver Spring, Maryland, Facility ID 10259*, Petition for Special Relief, MB Docket No. 17-306 (filed Nov. 7, 2017) (*Comcast Petition*); *Entravision Holdings LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station WJAL(TV), Silver Spring, Maryland, Facility ID 10259*, Petition for Special Relief, MB Docket No. 17-307 (filed Nov. 7, 2017) (*Cox Petition*) (collectively *Entravision Petitions*).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> *Entravision Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 2225, para. 15.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at 2229, para. 23.

<sup>36</sup> Petition at 8.

<sup>37</sup> See *Petition of WRNN License Company, LLC for Modification of the Television Market of Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 34 FCC Rcd 6446 (MB 2019) (*WRNN-Spectrum Order*); see also Petition at 8.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.* at 6452, para. 12.

<sup>39</sup> *Id.* at 6454, para. 18. The Bureau assigned no weight to the third and fourth statutory factors. Further, the Bureau found that the fifth factor did not support a grant of the market modification request, but recognized that there were mitigating circumstances related to the finding. *Id.* at 6456, para. 24.

<sup>40</sup> *Entravision Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 2231, para. 28.

stations or affected cable systems.”<sup>41</sup> Accordingly, while we do not discount the relevance of the *Entravision Order* or the *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, we evaluate this market modification request based on the specific facts and circumstances presented in this proceeding. While the *WRNN-Spectrum Order* and this case both involve the same Station, this market modification request focuses on different Communities and different facts.

**A. Statutory Factors**

**1. Historical Carriage**

12. The first statutory factor we must consider is “whether the station, or other stations located in the same area, have been historically carried on the cable system or systems within such community.”<sup>42</sup> The Petitioner states that Altice has not carried WRNN on its systems serving the Communities.<sup>43</sup> However, the Petitioner notes that, as the Bureau recognized in the *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, carriage of co-located stations in a particular community is also a relevant consideration in the context of a market modification request.<sup>44</sup> The Petitioner points to the Bureau’s explanation that “such carriage is evidence of a petitioner station’s nexus with a community” and that “[e]ven when a station has no history of carriage in a community, the Commission [gives] weight to this factor when another station based in the same area has been carried in the community.”<sup>45</sup> As such, even though WRNN had no history of carriage in the communities served by Spectrum, the Bureau found that the historic carriage factor weighed in favor of that prior carriage request because WRNN relocated its transmission facilities to WWOR’s transmitter site and Spectrum carried WWOR.<sup>46</sup> The Bureau also found that because Spectrum also carries other co-located and nearby stations, WRNN would be at a competitive disadvantage if Spectrum did not also carry the Station in the subject communities.<sup>47</sup>

13. In that regard, the Petitioner states that Altice carries WWOR on all of its systems serving the Communities.<sup>48</sup> In addition, the Petitioner notes that Altice carries a number of other stations that are co-located with WRNN and WWOR at One World Trade Center.<sup>49</sup> The Petitioner argues that WRNN would be an outlier among its peers and would be competitively disadvantaged if Altice were to refuse to carry the Station.<sup>50</sup> In addition, the Petitioner notes that WRNN is currently carried in the Communities

---

<sup>41</sup> *Id.*

<sup>42</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(I).

<sup>43</sup> Petition at 10.

<sup>44</sup> *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, 34 FCC Rcd at 6451, para. 10; *see also Entravision Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 2225, para. 15.

<sup>45</sup> *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, 34 FCC Rcd at 6452, para. 12 (quoting *Woods Communications Corporation*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 32 FCC Rcd 6597, 6600, para. 6 (MB 2017) (citing *Tennessee Broadcasting Partners*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 23 FCC Rcd 3928, 3934, para. 10 (MB 2008) (finding that carriage of a competing station in the same community provides evidence to support market modification)).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.*

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> Petition at 11 and Exhibit B (Altice Cable Lineup Card).

<sup>49</sup> *Id.* For example, the Petitioner points out that Altice carries WABC(DT), WCBS-TV, WNBC(DT), WNET(DT), and WPXN-TV, all of which broadcast from One World Trade Center. *Id.* at n.38.

