

Seth A. Davidson
+1 202 939 7924
fax +1 866 314 1926
sdavidson@edwardswildman.com

February 26, 2014

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room TWB-204
Washington, DC 20554**Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation**
Mediacom Communications Corporation
MB Docket No. 10-71

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 24, 2014, Joseph Young, General Counsel of Mediacom Communications Corporation, Lee Charles of Baker Botts LLP, and the undersigned (the “Mediacom Representatives”) met with Jonathan Sallet, Suzanne Tetreault, Susan Aaron, and Marilyn Sonn of the Office of General Counsel, Jonathan Levy of the Office of Strategic Planning and Policy, and Nancy Murphy and Deborah Sokolow of the Media Bureau. The purpose of the meeting was for the Mediacom Representatives to engage with the Commission staff in a discussion regarding the broad scope of the Commission’s statutory authority (and, indeed, the Commission’s legal obligation) to reform the outdated rules regarding the exercise of retransmission consent.

The Mediacom Representatives briefly reviewed the statutory language, legislative history, and relevant Commission and judicial precedent that overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that Sections 325(b) and 309 of the Communications Act, both on their face and as amplified by the Commission’s statutory ancillary authority, empower the Commission to regulate all aspects of the retransmission consent regime and that no provision in the law expressly restricts the Commission’s exercise of that authority. The Mediacom Representatives cited to several pleadings that it previously filed in this proceeding that specifically referenced the legislative history of the retransmission consent provision, including the floor debate and statements made by the broadcast industry themselves.¹

¹ The pleadings referenced by the Mediacom Representatives included the following: Joint Reply Comments of Mediacom Communications Corporation and Cequel Communications LLC d/b/a Suddenlink Communications, MM Docket No. 10-71 (filed June 3, 2010) at pages 2-6, 26-27, and 32-46; Joint Comments of Mediacom Communications Corporation, Cequel Communications LLC d/b/a Suddenlink Communications, and Insight Communications Company, MB Docket No. 10-71 (filed May 27, 2011) at page 3, note 6, and page 7.

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
February 26, 2014
Page 2

In response to questions from the staff, the Mediacom Representatives indicated that a number of proposed reforms have been proposed that are consistent with Congress' clear intent that the Commission protect consumers from unreasonable retransmission consent costs and retransmission consent-related service disruptions. These proposals address policies and practices that allow broadcasters to prevent MVPDs from obtaining an alternate source of programming as well as proposals that would more directly limit the circumstances under which a broadcaster could deny an MVPD's customers access to the broadcasters' programming as a negotiating tactic.²

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules, a copy of this notice is being filed electronically in the relevant dockets and a copy is being provided to above-named participants in the meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please communicate directly with the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Seth A. Davidson
*Counsel for Mediacom Communications
Corporation*

cc: J. Sallet
S. Tetreault
S. Aaron
M. Sonn
J. Levy
N. Murphy
D. Sokolow

Communications Corporation, Cequel Communications LLC d/b/a Suddenlink Communications, and Insight Communications Company, MB Docket No. 10-71 (filed May 27, 2011) at page 3, note 6, and page 7.

² See Joint Reply Comments of Mediacom Communications Corporation, Cequel Communications LLC d/b/a Suddenlink Communications, and Insight Communications Company, Inc., MM Docket No. 10-71 (filed June 27, 2011) at pages 7-8.