SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

FORM 10-K/A

Annual report pursuant to section 13 and 15(d) [amend]

Filing Date: **2001-08-03** | Period of Report: **2000-12-31**
SEC Accession No. 0001095811-01-503615

(HTML Version on secdatabase.com)

FILER

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LTD PARTNERSHIP

CIK:**788736**| IRS No.: **911318471** | State of Incorp.:**WA** | Fiscal Year End: **1231**
Type: **10-K/A** | Act: **34** | File No.: **000-16063** | Film No.: **1697299**
SIC: **4841** Cable & other pay television services

Mailing Address
1201 THIRD AVE STE 3600
SEATTLE WA 98103

Business Address
1201 THIRD AVE STE 3600
SEATTLE WA 98101
2066211351

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

FORM 10-K--ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR
15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934
(As last amended in Rel. No. 34-29354 eff. 7-1-91.)

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-KA

[X] ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 [FEE REQUIRED]

For the fiscal year ended DECEMBER 31, 2000

[ ] TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d) OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 [FEE REQUIRED]

For the transition period from ________to________

Commission file number 0-16063

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

STATE OF WASHINGTON	91-1318471
(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)	(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)

3600 WASHINGTON MUTUAL TOWER 1201 THIRD AVENUE, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON	98101
(Address of principal executive offices)	(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code: (206) 621-1351

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

Title of each class	Name of each exchange on which registered
(NONE)	(NONE)

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act:

UNITS OF LIMITED PARTNERSHIP INTEREST
(Title of class)

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

Yes [X] No [ ]

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE
(Partially Incorporated into Part IV)

(1) Form S-1 Registration Statement declared effective on July 10, 1986 (No. 33-2928).

(2) Form 10-K Annual Reports for fiscal years ended December 31, 1986, December 31, 1988, December 31, 1989, December 31, 1990 and December 31, 1992, respectively.

(3) Form 8-A Registration Statement filed July 24, 1987.

(4) Form 10-Q Quarterly Report for period ended September 30, 1988 and September 30, 1996, respectively.

(5) Form 8-K Registration Statement filed January 15, 1998.

This filing contains ______ pages. Exhibits Index appears on page _____.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Financial Statements/Schedules Index appears on page _____.

Cautionary statement for purposes of the "Safe Harbor" provisions of the Private Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Statements contained or incorporated by reference in this document that are not based on historical fact are "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of the Private Securities Reform Act of 1995. Forward-looking statements may be identified by use of forward-looking terminology such as "believe", "intends", "may", "will", "expect", "estimate", "anticipate", "continue", or similar terms, variations of those terms or the negative of those terms.

PART I

ITEM 1. BUSINESS

Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership (the "Partnership") is a Washington limited partnership consisting of two general partners (the "General Partners") and approximately 1,807 limited partners as of December 31, 2000. Northland Communications Corporation, a Washington corporation, is the Managing General Partner of the Partnership (referred to herein as "Northland" or the "Managing General Partner"). FN Equities Joint Venture, a California general partnership, is the Administrative General Partner of the Partnership (the "Administrative General Partner").

Northland was formed in March 1981 and is principally involved in the ownership and management of cable television systems. Northland currently manages the operations and is the General Partner for cable television systems owned by 4 limited partnerships. Northland is also the parent company of Northland Cable Properties, Inc. which was formed in February 1995 and is principally involved in direct ownership of cable television systems and is the majority member and manager of Northland Cable Ventures, LLC. Northland is a subsidiary of Northland Telecommunications Corporation ("NTC"). Other subsidiaries of NTC include:

NORTHLAND CABLE TELEVISION, INC. - formed in October 1985 and principally involved in the direct ownership of cable television systems. Sole shareholder of Northland Cable News, Inc.

NORTHLAND CABLE NEWS, INC. - formed in May 1994 and principally involved in the production and development of local news, sports and informational programming for the Partnership and other Northland affiliates.

NORTHLAND CABLE SERVICES CORPORATION - formed in August 1993 and principally involved in the development and production of computer software used in billing and financial record keeping for Northland-affiliated cable systems. Sole shareholder of Cable Ad-Concepts.

CABLE AD-CONCEPTS, INC. - formed in November 1993 and principally involved in the sale, development and production of video commercial advertisements that are cablecast on Northland-affiliated cable systems.

NORTHLAND MEDIA, INC. - formed in April 1995 as a holding company. Sole shareholder of the following two entities:

STATESBORO MEDIA, INC. - formed in April 1995 and principally involved in operating an AM radio station serving the community of Statesboro, Georgia and surrounding areas.

CORSICANA MEDIA, INC. - purchased in September 1998 and principally involved in operating an AM radio station serving the community of Corsicana, Texas and surrounding areas.

The Partnership was formed on January 22, 1986 and began operations in 1986. In January 1998, the Partnership purchased the cable television systems serving the communities of Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell and Bennettsville, all in the state of South Carolina (the "Barnwell System" and "Bennettsville System"). In April 1999, the Partnership sold the systems serving the communities of Sandersville, Heidelberg and Laurel, Mississippi. As of December 31, 2000, the total number of basic subscribers served by the Systems was 31,633, and the partnership's penetration rate (basic subscribers as a percentage of homes passed) was approximately 62%. The Partnership's properties are located in rural areas which, to some extent, do not offer consistently acceptable off-air network signals. This factor, combined with the existence of fewer entertainment alternatives than in large markets contributes to a larger proportion of the population subscribing to cable television (higher penetration).

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

The Partnership has 35 non-exclusive franchises to operate the Systems. These franchises, which will expire at various dates through the year 2017, have been granted by local, county, state and other governmental authorities in the areas in which the Systems

currently operate. Franchise fees are paid to the granting governmental authorities. These fees vary between 2% and 5% of the respective gross revenues of the system in a particular community. The franchises may be terminated for failure to comply with their respective conditions.

The Partnership operates five groups of "clusters" of cable systems serving the communities and surrounding areas of Starkville, Kosciusko, Philadelphia and Forest, Mississippi; Highlands, North Carolina; and Barnwell and Bennettsville, South Carolina. The following is a description of these areas:

Starkville, MS: The Starkville operating group serves the communities and surrounding areas of Starkville and Kosciusko, Mississippi. The City of Starkville is the home of Mississippi State University with an enrollment of approximately 12,000 students. The university's 10 colleges and schools comprise 58 departments that offer more than 120 majors. Mississippi State is also the largest employer in Starkville, with nearly 1,300 faculty members or professionals and 1,450 support staff. Also located in Starkville is the Mississippi Research and Technology Park, which is a long-range economic development project initiated through the joint efforts of the City of Starkville, Oktibbeha County, Mississippi State University and the local business community. The park is located on approximately 220 acres across from the entrance to the university and will enhance high-technology research for application to the economic sector. The developers and businesses that comprise the park intend to work hand in hand with research efforts at the university, and companies that locate in the park will have the benefit of university facilities and faculty. Certain information regarding the Starkville, MS system as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

Basic Subscribers	11,961
Tier Subscribers	6,063
Premium Subscribers	4,010
Estimated Homes Passed	16,525

Philadelphia, MS: The Philadelphia operating group serves the communities and surrounding areas of Philadelphia and Forest, Mississippi. The systems are located in central Mississippi in an area where the local economies are based primarily in manufacturing. The region has excellent highway and railroad transportation, a year-round mild climate, and the availability of a trained, cost-effective labor force. One of the main industries in the area is poultry. Nearly two million birds are dressed weekly in the city of Forest, which ranks as the second-largest producer of broilers in the nation. Other industries in the area include apparel, ready mix concrete, frozen food products, lumber, small appliances, electronic assembly, meat processing and steel. Certain information regarding the Philadelphia, MS operating group as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

Basic Subscribers	6,677
Tier Subscriber	2,971
Premium Subscribers	2,690
Estimated Homes Passed	8,910

Highlands and Sapphire Valley, NC: Located on a high plateau of the Blue Ridge Mountains where the corners of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina meet, Highlands has long offered a cool and beautiful summer retreat for the affluent families from such southern cities as Atlanta, New Orleans and Tampa. The Highlands region is almost encircled by the 200,000 acres of the End National Forest, and boasts a lush mixture of hardwoods and evergreens because of an abundant rainfall. Highlands has an average altitude of over 4,000 feet, and thus maintains a temperate summer climate. The influx of tourists increases Highland's year-round population of approximately 2,000 to over 20,000 between May and October.

The Highlands area is perhaps best known for its exclusive golf clubs. There are three beautiful golf courses in the Highlands area, the oldest being the Highlands Country Club. About half the land in the Highlands area is under

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

private ownership; the rest is part of the End National Forest, and is open for hiking, fishing, hunting, camping and other outdoor activities. The private land near the golf courses consists largely of exclusive housing developments, many of which feature rambling, ranch-style vacation homes with values ranging from $200,000 to a half million dollars. The Great Smokey Mountains National Park and the Blue Ridge Parkway are within easy driving distance of Highlands. Several lakes in the area offer swimming, boating, skiing, fishing and other water sports. Rafting is also popular in the area due to the close proximity of the Chattooga and Cullasaja Rivers. Certain information regarding the Highlands and Sapphire Valley, NC Systems as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

Basic Subscribers	2,664
Premium Subscribers	582
Estimated Homes Passed	4,190

Barnwell, SC and Bennettsville, SC: Barnwell, Bamberg and Allendale are located approximately sixty miles south of Columbia, South Carolina. The economy is based primarily on agricultural and manufacturing activities. Certain information regarding the Barnwell, SC system as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

Basic Subscribers	5,849
Premium Subscribers	3,767
Estimated Homes Passed	12,125

The City of Bennettsville is located approximately 100 miles northeast of Columbia, South Carolina and serves as the county seat of Marlboro County. The economy is primarily driven by agriculture and manufacturing, with three of the largest employers being Mohawk Carpet, United Technologies Automotive and Williamette Industries. Certain information regarding the Bennettsville, SC Systems as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

Basic Subscribers	4,482
Premium Subscribers	2,953
Estimated Homes Passed	9,090

The Partnership had 48 employees as of December 31, 2000. Management of these systems is handled through offices located in the towns of Starkville, Forest, Kosciusko and Philadelphia, Mississippi; Highlands, North Carolina; and Barnwell and Bennettsville, South Carolina. Pursuant to the Agreement of Limited Partnership, the Partnership reimburses the Managing General Partner for time spent by the Managing General Partner's accounting staff on Partnership accounting and bookkeeping matters. (See Item 13(a) below.)

The Partnership's cable television business is generally not considered seasonal. The business of the Partnership is not dependent upon a single customer or a few customers, the loss of any one or more of which would have a material adverse effect on its business. No customer accounts for 10% or more of revenues. No material portion of the Partnership's business is subject to renegotiation of profits or termination of contracts or subcontracts at the election of any governmental unit, except that franchise agreements may be terminated or modified by the franchising authorities as noted above. During the last year, the Partnership did not engage in any research and development activities.

Partnership revenues are derived primarily from monthly payments received from cable television subscribers. Subscribers are divided into four categories: basic subscribers, expanded basic subscribers, premium subscribers, and digital subscribers. "Basic subscribers" are households that subscribe to the basic level of service, which generally provides access to the three major television networks (ABC, NBC and CBS), a few independent local stations, PBS (the Public Broadcasting System) and certain satellite programming services, such as ESPN, CNN or The Discovery Channel. "Expanded basic subscribers" are households that subscribe to an additional level of programming services the content of which varies from system to system. "Premium subscribers" are

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

households that subscribe to one or more "pay channels" in addition to the basic service. These pay channels include such services as Showtime, Home Box Office, Cinemax, Disney or The Movie Channel. "Digital subscribers" are those who subscribe to digitally delivered video and audio services where offered.

COMPETITION

Cable television systems currently experience competition from several sources, including broadcast television, cable overbuilds, direct broadcast satellite services, private cable and multichannel multipoint distribution service systems. Cable television systems are also in competition in various degrees with other communications and entertainment media, including motion pictures, home video cassette recorders, internet data delivery and internet video delivery. The following provides a summary description of these sources of competition.

BROADCAST TELEVISION

Cable television systems have traditionally competed with broadcast television, which consists of television signals that the viewer is able to receive directly on his television without charge using an "off-air" antenna. The extent of this competition is dependent in part upon the quality and quantity of signals available by antenna reception as compared to the services provided by the local cable system. Accordingly, cable operators find it less difficult to obtain higher penetration rates in rural areas (where signals available off-air are limited) than in metropolitan areas where numerous, high quality off-air signals are often available without the aid of cable television systems. The recent licensing of digital spectrum by the FCC will provide incumbent broadcast licenses with the ability to deliver high definition television pictures and multiple digital-quality program streams, as well as advanced digital services such as subscription video.