<sup>50</sup> *Id.*

by Verizon FiOS, DISH, DIRECTV, and others,<sup>51</sup> and that such carriage by competitors is relevant for purposes of the historic carriage factor.<sup>52</sup> In addition, the Petitioner states that Altice itself carries WRNN on cable systems “immediately adjacent to and/or surrounding the cable systems serving the Communities.”<sup>53</sup> The Petitioner also notes that while WRNN was not accorded new station status in the *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, the Bureau did recognize the Station’s change in circumstances regarding change in community of license and transmitter site relocation as mitigating circumstances in analyzing this factor.<sup>54</sup>

14. With regard to this statutory factor, our precedent recognizes the relevance of carriage of co-located stations in a particular community. Although we need not accord WRNN new station status to properly analyze its market modification Petition, consistent with our precedent, we will consider the Station’s dramatic change in circumstances due to its change in community of license and transmitter site relocation as mitigating circumstances with respect to the Station’s lack of historic carriage.<sup>55</sup> Because Altice is carrying WRNN’s channel sharing partner on all of its systems serving the Communities, as well as other co-located and nearby stations, we believe that WRNN would be at a competitive disadvantage if Altice did not also carry WRNN in the Communities.<sup>56</sup> We find that this first statutory factor weighs in favor of the requested modification.

## 2. Local Service

15. Second, we consider “whether the television station provides coverage or other local service to such community.”<sup>57</sup> The Petitioner states that this statutory factor can be satisfied by demonstrating the Station’s signal coverage, its geographic proximity to the Communities, its shopping and labor patterns between the Station and the Communities, as well as locally-focused programming broadcast by the Station.<sup>58</sup> The Petitioner asserts, however, that less significance may be accorded to locally-focused programming when these other factors evidence a sufficient nexus to the Communities.<sup>59</sup>

16. Regarding contour and signal strength, the Petitioner asserts that because WRNN is now broadcasting from a transmitter located atop the One World Trade Center, the Station’s 41 dBu noise-limited service contour encompasses “nearly all of the Communities.”<sup>60</sup> The Petitioner submits a map showing WRNN’s current signal contour in relation to the Communities and the relevant Altice

---

<sup>51</sup> *Id.* and Exhibit C (Comcast, Verizon FiOS, DISH, and DIRECTV Channel Lineup Cards).

<sup>52</sup> *Id.* at n.40 (citing *Petition for Modification of Philadelphia, PA Designated Market Area With Regard to Station WACP, Atlantic City, NJ*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 29 FCC Rcd 1835, 1845, para. 19, n.77 (MB 2014)).

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* and Exhibit D (Altice Carriage of WRNN-TV).

<sup>54</sup> *Id.* at n.43.

<sup>55</sup> *Id.*

<sup>56</sup> See *Entravision Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 2225, para. 15 (“Because Comcast and Cox carry WUSA, along with every other full-power television station in the area, we believe that WJAL would be at a competitive disadvantage if these cable operators did not also carry WJAL in the Communities.”); *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, 34 FCC Rcd at 6452, para. 12 (“Because Spectrum is carrying WRNN’s channel sharing partner on its Bergen County system . . . [and] since Spectrum also carries other co-located and nearby stations, we believe that WRNN would be at a competitive disadvantage if Spectrum did not carry WRNN in the Communities.”).

<sup>57</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(II).

<sup>58</sup> Petition at 11-12.

<sup>59</sup> *Id.* at 12-13 (citing *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, 34 FCC Rcd at 6454-55, para. 18).

<sup>60</sup> *Id.* at 13.



headends.<sup>61</sup> The Petitioner further asserts that WRNN's signal contour covers all or part of each of the relevant cable systems.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, the Petitioner states that WRNN's coverage of the Communities is "nearly identical to the other major stations co-located on One World Trade Center – all of which are deemed local to the communities even though none has a contour that encompasses all of the Communities."<sup>63</sup> Accordingly, the Petitioner asserts that WRNN's signal contour supports the inclusion of the Communities in the Station's market.

17. The Petitioner also states that WRNN is geographically proximate to the Communities.<sup>64</sup> The Petitioner submits information that reflects the direct distances from WRNN's transmitter and community of license to the Communities; in eight of the ten relevant Altice cable systems named by the Petitioner, every community is fewer than 60 miles away.<sup>65</sup> The Petitioner acknowledges that some of the Communities located in the Riverside/East Hampton/Shelter Island and Seaside cable systems are farther from New Rochelle and the transmitter site, but attributes this "to the unique geographies of Long Island and the Barnegat Peninsula, each of which includes several Communities proximate to WRNN and within WRNN's 41 dBu service area."<sup>66</sup> According to the Petitioner, these landforms both extend over water away from not only WRNN but also the other stations co-located at One World Trade Center.<sup>67</sup> The Petitioner points out that New Rochelle is closer to eastern Long Island than New York, which is the community of license of each of the other co-located stations at One World Trade Center and carried in the Communities.<sup>68</sup> Lastly, the Petitioner notes that while the driving distance from New Rochelle to East Hampton (the farthest community) is 101.7 miles, this is closer than the driving distance from WRNN's prior community of license, Kingston, to the closest community in Nassau County, which the Bureau previously determined was part of WRNN's market.<sup>69</sup>

