

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20549

FORM 8-K

CURRENT REPORT

Pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the
Securities Exchange Act of 1934

Date of Report (Date of earliest event reported): AUGUST 16, 2005

MEDIACOM COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
(Exact name of Registrant as specified in its charter)

DELAWARE	0-29227	06-1566067
(State of incorporation)	(Commission File No.)	(IRS Employer Identification No.)

100 CRYSTAL RUN ROAD
MIDDLETOWN, NEW YORK 10941
(Address of principal executive offices)

Registrant's telephone number: (845) 695-2600

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the Registrant under any of the following provisions:

- Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)
- Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)
- Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))
- Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))

ITEM 7.01. REGULATION FD DISCLOSURE.

In connection with the proposed offering of senior notes by Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation, wholly-owned subsidiaries of Mediacom Communications Corporation, the following information was disclosed to potential investors.

TELEPHONY READY HOMES

	6/30/2005A	8/15/2005A	12/31/2005E
MEDIACOM LLC	17,000	130,000	270,000
MEDIACOM BROADBAND	93,000	870,000	1,230,000
MCCC	110,000	1,000,000	1,500,000

Broadband serves 8 of MCCC's top 10 markets

Attached hereto as Exhibit 99.1 is an excerpt of certain items included in the preliminary offering memorandum relating to the offer of the senior notes.

The senior notes will be offered to qualified institutional buyers under Rule 144A and to persons outside the United States under Regulation S. The senior notes will not be registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act"), and, unless so registered, may not be offered or sold in the United States except pursuant to an exemption from, or in a transaction not subject to, the registration requirements of the Securities Act and applicable state securities laws. This Form 8-K shall not constitute an offer to sell, or the solicitation of an offer to buy, the senior notes nor shall there be any sale of the senior notes in any state in which such offer, solicitation, or sale would be unlawful prior to registration or qualification under the securities laws of any such state.

Any statements in this Form 8-K that are not historical facts are forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. These forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from historical results or those Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation anticipate. For a discussion of such risks and uncertainties, which could cause actual results to differ from those contained in the forward-looking statements, see the reports and documents Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation file from time to time with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Statements included in this Form 8-K are based upon information known to Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation as of the date of this Form 8-K, and Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation assume no obligation to (and expressly disclaim any such obligation to) publicly update or alter their forward-looking statements made in this Form 8-K, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as otherwise required by applicable federal securities laws.

ITEM 8.01. OTHER EVENTS.

On August 16, 2005, Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation issued a press release pursuant to Rule 135c of the Securities Act concerning the proposed issuance by Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation of senior notes under Rule 144A. A copy of such press release is attached hereto as Exhibit 99.2.

ITEM 9.01. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND EXHIBITS.

- (a) Financial Statements of Businesses Acquired - None
- (b) Pro Forma Financial Information - None
- (c) Exhibits:

EXHIBIT NO.	DESCRIPTION
99.1	Excerpt of certain items included in the preliminary offering memorandum relating to the offer of the senior notes
99.2	Press release issued on August 16, 2005

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

Dated: August 16, 2005

MEDIACOM COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

By: /S/ MARK E. STEPHAN

Mark E. Stephan
Executive Vice President and
Chief Financial Officer

RISK FACTORS

An investment in the notes involves a high degree of risk. You should carefully consider the risk factors set forth below, as well as other information appearing elsewhere in this offering memorandum and the incorporated documents, before making an investment in the notes.

RISKS RELATED TO OUR BUSINESS

WE HAVE SUBSTANTIAL EXISTING DEBT AND HAVE SIGNIFICANT INTEREST PAYMENT REQUIREMENTS, WHICH COULD ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR ABILITY TO OBTAIN FINANCING IN THE FUTURE AND REQUIRE OUR OPERATING SUBSIDIARIES TO APPLY A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF THEIR CASH FLOW TO DEBT SERVICE.

We have now and after the closing of this offering will continue to have a substantial amount of debt. As of June 30, 2005, after giving pro forma effect to this offering, we would have had approximately \$1,480.5 million of debt outstanding reflected on our consolidated balance sheet (including approximately \$780.5 million of debt of our subsidiaries), and our subsidiaries would have had approximately \$548.1 million of unused credit commitments under the revolving credit portion of the subsidiary credit facility.

