

Maureen O. Helmer  
Partner

July 17, 2015

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Ms. Donna Giliberto  
Records Access Officer  
New York State Public Service Commission  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223-1350

**RE: Joint Petition of Charter Communications, Inc. and Time Warner Cable Inc. for Approval of a Transfer of Control of Subsidiaries and Franchises; for Approval of a Pro Forma Reorganization; and for Approval of Certain Financing Arrangements.**  
**Case 15-M-0388**

**Confidential Treatment Request for the Responses to the First Set of Interrogatories**

Dear Ms. Giliberto:

Enclosed please find the unredacted and confidential versions of the Responses to the First Set of Interrogatories issued by Department of Public Service Staff on July 7, 2015. Pursuant to 16 N.Y.C.R.R. § 6-1.3(b)(1), Charter Communications, Inc. (“Charter”) and Time Warner Cable Inc. (“TWC”) (collectively, “Petitioners”) seek exemption from public disclosure of (1) portions of the responses Interrogatories 2, 3, 8, 11, 16, 20, 23, 26, 34, and 35; and (2) Confidential Exhibits 1, 9, 14, 16, 20, and 22.

The Interrogatory Responses and Exhibits listed above contain confidential information with regards to Petitioners’ customer base in New York at a granular level, marketing plans, promotional offerings, and staffing levels, (“Confidential Information”). Petitioners therefore respectfully submit this confidential treatment request to demonstrate that the Confidential Information qualifies as “trade secret,” and also as “confidential commercial information” exempt from disclosure under Public Officers Law (“POL”) §§ 87(2)(d) and 89(5)(a)(1).

**Analysis**

POL § 87(2)(d) states in relevant part that agencies must deny access to records that “are trade secrets or are submitted to an agency by a commercial enterprise or derived from information obtained from a commercial enterprise and which if disclosed would cause substantial injury to the competitive position of the subject enterprise.” In the recent *Verizon* case, the Albany County Supreme Court held that the “trade secret” and “substantial competitive injury” tests are two alternative standards, such that information satisfying either test must be

exempted from public disclosure under New York's Freedom of Information Law ("FOIL").<sup>1</sup> Petitioners respectfully submit that the Confidential Information satisfies each of these alternative standards and must therefore be exempted from disclosure.

***a. Trade Secret***

The Commission's Regulations define a trade secret as "any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which provides an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it." These regulations set forth six non-exclusive factors for determining whether particular information should be considered to be a trade secret:

1. the extent to which disclosure would cause unfair economic or competitive damage;
2. the extent to which the information is known by others;
3. the value of the information to the possessor of the data and its competitors;
4. the difficulty and cost of developing the information;
5. the difficulty of recreating the data without permission; and
6. whether the data is otherwise exempted by law from disclosure.

The Confidential Information satisfies each of these factors. The information would be of significant competitive value to Petitioners' competitors, who could use it to tailor their marketing strategies and budgets. The granular data included in the Confidential Information is not generally available to the public nor does it constitute the type of information that competitors make available to each other in the normal course of business. Instead, this information is the product of a significant investment of time, effort and expense by Petitioners that cannot be replicated by others without Petitioners' consent. This information is held by the Petitioners on a confidential basis and is not disclosed to others except on a confidential basis or as required by law.

***b. Substantial Competitive Injury***

The Confidential Information constitutes information obtained from a commercial enterprise, the disclosure of which would cause substantial injury to the competitive position of the subject enterprise by exposing their market position. The Petitioners are both commercial enterprises. Disclosure of the Confidential Information would make it easier for Petitioners' competitors to tailor their marketing strategies and budgets, conferring on them an advantage over Petitioners. The information is not available to those competitors from any other source, and Petitioners do not have access to comparable information from their competitors.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Matter of Verizon New York Inc. v. New York Public Service Commission*, 46 Misc. 3d 858 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Albany County July 31, 2014) ("Verizon").

July 17, 2015

Page 3

Accordingly, TWC and Charter respectfully request that you find that the Confidential Information contained in the Interrogatory Responses and Confidential Exhibits satisfies both the “trade secret” and the “substantial competitive injury” tests under the POL and must be exempted from disclosure under FOIL. To protect the confidentiality of this information, the Confidential Information must be maintained in the Department of Public Service’s confidential files and must be provided only to interested members of the Commission and DPS Staff, and not otherwise be disclosed or made available, either through FOIL or otherwise.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Maureen O. Helmer

Maureen O. Helmer

Barclay Damon, LLP

Albany, N.Y. 12207

80 State Street

Phone: (518) 429-4220

Email: mhelmer@barclaydamon.com

*Counsel for Charter Communications, Inc. and*

*Time Warner Cable Inc.*

ES/

cc: Michael Quinn, Time Warner Cable, Inc.  
Michael Moore, Charter Communications, Inc.  
Adam Falk, Charter Communications, Inc.  
Luke Platzer, Jenner & Block LLP  
Christopher Harvie, Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo, P.C.  
Paul Abbott, Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo, P.C.  
Matthew Brill, Latham & Watkins LLP  
Amanda Potter, Latham & Watkins LLP