18. Additionally, the Petitioner addresses shopping and labor patterns and states that WRNN's new community of license shares strong economic connections with the Communities.<sup>70</sup> New

---

<sup>61</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit E (Contour Map – WRNN). The Petitioner states that the locations of the cable headends are no longer publicly available through cable operators' online public inspection files. We are informed that WRNN License Co.'s engineer called his counterpart at Altice to determine the location of the headends for the systems serving the Communities. The Petitioner states that the engineer was told that Altice operates three master headends where signals are ingested and encoded before they are distributed to the hub-sites for the Communities. The location of Altice's master headends are plotted on the Contour Map submitted by Petitioner in Exhibit D. The Petitioner further states that "[g]iven the number of Communities at issue, including all of the Communities on a single map would have rendered the map illegible." Petition at n.50. In that regard, and in response to the Bureau's dismissal of the *WRNN September Petition*, the Petitioner, in its supplemented Exhibit E, provides "an overview map (WRNN-DT Overview Map) identifying all of the counties and systems in which the Communities are located and more detailed maps reflecting the location of each of the Communities." *Id.* at n.50 and Exhibit E. The detailed maps of the "WRNN-DT Longley-Rice 41+ DBU Coverage of Altice Communities" are those located in Essex County, NJ, Hudson County, NJ, Monmouth County, NJ, Ocean County, NJ, Suffolk County, NY, and Union County, NJ. *Id.* at n.50 and Exhibit E.

<sup>62</sup> *Id.*

<sup>63</sup> *Id.* at 13-14 and Exhibit F (Contour Map of Stations Located at One World Trade Center).

<sup>64</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit E.

<sup>65</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit G (distances). This table reflects the distances both "as the crow flies" and the driving distance from the Station's community of license and transmitter site to each of the Communities, and terrain maps in Exhibit H show the distances to a sample community in each of the Altice systems. The Petitioner states that the closest Community on each system is fewer than 60 miles from New Rochelle, which is comparable to distances that were previously found geographically proximate to the station at issue in other cases. *Id.* at 15 (citing *In re KJLA, LLC for Modification of the Television Market for Station KJLA-DT, Ventura, California*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 26 FCC Rcd 12652, para. 11 (MB 2011) (modifying KJLA's market to include communities located between 64 and 108 miles from the station's community of license); *KNTV License, Inc.*, 16 FCC Rcd 6785 (2001)

Rochelle and the Communities are part of the larger New York/New Jersey Metropolitan area and are connected by a large number of interstate and state highways, in addition to public transportation. The Petitioner also states that New Rochelle is easily accessible by car from any of the Communities.<sup>71</sup> The Communities are all part of New York/New Jersey's interconnected public transportation system, which connects New Rochelle and all of the Communities through Penn Station, which the Petitioner notes is the busiest train station in the country serving approximately 650,000 passengers each day.<sup>72</sup> The Petitioner observes that passengers can access New Rochelle from Penn Station by Amtrak in just 26 minutes.<sup>73</sup>

19. Moreover, the Petitioner states that New Rochelle has numerous businesses and shopping outlets, as well as entertainment and sports venues that attract residents from the New York/New Jersey metropolitan area, including the Communities.<sup>74</sup> In addition, the Petitioner states that U.S. Census Data shows that New Rochelle and the Communities share many common characteristics.<sup>75</sup> As an example, the Petitioner notes that the average commuting time in New Rochelle and sample Communities in each of the relevant cable systems is around 30 minutes, reflecting the interconnected and interdependent nature of the New York/New Jersey Metropolitan Area.<sup>76</sup> Additionally, the Petitioner observes that health care and social assistance are among the top three industries in nearly all of the Communities that were identified in that same sample study.<sup>77</sup> Further, the Petitioner points out that the Communities on Long Island and the Barnegat Peninsula are also popular vacation destinations for residents in the New York City area, including Westchester County.<sup>78</sup> Further demonstrating the interconnected nature of the New York/New Jersey Metropolitan Area, the Petitioner notes that the counties of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester, the home to New Rochelle, are working together on an initiative to purchase over 200 police vehicles for the counties themselves as well as the towns and villages within their boundaries.<sup>79</sup> The Petitioner asserts that these illustrative examples demonstrate the interconnection between New Rochelle