On a pro forma basis, assuming that this offering and the application of the proceeds therefrom had occurred at June 30, 2005, our ratio of earnings to fixed charges would have been 1.02x for the six months ended June 30, 2005. The ratio of earnings to fixed charges is often used by investors to evaluate a company's capital structure and its ability to make payments on its debt.

Subject to restrictions in our subsidiary credit facility, the indenture governing our 11% senior notes due 2013 (our "existing senior notes") and the indenture governing the notes offered hereby, we may incur significant amounts of additional debt for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions and other purposes.

Our high level of combined debt could have important consequences for you, including the following:

- Our ability to access new sources of financing for working capital, capital expenditures, acquisitions or other purposes may be limited;
- We will need to use a large portion of our revenues to pay interest on borrowings under our subsidiary credit facility, our existing senior notes and the notes, which will reduce the amount of money available to finance our operations, capital expenditures and other activities;
- Some of our debt has a variable rate of interest, which exposes us to the risk of increased interest rates;
- Borrowings under our subsidiary credit facility are secured and will mature prior to the notes;
- We may be more vulnerable to economic downturns and adverse developments in our business;
- We may be less flexible in responding to changing business and economic conditions, including increased competition and demand for new products and services;
- We may be at a disadvantage when compared to our competitors that have less debt; and
- We may not be able to implement our business strategy.

A DEFAULT UNDER THE INDENTURES GOVERNING OUR EXISTING SENIOR NOTES AND THE NOTES OR UNDER OUR SUBSIDIARY CREDIT FACILITY COULD RESULT IN AN ACCELERATION OF OUR INDEBTEDNESS AND OTHER MATERIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS.

The agreements and instruments governing our own and our subsidiaries' indebtedness contain numerous financial and operating covenants. The breach of any of these covenants could cause a default, which could result in the indebtedness becoming immediately due and payable. If this were to occur, we would be unable to adequately finance our operations. In addition, a default could result in a default or acceleration of our other indebtedness subject to cross-default provisions. If this occurs, we may not be able to pay our debts or borrow sufficient funds to refinance them. Even if new financing is available, it may not be on terms that are acceptable to us. The membership interests of our operating subsidiaries are pledged as collateral under our subsidiary credit facility. A default under our subsidiary credit facility could result in a foreclosure by the lenders on the membership interests pledged under that facility. Because we are dependent upon our operating subsidiaries for all of our revenues, a foreclosure would have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operations.

WE HAVE A HISTORY OF NET LOSSES.

We have a history of net losses. Although we reported net income of \$10.3 million and \$22.9 million for the six months ended June 30, 2005 and 2004, respectively, and net income of \$34.9 million and \$10.1 million for the years ended December 31, 2004 and 2003, respectively, we reported net losses of \$27.2 million and \$50.6 million for the year ended December 31, 2002 and for the period from April 5, 2001 (date of inception) through December 31, 2001, respectively. The principal reasons for our prior net losses include the depreciation and amortization expenses associated with our capital expenditures related to expanding and upgrading our cable systems and interest costs on borrowed money.

OUR SUBSIDIARY CREDIT FACILITY IMPOSES SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS.

Our subsidiary credit facility contains covenants that restrict our subsidiaries' ability to:

- distribute funds or pay dividends to us;
- incur additional indebtedness or issue additional equity;
- repurchase or redeem equity interests and indebtedness;
- pledge or sell assets or merge with another entity;
- create liens; and
- make certain capital expenditures, investments or acquisitions.

The ability of our subsidiaries to comply with these provisions may be affected by events beyond our control. If they were to breach any of these covenants, they would be in default under the credit facilities and they would be prohibited from making distributions to us.

Under certain circumstances, lenders could elect to declare all amounts borrowed under our subsidiary credit facility, together with accrued interest and other fees, to be due and payable. If that occurred, our obligations under the existing senior notes and the notes could also become payable immediately. Under such circumstances, we may not be able to repay such amounts or the senior notes.

THE TERMS OF OUR INDEBTEDNESS COULD MATERIALLY LIMIT OUR FINANCIAL AND OPERATING FLEXIBILITY.