OVERBUILDS

Cable television franchises are not exclusive, so that more than one cable television system may be built in the same area. This is known as an "overbuild." Overbuilds have the potential to result in loss of revenues to the operator of the original cable television system. Constructing and developing a cable television system is a capital intensive process, and it is often difficult for a new cable system operator to create a marketing edge over the existing system. Generally, an overbuilder would be required to obtain franchises from the local governmental authorities, although in some instances, the overbuilder could be the local government itself. In any case, an overbuilder would be required to obtain programming contracts from entertainment programmers and, in most cases, would have to build a complete cable system such as headends, trunk lines and drops to individual subscribers homes throughout the franchise areas.

Federal cross-ownership restrictions historically limited entry by local telephone companies into the cable television business. The 1996 Telecom Act eliminated this cross-ownership restriction. See "Regulation and Legislation" below. It is therefore possible for companies with considerable resources to overbuild existing cable operators and enter the business. Several telephone companies have begun seeking cable television franchises from local governmental authorities and constructing cable television systems. The Partnership cannot predict at this time the extent of telephone company competition that will emerge in areas served by the Partnership's cable television systems. The entry of telephone companies as direct competitors, however, is likely to continue over the next several years and could adversely affect the profitability and market value of the Partnership's systems. The entry of electric utility companies into the cable television business, as now authorized by the 1996 Telecom Act, could have a similar adverse effect.

DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITE SERVICE

High powered direct-to-home satellites have made possible the wide-scale delivery of programming to individuals throughout the United States using small roof-top or wall-mounted antennas. The two leading DBS providers have experienced dramatic growth over the last several years and together now serve over 10 million customers nationwide. Companies offering direct broadcast satellite service use video compression technology to increase channel capacity of their systems to more than 100 channels and to provide packages of movies, satellite networks and other program services which are competitive to those of cable television systems. DBS companies historically faced significant legal and technological impediments to providing popular local broadcast programming to their customers. Recent federal legislation reduced this competitive disadvantage. Nevertheless, technological limitations still affect DBS companies, and it is expected that DBS companies will offer local broadcast

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

programming only in the top 50 to 100 U.S. markets for the foreseeable future. The same legislation reduced the compulsory copyright fees paid by DBS companies and allowed them to continue offering distant network signals to rural customers. The availability of low or no cost DBS equipment, delivery of local signals in some markets and exclusivity with respect to certain sports programming has increased DBS's market share over recent years. The impact of DBS services on the Partnership's market share within its service areas cannot be precisely determined but is estimated to have taken away between 2% and 6% depending upon the specific area.

PRIVATE CABLE

Additional competition is provided by private cable television systems, known as satellite master antenna television, serving multi-unit dwellings such as condominiums, apartment complexes, and private residential communities. These private cable systems may enter into exclusive agreements with apartment owners and homeowners associations, which may preclude operators of franchised systems from serving residents of these private complexes. Operators of private cable, which do not cross public rights of way, are free from the federal, state and local regulatory requirements imposed on franchised cable television operators.

MULTICHANNEL MULTIPOINT DISTRIBUTION SERVICE SYSTEMS

Cable television systems also compete with wireless program distribution services such as multichannel, multipoint distribution service systems, commonly called wireless cable, which are licensed to serve specific areas. Multichannel, multipoint distribution service systems use low-power microwave frequencies to transmit television programming over-the-air to paying subscribers. This industry is less capital intensive than the cable television industry, and it is therefore more practical to construct systems using this technology in areas of lower subscriber penetration.

REGULATION AND LEGISLATION

SUMMARY

The following summary addresses the key regulatory developments and legislation affecting the cable television industry. Other existing federal legislation and regulations, copyright licensing and, in many jurisdictions, state and local franchise requirements are currently the subject of a variety of judicial proceedings, legislative hearings and administrative and legislative proposals which could change, in varying degrees, the manner in which cable television systems operate. Neither the outcome of these proceedings nor their impact upon the cable television industry or the Partnership can be predicted at this time.

The Partnership expects to adapt its business to adjust to the changes that may be required under any scenario of regulation. At this time, the Partnership cannot assess the effects, if any, that present regulation may have on the Partnership's operations and potential appreciation of its Systems. There can be no assurance that the final form of regulation will not have a material adverse impact on the Partnership's operations.

The operation of a cable system is extensively regulated at the federal, local, and, in some instances, state levels. The Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 (the "1992 Cable Act"), and the 1996 Telecommunications Act (the "1996 Telecom Act", and, collectively, the "Cable Act") establish a national policy to guide the development and regulation of cable television systems. The Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") has principal responsibility for implementing the policies of the Cable Act. Many aspects of such regulation are currently the subject of judicial proceedings and administrative or legislative proposals. Legislation and regulations continue to change, and the Partnership cannot predict the impact of future developments on the cable television industry. Future regulatory and legislative changes could adversely affect the Partnership's operations.

CABLE RATE REGULATION

The 1992 Cable Act imposed an extensive rate regulation regime on the cable television industry, which limited the ability of cable companies to increase subscriber fees. Under that regime, all cable systems were subject to rate regulation, unless they face "effective competition" in their local franchise area. Federal law now defines "effective competition" on a community-specific basis as requiring satisfaction of conditions rarely satisfied in the current marketplace.

Although the FCC established the underlying regulatory scheme, local

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

government units, commonly referred to as local franchising authorities, are primarily responsible for administering the regulation of the lowest level of cable service called the basic service tier. The basic service tier typically contains local broadcast stations and public, educational, and government access channels. Local franchising authorities also have primary responsibility for regulating cable equipment rates. Under federal law, charges for various types of cable equipment must be unbundled from each other and from monthly charges for programming services. Before a local franchising authority begins basic service rate regulations, it must certify to the FCC that it will follow applicable federal rules. Many local franchising authorities have voluntarily declined to exercise their authority to regulate basic service rates.

As of December 31, 2000, approximately 14% of the Partnership's local franchising authorities were certified to regulate basic tier rates. The 1992 Cable Act permits communities to certify and regulate rates at any time, so that it is possible that additional localities served by the systems may choose to certify and regulate rates in the future.

The FCC itself historically administered rate regulation of cable programming service tiers, which represent the expanded level of non-"basic" and non-"premium", programming services. The 1996 Telecom Act, however, provided special rate relief for small cable operators offering cable programming service tiers. The elimination of cable programming service tier regulation afforded the Partnership substantially greater pricing flexibility.

Under the rate regulations of the FCC, most cable systems were required to reduce their basic service tier and cable programming service tier rates in 1993 and 1994, and have since had their rate increases governed by a complicated price cap scheme that allows for the recovery of inflation and certain increased costs, as well as providing some incentive for expanding channel carriage. The FCC has modified its rate adjustment regulations to allow for annual rate increases and to minimize previous problems associated with regulatory lag. Operators also have the opportunity to bypass this "benchmark" regulatory scheme in favor of traditional "cost-of-service" regulation in cases where the latter methodology appears favorable. Cost of service regulation is a traditional form of rate regulation, under which a utility is allowed to recover its costs of providing the regulated service, plus a reasonable profit.

In a particular effort to ease the regulatory burden on small cable systems, the FCC created special rate rules applicable for systems with fewer than 15,000 subscribers owned by an operator with fewer than 400,000 subscribers. The special rate rules allow for a simplified cost-of-service showing. All of the Partnership's systems are eligible for these simplified cost-of-service rules, and have calculated rates generally in accordance with those rules.

Under the FCC's rate rules, premium cable services offered on a per-channel or per-program basis remain unregulated, as do affirmatively marketed packages consisting entirely of new programming product. However, federal law requires that the basic service tier be offered to all cable subscribers and limits the ability of operators to require purchase of any cable programming service tier if a customer seeks to purchase premium services offered on a per-channel or per-program basis, subject to a technology exception which sunsets in 2002. The 1996 Telecom Act also relaxes existing "uniform rate" requirements by specifying that uniform rate requirements do not apply where the operator faces "effective competition," and by exempting bulk discounts to multiple dwelling units, although complaints about predatory pricing still may be made to the FCC.

Regulation by the FCC of cable programming service tier rates for all systems, regardless of size, sunset pursuant to the 1996 Telecom Act on March 31, 1999. Certain legislators, however, have called for new rate regulations. Should this occur, all rate deregulation, including that applicable to small operators like the Partnership, could be jeopardized.

CABLE ENTRY INTO TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The 1996 Telecom Act creates a more favorable environment for the Partnership to provide telecommunications services beyond traditional video delivery. It provides that no state or local laws or regulations may prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting any entity from providing any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service. A cable operator is authorized under the 1996 Telecom Act to provide telecommunications services without obtaining a separate local franchise. States are authorized, however, to impose "competitively neutral" requirements regarding universal service, public safety and welfare, service quality, and consumer protection. State and local governments also retain their authority to manage the public rights-of-way and may require reasonable, competitively neutral compensation for management of the

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

public rights-of-way when cable operators provide telecommunications service.

The favorable pole attachment rates afforded cable operators under federal law can be gradually increased by utility companies owning the poles, beginning in 2001, if the operator provides telecommunications service, as well as cable service, over its plant. The FCC recently clarified that a cable operator's favorable pole rates are not endangered by the provision of Internet services, but the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit recently ruled in Gulf Power Co. v. FCC, 208F.3d 1263 (11th Cir. 2000) ("Gulf Power") that the FCC has no authority to regulate pole rents for cable systems providing Internet services (because, the court ruled, Internet services are not telecommunications services or cable services). The court subsequently stayed the issuance of the mandate in Gulf Power pending the filing of and final action on a petition for write of certiorari seeking review of the Gulf Power decision in the U.S. Supreme Court. The stay allows for the orderly review of the decision in the U.S. Supreme Court. In the interim, the FCC may continue to process pending pole attachment complaints under its existing rules and procedures. If the 11th Circuit decision goes into effect, it could significantly increase pole attachment rates and adversely impact cable operators.

Cable entry into telecommunications will be affected by the regulatory landscape now being fashioned by the FCC and state regulators. One critical component of the 1996 Telecom Act to facilitate the entry of new telecommunications providers (including cable operators) is the interconnection obligation imposed on all telecommunications carriers. The Supreme Court effectively upheld most of the FCC interconnection regulations, but recently the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals vacated other portions of the FCC's rules on slightly different grounds. More recently, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in the FCC's favor on these same rules, creating a split in authority that may be resolved by the Supreme Court. Although these regulations should enable new telecommunications entrants to reach viable interconnection agreements with incumbent carriers, many issues, including which specific network elements the FCC can mandate that incumbent carriers make available to competitors, remain unresolved.

Similarly, if another FCC decision requiring that incumbent telephone companies permit co-location of competitors' equipment on terms more favorable to competitors is sustained on administrative and judicial appeal, this decision, too, would make it easier for new entrants, including the Partnership, to provide telecommunications service.

INTERNET SERVICE

There is at present no significant federal regulation of cable system delivery of Internet services. Furthermore, the FCC recently issued several reports finding no immediate need to impose this type of regulation. However, this situation may change as cable systems expand their broadband delivery of Internet services. In particular, proposals have been advanced at the federal level that would require cable operators to provide access to unaffiliated Internet-service providers and online service providers. In one instance, the Federal Trade Commission is considering whether and to what extent to impose, as a condition of Time Warner's merger with America Online, certain "open access" requirements on Time Warner's cable systems, thereby allowing unaffiliated Internet-service providers access to Time Warner's broadband distribution infrastructure.

Some local franchising authorities unsuccessfully tried to impose mandatory Internet access or "open access" requirements as part of cable franchise renewals or transfers. In AT&T Corp v. City of Portland, No. 99-35609 (9th Cir., June 22, 2000), the federal Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit overturned a federal district court in Portland, Oregon's ruling that local franchising authorities have the lawful authority to impose these type of conditions. The lower court had ruled that the City of Portland had inherent authority to require, as a condition of the City's consent to the transfer of TCI's cable franchise to AT&T, that AT&T provide "open access" to the "cable modem platform" of the Excite@Home Internet service. On appeal, the Court of Appeals rejected the City's attempt to impose "open access" conditions on AT&T delivery of Internet service over the cable system because that service, according to the Court, is not a cable service, but a "telecommunications service." The potential regulatory state and federal implications of this rationale are unclear, given the various regulatory requirements for the provision of telecommunications services. There have been at least two additional court rulings that have rejected local imposition of "open access" conditions on cable-provided Internet access, but those ruling have employed very different legal reasoning. A federal court in Virginia found that Internet service was a cable service, but as such was exempt from local "open access" regulation. Another federal court in Florida even more recently ruled that "open access" could not be imposed on local operators because doing so would violate

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

the First Amendment. Other local authorities have imposed or may impose mandatory Internet access requirements on cable operators. These developments could, if they become widespread, burden the capacity of cable systems and complicate any plans the Partnership may have to develop for providing Internet service.

TELEPHONE COMPANY ENTRY INTO CABLE TELEVISION

The 1996 Telecom Act allows telephone companies to compete directly with cable operators by repealing the historic telephone company/cable cross-ownership ban. Local exchange carriers, including the regional telephone companies, can now compete with cable operators both inside and outside their telephone service areas with certain regulatory safeguards. Because of their resources, local exchange carriers could be formidable competitors to traditional cable operators. Various local exchange carriers currently are providing video programming services within their telephone service areas through a variety of distribution methods, including both the deployment of broadband wire facilities and the use of wireless transmission.