---

(...continued from previous page)

(adding communities that were 35-55 miles away); *Paxson Atlanta License, Inc.*, 13 FCC Rcd 20087 (1998) (adding communities that were 50 miles away); *Burnham Broadcasting, Inc.*, 10 FCC Rcd 7117 (1997) (adding a community that was 48 miles away); *Time Warner Cable*, 11 FCC Rcd 8047 (1996) (refusing to delete communities that were 60 miles away); *Cablevision Systems Corporation*, 11 FCC Rcd 6453 (1996) (refusing to delete communities that were 48-55 miles away); *Time Warner Cable*, 11 FCC Rcd 3510 (1996) (refusing to delete communities that were 45 miles away)).

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* at 16.

<sup>67</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit F (Contour Map of Stations Located at One World Trade Center).

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit H (Terrain Maps).

<sup>69</sup> *Id.* (citing *Petition of WRNN License Company, LLC for Modification of Television Market WRNN-DT, Kingston, New York*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 21 FCC Rcd 5952, 5958, para. 13 (MB 2006), *aff'd* 22 FCC Rcd 21054 (2007) (explaining that "the driving distance from the closest Community to WRNN-DT's community of license is 111 miles"))).

<sup>70</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.* and Exhibit I (Driving and Public Transportation Routes). Further, the Petitioner adds that New York is currently considering a proposal to build a tunnel from Westchester County to Long Island that will further reduce travel times between New Rochelle and the Suffolk County Communities. See Jordan Fenster, *Westchester to Long Island Tunnel Plan Get 6 Developers' Thumbs-up As Feasible, Desirable*, USA Today: lohud (Apr. 27, 2018).

<sup>72</sup> *Id.* (referring to John Schettino, *The New York Penn Station Atlas* (2015), <http://pennstationatlas.com/book/>).

<sup>73</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit J (Amtrak Route from New Rochelle to Penn Station).

and the Communities and therefore support weighing the second statutory in favor of the requested modification.<sup>80</sup>

20. Finally, we note that WRNN airs, almost exclusively, general interest programming such as “regional and international news, paid programming, and syndicated programming,” rather than locally relevant programming.<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, we have found substantial evidence regarding WRNN’s signal coverage,<sup>82</sup> geographic proximity, and shopping and labor patterns in relation to the Communities that conclusively demonstrate WRNN’s coverage and local service to the Communities. We therefore find that the second statutory factor weighs in favor of WRNN’s Petition.

### 3. Promoting Consumer Access to Local Stations

21. The third statutory factor is “whether modifying the market of the television station would promote consumers’ access to television broadcast station signals that originate in their State of residence.”<sup>83</sup> This factor is intended to ensure that multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) subscribers are “receiving news, politics, sports, emergency information, and other television programming relevant to their home state” and “relevant to their everyday lives.”<sup>84</sup> A petitioner is considered to satisfy this factor if the involved station is licensed to a community within the same state as the new community.<sup>85</sup> This factor may be given increased weight if the station provides programming specifically related to subscribers’ state of residence, and may be given even more weight if subscribers in the existing market have little or no access to such in-state programming.<sup>86</sup> However, this new in-state factor was not intended to bar a market modification because it did not result in increased consumer access to an in-state

---

(...continued from previous page)

<sup>74</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit K (New Rochelle Chamber of Commerce Business Directory).

<sup>75</sup> *Id.* at 18 (citing Data USA, <http://datausa.io/>).

<sup>76</sup> *Id.*

<sup>77</sup> *Id.* at 19.

<sup>78</sup> *Id.*

<sup>79</sup> *Id.* at 20 (citing Thomas P. DiNapoli, *Long Island Economic Snapshot* (May 2019), Office of the New York State Comptroller, <https://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/pubs/economicprofile/long-island-region.pdf>).

<sup>80</sup> *Id.*

<sup>81</sup> *Id.* With respect to locally relevant programming, Petitioner identifies only a few episodes of a nightly talk show.