Several of the covenants contained in the agreements and instruments governing our own and our subsidiaries' indebtedness could materially limit our financial and operating flexibility by restricting, among other things, our ability and the ability of our operating subsidiaries to:

- incur additional indebtedness;
- create liens and other encumbrances;
- pay dividends and make other payments, investments, loans and guarantees;
- enter into transactions with related parties;
- sell or otherwise dispose of assets and merge or consolidate with another entity;
- repurchase or redeem capital stock, other equity interests or debt;
- pledge assets; and
- issue capital stock or other equity interests.

Complying with these covenants could cause us to take actions that we otherwise would not take or cause us not to take actions that we otherwise would take.

WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO OBTAIN ADDITIONAL CAPITAL TO CONTINUE THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR BUSINESS.

We have invested substantial capital for the upgrade, expansion and maintenance of our cable systems and the launch and expansion of new or additional products and services. While we have substantially completed our planned system upgrades, if there is accelerated growth in our video, HSD and voice products and services, or we decide to introduce other new advanced products and services, or the cost to provide these products and services increases, or we consummate one or more acquisitions, we may need to make unplanned additional capital expenditures. We may not be able to obtain the funds necessary to finance additional capital requirements through internally generated funds, additional borrowings or other sources. If we are unable to obtain these funds, we would not be able to implement our business strategy and our results of operations would be adversely affected.

IF WE ARE UNSUCCESSFUL IN IMPLEMENTING OUR GROWTH STRATEGY, OUR BUSINESS AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS COULD BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED.

We currently expect that a substantial portion of our future growth in revenues will come from the expansion of relatively new services, the introduction of additional new services, and, possibly, acquisitions. Relatively new services include HSD, VOD, DVRs and HDTV. In the second quarter of 2005, we began to offer cable telephony service to subscribers in certain markets and we expect to have 1.1 million homes telephony-ready by the end of 2005. We may not be able to successfully expand existing services due to unpredictable technical, operational or regulatory challenges. It is also possible that these services will not generate significant revenue growth.

THE ACQUISITION AND INTEGRATION OF ADDITIONAL CABLE SYSTEMS COULD ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR BUSINESS AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS.

From time to time we evaluate opportunities to acquire additional cable systems. If we make acquisitions in the future, we may need to incur more debt and we may incur contingent liabilities and amortization expenses, which could adversely affect our operating results and

financial condition. If we make acquisitions in the future and the expected operating efficiencies do not materialize, or if we fail to effectively integrate acquired cable systems into our existing business, or if the costs of such integration exceed expectations, our operating results and financial condition could be adversely affected.

OUR PROGRAMMING COSTS ARE INCREASING, AND OUR BUSINESS AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS WILL BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED IF WE CANNOT PASS THROUGH A SUFFICIENT PART OF THE ADDITIONAL COSTS TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Our programming costs have been, and are expected to continue to be, one of our largest single expense items. In recent years, the cable and satellite video industries have experienced a rapid increase in the cost of programming, particularly sports programming. This increase in programming costs is expected to continue, and we may not be able to pass on all programming cost increases to our customers. In addition, as we add programming to our basic and expanded basic programming tiers, we may not be able to pass on all of our costs of the additional programming to our customers without the potential loss of basic subscribers. To the extent that we may not be able to pass on increased or additional programming costs, particularly sports programming, to subscribers, our business and results of operations will be adversely affected.

We also expect to be subject to increasing financial and other demands by broadcasters to obtain the required consents for the transmission of broadcast programming to our subscribers. We cannot predict the impact of these negotiations on our business and results of operations or the effect on our subscribers should we be required to suspend the carriage of this programming.

WE OPERATE IN A HIGHLY COMPETITIVE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT, WHICH AFFECTS OUR ABILITY TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN CUSTOMERS AND CAN ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR BUSINESS AND OPERATIONS. WE HAVE LOST A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS TO DIRECT BROADCAST SATELLITE COMPETITION, AND FURTHER LOSS OF CUSTOMERS COULD HAVE A MATERIAL NEGATIVE IMPACT ON OUR BUSINESS.

The industry in which we operate is highly competitive and is often subject to rapid and significant changes and developments in the marketplace and in the regulatory and legislative environment. In some instances, we compete against companies with fewer regulatory burdens, easier access to financing, greater resources and operating capabilities, greater brand name recognition and long-standing relationships with regulatory authorities and customers.