Under the 1996 Telecom Act, local exchange carriers providing video programming should be regulated as a traditional cable operator, subject to local franchising and federal regulatory requirements, unless the local exchange carrier elects to deploy its plant as an open video system. To qualify for favorable open video system status, the competitor must reserve two-thirds of the system's activated channels for unaffiliated entities. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed certain of the FCC's open video system rules, including its preemption of local franchising. The FCC recently revised its OVS rules to eliminate this general preemption, thereby leaving franchising discretion to local and state authorities. It is unclear what effect this ruling will have on the entities pursuing open video system operation.

Although local exchange carriers and cable operators can now expand their offerings across traditional service boundaries, the general prohibition remains on local exchange carrier buyouts of co-located cable systems. Cable operator buyouts of co-located local exchange carrier systems, and joint ventures between cable operators and local exchange carriers in the same market also are prohibited. The 1996 Telecom Act provides a few limited exceptions to this buyout prohibition, including a carefully circumscribed "rural exemption." The 1996 Telecom Act also provides the FCC with the limited authority to grant waivers of the buyout prohibition.

ELECTRIC UTILITY ENTRY INTO TELECOMMUNICATIONS/CABLE TELEVISION

The 1996 Telecom Act provides that registered utility holding companies and subsidiaries may provide telecommunications services, including cable television, notwithstanding the Public Utility Holding Company Act. Electric utilities must establish separate subsidiaries, known as "exempt telecommunications companies" and must apply to the FCC for operating authority. Like telephone companies, electric utilities have substantial resources at their disposal, and could be formidable competitors to traditional cable systems. Several of these utilities have been granted broad authority by the FCC to engage in activities which could include the provision of video programming.

ADDITIONAL OWNERSHIP RESTRICTIONS

The 1996 Telecom Act eliminates statutory restrictions on broadcast/cable cross-ownership, including broadcast network/cable restrictions, but leaves in place existing FCC regulations prohibiting local cross-ownership between co-located television stations and cable systems. The 1996 Cable Act leaves in place existing restrictions on cable cross-ownership with satellite master antenna television and multichannel multipoint distribution service facilities, but lifts those restrictions where the cable operator is subject to effective competition. FCC regulations permit cable operators to own and operate satellite master antenna television systems within their franchise area, provided that their operation is consistent with local cable franchise requirements.

MUST CARRY/RETRANSMISSION CONSENT

The 1992 Cable Act contains broadcast signal carriage requirements. Broadcast signal carriage is the transmission of broadcast television signals over a cable system to cable customers. These requirements, among other things, allow local commercial television broadcast stations to elect once every three years between a "must carry" status or a "retransmission consent" status. Less popular stations typically elect must carry, which is the broadcast signal carriage requirement that allows local commercial television broadcast stations to require a cable system to carry the station. Must carry requests can dilute the appeal of a cable system's programming offerings because a cable system with

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

limited channel capacity may be required to forego carriage of popular channels in favor of less popular broadcast stations electing must carry. More popular stations, such as those affiliated with a national network, typically elect retransmission consent, which is the broadcast signal carriage rule that allows local commercial television broadcast stations to negotiate terms (such as mandating carriage of an affiliated cable network) for granting permission to the cable operator to carry the stations. Retransmission consent demands may require substantial payments or other concessions.

The Partnership has been able to reach agreements with all of the broadcasters who elected retransmission consent. To date, compliance with the "retransmission consent" and "must carry" provisions of the 1992 Cable Act has not had a material effect on the Partnership, although these provisions may affect the operations of the Partnership in the future, depending on factors as market conditions, the introduction of digital broadcasts, channel capacity and similar matters when these arrangements are negotiated or renegotiated.

The burden associated with must carry may increase substantially if broadcasters proceed with planned conversion to digital transmission and the FCC determines that cable systems must carry all analog and digital broadcasts in their entirety. This burden would reduce capacity available for more popular video programming and new Internet and telecommunication offerings. The broadcast industry continues to press the FCC on the issue of digital must carry. A rulemaking regarding must carry obligations during the transition from analog to digital broadcasting remains pending at the FCC. It remains unclear when a final decision will be released.

ACCESS CHANNELS

Local franchising authorities can include franchise provisions requiring cable operators to set aside certain channels for public, educational and governmental access programming. Federal law also requires cable systems to designate a portion of their channel capacity, up to 15% in some cases, for commercial leased access by unaffiliated third parties. The FCC has adopted rules regulating the terms, conditions and maximum rates a cable operator may charge for commercial leased access use. In the Partnership's experience to date, requests for commercial leased access carriages have been relatively limited.

ACCESS TO PROGRAMMING

To spur the development of independent cable programmers and competition to incumbent cable operators, the 1992 Cable Act imposed restrictions on the dealings between cable operators and cable programmers. Of special significance from a competitive business posture, the 1992 Cable Act precludes video programmers affiliated with cable companies from favoring their cable operators over new competitors and requires these programmers to sell their programming to other multichannel video distributors. This provision limits the ability of vertically integrated cable programmers to offer exclusive programming arrangements to cable companies. There also has been interest expressed in further restricting the marketing practices of cable programmers, including subjecting programmers who are not affiliated with cable operators or programmers who deliver their service by terrestrial means (rather than by satellite) to the program access requirements. These changes should not have a dramatic impact on the Partnership, but would limit potential competitive advantages the Partnership enjoys.

INSIDE WIRING; SUBSCRIBER ACCESS

In an order issued in 1997, the FCC established rules that require an incumbent cable operator upon expiration of a multiple dwelling unit service contract to sell, abandon, or remove "home run" wiring that was installed by the cable operator in a multiple dwelling unit building. These inside wiring rules are expected to assist building owners in their attempts to replace existing cable operators with new programming providers who are willing to pay the building owner a higher fee, where this fee is permissible. The FCC has also proposed abrogating all exclusive multiple dwelling unit service agreements held by incumbent operators.

With limited exceptions, existing FCC regulations prohibit any state or local law or regulations, or private covenant, private contract, lease provision, homeowners' association rule or similar restriction, impairing the installation, maintenance or use of certain video reception antennas on property within the exclusive control of a tenant or property owner.

OTHER REGULATIONS OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

In addition to the FCC regulations noted above, there are other FCC

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

regulations covering such areas as:

- equal employment opportunity,
- subscriber privacy,
- programming practices, including, among other things,
    - syndicated program exclusivity
    - network program nonduplication,
    - local sports blackouts,
    - indecent programming,
    - lottery programming,
    - political programming,
    - sponsorship identification,
    - children's programming advertisements, and
    - closed captioning,
- registration of cable systems and facilities licensing,
- maintenance of various records and public inspection files,

- aeronautical frequency usage,
- lockbox availability,
- antenna structure notification,
- tower marking and lighting,
- consumer protection and customer service standards,
- technical standards,
- consumer electronics equipment compatibility, and
- emergency alert systems.

The FCC recently ruled that cable customers must be allowed to purchase cable converters from third parties and established a multi-year phase-in during which security functions, which would remain in the operator's exclusive control, would be unbundled from basic converter functions, which could then be satisfied by third party vendors.

The FCC has the authority to enforce its regulations through the imposition of substantial fines, the issuance of cease and desist orders and/or the imposition of other administrative sanctions, such as the revocation of FCC licenses needed to operate certain transmission facilities used in connection with cable operations.

COPYRIGHT

Cable television systems are subject to federal copyright licensing covering carriage of television and radio broadcast signals. In exchange for filing certain reports and contributing a percentage of their revenues to a federal copyright royalty pool, cable operators can obtain blanket permission to retransmit copyrighted material included in broadcast signals. Effective July 1, 2000, the federal Copyright Office increased the cable compulsory license rates used to calculate cable systems' copyright payments under the cable compulsory license. The possible modification or elimination of this compulsory copyright license is the subject of continuing legislative review and could adversely affect the Partnership's ability to obtain desired broadcast programming. The outcome of this legislative activity cannot be predicted. Copyright clearances for nonbroadcast programming services are arranged through private negotiations.

Cable operators distribute locally originated programming and advertising that use music controlled by the two principal major governmental agencies, some of which impose regulation of a character similar to that of a public utility. Although local franchising authorities have considerable

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

discretion in establishing franchise terms, there are certain federal limitations. For example, local franchising authorities cannot insist on franchise fees exceeding 5% of the system's gross cable-related revenues, cannot dictate the particular technology used by the system, and cannot specify video programming other than identifying broad categories of programming.

Federal law contains renewal procedures designed to protect incumbent franchisees against arbitrary denials of renewal. Even if a franchise is renewed, the local franchising authority may seek to impose new and more onerous requirements such as significant upgrades in facilities and service or increased franchise fees as a condition of renewal. Similarly, if a local franchising authority's consent is required for the purchase or sale of a cable system or franchise, the local franchising authority may attempt to impose more burdensome or onerous franchise requirements in connection with a request for consent. The Cable Act requires franchising authorities to act on any franchise transfer request within 120 days after receipt by the franchising authority of all information required by FCC regulations. Approval is deemed to be granted if the franchising authority fails to act within such 120-day period. Historically, most of the Partnership's franchises have been renewed and transfer consents granted.

Under the 1996 Telecom Act, local franchising authorities are prohibited from limiting, restricting, or conditioning the provision of competitive telecommunications services except for certain "competitively neutral" requirements necessary to manage public rights of way. In addition, local franchising authorities may not require the Partnership to provide any telecommunications service or facilities, other than institutional networks under certain circumstances, as a condition of an initial cable franchise grant, franchise renewal, or franchise transfer. The 1996 Telecom Act also provides that franchising fees are limited to an operator's cable-related revenues and do not apply to revenues that the Partnership derives from providing new telecommunications services.

ITEM 2. PROPERTIES

The Partnership's cable television systems are located in and around Starkville, Philadelphia, Kosciusko, Carthage, Forest and Raleigh, Mississippi; Highlands and Sapphire Valley, North Carolina; and Barnwell, Bamberg, Allendale and Bennettsville, South Carolina. The principal physical properties of the Systems consist of system components (including antennas, coaxial cable, electronic amplification and distribution equipment), motor vehicles, miscellaneous hardware, spare parts and real property, including office buildings and land on which towers and antennas are located. The Partnership's cable plant passed approximately 50,840 homes as of December 31, 2000. Management believes that the Partnership's plant passes all areas which are currently economically feasible to service. Future line extensions depend upon the density of homes in the area as well as available capital resources for the construction of new plant. (See Part II. Item 7. Liquidity and Capital Resources.)

ITEM 3. LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

None.

ITEM 4. SUBMISSION OF MATTERS TO VOTE OF SECURITY HOLDERS

None.

PART II

ITEM 5. MARKET FOR REGISTRANT'S COMMON EQUITY AND RELATED STOCKHOLDER MATTERS

(a) There is no established public trading market for the Partnership's units of limited partnership interest.

(b) The approximate number of equity holders as of December 31, 2000, is as follows:

<TABLE>

<S>	<C>
Limited Partners:	1,807

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

General Partners: 2

</TABLE>

(c) (C)The Partnership made no cash distributions during 2000, 1999 and 1998. The limited partners have received in the aggregate in the form of cash distributions $3,817,997 on total initial contributions of $15,000,000 as of December 31, 2000. As of December 31, 2000, the Partnership had repurchased $100,475 of limited partnership units (173 units at $500 per unit and 43 units at $325 per unit). Future distributions depend upon results of operations, leverage ratios and compliance with financial covenants required by the Partnership's lender, but are expected to remain at their current level.