<sup>82</sup> We note that pursuant to the Petitioner’s submission of maps in Exhibit E, there are a number of Communities that are not encompassed within the WRNN-DT Longley-Rice 41+ DBU Coverage of Altice Communities in Suffolk County, NY and there is one Community in Ocean County, NJ that is not within the 41+ DBU coverage. However, as the Petitioner notes and as demonstrated by Exhibit F, WRNN’s coverage of the Communities is nearly identical to the other major stations co-located on One World Trade Center. The noted stations are WPXN-TV, WCBS-TV, WNET, WNBC, and WNYC. As the Petitioner asserts these other major stations are deemed local to the Communities even though none has a contour that encompasses all of the Communities. Petition at 13-14 and Exhibit F. As such, we find that WRNN would be an outlier if we did not treat all of these stations the same in these

station's programming.<sup>87</sup> In such cases, the Commission determined that the "in-state factor would be inapplicable and the modification request would be evaluated based on the other statutory factors."<sup>88</sup>

22. WRNN is licensed to New Rochelle, New York and broadcasts from a transmitter located on top of One World Trade Center in Lower Manhattan. The Suffolk County Communities are located in New York and, accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of the market modification with regard to those Communities. The remaining Communities are all located in New Jersey, and thus we assign no weight to this factor with regard to those Communities.

#### 4. Carriage of Other Eligible Stations

23. Fourth, we consider "whether any other television station that is eligible to be carried by a cable system in such community in fulfillment of the requirements of this section provides news coverage of issues of concern to such community or provides carriage or coverage of sporting and other events of interest to the community."<sup>89</sup> In general, this factor is interpreted as enhancing a station's market modification petition if other stations do not sufficiently serve the communities at issue; however, other stations' service to the communities rarely has counted against a petition.<sup>90</sup> The Petitioner states that "[u]pon information and belief, Altice's systems serving each of the Communities carry other television stations that provide coverage of news, sports, and other issues of interest to the Communities."<sup>91</sup> Accordingly, consistent with our precedent, we assign no weight to this factor.

#### 5. Viewing Patterns

24. The fifth statutory factor focuses on "evidence of viewing patterns" in cable and noncable households "within the areas served by" the cable system or systems in such community.<sup>92</sup> The Petitioner states that WRNN "still does not subscribe to Nielsen or any other ratings service and has requested, but did not receive, permission to utilize published audience data relevant to this factor."<sup>93</sup> Furthermore, the

---

(...continued from previous page)  
circumstances.

<sup>83</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(III).

<sup>84</sup> *STELAR Market Mod. Order*, 30 FCC Rcd at 10407, para. 1, 10420, para. 18 (citing Report from the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation accompanying S. 2799, 113th Cong., S. Rep. No. 113-322, at 11 (2014)).

<sup>85</sup> *Id.* at 10420, para. 18.

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*

<sup>87</sup> *Id.* at 10421, para. 19.

<sup>88</sup> *Id.*

<sup>89</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(IV).

<sup>90</sup> *See Petition for Modification of Dayton, OH Designated Mkt. Area with Regard to Television Station WHIO-TV, Dayton, OH*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 28 FCC Rcd 16011, 16019, para. 22 (MB 2013); *see also Tennessee Broadcasting Partners*, 23 FCC Rcd at 3947, para. 49.

<sup>91</sup> Petition at 22-23.

<sup>92</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(1)(C)(ii)(V).

<sup>93</sup> Petition at 23. The Petitioner has requested a waiver of the requirement of 47 CFR § 76.59(b)(6) to provide published audience data for the Station. We waive this rule to the extent necessary because the Petitioner, although unsuccessful, made the effort to secure such published audience data and submitted in the alternative WRNN Direct Response Logs as evidence of viewership. While the *January Dismissal Order* did not address the merits of the

Petitioner states that while the Station does maintain “advertising and sales data for the market generally,” it does not have any specific sales in the Communities and, being a commercial station, it does not have any viewer contribution records.<sup>94</sup> However, the Petitioner asserts that “WRNN’s direct response media provider does maintain logs of orders received in response to programming broadcast on WRNN, which, thus far in 2019, have included numerous orders from the Communities – evidencing WRNN’s viewership in those [C]ommunities.”<sup>95</sup> In addition, as previously noted, the Petitioner states that WRNN’s market was previously modified to exclude the relevant Communities.<sup>96</sup> In that regard, the Petitioner asserts that to the extent that the Bureau may consider WRNN’s viewership to be low or nonexistent, it should consider that level of viewership to be unsurprising because of the modification of the Station’s market many years ago, and therefore, according to the Petitioner, this factor should be accorded at least limited weight.<sup>97</sup> Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that the Station’s recent modifications to its community of license, transmitter site relocation, and signal coverage improvement should be viewed as mitigating circumstances with respect to any lack of viewership in the Communities.<sup>98</sup>