Our video business faces competition primarily from DBS service providers. Our principal competitor in the HSD business, in markets where it is available, is telephone service, or DSL. The two largest DBS companies, DIRECTV, Inc. and EchoStar Communications, are each among the four largest providers of multichannel video programming services based on reported customers. In addition, DIRECTV's affiliation with News Corporation could strengthen that company's competitive positioning, as News Corporation also owns Fox Television Network and several cable programming services. Competition from DBS has had an adverse effect on our ability to retain customers. DBS has grown rapidly over the past several years and continues to do so. We have lost a significant number of customers to DBS competition, and will continue to face significant challenges from DBS providers.

Local telephone companies are capable of offering video and other services in competition with us and they may increasingly do so in the future. Certain telephone companies have begun to deploy fiber more extensively in their networks and some have announced plans to

deploy broadband services, including video programming services, in a manner which avoids the same regulatory burdens imposed on our business. These deployments will enable them to begin providing video services, as well as telephone and Internet access services, to residential and business customers. New laws or regulations at the federal or state level may clarify the ability of the local telephone companies to provide their services without obtaining state or local cable franchises. If local telephone companies are not required to obtain local cable franchises comparable to ours, it would be adverse to our business.

We also face growing competition from municipal entities that construct facilities and provide cable television, HSD, telephony and/or other related services. In addition to hard-wired facilities, some municipal entities are exploring building wireless fidelity networks to deliver these services. In Iowa, our largest market, an organization named Opportunity Iowa, is actively encouraging Iowa municipalities to construct facilities that could be used to provide services that compete with the services we offer.

We also face competition from over-the-air television and radio broadcasters and from other communications and entertainment media such as movie theaters, live entertainment and sports events, newspapers and home video products. Further losses of customers to DBS or other alternative video and HSD services could also have a material adverse effect on our business.

In our HSD business, we face competition primarily from telephone companies and other providers of "dial-up" and DSL. DSL service is competitive with HSD service over cable systems. Telephone companies (which already have telephone lines into the household, an existing customer base and other operational functions in place) and other companies offer DSL service. In addition, certain DBS providers are currently offering two-way broadband data access services, which compete with our ability to offer bundled services to our customers.

Our HSD business may also face competition in the future from registered utility holding companies and subsidiaries. In 2004, the FCC adopted rules: (i) that affirmed the ability of electric service providers to provide broadband Internet access services over their distribution systems; and (ii) that seek to avoid interference with existing services. Electric utilities could be formidable competitors to us.

Some of our competitors, including franchised, wireless or private cable operators, satellite television providers and local exchange carriers, may benefit from permanent or temporary business combinations such as mergers, joint ventures and alliances and the potential repeal of certain ownership rules, either through access to financing, resources or efficiencies of scale, or the ability to provide multiple services in direct competition with us. Some of our present or future competitors may have greater financial resources or, through their affiliates, greater access to programming or other services, than we do.

IF WE ARE UNABLE TO KEEP PACE WITH TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE, OUR BUSINESS AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS COULD BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED.

Our industry is characterized by rapid technological change and the introduction of new products and services. We cannot assure you that we will be able to fund the capital expenditures necessary to keep pace with future technological developments. We also cannot assure you that we will successfully anticipate the demand of our customers for products and services requiring new technology. This type of rapid technological change could adversely affect our ability to maintain, expand or upgrade our systems and respond to competitive pressures. An inability to maintain and expand our systems and provide advanced services in a

timely manner, or to anticipate the demands of the market place, could adversely affect our ability to compete and our results of operations.

THE LOSS OF KEY PERSONNEL COULD HAVE A MATERIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON OUR BUSINESS.

If any of our manager's key personnel ceases to participate in our business and operations, our profitability could suffer. Our success is substantially dependent upon the retention of, and the continued performance by, our manager's key personnel, including Rocco B. Commisso, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of our manager. Our manager has not entered into a long-term employment agreement with Mr. Commisso. Neither our manager nor we currently maintain key man life insurance on Mr. Commisso or other key personnel.

WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO OBTAIN CRITICAL ITEMS AT A REASONABLE COST OR WHEN REQUIRED, WHICH COULD ADVERSELY AFFECT BUSINESS, FINANCIAL CONDITION AND RESULTS OF OPERATIONS.

We depend on third-party suppliers for equipment, software, services and other items that are critical for the operation of our cable systems and the provision of advanced services, including digital set-top converter boxes, digital video recorders and routers, fiber-optic cable, telephone circuits, software, the "backbone" telecommunications network for our high-speed data service and construction services for expansion and upgrades of our cable systems. These items are available from a limited number of suppliers. Demand for these items has increased with the general growth in demand for Internet and telecommunications services. We typically do not carry significant inventories of equipment. Moreover, if there are no suppliers that are able to provide set-top converter boxes that comply with evolving Internet and telecommunications standards or that are compatible with other equipment and software that we use, our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected. If we are unable to obtain critical equipment, software, services or other items on a timely basis and at an acceptable cost, our ability to offer our products and services and roll out advanced services may be impaired, and our business, financial condition and results of operations could be materially adversely affected.

WE RELY ON OUR PARENT AND AFFILIATE COMPANIES FOR VARIOUS SERVICES AND JOINT ENDEAVORS.

We rely on our parent, Mediacom Communications, for various services such as corporate and administrative support. In addition, as permitted by the indenture governing the notes, we enter into many types of transactions with Mediacom Communications or its subsidiaries, such as Mediacom LLC, the primary purpose of which is to result in cost savings and related synergies. These transactions relate to, among other things:

- - the sharing of centralized services, personnel, facilities, headends and plant;
- - the joint procurement of goods and services;
- - the allocation of certain costs and expenses; and
- - other matters reasonably related to the foregoing.

Our financial position, results of operations and cash flows could differ from those that would have resulted had Mediacom Broadband operated autonomously or as an entity independent of Mediacom Communications. Similarly, our financial position, results of operations and cash flows would be impacted if, for any reason, transactions such as those described above were unavailable to us or if we were required to fulfill any jointly contracted obligations that an affiliate outside of our control failed to perform. We are unable to predict or quantify the

impact of any changes that would result if joint transactions such as those described above were unavailable to us.

RISKS RELATED TO LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MATTERS

OUR CABLE TELEVISION BUSINESS IS SUBJECT TO EXTENSIVE GOVERNMENTAL REGULATION.

The cable television industry is subject to extensive legislation and regulation at the federal and local levels, and, in some instances, at the state level. Many aspects of such regulation are currently the subject of judicial and administrative proceedings and legislative and administrative proposals, and lobbying efforts by us and our competitors. We expect that court actions and regulatory proceedings will continue to refine our rights and obligations under applicable federal, state and local laws. The results of these judicial and administrative proceedings and legislative activities may materially affect our business operations. Local authorities grant us non-exclusive franchises that permit us to operate our cable systems. We renew or renegotiate these franchises from time to time. Local franchising authorities may demand concessions, or other commitments, as a condition to renewal, and these concessions or other commitments could be costly. The Communications Act contains renewal procedures and criteria designed to protect incumbent franchisees against arbitrary denials of renewal, and although such Act requires the local franchising authorities to take into account the costs of meeting such concessions or commitments, there is no assurance that we will not be compelled to meet their demands in order to obtain renewals. We cannot predict whether any of the markets in which we operate will expand the regulation of our cable systems in the future or the impact that any such expanded regulation may have upon our business.

Similarly, due to the increasing popularity and use of commercial online services and the Internet, certain aspects have become subject to regulation at the federal and state level such as collection of information online from children, disclosure of certain subscriber information to governmental agencies, commercial emails or "spam," privacy, security and distribution of material in violation of copyrights. In addition to the possibility that additional federal laws and regulations may be adopted with respect to commercial online services and the Internet, several individual states have imposed such restrictions and others may also impose similar restrictions, potentially creating an intricate patchwork of laws and regulations. Future federal and/or state laws may cover such issues as privacy, access to some types of content by minors, pricing, encryption standards, consumer protection, electronic commerce, taxation of e-commerce, copyright infringement and other intellectual property matters. The adoption of such laws or regulations in the future may decrease the growth of such services and the Internet, which could in turn decrease the demand for our cable modem service, increase our costs of providing such service or have other adverse effects on our business, financial condition and results of operations. Such laws or regulations may also require disclosure of failures of our procedures or breaches to our system by third parties, which can increase the likelihood of claims against us by affected subscribers.