ITEM 6. SELECTED FINANCIAL DATA

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31,				
	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
<S>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>
SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS:					
Revenue	$ 15,221,887	$ 15,005,218	$ 14,746,766	$ 9,644,320	$ 9,262,702
Operating income	1,587,889	1,312,323	1,621,138	2,061,496	1,394,255
Gain/(Loss) on retirement of assets	(266,933)	1,330,533	(229,940)	7,095	(152,698)
Net income (loss)	(1,326,393)	98,856	(1,369,601)	1,215,899	381,451
Net income (loss)per limited partner unit (weighted average)	(44)	3	(46)	40	13
Cumulative tax losses per limited partner unit	(342)	(342)	(342)	(342)	(342)

</TABLE>

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	DECEMBER 31,				
	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
<S>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>
BALANCE SHEET DATA:					
Total assets	$ 28,528,812	$ 30,603,533	$ 32,971,969	$ 13,609,386	$ 13,253,610
Notes payable	28,215,281	28,965,281	31,372,848	10,899,421	11,920,821
Total liabilities	30,037,951	30,786,279	33,249,571	12,513,387	13,365,510
General partners' deficit	(142,106)	(128,842)	(129,831)	(116,135)	(128,294)
Limited partners' (deficit)capital	(1,367,033)	(53,904)	(147,771)	1,212,134	16,394
Distributions per limited partner unit	0	0	0	0	3
Cumulative distributions per limited partner unit	128	128	128	128	128

</TABLE>

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	QUARTERS ENDED				
	DECEMBER 31, 2000	SEPTEMBER 30, 2000	JUNE 30, 2000	MARCH 31, 2000	DECEMBER 31, 1999
<S>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>	<C>
Revenue	$ 3,852,433	$ 3,812,503	$ 3,803,536	$ 3,753,415	$ 3,798,006
Operating income	188,724	477,807	465,645	455,714	144,431
Gain (loss) on retirement of assets	(162,743)	(108,898)	--	4,708	(273,689)
Net income (loss)	$ (636,500)	$ (309,847)	$ (195,891)	$ (184,093)	$ (795,897)
Net income (loss) per limited partner unit (weighted average)	$ (21)	$ (10)	$ (7)	$ (6)	$ (26)
Investment in cable television properties	$ 26,422,694	$ 27,009,267	$ 27,446,910	$ 28,197,268	$ 29,161,847

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Book value per partnership unit	$ 897	$ 907	$ 922	$ 947	$ 979

</TABLE>

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	QUARTERS ENDED		
	SEPTEMBER 30, 1999	JUNE 30, 1999	MARCH 31, 1999
<S>	<C>	<C>	<C>
Revenue	$ 3,709,213	$ 3,765,209	$ 3,732,791
Operating income	429,065	487,176	302,304
Gain (loss) on retirement of assets	(58,045)	1,662,267	--
Net income (loss)	$ (261,347)	$ 1,467,256	$ (311,159)
Net income (loss) per limited partner unit (weighted average)	$ (9)	$ 49	$ (10)
Investment in cable television properties	$ 29,907,660	$30,170,700	$ 30,583,736
Book value per partnership unit	$ 1,004	$ 1,013	$ 1,027

</TABLE>

ITEM 7. MANAGEMENT'S DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

GENERAL music performing rights organizations, the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP) and Broadcast Music, Inc. (BMI). The cable industry has had a long series of negotiations and adjudications with both organizations. A prior voluntarily negotiated settlement with BMI has now expired, and is subject to further proceedings. The governing rate court recently set retroactive and prospective cable industry rates for ASCAP music based on the previously negotiated BMI rate. Although the Partnership cannot predict the ultimate outcome of these industry proceedings or the amount of any license fees that they may be required to pay for past and future use of association-controlled music, the Partnership does not currently believe these license fees will be significant to their business and operations.

STATE AND LOCAL REGULATION

Cable television systems generally are operated pursuant to nonexclusive franchises granted by a municipality or other state or local government entity in order to cross public rights-of-way. Federal law now prohibits local franchising authorities from granting exclusive franchises or from unreasonably refusing to award additional franchises.

Cable franchises generally are granted for fixed terms and in many cases include monetary penalties for non-compliance and may be terminable if the franchisee fails to comply with material provisions. The specific terms and conditions of franchises vary materially between jurisdictions. Each franchise generally contains provisions governing cable operations, service rates, franchising fees, system construction and maintenance obligations, system channel capacity, design and technical performance, customer service standards, and indemnification protections. A number of states subject cable systems to the jurisdiction of centralized state

Under the terms of the Partnership's credit agreement, all amounts outstanding under the note payable become due and payable on June 30, 2001. The Partnership's continuing operations will not provide sufficient liquidity to satisfy this obligation at its stated maturity. Management believes agreement by the lenders to extend the maturity date would be contingent upon the approval of the limited partners to extend the expiration of the Partnership's life, which currently expires on December 31, 2001.

The Partnership has filed a Preliminary Proxy Statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission which solicits votes for two separate proposals. The first proposal is to extend the term of the Partnership for six years until December 31, 2007. The second proposal, if approved, will provide authority to sell all of its existing assets Northland Communications Corporation, managing general partner of NCP-Six, or its assigns, for an aggregate price of $70,200,000. It is management's opinion that the likelihood that either of these proposals not be approved by the limited partners is remote.

RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

2000 AND 1999

Total revenue reached $15,221,887 for the year ended December 31, 2000,

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

representing an increase of approximately 1% over 1999. Of the 2000 revenue, $11,025,826 (72%) is derived from subscriptions to basic services, $1,379,913 (9%) from subscriptions to premium services, $948,969 (6%) from subscriptions to tier services, $581,281 (4%) from advertising, $397,470 (3%) from service

maintenance revenue, $333,125 (2%) from installation charges and $555,303 (4%) from other sources. The April 1999 disposition of the Sandersville, Mississippi System decreased revenues approximately $200,000, or 2%. Assuming the Sandersville System was disposed of at the beginning of each of the respective periods, revenue would have increased approximately 3%. The growth in revenue is attributable primarily to rate increases as well as new product services introduced in 2000.

The following table displays historical average rate information for various services offered by the Partnership's systems (amounts per subscriber per month):

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

<S>	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996
Basic Rate	$ 28.50	$ 26.50	$ 24.20	$ 23.00	$ 22.24
Tier Rate	8.95	8.50	7.65	6.90	6.35
HBO Rate	10.30	10.25	10.50	11.35	11.25
Cinemax Rate	8.25	7.70	7.30	8.70	8.50
Showtime Rate	8.15	7.95	6.30	4.50	8.45
Movie Channel Rate	6.20	6.00	6.60	--	--
Disney Rate	--	6.50	6.20	5.10	6.00
Encore Rate	1.10	1.50	1.50	--	--
Starz Rate	6.25	8.50	8.50	--	--
Service Contract Rate	2.25	2.30	2.35	2.60	2.65

</TABLE>

Operating expenses totaled $1,161,419 for the year ended December 31, 2000, representing a decrease of approximately 12% over the same period in 1999. Excluding the impact of the Sandersville System disposition, operating expenses would have decreased approximately 10% for the year ended December 31, 2000. This is primarily due to decreased operating salaries, regional management expense, system maintenance costs offset by increased vehicle operating expenses.

General and administrative expenses totaled $4,035,555 for the year ended December 31, 2000, representing decrease of approximately 1% over the same period in 1999. Excluding the impact of the Sandersville System disposition, general and administrative expenses would have decreased less than 1% for the year ended December 31, 2000.

Programming expenses totaled $3,968,492 for the year ended December 31, 2000, representing an increase of approximately 1% over 1999. Programming expenses consist mainly of payments made to the suppliers of various cable programming services. Adjusting for the Sandersville System disposition programming expenses would have increased approximately 3% for the year ended December 31, 2000 compared to the same period in 1999. This is mainly due to higher costs charged by various program suppliers offset by reduced local programming expense.

Depreciation and amortization expenses totaled $4,468,532 for the year ended December 31, 2000, representing an increase of approximately 2% over the same period in 1999. This increase is due to depreciation and amortization on purchases of plant and equipment in 2000 offset by assets becoming fully depreciated.

Interest expense for 2000 increased approximately 5% over 1999. The average bank debt decreased from $30,169,000 during 1999 to $28,590,000 during 2000, offset by an increase to the Partnership's effective interest rate from 8.18% in 1999 to 8.50% in 2000.

1999 AND 1998

Total revenue reached $15,005,218 for the year ended December 31, 1999, representing an increase of approximately 2% over 1998. Of the 1999 revenue, $10,781,941 (72%) was derived from subscriptions to basic services, $1,509,949 (10%) from subscriptions to premium services, $846,215 (6%) from subscriptions to tier services, $507,932 (3%) from advertising, $384,380 (3%) from service maintenance revenue, $367,300 (2%) from installation charges and $607,501 (4%) from other sources. The increase in revenue is attributable primarily to rate

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

increases placed into effect in August 1999 as well as new product services introduced in 1999. In April 1999, the Partnership sold the cable television system and assets relating to its Sandersville, Mississippi system, resulting in the disposition of approximately 1,400 subscribers and decreased revenues approximately $200,000 or 2%.

Assuming the Sandersville, Mississippi system was disposed of at the beginning of each of the respective periods, revenues would have increased approximately 4%.

Operating expenses totaled $1,320,255 for the year ended December 31, 1999, representing an increase of approximately 5% as compared to 1998. Excluding the impact of the disposition of the Sandersville, Mississippi system, operating expenses would have increased approximately 9% for the year. This is primarily due to increased operating salaries and pole rental expense offset by decreased system maintenance expenses and drop materials. Salary and benefit costs are a major component of operating expenses. Employee wages are reviewed annually and, in most cases, increased based on cost of living adjustments and other factors. Therefore, management expects operating expenses to increase in future years.

General and administrative expenses totaled $4,064,866 for the year ended December 31, 1999, representing an increase of approximately 7% over 1998. Excluding the impact of the Sandersville, Mississippi system disposition, general and administrative expenses would have increased approximately 10% compared to the same period in 1998. This is due to higher revenue based expenses such as management fees and franchise fees as well as increased utilities, legal expenses, property taxes and bad debt expense offset by reduced billing expenses, marketing expense and copyright fees. Significant general and administrative expenses are based on revenues. As the Partnership's revenue increases the trend of increased administrative expenses is expected to continue.

Programming expenses totaled $3,915,701 for the year ended December 31, 1999, representing an increase of approximately 3% over 1998. Adjusting for the Sandersville, Mississippi system disposition, programming expenses would have increased approximately 6% compared to the same period in 1998. This is mainly due to higher costs charged by various program suppliers as well as increased advertising expenses and production expense. Programming expenses consist mainly of payments made to the suppliers of various cable programming services. As these costs are based on the number of subscribers served, future subscriber increases will cause the trend of increasing programming costs to continue. Additionally, rate increases from program suppliers, as well as new fees associated with the launch of additional channels will also contribute to increased programming costs.

Depreciation and amortization expenses totaled $4,392,073 for the year ended December 31, 1999, representing an increase approximately 2% over 1998. This increase is due to depreciation and amortization on purchases of plant and equipment in 1999 offset by assets becoming fully depreciated.

Interest expense decreased from $2,566,743 in 1998 to $2,379,744 in 1999 (approximately 7%). The Partnership's average debt balance decreased from approximately $31,373,000 during 1998 to $30,169,000 during 1999. The Partnership's effective interest rate increased from approximately 7.88% in 1998 to 8.18% in 1999.

LIQUIDITY AND CAPITAL RESOURCES

The Partnership's primary sources of liquidity are cash flow provided from operations and availability under an $8 million revolving credit line, of which approximately $5.65 million was outstanding as of December 31, 2000. Based on management's analysis, the Partnership's cash flow from operations and amounts available for borrowing under its loan agreement are sufficient to cover operating costs, debt service and planned capital expenditures up to June 30, 2001, at which time all amounts outstanding under the revolving credit and term loan agreement become due. The Partnership's continuing operations will not provide sufficient liquidity to satisfy this obligation at its stated maturity. Management believes an agreement by the lenders to extend the maturity date would be contingent upon the approval of the limited partners to extend the expiration of the Partnership's life, which currently expires on December 31, 2001.

The Partnership has filed a Preliminary Proxy Statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission which solicits votes for two separate proposals. The first proposal, if approved, will extend the term of the Partnership for six years until December 31, 2007. The second proposal, if approved, will provide authority to sell all of its existing assets Northland

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Communications Corporation, managing general partner of NCP-Six, or its assigns, for an aggregate purchase price of $70,200,000. It is management's opinion that the likelihood that either of these proposals not be approved by the limited partners is remote.

During 2000, the Partnership's primary sources of liquidity was cash provided from operations. The Partnership generates cash on a monthly basis through the monthly billing of subscribers for cable services. Losses from uncollectible accounts have not been material. During 2000, cash generated from monthly billings was sufficient to meet the Partnership's needs for working capital, capital expenditures and scheduled debt service.

On December 31, 1997, the Partnership amended and restated its credit agreement with its current lender to finance the acquisition of the Bennettsville, Barnwell, Bamberg and Allendale, South Carolina systems. This credit facility provides for borrowings up to $33 million, including a $25 million term loan and an $8 million revolving credit facility. In July 1999, the Partnership further amended its credit agreement to modify the amortization of its term loan and certain financial covenants. In December 2000, the Partnership further amended its credit agreement to extend the maturity of the credit facility to June 2001.

Under the terms of the loan agreement, the Partnership has agreed to restrictive covenants which require the maintenance of financial ratios, including a senior debt to annualized operating cash flow ratio of 5.25 to 1 and an annual operating cash flow to interest expense ratio of not less than 2.25 to 1. As of December 31, 2000, the Partnership was in compliance with its required financial covenants.

As of December 31, 2000, the balance under the credit facility was $28,215,281 and $2.35 million was available for borrowing by the Partnership subject to compliance with financial covenants. As of December 31, 2000, interest rates on the credit facility were as follows: approximately $28,215,281 fixed at Libor based rate of 8.5 % expiring March 28, 2001. The above includes a margin paid to the lender based on overall leverage, and may increase or decrease as the Partnership's leverage fluctuates.

