



State of New Jersey  
DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL  
140 EAST FRONT STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FL.  
P.O. Box 003  
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

PHIL MURPHY  
*Governor*

SHEILA OLIVER  
*Lt. Governor*

BRIAN O. LIPMAN  
*Director*

Via Electronic and Regular Mail

August 15, 2023

Ms. Sherri Golden, Board Secretary  
New Jersey Board of Public Utilities  
44 South Clinton Avenue  
P.O. Box 350  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0350

Re: I/M/O Verified Petition of CSC TKR, LLC d/b/a Cablevision of Raritan Valley  
for Approval To Relocate Its Customer Service Office  
**BPU Docket No.: CE23020096**

Dear Secretary Golden:

The New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel (“Rate Counsel”) submits its comments for consideration on the above-referenced matter filed by CSC TKR, LLC, d/b/a Cablevision of Raritan Valley (“Altice” or “Petitioner”). Petitioner seeks approval by the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (“Board”) to move a customer service window and seeks a waiver of a Notice requirement found at N.J.A.C. 14:18-5.1(c). On February 17, 2023, Altice filed a Petition with the Board seeking approval to relocate its store from 2909 Washington Road, Parlin, New Jersey to 1028 US-9, Suite 1028, Old Bridge, New Jersey. On June 27, 2023, Altice filed a supplemental letter to its Petition seeking Board waiver of a Notice requirement found at N.J.A.C. 14:18-5.1(c). This comment letter addresses both the February 17 Petition and the June 27 letter. After review of the Petition and waiver request, Rate Counsel does not object to the Board’s grant of approval of Petitioners’ requests.

Regarding Altice’s request to move its store, Rate Counsel does not object to this relocation. Petitioner explains that Altice is the current holder of a Board-issued 2007 Certificate of Approval to construct, operate, and maintain a cable system in the Borough of Sayreville.<sup>1</sup> Although the terms of the Certificate of Approval expired on November 6, 2016, Petitioner claims that it is authorized to continue providing cable service to Sayreville pursuant to the Board’s procedures governing automatic renewals found at N.J.A.C. 14:18-13.6.<sup>2</sup> Petitioner further claims that the new office will be less than two road miles from the existing office and will provide an improved customer service experience.<sup>3</sup> Altice further claims that no staffing

---

<sup>1</sup> Verified Petition at p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Id.

<sup>3</sup> Verified Petition at p. 2.

reductions will occur as a result of the move.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, Petitioner states that while Sayreville has enacted an Ordinance requiring Petitioner to maintain a local business office in Sayreville for local consumer service purposes,<sup>5</sup> Sayreville filed a letter in this docket stating that it consents to the relocation and plans to revise its Ordinance in the near future.<sup>6</sup>

Regarding waiver of the Notice requirement found at N.J.A.C. 14:18-5.1(c), Rate Counsel does not object to Board approval of same. Petitioner explains that its original notice, which it timely sent to the correct newspaper, was not published due to an error by the newspaper.<sup>7</sup> Based on the explanation provided by Altice, Rate Counsel is satisfied that Altice timely acted to correct this mistake. Additionally, the Notice ran in the correct newspaper, albeit later than required by New Jersey Rules, and the public was afforded a comment period from the publication date of March 2 to March 27, 2023. The comment period was shortened by less than a week due to the newspaper's error, although Rate Counsel notes that Altice could have simply extended it in order to comply with the Rules.<sup>8</sup>

Lastly, the Rules specify that a newspaper Notice must run simultaneously with Board filing and run in the local newspaper within three days of when the petition is filed with the Board.<sup>9</sup> Here, that would have been on February 17 and not on March 2 (or even February 27, as planned by Altice). Altice does not address this portion of the Rule or the delay in their letter. However, any harm to the public by this delayed and slightly shortened comment period was de minimis and does not merit disapproval of Petitioner's request to move its customer service window. Given the discrepancies in time, Rate Counsel assumes Altice did not reject any comments as out of time.

Very truly yours,

BRIAN O. LIPMAN, ESQ.  
DIRECTOR  
NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF RATE COUNSEL

*Emily F. Smithman, Esq.* \_\_\_\_\_  
Emily F. Smithman, Esq.  
Assistant Deputy Rate Counsel

EFS/td  
cc: Service List

---

<sup>4</sup> Id. at p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Verified Petition at pp. 1-2.

<sup>6</sup> See Letter from Glenn R. Skarzynski, Borough Administrator, Borough of Sayreville, dated July 18, 2023.

<sup>7</sup> Letter at pp. 1-3.

<sup>8</sup> The Rules state that the comment period must be at least 30 days. N.J.A.C. 14:18-5.1(c).

<sup>9</sup> N.J.A.C. 14:18-5.1(c).