CHANGES IN CHANNEL CARRIAGE REGULATIONS COULD IMPOSE SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL COSTS ON US.

Cable operators face significant regulation of their channel carriage. Currently, they can be required to devote substantial capacity to the carriage of programming that they might not carry voluntarily, including certain local broadcast signals, local public, educational and government access programming, and unaffiliated commercial leased access programming. If the FCC or Congress were to require cable systems to carry both the analog and digital versions of local broadcast signals or to carry multiple program streams included with a single digital

broadcast transmission, this carriage burden would increase substantially. Recently, the FCC reaffirmed that cable operators need only carry one programming service of each television broadcaster to fulfill its must-carry obligation, however, changes in the composition of the Commission as well as proposals currently under consideration could result in an obligation to carry both the analog and digital version of local broadcast stations and/or to carry multiple digital program streams. Further, this decision has been appealed to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Recently, the FCC imposed "reciprocal" good faith retransmission consent negotiation obligations on cable operators. These rules identify seven types of conduct that would constitute "per se" violations of the new requirements. Thus, even though we may have no interest in carrying a particular broadcaster's programming, we may be required under the new rules to engage in negotiations within the parameters of the FCC's rules. The impact of these rules on our business cannot be determined at this time. While noting that the parties in retransmission consent negotiations were now subject to a "heightened duty of negotiation," the FCC emphasized that failure to ultimately reach an agreement is not a violation of the rules. Broadcasters must submit their elections to cable operators to be classified as either a "must-carry" or a "retransmission consent" signal for the period January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2008 by October 1, 2005.

OUR FRANCHISES ARE NON-EXCLUSIVE AND LOCAL FRANCHISING AUTHORITIES MAY GRANT COMPETING FRANCHISES IN OUR MARKETS.

Our cable systems are operated under non-exclusive franchises granted by local franchising authorities. As a result, competing operators of cable systems and other potential competitors, such as municipal utility providers, may be granted franchises and may build cable systems in markets where we hold franchises. Some may not require local franchises at all, such as certain municipal utility providers. Any such competition could adversely affect our business. The existence of multiple cable systems in the same geographic area is generally referred to as an "overbuild." As of March 31, 2005, approximately 15.8% of the estimated homes passed by our cable systems were overbuilt by other cable operators. We cannot assure you that competition from overbuilders will not develop in other markets that we now serve or will serve after any future acquisitions.

Legislation recently passed in one state (in which we do not currently operate cable systems) and similar legislation is pending or has been proposed in certain other states and in Congress that would allow local telephone companies to deliver services would compete with our cable service without obtaining equivalent local franchises. Such a legislatively granted advantage to our competitors could adversely affect our business. The effect of such initiatives, if any, on our obligation to obtain local franchises in the future or on any of our existing franchises, many of which have years remaining in their terms, cannot be predicted.

PENDING FCC AND COURT PROCEEDINGS COULD ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR HSD SERVICE.

The legal and regulatory status of providing high-speed Internet access service by cable television companies is uncertain. Although the United States Supreme Court recently held that cable modem service was properly classified by the FCC as an "information service," freeing it from regulation as a "telecommunications service," it recognized that the FCC has jurisdiction to impose regulatory obligations on facilities based Internet Service Providers. The FCC has an ongoing rulemaking to determine whether to impose regulatory obligations on such providers, including us. The FCC has issued a declaratory ruling that cable modem service, as it is currently

offered, is properly classified as an interstate information service that is not subject to common carrier regulation. However, the FCC is still considering the following: whether to require cable companies to provide capacity on their systems to other entities to deliver high-speed Internet directly to customers, also known as open access; whether certain other regulatory requirements do or should apply to cable modem service; and whether and to what extent cable modem service should be subject to local franchise authorities' regulatory requirements or franchise fees. The adoption of new rules by the FCC could place additional costs and regulatory burdens on us, reduce our anticipated revenues or increase our anticipated costs for this service, complicate the franchise renewal process, result in greater competition or otherwise adversely affect our business. While we cannot predict the outcome of this proceeding, we do note that the FCC recently removed the requirement that telecommunications carriers provide access to competitors to resell their DSL Internet access service citing the need for competitive parity with cable modem service which has no similar access requirement.