25. We find that WRNN’s recent changed circumstances regarding its community of license and transmitter site relocation and improved signal coverage are mitigating circumstances with respect to any lack of viewership in the Communities. We also recognize Petitioners’ evidence of direct sales to viewers in the Communities and the demonstrated effort to provide additional evidence of viewership within the Communities. In light of these circumstances, we find that the fifth statutory factor weighs in favor of WRNN License Co.’s modification request.

## 6. Conclusion

26. We conclude that the facts support the grant of the Petitioner’s request to modify the market of Station WRNN-TV, New Rochelle, New York, to include all of the Communities served by Altice’s systems in the following counties: Suffolk (NY), Essex(NJ), Hudson (NJ), Monmouth (NJ), Ocean (NJ), and Union (NJ). We find that the first, second, and fifth statutory factors weigh in favor of the market modification request. The third statutory weighs in favor of the Communities located in New York and we assign no weight to this factor with regard to the New Jersey Communities. We assign no weight to the fourth statutory factor. For the reasons discussed herein, we grant the Petition. Finally, we note that the decision to modify WRNN’s market to include the Communities is based on the specific facts and circumstances presented in this proceeding. It should not be interpreted as prejudging future market modifications filed by relocated channel sharing stations or affected cable systems. All market modifications are evaluated on the specific facts and circumstances presented in those proceedings, including those arising from channel sharing as expressly contemplated by the Commission in the

---

(...continued from previous page)

evidence that WRNN was able to collect and provide under this rule, the Bureau determined that WRNN “made a “substantial and good-faith effort to obtain ‘specific audience information’ responsive to the requirements of section 76.59(b)(6) . . . in a genuine attempt to demonstrate specific engagement by viewers in the Communities it hopes to more fully serve.” *Id.* at 4, para. 7. The Bureau further stated that “[i]n light of this demonstrated effort, we anticipate that a waiver of the requirements of section 76.59(b)(6) to the extent necessary would be appropriate, and will not expect WRNN to provide new or additional evidence responsive to this section if it chooses to refile.” *Id.*

<sup>94</sup> *Id.* at 23-24.

<sup>95</sup> *Id.* at 24 and Exhibit O (WRNN Direct Response Order Logs).

<sup>96</sup> *Id.*; *see supra* paras. 7-8 (discussing WRNN’s previous market modification history).

<sup>97</sup> *Id.* (citing *Entravision Order*, 33 FCC Rcd at 2231, para. 27; *WRNN-Spectrum Order*, 34 FCC Rcd at 6456, para. 23).

<sup>98</sup> *Id.*

*Incentive Auction Report and Order.*<sup>99</sup>

#### IV. ORDERING CLAUSES

27. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED**, pursuant to Section 614(h) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 534, and Section 76.59 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR § 76.59, that the captioned Petition for Special Relief (MB Docket No. 20-26, CSR 8986-A) filed by WRNN License Company, LLC **IS GRANTED**.

28. This action is taken pursuant to authority delegated by Section 0.283 of the Commission's rules.<sup>100</sup>

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

---

<sup>99</sup> See *supra* para. 5 (citing *Incentive Auction Report and Order*, 29 FCC Rcd at 6857, para. 709).

<sup>100</sup> 47 CFR § 0.283.

## ADDENDUM

**PSID 001994 – Hauppauge/Islip**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NY1403	Suffolk	Belle Terre	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0690	Suffolk	Brightwaters	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0237	Suffolk	Brookhaven	CSC Holdings LLC
NY1506	Suffolk	Head of the Harbor	CSC Holdings LLC
NY1689	Suffolk	Islandia	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0239	Suffolk	Islip	CSC Holdings LLC
NY1429	Suffolk	Nissequogue	CSC Holdings LLC
NY1576	Suffolk	Old Field	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0713	Suffolk	Port Jefferson	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0691	Suffolk	Shoreham	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0242	Suffolk	Smithtown	CSC Holdings LLC
NY0667	Suffolk	Village of Branch	CSC Holdings LLC

**PSID 001592 – Brookhaven/Suffolk**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NY0581	Suffolk	Bellport	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.
NY0052	Suffolk	Brookhaven	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.
NY0451	Suffolk	Lake Grove	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.
NY0363	Suffolk	Patchogue	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.
NY0929	Suffolk	Poquott	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.
NY1981	Suffolk	Village of Mastic Beach	Cablevision of Brookhaven Inc.

