

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

March 4, 2014

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room TWB-204  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation  
Mediacom Communications Corporation  
MB Dockets No. 10-71, 12-68, 07-18, 05-192, GN Docket No. 14-28**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On February 27, 2014, Rocco Commisso, Chairman and CEO of Mediacom Communications Corporation ("Mediacom"), Joseph Young, Mediacom's Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Thomas Larsen, Mediacom's Group Vice President, Legal and Public Affairs, and the undersigned met with Commissioner Mike O'Rielly and Courtney Reinhard, Senior Legal Advisor and Chief of Staff to Commissioner O'Rielly.

The purpose of the meeting was to introduce Commissioner O'Rielly to Mediacom and to discuss Mediacom's longstanding concerns regarding the state of the video marketplace. In addition, Mr. Commisso discussed his views on the issue of "network neutrality."

With respect to the state of the video marketplace, Mr. Commisso described how consumers are being harmed because of the absence of effective competitive or regulatory constraints on wholesale programming costs, including retransmission consent costs. In response to questions raised by Commissioner O'Rielly regarding the scope of the Commission's authority to address the escalating number of retransmission consent blackouts and the escalating prices demanded by broadcasters for retransmission consent, the Mediacom participants urged the Commissioner and his staff to take a fresh look at Mediacom's pleadings in the retransmission consent reform proceeding, wherein it has demonstrated persuasively that the Commission not only has the authority to update its retransmission consent rules, but the obligation to do so. Mr. Commisso also reiterated statements made by Mediacom in its pleadings in the above referenced-proceedings regarding the various abusive practices, particularly unjust "volume-based" price discrimination, engaged in by programming suppliers.

Finally, Mr. Commisso noted that the proponents of network neutrality regulation seek to prevent Mediacom from asking edge providers to share a fair portion of Mediacom's burden in

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
March 4, 2014  
Page 2

operating and upgrading its facilities to handle the volume of traffic created by those edge providers. As Mr. Comisso pointed out, when “network neutrality” regulation is discussed, little or no consideration is given to the fact that if edge providers – particularly the large edge providers that benefit the most from the investment that Mediacom and other Internet Service Providers have made in their broadband networks – cannot be asked to bear their fair share of the burden, the consumer is the one that will suffer in the form of higher prices and, ultimately, less innovation

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: M. O’Rielly  
C. Reinhard

AM 29738722.1