

Matthew A. Brill  
Direct Dial: (202) 637-1095  
Matthew.Brill@lw.com

555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304  
Tel: +1.202.637.2200 Fax: +1.202.637.2201  
www.lw.com

# LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

## FIRM / AFFILIATE OFFICES

Abu Dhabi	Moscow
Barcelona	Munich
Beijing	New Jersey
Brussels	New York
Chicago	Orange County
Doha	Paris
Dubai	Riyadh
Frankfurt	Rome
Hamburg	San Diego
Hong Kong	San Francisco
Houston	Shanghai
London	Silicon Valley
Los Angeles	Singapore
Madrid	Tokyo
Milan	Washington, D.C.

November 23, 2010

Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Notification of Ex Parte Presentations of Time Warner Cable Inc. and CRC Communications of Maine, Inc., *Petition of CRC Communications of Maine, Inc. and Time Warner Cable Inc for Preemption Pursuant to Section 253 of the Communications Act, As Amended, WC Docket No. 10-143***

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On November 22, 2010, Terri Natoli of Time Warner Cable Inc. (“TWC”), Amanda E. Potter and the undersigned of Latham & Watkins LLP, and Trina M. Bragdon of CRC Communications of Maine, Inc. (“CRC”) met separately with Margaret McCarthy, Policy Advisor to Commissioner Copps; Angela Kronenberg, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Clyburn; Brad Gillen, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Baker; and Zachary Katz, Legal Advisor to Chairman Genachowski to discuss the above-referenced Petition for Preemption (“Petition”).

At these meetings, we recounted the procedural history of proceedings before the MPUC, which led CRC and TWC to seek preemption and/or declaratory relief from the Commission. We also summarized the key arguments set forth in CRC/TWC’s Petition and reply comments, explaining why the interpretation of Section 251 adopted by the Maine Public Utilities Commission (“MPUC”) is incorrect as a matter of law and contrary to the public interest. We therefore urged the Commission to take prompt action to preempt the MPUC and/or issue a declaratory ruling to clarify that the rural exemption under Section 251(f) has no effect on a carrier’s rights to interconnect and exchange local traffic with rural local exchange carriers pursuant to Sections 251(a) and (b).

LATHAM & WATKINS<sup>LLP</sup>

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions about this notice.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Matthew A. Brill*

Matthew A. Brill  
of LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

cc: Brad Gillen  
Zachary Katz  
Angela Kronenberg  
Margaret McCarthy