WE MAY BE SUBJECT TO LEGAL LIABILITY BECAUSE OF THE ACTS OF OUR HSD CUSTOMERS OR BECAUSE OF OUR OWN NEGLIGENCE.

Our HSD service enables individuals to access the Internet and to exchange information, generate content, conduct business and engage in various online activities on an international basis. The law relating to the liability of providers of these online services for activities of their users is currently unsettled both within the United States and abroad. Potentially, third parties could seek to hold us liable for the actions and omissions of our cable modem service customers, such as defamation, negligence, copyright or trademark infringement, fraud or other theories based on the nature and content of information that our customers use our service to post, download or distribute. We also could be subject to similar claims based on the content of other Websites to which we provide links or third-party products, services or content that we may offer through our Internet service. Due to the global nature of the Web, it is possible that the governments of other states and foreign countries might attempt to regulate its transmissions or prosecute us for violations of their laws.

It is also possible that information provided directly by us will contain errors or otherwise be negligently provided to users, resulting in third parties making claims against us. For example, we offer Web-based email services, which expose us to potential risks, such as liabilities or claims resulting from unsolicited email, lost or misdirected messages, illegal or fraudulent use of email, or interruptions or delays in email service. Additionally, we host website "portal pages" designed for use as a home page by, but not limited to, our HSD customers. These portal pages offer a wide variety of content from us and third parties which could contain errors or other material that could give rise to liability.

To date, we have not been served notice that such a claim has been filed against us. However, in the future someone may serve such a claim on us in either a domestic or international jurisdiction and may succeed in imposing liability on us. Our defense of any such actions could be costly and involve significant distraction of our management and other resources. If we are held or threatened with significant liability, we may decide to take actions to reduce our exposure to this type of liability. This may require us to spend significant amounts of money for new equipment and may also require us to discontinue offering some features or our cable modem service.

Since we launched our proprietary Mediacom Online(SM) HSD service in February 2002, from time to time, we receive notices of claimed infringements by our cable modem service users. The owners of copyrights and trademarks have been increasingly active in seeking to prevent use of

the Internet to violate their rights. In many cases, their claims of infringement are based on the acts of customers of an Internet service provider—for example, a customer's use of an Internet service or the resources it provides to post, download or disseminate copyrighted music, movies, software or other content without the consent of the copyright owner or to seek to profit from the use of the goodwill associated with another person's trademark. In some cases, copyright and trademark owners have sought to recover damages from the Internet service provider, as well as or instead of the customer. The law relating to the potential liability of Internet service providers in these circumstances is unsettled. In 1996, Congress adopted the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which is intended to grant ISPs protection against certain claims of copyright infringement resulting from the actions of customers, provided that the ISP complies with certain requirements. So far, Congress has not adopted similar protections for trademark infringement claims.

WE MAY BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO OUR NETWORKS TO OTHER INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS, WHICH COULD SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE OUR COMPETITION AND ADVERSELY AFFECT OUR ABILITY TO PROVIDE NEW PRODUCTS AND SERVICES.

Local authorities and the FCC have been asked to require cable operators to provide non-discriminatory access over their cable systems to other Internet service providers. The recent decision by the United State Supreme Court upholding the FCC's classification of cable modem service as an "information service" may effectively forestall efforts by competitors to obtain access to the networks of cable operators to provide Internet access services. As noted above, however, the FCC continues to have jurisdiction over this issue and a rulemaking initiated prior to the Supreme Court's decision remains ongoing. While we cannot predict the outcome of this proceeding, we do note that the FCC recently removed the requirement that telecommunications carriers provide access to competitors to resell their DSL internet access service citing the need for competitive parity with cable modem service which has no similar access requirement. If we are required to provide access in this manner, it could have a significant adverse impact on our financial results, including by: (i) increasing competition; (ii) increasing the expenses we incur to maintain our systems; and/or (iii) increasing the expense of upgrading and/or expanding our systems.

WE MAY BECOME SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL REGULATORY BURDENS BECAUSE WE OFFER CABLE TELEPHONY SERVICE.