The Partnership has only limited involvement with derivative financial instruments and does not use them for trading purposes. They are used to manage well-defined interest rate risks. The Partnership enters into interest rate swap agreements with major banks or financial institutions (typically its bank) in which the Partnership pays a fixed rate and receives a floating rate with the interest payments being calculated on a notional amount. Gains or losses associated with changes in fair values of these swaps and the underlying notional principal amounts are deferred and recognized against interest expense over the term of the agreements the Partnership's statements of operations. As of December 31, 2000, the Partnership had no interest rate swap agreements outstanding.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

During 2000, the Partnership incurred approximately $2,054,000 in capital expenditures. These expenditures included the ongoing system upgrade to 550 MHz in the Starkville System, the continued deployment of fiber in the Highlands System, the continued system upgrade to 450 MHz and channel additions in the Philadelphia System, and the continued system upgrade to 450 MHz in the Barnwell System, as well as various line extensions in all of the systems.

Management estimates that the Partnership will spend approximately $3,115,000 on capital expenditures during 2001. These expenditures include specific digital service launches, the continuation of the ongoing system upgrade to 550 MHz in the Starkville System, ongoing deployment of fiber and system upgrades in the Philadelphia and Highlands Systems, ongoing system upgrade to 550 MHz in the Forest System, and various line extensions and channel additions in all of the systems.

RECENT ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS

On April 30, 1999, the Partnership sold the assets of its cable television system serving approximately 1,400 subscribers in and around the communities of Sandersville, Mississippi. The sales price for the system was $1.9 million, and the net proceeds were utilized to reduce outstanding debt. The Partnership determined to sell the Sandersville system due to the significant overbuild situation facing the system and the surrounding geographic area. Due to the overbuild and the lack of other interested purchasers for the system, the Partnership sold the Sandersville system to the overbuilder.

On January 2, 1998, the Partnership purchased cable television systems

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

serving approximately 11,200 subscribers in and around the communities of Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell and Bennettsville, South Carolina. The purchase price of these systems was $20.5 million. The Partnership borrowed approximately $20.47 million under an amended and restated revolving credit and term loan agreement with its lender to finance the acquisition of the South Carolina cable systems.

Pro forma operating results of the Partnership for the year ending December 31, 1999, assuming the disposition of the Sandersville system had been completed as of the beginning of 1998, is as follows:

	1999	1998
Revenue	$ 14,183,800	$ 14,183,431
Net loss	$ (1,482,272)	$ (1,271,034)
Net loss per limited partnership unit	$ (50)	$ (43)

PROPOSED LIQUIDATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP

The Partnership has filed a proxy statement with the SEC relating to a proposal to be made to the unaffiliated limited partners of NCP-Six to consider and vote on an amendment to the NCP-Six Partnership Agreement that would extend the term of NCP-Six from its current expiration date of December 31, 2001 until December 31, 2007. Without such amendment to the NCP-Six Partnership Agreement, NCP-Six is currently scheduled to terminate on December 31, 2001, and upon such termination, the General Partners will be required to initiate the winding up of NCP-Six's affairs pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in the NCP-Six Partnership Agreement and Washington law. Even before December 31, 2001, however, NCP-Six will face the maturity of its current credit facility. That credit facility is currently scheduled to mature on June 30, 2001. Based on discussions with NCP-Six's lenders, we do not believe the maturity date can be further extended without first extending the term of the partnership for a reasonable period of time. As of December 31, 2000, the balance owed on the NCP-Six credit facility was $28,215,281.

The proxy statement also contains a proposal to be made to the unaffiliated limited partners of NCP-Six to consider and vote on an amendment to the NCP-Six Partnership Agreement that would authorize the sale and distribution by NCP-Six of its cable television systems and other assets owned by it to Northland Communications Corporation, its affiliates or its assigns. The proposed transaction is subject to the approval of holders of a majority in interest of the units of limited partnership of NCP-Six (excluding the 30 units held by Northland or its affiliates). If completed, the proposed transaction will result in the following:

- All of NCP-Six's assets will be sold to Northland or an affiliate thereof in a transaction valued at $70,200,000. The assets that will be acquired by Northland or its affiliates will include NCP-Six's cable television franchises and cable television systems located in Starkville, Mississippi; Philadelphia, Mississippi, Highlands, North Carolina; Barnwell, South Carolina and Bennettsville, South Carolina.

- At closing, Northland or its affiliates will assume some partnership liabilities, which will result in a downward adjustment to the purchase price, and NCP-Six will make an in-kind distribution to Northland of assets equal in value to Northland's partnership interest in NCP-Six.

- Northland or its affiliates will pay for the assets with cash and a $11,025,000 promissory note. It is currently estimated that the total amount of cash payable by Northland will be approximately $53,200,000. The total value of the cash and promissory note payable by Northland and the in-kind distribution to Northland will be $70,200,000, as adjusted for assumed liabilities and other matters.

- The promissory note will be due and payable in two equal installments (the first installment on the first anniversary of

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

closing the proposed transaction and the second installment on the second anniversary of closing the proposed transaction) and will be held by a liquidating trust that will be established.

- The promissory note will bear interest at a fixed rate per annum of six and one-half percent, will be full recourse and unsecured. The maker on the note will be Northland and the note will be subordinated to Northland's senior debt, of which Northland currently has senior debt in the aggregate amount of $53,900,000.

- NCP-Six will set aside appropriate amounts for payment of liabilities not assumed by Northland or its affiliates in the transaction and other partnership obligations. This includes an aggregate amount of $750,000 to be funded from cash paid by Northland at closing which will also be retained by NCP-Six in the liquidating trust. Amounts remaining in the liquidating

trust following the later of the second anniversary of closing the proposed transaction, or resolution of any contingent liabilities of NCP-Six, will be distributed to the unaffiliated limited partners and the Administrative General Partner pursuant to their respective ownership interests in NCP-Six.

- Net proceeds from the proposed transaction remaining after the payment of NCP-Six's debt and provisions for requirements associated with winding up the partnership will be distributed only to the unaffiliated limited partners and to the Administrative General Partner of NCP-Six, pursuant to their respective interests as set forth in the NCP-Six Partnership Agreement.

- Northland, as the managing general partner of NCP-Six, will not receive a cash distribution but will instead receive only an in-kind distribution equal to its percentage interest of the assets of NCP-Six.

YEAR 2000 READINESS DISCLOSURE

The efficient operation of the Partnership's business is dependent in part on its computer software programs and operating systems. These programs and systems are used in several key areas of the Partnership's business, including subscriber billing and collections and financial reporting. Management has evaluated the programs and systems utilized in the conduct of the Partnership's business for the purpose of identifying Year 2000 compliance problems. We experienced no material issues or problems arising out of the Year 2000 issues, either in connection with our internal operations, third-party relationships or software products. We will continue to monitor our software products to ensure no problems arise either with regard to leap year or Year 2000 issues. We anticipate no material additional costs.

ITEM 8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

The audited financial statements of the Partnership for the years ended December 31, 2000, 1999 and 1998 are included as a part of this filing (see Item 14(a)(1) below).

ITEM 9. CHANGES IN AND DISAGREEMENTS WITH ACCOUNTANTS ON ACCOUNTING AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

None.

PART III

ITEM 10. DIRECTORS AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE REGISTRANT

The Partnership has no directors or officers. The Managing General Partner of the Partnership is Northland Communications Corporation, a Washington corporation; the Administrative General Partner of the Partnership is FN Equities Joint Venture, a California general partnership.

Certain information regarding the officers and directors of Northland is

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

set forth below.

JOHN S. WHETZELL (AGE 59). Mr. Whetzell is the founder of Northland Communications Corporation and has been President since its inception and a Director since March 1982. Mr. Whetzell became Chairman of the Board of Directors in December 1984. He also serves as President and Chairman of the Board of Northland Telecommunications Corporation and each of its subsidiaries. He has been involved with the cable television industry for over 26 years. Between March 1979 and February 1982 he was in charge of the Ernst & Whinney national cable television consulting services. Mr. Whetzell first became involved in the cable television industry when he served as the Chief Economist of the Cable Television Bureau of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from May 1974 to February 1979. He provided economic studies to support the deregulation of cable television both in federal and state arenas. He participated in the formulation of accounting standards for the industry and assisted the FCC in negotiating and developing the pole attachment rate formula for cable television. His undergraduate degree is in economics from George Washington University, and he has an MBA degree from New York University.

JOHN E. IVERSON (AGE 64). Mr. Iverson is the Secretary of Northland Communications Corporation and has served on the Board of Directors since December 1984. He also is the Secretary and serves on the Board of Directors of Northland Telecommunications Corporation and each of its subsidiaries. He is currently a member in the law firm of Ryan, Swanson & Cleveland, P.L.L.C. He is a member of the Washington State Bar Association and American Bar Association and has been practicing law for more than 38 years. Mr. Iverson is the past President and a Trustee of the Pacific Northwest Ballet Association. Mr. Iverson has a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Washington.

RICHARD I. CLARK (AGE 43). Mr. Clark is an original incorporator of Northland Communications Corporation and serves as Vice President, Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer of Northland Communications Corporation. He also serves as Vice President, Assistant Secretary and Treasurer of Northland Telecommunications Corporation. Mr. Clark has served on the Board of Directors of both Northland Communications Corporation and Northland Telecommunications Corporation since July 1985. In addition to his other responsibilities, Mr. Clark is responsible for the administration and investor relations activities of Northland, including financial planning and corporate development. From July 1979 to February 1982, Mr. Clark was employed by Ernst & Whinney in the area of providing cable television consultation services and has been involved with the cable television industry for nearly 22 years. He has directed cable television feasibility studies and on-site market surveys. Mr. Clark has assisted in the design and maintenance of financial and budget computer programs, and he has prepared documents for major cable television companies in franchising and budgeting projects through the application of these programs. In 1979, Mr. Clark graduated cum alude from Pacific Lutheran University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in accounting.

GARY S. JONES (AGE 43). Mr. Jones is Vice President and Chief Financial Officer for Northland. Mr. Jones joined Northland in March 1986 as Controller and has been Vice President of Northland Telecommunications Corporation and each of its subsidiaries since October 1986. Mr. Jones is responsible for cash management, financial reporting and banking relations for Northland and is involved in the acquisition and financing of new cable systems. Prior to joining Northland, Mr. Jones was employed as a Certified Public Accountant with Laventhol & Horwath from 1980 to 1986. Mr. Jones received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration with a major in accounting from the University of Washington in 1979.

RICHARD J. DYSTE (AGE 55). Mr. Dyste has served as Vice President-Technical Services of Northland Telecommunications Corporation and each of its subsidiaries since April 1987. Mr. Dyste is responsible for planning and advising all Northland cable systems with regard to technical performance as well as system upgrades and rebuilds. He is a past president and current member of the Mount Rainier Chapter of the Society of Cable Television Engineers, Inc. Mr. Dyste joined Northland in 1986 as an engineer and served as Operations Consultant to Northland Communications Corporation from August 1986 until April 1987. From 1977 to 1985, Mr. Dyste owned and operated Bainbridge TV Cable. He is a graduate of Washington Technology Institute.

H. LEE JOHNSON (AGE 57). Mr. Johnson has served as Divisional Vice President for Northland since March 1994. He is responsible for the management of systems serving subscribers in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina. Prior to his association with Northland he served as Regional Manager for Warner Communications, managing four cable systems in Georgia from 1968 to 1973. Mr. Johnson has also served as President of Sunbelt Finance Corporation and was employed as a System Manager for Statesboro CATV when Northland purchased the system in 1986. Mr. Johnson has been involved in

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

the cable television industry for over 32 years and is a current member of the Society of Cable Television Engineers. He is a graduate of Swainsboro Technical Institute and has attended numerous training seminars, including courses sponsored by Jerrold Electronics, Scientific Atlanta, The Society of Cable Television Engineers and CATA.

R. GREGORY FERRER (AGE 45). Mr. Ferrer joined Northland in March 1984 as Assistant Controller and currently serves as Vice President and Treasurer of Northland Communications Corporation. Mr. Ferrer also serves as Vice President and Assistant Treasurer of Northland Telecommunications Corporation. Mr. Ferrer is responsible for coordinating all of Northland's property tax filing, insurance requirements and system programming contracts as well as interest rate management and other treasury functions. Prior to joining Northland, he was a Certified Public Accountant at Benson & McLaughlin, a local public accounting firm, from 1981 to 1984. Mr. Ferrer received his Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration from Washington State University with majors in marketing in 1978 and accounting and finance in 1981.

MATTHEW J. CRYAN (AGE 36). Mr. Cryan is Vice President - Budgets and Planning and has been with Northland since September 1990. Mr. Cryan is responsible for the development of current and long-term operating budgets for all Northland entities. Additional responsibilities include the development of financial models used in support of acquisition financing, analytical support for system and regional managers, financial performance monitoring and reporting and programming analysis. Prior to joining Northland, Mr. Cryan was employed as an analyst with NKV Corp., a securities litigation support firm located in Redmond, Washington. Mr. Cryan graduated from the University of Montana in 1988 with honors and holds a Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration with a major in finance.