**PSID 003782 – Riverhead/East Hampton/Shelter Island**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NY0238	Suffolk	Dering Harbor	CSC Holdings Inc.
NY0149	Suffolk	East Hampton	Cablevision Systems East Hampton Corp.
NY0150	Suffolk	East Hampton	Cablevision Systems East Hampton Corp.
NY0176	Suffolk	Greenport	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0240	Suffolk	North Haven	CSC Holdings, Inc.
NY0183	Suffolk	Quogue	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0186	Suffolk	Riverhead	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0187	Suffolk	Sag Harbor	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY1819	Suffolk	Sagaponack	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0241	Suffolk	Shelter Island	CSC Holdings Inc.
NY0190	Suffolk	Southampton	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0192	Suffolk	Southampton	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0188	Suffolk	Southold	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY1728	Suffolk	West Hampton Dunes	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.
NY0197	Suffolk	West Hampton Beach	CSC Acquisition-NY Inc.

**PSID 010957 -- Newark**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0476	Essex	Newark	Cablevision of Newark
NJ0582	Essex	South Orange	Cablevision of Newark

**PSID 000554 – Monmouth East**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0069	Monmouth	Asbury Park	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0277	Monmouth	Avon-By-The-Sea	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0278	Monmouth	Belmar	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0279	Monmouth	Bradley Beach	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0280	Monmouth	Brielle	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0483	Monmouth	Farmingdale	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0456	Monmouth	Interlaken	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0281	Monmouth	Manasquan	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0283	Monmouth	Neptune	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0282	Monmouth	Neptune City	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0161	Monmouth	Ocean	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0284	Monmouth	Sea Girt	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0286	Monmouth	South Belmar	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0285	Monmouth	Spring Lake	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0287	Monmouth	Spring Lake Heights	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0288	Monmouth	Wall	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC

**PSID 011794 – Monmouth West**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0556	Monmouth	Colts Neck	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ1021	Monmouth	NWS Earle	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0429	Monmouth	Englishtown	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0428	Monmouth	Freehold	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0531	Monmouth	Howell	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0346	Ocean	Jackson	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0503	Ocean	Lakewood	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0430	Monmouth	Manalapan	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0557	Monmouth	Marlboro	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0617	Monmouth	Millstone	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0618	Monmouth	Upper Freehold	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC

**PSID 001821 – Seaside**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0214	Ocean	Berkeley	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0213	Ocean	Dover <sup>101</sup>	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC

<sup>101</sup> The Petitioner states that “[a]lthough the FCC’s Cable and Operations Licensing System still refers to Community Unit NJ0213 in Ocean County, New Jersey, as ‘Dover,’ in 2006, Dover Township changed its name to Toms River Township. Any references to Dover in this petition are intended to refer to the community currently



NJ0128	Ocean	Lavallette	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0127	Ocean	Seaside Heights	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC
NJ0129	Ocean	Seaside Park	Cablevision of Monmouth LLC

**PSID 005968 – Bayonne**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0381	Hudson	Bayonne	Cablevision of New Jersey LLC

**PSID 001995 – Hudson/Riverview**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0083	Hudson	North Bergen	Cablevision of Hudson County LLC
NJ0111	Hudson	Hoboken	Cablevision of Hudson County LLC
NJ0345	Hudson	Weehawken	Cablevision of Hudson County LLC
NJ0365	Hudson	West New York	Cablevision of Hudson County LLC
NJ0366	Hudson	Union	Cablevision of Hudson County LLC

**PSID 000260 – Elizabeth**

<b>CUID</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>COMMUNITY NAME</b>	<b>LEGAL NAME</b>
NJ0117	Union	Elizabeth	CSC TKR LLC

---

(...continued from previous page)

known as Toms River Township.” Exhibit A at 5. As such, the Petitioner continues to list Dover as the Community in Ocean County for CUID NJ0213 in Exhibit A of the Petition, and we do the same here.