income areas, which could benefit the most from enhanced competition, will be denied these benefits.

IX. CONCLUSION.

For the reasons set forth above, the Commission should adopt safeguards against the very real potential for LEC abuse of their local telephony monopoly, and adopt specific, minimum standards for assuring nondiscriminatory access and just and reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates, terms and conditions. All regulation of OVS should be consistent with the statutory precepts of competitive neutrality and nondiscrimination.

Respectfully submitted,

TIME WARNER CABLE

By _____

Brian Conboy
Michael Hammer
Michael G. Jones

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

ITS ATTORNEYS

11 April 1996

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Dennette Manson, do hereby certify that on this 11th day of April, 1996, copies of the foregoing Reply Comments of Time Warner Cable were delivered by hand, unless otherwise indicated, to the following parties:

Commissioner Rachelle Chong
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 844
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Susan Ness
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 832
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner James H. Quello
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 802
Washington, DC 20554

Chairman Reed E. Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 814
Washington, DC 20554

ITS, Inc.
2100 M Street, N.W.
Room 140
Washington, DC 20037

Larry Walke
Cable Services Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
2033 M Street, N.W.
Room 408A
Washington, DC 20554

Dennette Manson

Dennette Manson

0003776.01