LAURA N. WILLIAMS (age 34). Ms Williams is Vice President and Senior Counsel for Northland and has served in this role since August 2000. Prior to this time, she served as Associate Counsel for each of the Northland entities from August 1995. She is a member of the Washington State Bar Association, American Bar Association and Women in Telecommunications. Ms. Williams received her Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with a major in finance and an MBA degree from California State University, Long Beach, and has a Juris Doctor degree from Seattle University School of Law.

Certain information regarding the officers and directors of FN Equities Joint Venture is set forth below:

MILES Z. GORDON (AGE 54). Mr. Gordon is President of FNE and President and Chief Executive Officer of Financial Network Investment Corporation (FNIC), and has held those positions since 1983. From 1979 through April 1983 he was President of University Securities Corporation. In 1978, Mr. Gordon was engaged in the private practice of law, and from 1973 through 1978 he was employed by the Securities and Exchange commission. He presently serves as Chairman of the Securities Industry Association Independent Contractor Firms Committee. Mr. Gordon was also Chairman and a member of the NASD District Business Conduct Committee and a former member of the NASD Board of Governors. He is past president of the California Syndication Forum and has also served on several committees for the Securities Industry Association.

JOHN S. SIMMERS (AGE 51). Mr. Simmers is Vice President and Secretary of FNE and Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of FNIC and has held those positions since 1983. From June 1980 through April 1983 he was Executive Vice President of University Securities Corporation, Vice President of University Capital Corporation, and Vice President of University Asset Management Group. From 1974 through May 1980 he was employed by the National Association of Securities Dealers.

ITEM 11. EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

The Partnership does not have executive officers. However, compensation was paid to the Managing General Partner during 2000 as indicated in Note 3 of the Notes to Financial Statements--December 31, 2000 (see Items 13(a) and 14(a)(1) below).

ITEM 12. SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT

(a) CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT. Security ownership of management as of December 31, 2000 is as follows:

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	NAME AND ADDRESS	AMOUNT AND NATURE OF BENEFICIAL	PERCENT OF

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

TITLE OF CLASS	OF BENEFICIAL OWNER	OWNERSHIP	CLASS
General Partner's Interest	Northland Communications Corporation 1201 Third Avenue Suite 3600 Seattle, Washington 98101	(See Note A)	(See Note A)
General Partner's Interest	FN Equities Joint Venture 2780 Skypark Dr. Suite 300 Torrance, California 90505	(See Note B)	(See Note B)

Note A: Northland has a 1% interest in the Partnership, which increases to a 20% interest in the Partnership at such time as the limited partners have received 100% of their aggregate cash contributions. The natural person who exercises voting and/or investment control over these interests is John S. Whetzell.

Note B: FN Equities Joint Venture has no interest in the Partnership until such time as the limited partners have received 100% of their aggregate cash contributions, at which time FN Equities Joint Venture will have a 5% interest in the Partnership. The natural person who exercises voting and/or investment control over these interests is John S. Simmers.

(b) CHANGES IN CONTROL. Northland has pledged its ownership interest as Managing General Partner of the Partnership to the Partnership's lender as collateral pursuant to the terms of the term loan agreement between the Partnership and its lender.

ITEM 13. CERTAIN RELATIONSHIPS AND RELATED TRANSACTIONS

(a) TRANSACTIONS WITH MANAGEMENT AND OTHERS. The Managing General Partner receives a management fee equal to 6% of the gross revenues of the Partnership, not including revenues from any sale or refinancing of the Partnership's Systems. The Managing General Partner also receives reimbursement of normal operating and general and administrative expenses incurred on behalf of the Partnership.

The Partnership entered into an operating agreement with Northland Premier Cable Limited Partnership ("Premier"), an affiliated partnership organized and managed by Northland. Under the terms of this agreement, Premier serves as the exclusive managing agent for the Highlands NC system, and is reimbursed for certain operating and administrative costs.

Northland Cable Services Corporation ("NCSC"), an affiliate of Northland, provides software installation and billing services to the Partnership's Systems.

Northland Cable News, Inc. ("NCN"), an affiliate of Northland, provides programming to certain of the Partnership's systems.

Cable Ad-Concepts, Inc. ("CAC"), an affiliate of Northland, provides the production and development of video commercial advertisements and advertising sales support.

See Note 3 of the Notes to Financial Statements--December 31, 2000 for disclosures regarding transactions with the General Partners and affiliates.

The following schedule summarizes these transactions:

	FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31,		
	2000	1999	1998
Partnership management fees	$913,313	$900,313	$884,806
Operating expense reimbursements	769,480	719,456	663,191
Software installation and billing service fees to NCSC	75,798	73,965	79,590
Programming fees to NCN	0	178,797	165,147
Reimbursement to CAC for services	85,895	69,752	57,611
Reimbursements to Premier	25,788	160,722	290,147
Amounts due to General Partner			

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

and affiliates at year end	35,458	46,388	142,746

</TABLE>

Management believes that all of the above transactions are on terms as favorable to the Partnership as could be obtained from unaffiliated parties for comparable goods or services.

As disclosed in the Partnership's Prospectus (which has been incorporated by reference), certain conflicts of interest may arise between the Partnership and the General Partners and their affiliates. Certain conflicts may arise due to the allocation of management time, services and functions between the Partnership and existing and future partnerships as well as other business ventures. The General Partners have sought to minimize these conflicts by allocating costs between systems on a reasonable basis. Each limited partner may have access to the books and non-confidential records of the Partnership. A review of the books will allow a limited partner to assess the reasonableness of these allocations. The Agreement of Limited Partnership provides that any limited partner owning 10% or more of the Partnership units may call a special meeting of the Limited Partners, by giving written notice to the General Partners specifying in general terms the subjects to be considered. In the event of a dispute between the General Partners and Limited Partners which cannot be otherwise resolved, the Agreement of Limited Partnership provides steps for the removal of a General Partner by the Limited Partners.

(b) CERTAIN BUSINESS RELATIONSHIPS. John E. Iverson, a Director and Assistant Secretary of the Managing General Partner, is a member of the law firm of Ryan, Swanson & Cleveland, PLLC, which has rendered and is expected to continue to render legal services to the Managing General Partner and the Partnership.

(c) INDEBTEDNESS OF MANAGEMENT. None.

PART IV

ITEM 14. EXHIBITS, FINANCIAL STATEMENT SCHEDULES, AND REPORTS ON FORM 8-K

(a) DOCUMENTS FILED AS A PART OF THIS REPORT:

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

<S>		SEQUENTIALLY NUMBERED PAGE <C>
(1)	FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:	
	Report of Independent Public Accountants	27
	Balance Sheets--December 31, 2000 and 1999	28
	Statements of Operations for the years ended December 31, 2000, 1999 and 1998	29
	Statements of Changes in Partners' Capital (Deficit) for the years ended December 31, 2000, 1999 and 1998	31
	Statements of Cash Flows for the years ended December 31, 2000, 1999 and 1998	32
	Notes to Financial Statements--December 31, 2000	33

</TABLE>

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

Financial Statements
As of December 31, 2000 and 1999
Together with Report of Independent Public Accountants

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

REPORT OF INDEPENDENT PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

To the Partners of
Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership:

We have audited the accompanying balance sheets of Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership (a Washington limited partnership) as of December 31, 2000 and 1999, and the related statements of operations, changes in partners' deficit and cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2000. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Partnership's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership as of December 31, 2000 and 1999, and the results of its operations and its cash flows for each of the three years in the period ended December 31, 2000, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States.

Seattle, Washington
January 26, 2001

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

BALANCE SHEETS

DECEMBER 31, 2000 AND 1999

ASSETS

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

<S>	2000 <C>	1999 <C>
CASH	$ 1,281,380	$ 556,962
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE, including $14,109 and $24,885 due from affiliates in 2000 and 1999, respectively	739,232	806,712
PREPAID EXPENSES AND OTHER ASSETS	85,506	78,012
INVESTMENT IN CABLE TELEVISION PROPERTIES:		
Property and equipment	30,285,589	28,912,812
Less- Accumulated depreciation	(16,325,363)	(14,639,656)
	13,960,226	14,273,156
Franchise agreements (net of accumulated amortization of $15,438,907 and $13,309,803 in 2000 and 1999, respectively)	11,788,486	13,917,591
Acquisition costs (net of accumulated amortization of $154,766 and $107,709 in 2000 and 1999, respectively)	82,806	129,862
Loan fees and other intangibles (net of accumulated amortization of $1,067,714 and $911,862 in 2000 and 1999, respectively)	591,176	841,238
Total investment in cable television properties	26,422,694	29,161,847
Total assets	$ 28,528,812	$ 30,603,533

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

</TABLE>

LIABILITIES AND PARTNERS' DEFICIT

	2000	1999
LIABILITIES:		
Accounts payable	$ 188,372	$ 607,156
Other current liabilities	1,109,212	719,404
Due to general partner and affiliates	35,458	46,388
Deposits	29,590	35,422
Subscriber prepayments	460,038	412,628
Note payable	28,215,281	28,965,281
Total liabilities	30,037,951	30,786,279
COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES (Note 8)		
PARTNERS' DEFICIT:		
General partners-		
Contributed capital, net	(37,565)	(37,565)
Accumulated deficit	(104,541)	(91,277)
	(142,106)	(128,842)
Limited partners-		
Contributed capital, net - 29,784 units in 2000 and 1999	8,982,444	8,982,444
Accumulated deficit	(10,349,477)	(9,036,348)
	(1,367,033)	(53,904)
Total liabilities and partners' deficit	$ 28,528,812	$ 30,603,533

</TABLE>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these balance sheets.

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000, 1999 AND 1998

	2000	1999	1998
REVENUE	$ 15,221,887	$ 15,005,218	$ 14,746,766
EXPENSES:			
Operating (including $270,067, $286,365 and $285,212, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	1,161,419	1,320,255	1,262,672
General and administrative (including $1,505,136, $1,575,500 and $1,632,936, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	4,035,555	4,064,866	3,790,975
Programming (including $95,703, $233,163 and $241,521, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	3,968,492	3,915,701	3,784,358
	9,165,466	9,300,822	8,838,005
Operating income before other income (expense), depreciation and amortization expense	6,056,421	5,704,396	5,908,761
OTHER INCOME (EXPENSE):			
Interest income	45,351	26,668	17,932

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Interest expense	(2,495,892)	(2,379,744)	(2,566,743)
(Loss) gain on disposal of assets	(266,933)	1,330,533	(229,940)
Amortization of loan fees and other	(196,808)	(190,924)	(211,988)
Income before depreciation and amortization expense	3,142,139	4,490,929	2,918,022
DEPRECIATION AND AMORTIZATION EXPENSE	(4,468,532)	(4,392,073)	(4,287,623)
Net (loss) income	$ (1,326,393)	$ 98,856	$ (1,369,601)
ALLOCATION OF NET (LOSS) INCOME:			
General partners	$ (13,264)	$ 989	$ (13,696)
Limited partners	$ (1,313,129)	$ 97,867	$ (1,355,905)
NET (LOSS) INCOME PER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP UNIT	$ (44)	$ 3	$ (46)

</TABLE>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these statements.

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000, 1999 AND 1998

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

<S>	2000 <C>	1999 <C>	1998 <C>
REVENUE	$ 15,221,887	$ 15,005,218	$ 14,746,766
EXPENSES:			
Operating (including $270,067, $286,365 and $285,212, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	1,161,419	1,320,255	1,262,672
General and administrative (including $1,505,136, $1,575,500 and $1,632,936, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	4,035,555	4,064,866	3,790,975
Programming (including $95,073, $233,163 and $241,521, net, paid to affiliates in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively)	3,968,492	3,915,701	3,784,358
Depreciation and amortization	4,468,532	4,392,073	4,287,623
	13,633,998	13,692,895	13,125,628
Operating income	1,587,889	1,312,323	1,621,138
OTHER INCOME (EXPENSE):			
Interest income	45,351	26,668	17,932
Interest expense	(2,495,892)	(2,379,744)	(2,566,743)
(Loss) gain on disposal of assets	(266,933)	1,330,533	(229,940)
Amortization of loan fees and other	(196,808)	(190,924)	(211,988)
Net (loss) income	$ (1,326,393)	$ 98,856	$ (1,369,601)
ALLOCATION OF NET (LOSS) INCOME:			
General partners	$ (13,264)	$ 989	$ (13,696)
Limited partners	$ (1,313,129)	$ 97,867	$ (1,355,905)
NET (LOSS) INCOME PER LIMITED PARTNERSHIP UNIT	$ (44)	$ 3	$ (46)

</TABLE>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these statements.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN PARTNERS' DEFICIT

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000, 1999 and 1998

	General Partners	Limited Partners	Total
BALANCE, December 31, 1997	$(116,135)	$ 1,212,134	$ 1,095,999
Repurchase of limited partnership units	--	(4,000)	(4,000)
Net loss	(13,696)	(1,355,905)	(1,369,601)
BALANCE, December 31, 1998	(129,831)	(147,771)	(277,602)
Repurchase of limited partnership units	--	(4,000)	(4,000)
Net income	989	97,867	98,856
BALANCE, December 31, 1999	(128,842)	(53,904)	(182,746)
Net loss	(13,264)	(1,313,129)	(1,326,393)
BALANCE, December 31, 2000	$(142,106)	$(1,367,033)	$(1,509,139)

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these statements.

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS

FOR THE YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2000, 1999 AND 1998

	2000	1999	1998
CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES:			
Net (loss) income	$(1,326,393)	$ 98,856	$ (1,369,601)
Adjustments to reconcile net (loss) income to net cash provided by operating activities-			
Depreciation and amortization expense	4,468,532	4,392,073	4,287,623
Amortization of loan costs	196,808	190,923	182,859
Loss (gain) on disposal of assets	266,933	(1,330,533)	229,940
Changes in certain assets and liabilities:			
Accounts receivable	(122,520)	131,092	(278,190)
Prepaid expenses and other assets	(7,494)	(120,998)	153,371
Accounts payable and other current liabilities	(28,976)	144,817	224,658
Due to general partner and affiliates	(10,930)	(121,243)	(12,090)
Deposits	(5,832)	(21,635)	(35,036)
Subscriber prepayments	47,410	(82,549)	85,225
Net cash provided by operating activities	3,477,538	3,280,803	3,468,759
CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES:			
Purchase of property and equipment	(2,054,270)	(2,659,141)	(2,820,143)
Acquisition of cable system	--	--	(20,500,000)
Proceeds from disposal of assets	202,700	1,726,026	500
Purchase of intangibles	(151,550)	(59,887)	(77,199)
Net cash used in investing activities	(2,003,120)	(993,002)	(23,396,842)
CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES:			
Proceeds from notes payable	--	--	20,473,427

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Principal payments on notes payable	(750,000)	(2,407,567)	--
Repurchase of limited partnership units	--	(4,000)	(4,000)
Loan fees and other costs	--	(26,179)	(7,471)
Net cash (used in) provided by financing activities	(750,000)	(2,437,746)	20,461,956
INCREASE (DECREASE) IN CASH	724,418	(149,945)	533,873
CASH, beginning of year	556,962	706,907	173,034
CASH, end of year	$ 1,281,380	$ 556,962	$ 706,907
SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE OF CASH FLOW INFORMATION:			
Cash paid during the year for interest	$ 2,489,075	$ 2,373,440	$ 2,562,492

</TABLE>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these statements.

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 2000

1. ORGANIZATION AND PARTNERS' INTERESTS:

Formation and Business

Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership (the Partnership), a Washington limited partnership, was formed on January 22, 1986. The Partnership was formed to acquire, develop and operate cable television systems. The Partnership began operations on November 3, 1986 by acquiring a cable television system in Mississippi. Subsequently, additional cable television systems were acquired in Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina. The Partnership has 35 nonexclusive franchises to operate cable systems for periods, which will expire at various dates through 2017.

Northland Communications Corporation is the Managing General Partner (the General Partner or Northland) of the Partnership. Certain affiliates of the Partnership also own and operate other cable television systems. In addition, the General Partner manages cable television systems for other limited partnerships for which it is General Partner.

FN Equities Joint Venture, a California joint venture, is the Administrative General Partner of the Partnership.

Contributed Capital, Commissions and Offering Costs

The capitalization of the Partnership is set forth in the accompanying statements of changes in partners' deficit. No limited partner is obligated to make any additional contribution.

The general partners purchased their 1% interest in the Partnership by contributing $1,000 to Partnership capital.

Pursuant to the Partnership Agreement, brokerage fees paid to an affiliate of the Administrative General Partner and other offering costs paid to the General Partner were recorded as a reduction of limited partners' capital. The Administrative General Partner received a fee for providing certain administrative services to the Partnership.

2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

Property and Equipment

Property and equipment are stated at cost. Replacements, renewals and improvements are capitalized. Maintenance and repairs are charged to expense as incurred.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Depreciation of property and equipment is provided using the straight-line method over the following estimated service lives:

Buildings	20 years
Distribution plant	10 years
Other equipment and leasehold improvements	5-20 years

The Partnership periodically reviews the carrying value of its long-lived assets, including property, equipment and intangible assets, whenever events or changes in circumstances indicate that the carrying value may not be recoverable.

Allocation of Cost of Purchased Cable Television Systems

The Partnership allocated the total contract purchase price of cable television systems acquired as follows: first, to the estimated fair value of net tangible assets acquired; then, to the franchise and other determinable intangible costs; then any excess is allocated to goodwill.

Intangible Assets

Costs assigned to franchise agreements, loan fees, acquisition costs and other intangibles are being amortized using the straight-line method over the following estimated useful lives:

Franchise agreements	10-20 years
Acquisition costs	5 years
Loan fees and other intangibles	1-10 years

Revenue Recognition

Cable television service revenue, including service maintenance, is recognized in the month service is provided to customers. Installation revenue is recognized to the extent of direct selling costs when the installation is complete. Advance payments on cable services to be rendered are recorded as subscriber prepayments. Revenues resulting from the sale of local spot advertising are recognized when the related advertisements or commercials appear before the public. Local spot advertising revenues earned were $581,280, $507,932 and $456,007, respectively, in 2000, 1999 and 1998.

Derivatives

The Partnership has only limited involvement with derivative financial instruments and does not use them for trading purposes. They are used to manage well-defined interest rate risks. The Partnership periodically enters into interest rate swap agreements with major banks or financial institutions (typically its bank) in which the Partnership pays a fixed rate and receives a floating rate with the interest payments being calculated on a notional amount. Gains or losses associated with changes in fair values of these swaps and the underlying notional principal amounts are deferred and recognized against interest expense over the term of the agreements in the Partnership's statements of operations.

Recently Issued Accounting Pronouncements

Statement of Financial Accounting Standards (SFAS) No. 133 - In June 1998, the Financial Accounting Standards Board issued SFAS No. 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities," (SFAS 133) and in June 2000 issued SFAS No. 138, "Accounting for Certain Derivative Instruments and Certain Hedging Activities," an amendment of SFAS 133. These statements establish accounting and reporting standards requiring that every derivative instrument (including certain derivative instruments embedded in other contracts) be recorded in the balance sheet as either an asset or liability measured at its fair value. These statements require that changes in the derivative's fair value be recognized currently in earnings unless specific hedge accounting criteria are met. Special accounting for qualifying hedges allows a derivative's gains and losses to offset related results on the hedged item in the statement of operations, and requires that a company must formally document, designate, and assess the effectiveness of transactions that are subject to hedge accounting.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

Pursuant to SFAS No. 137, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities -- Deferral of the Effective Date of FASB No. 133 -- an Amendment to FASB Statement No. 133" the effective date of SFAS 133 has been deferred until fiscal years beginning after January 15, 2000. SFAS 133 cannot be applied retroactively. SFAS 133 must be applied to (a) derivative instruments and (b) certain derivative instruments embedded in hybrid contracts that were issued, acquired, or substantively modified after December 31, 1998 (and, at the company's election, before January 1, 1999).

The Partnership had no outstanding interest rate swaps or other derivative financial instruments at December 31, 2000.

Estimates Used in Financial Statement Presentation

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

3. TRANSACTIONS WITH GENERAL PARTNER AND AFFILIATES:

Management Fees

The General Partner receives a fee for managing the Partnership equal to 6% of the gross revenues of the Partnership, excluding revenues from the sale of cable television systems or franchises. The amount of management fees charged by the General Partner was $913,313, $900,313 and $884,806 in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively.

Income Allocation

All items of income, loss, deduction and credit are allocated 99% to the limited partners and 1% to the general partners until the limited partners have received aggregate cash distributions in an amount equal to aggregate capital contributions. Thereafter, the general partners receive 25% and the limited partners are allocated 75% of partnership income and losses. Prior to the general partners receiving a distribution in any year, the limited partners must receive distributions equal to at least 50% of their allocable share of net income for such year, based on projections by the Managing General Partner of the net income of the Partnership for the year. If cash distributions to the general partners are deferred because of this 50% limitation, those deferred cash distributions will be paid to the general partners in subsequent years or upon liquidation of the Partnership. Any distributions other than from cash flow, such as from the sale or refinancing of a system or upon dissolution of the Partnership, will be determined according to contractual stipulations in the Partnership Agreement.

The limited partners' total initial contributions to capital were $15,000,000 ($500 per partnership unit). As of December 31, 2000, $3,817,997 ($127.50 per partnership unit) has been distributed to the limited partners, and the Partnership has repurchased $100,475 of limited partnership units (173 units at $500 per unit and 43 units at $325 per unit).

Reimbursements

The General Partner provides or causes to be provided certain centralized services to the Partnership and other affiliated entities. The General Partner is entitled to reimbursement from the Partnership for various expenses incurred by it or its affiliates on behalf of the Partnership allocable to its management of the Partnership, including travel expenses, pole and site rental, lease payments, legal expenses, billing expenses, insurance, governmental fees and licenses, headquarters' supplies and expenses, pay television expenses, equipment and vehicle charges, operating salaries and expenses, administrative salaries and expenses, postage and office maintenance.

The amounts billed to the Partnership are based on costs incurred by affiliates in rendering the services. The costs of certain services are charged directly to the Partnership, based upon the personnel time spent by the employees rendering the service. The cost of other services is allocated to the Partnership and affiliates based upon relative size and revenue. Management believes that the methods used to allocate services to the Partnership are reasonable. Amounts charged for these services were $769,480, $719,456 and $663,191 for 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively.

In 2000, 1999 and 1998, the Partnership paid installation charges and

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

maintenance fees for billing system support provided by an affiliate, amounting to $75,798, $73,965 and $79,590, respectively.

The Partnership has entered into operating management agreements with affiliates managed by the General Partner. Under the terms of these agreements, the Partnership or an affiliate serves as the executive managing agent for certain cable television systems and is reimbursed for certain operating and administrative expenses. The Partnership paid $25,788, $160,722 and $290,147, net, under the terms of these agreements during 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively.

The Partnership pays monthly program license fees to Northland Cable News, Inc. (NCN), an affiliate of the General Partner, for the rights to distribute programming developed and produced by NCN. Total license fees paid to NCN during 2000, 1999 and 1998 were $0, $178,797 and $165,147, respectively.

Cable Ad Concepts, Inc. (CAC), an affiliate of the General Partner, was formed in 1993 and began operations in 1994. CAC was organized to assist in the development of local advertising markets and management and training of local sales staff. CAC billed the Partnership $85,895, $69,752 and $57,611 in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively, for these services.

Due to General Partner and Affiliates

	December 31, 2000	December 31, 1999
Reimbursable operating costs and other	$25,534	$12,417
Other amounts due to affiliates, net	9,924	33,971
	$35,458	$46,388

4. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT:

	December 31, 2000	December 31, 1999
Land and buildings	$ 880,611	$ 858,198
Distribution plant	27,278,014	26,230,081
Other equipment	1,775,523	1,738,465
Leasehold improvements	43,020	40,550
Construction in progress	308,421	45,518
	$30,285,589	$28,912,812

5. OTHER CURRENT LIABILITIES:

	December 31, 2000	December 31, 1999
Program license fees	$ 317,339	$ 52,159
Accrued property taxes	263,174	133,728
Accrued franchise fees	261,775	253,003
Other	266,924	280,514
	$1,109,212	$719,404

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

6. NOTE PAYABLE:

The Partnership's note payable consists of a revolving credit and term loan agreement, collateralized by a first lien position on all present and future assets of the Partnership. The note's book value approximates its fair value. Interest rates vary based on certain financial covenants; currently 8.50%. The maturity of the note has been extended to June 30, 2001 at which time it is due in full.

Under the terms of the revolving credit and term loan agreement, the Partnership has agreed to restrictive covenants which require the maintenance of certain ratios, including an Annual Operating Cash Flow to Interest Expense Ratio greater than 2.25 to 1, and a Senior Debt to Annualized Operating Cash Flow Ratio of no more than 5.25 to 1, amongst others. The General Partner submits quarterly debt compliance reports to the Partnership's creditor under this agreement. As of December 31, 2000, the Partnership was in compliance with the terms of the loan agreement.

7. INCOME TAXES:

Income taxes payable have not been recorded in the accompanying financial statements because they are obligations of the partners. The federal and state income tax returns of the Partnership are prepared and filed by the General Partner.

The tax returns, the qualification of the Partnership as such for tax purposes, and the amount of distributable partnership income or loss are subject to examination by federal and state taxing authorities. If such examinations result in changes with respect to the Partnership's qualification or in changes with respect to the income or loss, the tax liability of the partners would likely be changed accordingly.

There was no taxable income to the limited partners in any of the three years in the periods ended December 31, 2000. Generally, subject to the allocation procedures discussed in the following paragraph, taxable income to the limited partners is different from that reported in the statements of operations principally due to differences in depreciation and amortization expense allowed for tax purposes and the amount recognizable under generally accepted accounting principles. Traditionally, there are no other significant differences between taxable income and net income reported in the statements of operations.

The Partnership agreement provides that tax losses may not be allocated to the Limited Partners if such loss allocation would create a deficit in the Limited Partners' Capital Account. Such excess losses are reallocated to the General Partner ("Reallocated Limited Partner Losses"). In general, in subsequent years, 100% of the Partnership's net income is allocated to the General Partner until the General Partner has been allocated net income in amounts equal to the Reallocated Limited Partner Losses.

In general, under current federal income tax laws, a partner's allocated share of tax losses from a partnership is allowed as a deduction on their individual income tax return only to the extent of the partner's adjusted basis in their partnership interest at the end of the tax year. Any excess losses over adjusted basis may be carried forward to future tax years and are allowed as a deduction to the extent the partner has an increase in their adjusted basis in the Partnership through either an allocation of partnership income or additional capital contributions to the Partnership.

In addition, the current tax law does not allow a taxpayer to use losses from a business activity in which they do not materially participate (a "passive activity," e.g., a limited partner in a limited partnership) to offset other income such as salary, active business income, dividends, interest, royalties and capital gains. However, such losses can be used to offset income from other passive activities. In addition, disallowed losses can be carried forward indefinitely to offset future income from passive activities. Disallowed losses can be used in full when the taxpayer recognizes gain or loss upon the disposition of their entire interest in the passive activity.

8. COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES:

Lease Arrangements

The Partnership leases certain tower sites, office facilities and pole attachments under leases accounted for as operating leases. Rental expense included in operations amounted to $231,248, $214,581 and $209,627 in 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively. Minimum lease payments through the end of the lease

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

terms are as follows:

2001	$12,431
2002	3,133
2003	1,083
2004	283
2005	283
Thereafter	1,671
	$18,884

Effects of Regulation

On February 8, 1996, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the 1996 Act) was enacted. This act dramatically changed federal telecommunications laws and the future competitiveness of the industry. Many of the changes called for by the 1996 Act will not take effect until the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issues new regulations which, in some cases, may not be completed for a few years. Because of this, the full impact of the 1996 Act on the Partnership's operations cannot be determined at this time. A summary of the provisions affecting the cable television industry, more specifically those affecting the Partnership's operations, follows.

Cable Programming Service Tier Regulation. FCC regulation of rates for cable programming service tiers has been eliminated for small cable systems owned by small companies. Small cable systems are those having 50,000 or fewer subscribers which are owned by companies with fewer than 1% of national cable subscribers (approximately 600,000) and having no more than $250 million in annual revenue. The Partnership qualifies as a small cable company and all of the Partnership's cable systems qualify as small cable systems. Basic tier rates remain subject to regulations by the local franchising authority under most circumstances until effective competition exists. The 1996 Act expands the definition of effective competition to include the offering of video programming services directly to subscribers in a franchised area served by a local telephone exchange carrier, its affiliates or any multichannel video programming distributor which uses the facilities of the local exchange carrier. The FCC has not yet determined the penetration criteria that will trigger the presence of effective competition under these circumstances.

Telephone Companies. The 1996 Act allows telephone companies to offer video programming services directly to customers in their service areas immediately upon enactment. They may provide video programming as a cable operator fully subject to any provision of the 1996 Act, or a radio-based multichannel programming distributor not subject to any provisions of the 1996 Act, or through nonfranchised "open video systems" offering nondiscriminatory capacity to unaffiliated programmers, subject to select provisions of the 1996 Act. Although management's opinion is that the probability of competition from telephone companies in rural areas is unlikely in the near future, there are no assurances that such competition will not materialize.

The 1996 Act encompasses many other aspects of providing cable television service including prices for equipment, discounting rates to multiple dwelling units, lifting of anti-trafficking restrictions, cable-telephone cross ownership provisions, pole attachment rate formulas, rate uniformity, program access, scrambling and censoring of Public, Educational and Governmental and leased access channels.

Self-Insurance

The Partnership began self-insuring for aerial and underground plant in 1996. Beginning in 1997, the Partnership began making quarterly contributions into an insurance fund maintained by an affiliate which covers all Northland entities and defrays a portion of any loss should the Partnership be faced with a significant uninsured loss. To the extent the Partnership's losses exceed the fund's balance, the Partnership absorbs any such loss. If the Partnership were to sustain a material uninsured loss, such reserves could be insufficient to fully fund such a loss. The capital cost of replacing such equipment and physical plant, could have a material adverse effect on the Partnership, its financial condition, prospects and debt service ability.

Amounts paid to the affiliate, which maintains the fund for the Partnership and its affiliates, are expensed as incurred and are included in the statements of operations. To the extent a loss has been incurred related to risks that are self-insured, the Partnership records an expense and an associated liability for

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

the amount of the loss, net of any amounts to be drawn from the fund. For 2000, 1999 and 1998, respectively, the Partnership was charged $19,456, $20,197 and $20,878 by the fund. As of December 31, 2000, the fund had a balance of $509,135.

9. ACQUISITION OF SYSTEMS AND DISPOSITION OF ASSETS:

On January 2, 1998, the Partnership purchased cable television systems located in and around the communities of Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell and Bennettsville, all in the state of South Carolina. The purchase price of these systems was $20,500,000. The systems are operated from four headends and serve 11,200 subscribers.

The Partnership borrowed an additional $20,473,427 under an amended and restated revolving credit and term loan agreement with its lender to finance the acquisition of the South Carolina cable systems.

On April 30, 1999, the Partnership sold cable television systems serving approximately 1,400 subscribers in and around the communities of Sandersville, Heidelberg and Laurel, Mississippi. The system was sold at a sales price of $1,900,000 of which the Partnership received $1,710,000. The remaining balance of $190,000 was held in escrow for one year from the date of sale. The Partnership used net proceeds of $1,540,000 to pay down the existing bank debt.

Pro Forma operating results of the Partnership for 1999 and 1998, assuming the disposition described above had been completed as of the beginning of 1998 follows:

<TABLE>
<CAPTION>

	For the Year Ended December 31,	
	1999	1998
	(unaudited)	(unaudited)
<S>	<C>	<C>
Revenue	$ 14,183,800	$ 14,183,431
Net loss	$ (1,482,272)	$ (1,271,034)
Net loss per limited partnership unit	$ (50)	$ (43)

</TABLE>

10. SUBSEQUENT EVENT:

The Partnership has filed a Preliminary Proxy Statement (Proxy) with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) which solicits votes for two separate proposals. Upon clearance from the SEC, the Proxy will be delivered to the limited partners for their vote. A vote of more than 50% of the outstanding limited partnership units is required to approve each proposal. The first proposal is to extend the term of the Partnership for six years until December 31, 2007. The second proposal will provide authority to sell all of its existing assets, excluding the Bennettsville System, which is being sold to a third party in a separate transaction, to the General Partner, or its affiliates, for an aggregate price of $62,250,000. The Partnership's current revolving credit and term loan facility matures on June 30, 2001. Should the Partnership continue its operations beyond this date, an amendment to the existing loan agreement would be required to extend the loan maturity and revise certain financial covenants. In the event the sale is not approved, management believes it will be able to renegotiate the terms of the note payable at a cost and on terms that would not adversely affect the Partnership's ability to continue operating as a going concern, as long as the limited partners have approved the extension of the partnership term. It is management's opinion that the likelihood that both of these proposals would not be approved by a majority of the limited partners is remote.

Once the sale proposal is approved, the financial statement disclosure thereafter will be on the liquidation basis.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

(2) EXHIBITS:

4.1	Amended and Restated Certificate and Agreement of Limited Partnership dated November 3, 1986(3)
10.1	Agreement of Purchase and Sale with Highlands Community Cable Television, Inc.(2)
10.2	Mississippi State University Contract(2)
10.3	Mathiston Franchise(2)
10.4	Maben Franchise(2)
10.5	Starkville Franchise(2)
10.6	Oktibbeha County Franchise(2)
10.7	Raleigh Franchise(2)
10.8	Philadelphia Franchise(2)
10.9	Neshoba Franchise(2)
10.10	Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians Franchise(2)
10.11	Carthage Franchise(2)
10.12	Kosciusko Franchise(2)
10.13	Morton Franchise(2)
10.14	Forest Franchise(2)
10.15	Scott County Franchise(2)

10.16	Highlands Franchise(2)
10.17	Macon County Franchise(2)
10.18	Jackson County Franchise(2)
10.19	Heidelberg Franchise(2)
10.20	Jasper County Franchise(2)
10.21	Jones County Franchise(2)
10.22	Sandersville Franchise(2)
10.23	Golf Properties Franchise(2)
10.24	Management Agreement dated as of October 10, 1986(2)
10.25	Credit Agreement with National Westminster Bank USA dated as of October 31, 1986 ("Credit Agreement")(1)
10.26	First Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of December 12, 1986(5)
10.27	Second Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of October 26, 1987(5)
10.28	Third Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of September 26, 1988(5)
10.29	Agreement of Purchase and Sale with Starkville TV Cable Company(1)
10.30	Agreement of Purchase and Sale between Northland Telecommunications Corporation and Seemore TV, Inc.(1)
10.31	Agreement of Purchase and Sale between Northland Telecommunications Corporation and Central Cable TV, Inc.(1)
10.32	Agreement of Purchase and Sale between Northland Telecommunications Corporation and Clear Vision TV Company of Kosciusko, A Corporation(1)

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

10.33	Agreement of Purchase and Sale between Northland Telecommunications Corporation and Scott Cable TV, Inc.(1)
10.34	Agreement of Purchase and Sale with SCAN, Inc. and South Central Antenna Network Inc. dated July 18, 1988(4)
10.35	Fourth Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of March 31, 1989(6)
10.36	Fifth Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of February 15, 1990(6)
10.37	Leake County Franchise(7)
10.38	Sixth Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of May 28, 1992(8)
10.39	Loan Agreement with First Union Bank of North Carolina dated as of February 16, 1993(8)
10.40	Asset Purchase Agreement between TCI Cablevision of Georgia, Inc. and Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership, dated July 19, 1996(9)

</TABLE>

<TABLE>

<S>	<C>
10.41	Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement between InterMedia Partners of Carolina, L.P. and Robin Cable Systems, L.P. as Sellers and Northland Cable Television, Inc. as Buyer, dated August 27, 1997(10)
10.42	Assignment and Assumption of Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement between Northland Cable Television, Inc. and Northland Cable Properties Six Limited Partnership, dated October 27, 1997(10)
10.43	Amended and Restated Credit Agreement with First Union National Bank, dated December 31, 1997(10)
10.44	First Amendment to the Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement between Northland Cable Television, Inc. and InterMedia Partners of Carolina, L.P. and Robin Cable Systems, L.P., dated December 31, 1997(10)
10.45	Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of July 20, 1999
10.46	Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of December 22, 2000

</TABLE>

----

(1) Incorporated by reference from the Partnership's Form S-1 Registration Statement declared effective on July 10, 1986 (No. 33-2928).

(2) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-K Annual Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1986.

(3) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 8-A Registration Statement filed July 24, 1987.

(4) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-Q Quarterly Report for the period ended September 30, 1988.

(5) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-K Annual Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1988.

(6) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-K Annual Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1989.

(7) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-K Annual Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1990.

(8) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-K Annual Report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1992.

(9) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 10-Q Quarterly Report for the period ended September 30, 1996.

(10) Incorporated by reference from the partnership's Form 8-K Registration Statement filed January 15, 1998.

(b) REPORTS ON FORM 8-K. No Partnership reports on Form 8-K have been filed for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year ended December 31, 1999.

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized.

NORTHLAND CABLE PROPERTIES SIX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP

By: NORTHLAND COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
(Managing General Partner)

By: /s/ Gary S. Jones   Date: 8/3/01
Gary S. Jones, President

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this report has been signed below by the following persons on behalf of the registrant and in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

SIGNATURES	CAPACITIES	DATE
/s/ John S. Whetzell John S. Whetzell	Chief executive officer of registrant; chief executive officer and chairman of the board of directors of Northland Communications Corporation	8/3/01
/s/ Richard I. Clark Richard I. Clark	Director of Northland Communications Corporation	8/3/01
/s/ John E. Iverson John E. Iverson	Secretary and Director of Northland Communications Corporation	8/3/01
/s/ Gary S. Jones Gary S. Jones	President and principal accounting officer of Northland Communications Corporation	8/3/01

EXHIBITS INDEX

EXHIBIT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	SEQUENTIALLY NUMBERED PAGE
10.45	Amendment to Credit Agreement dated as of July 20, 1999	

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document

EX-10.45

Amendment to Credit Agreement

Copyright © 2012 www.secdatabase.com. All Rights Reserved.
Please Consider the Environment Before Printing This Document