The regulatory treatment of VoIP services like those we and others offer is uncertain. The FCC, Congress, and the states are continuing to look at issues surrounding the provision of VoIP and some of those issues are also before federal courts. We cannot predict how these issues will be resolved, but any determination that results in greater or different regulatory obligations could result in increased costs, reduce anticipated revenues, impede our ability to effectively compete or otherwise adversely affect our ability to successfully roll-out and conduct our telephony business.

ACTIONS BY POLE OWNERS MIGHT SUBJECT US TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED POLE ATTACHMENT COSTS.

Our cable facilities are often attached to or use public utility poles, ducts or conduits. Historically, cable system attachments to public utility poles have been regulated at the federal or state level. Generally this regulation resulted in favorable pole attachment rates for attachments used to provide cable service. The FCC clarified that the provision of Internet access does not endanger a cable operator's favorable pole rates; this approach ultimately was

upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. That ruling, coupled with the recent Supreme Court decision upholding the FCC's classification of cable modem service as an information service, should strengthen our ability to resist such rate increases based solely on the delivery of cable modem services over our cable systems. As we continue our deployment of cable telephony and certain other advanced services, utilities may continue to invoke higher rates. Our financial results could suffer a material adverse impact from any significant increased costs, and such increased pole attachment costs could discourage system upgrades and the introduction of new products and services.

CHANGES IN COMPULSORY COPYRIGHT REGULATIONS MIGHT SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE OUR LICENSE FEES.

Two recently filed petitions for rulemaking with the United States Copyright Office propose revisions to certain compulsory copyright license reporting requirements and seek clarification of certain issues relating to the application of the compulsory license to the carriage of digital broadcast stations. The petitions seek, among other things: (1) clarification of the inclusion in gross revenues of digital converter fees, additional set fees for digital service and revenue from required "buy throughs" to obtain digital service; (2) reporting of "dual carriage" and multicast signals; and (3) revisions to the Copyright Office's rules and Statement of Account forms, including increased detail regarding services, rates and subscribers, additional information regarding non-broadcast tiers of service, cable headend location information, community definition clarification and identification of the county in which the cable community is located and the effect of interest payments on potential liability for late filing. We understand that the Copyright Office intends to open one or more rulemakings in response to these petitions. We cannot predict the outcome of such rulemakings, however, it is possible that certain changes in the rules or copyright compulsory license fee computations could have an adverse affect on our business by increasing our copyright compulsory license fee costs or by causing us to reduce or discontinue carriage of certain broadcast signals that we currently carry on a discretionary basis.

RISKS RELATED TO THE NOTES

WE AND OUR SUBSIDIARIES MAY STILL BE ABLE TO INCUR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE DEBT WHICH COULD EXACERBATE THE RISKS DESCRIBED ABOVE

We and our subsidiaries may be able to incur substantial additional debt in the future. If we or our subsidiaries do so, the risks described above could intensify. The terms of the indenture governing the existing senior notes do not, and the terms of the indenture governing the notes will not, fully prohibit us or our subsidiaries from doing so. As of June 30, 2005, as adjusted to give effect to this offering and the application of the proceeds therefrom, we would have had approximately \$548.1 million available (subject to certain borrowing conditions) for additional borrowings under our subsidiary credit facility. We expect to continue to borrow under this facility.

THE NOTES WILL BE EFFECTIVELY SUBORDINATED TO ALL DEBT AND OTHER LIABILITIES OF OUR SUBSIDIARIES.

Mediacom Broadband LLC is a holding company. As a result, the notes are effectively subordinated to all existing and future liabilities of our subsidiaries, including debt under our subsidiary credit facility. If the maturity of the loans under our subsidiary credit facility were accelerated, our subsidiaries would have to repay all debt outstanding under that credit facility before they could distribute any assets or cash to us. Remedies to the lenders under our

subsidiary credit facility could constitute events of default under the indenture governing the notes. If these remedies were exercised, the maturity of the notes could be accelerated, and our subsidiaries' obligations under our subsidiary credit facility could be accelerated also. In such circumstances, there can be no assurance that our subsidiaries' assets would be sufficient to repay all of their debt and then to make distributions to us to enable us to meet our obligations under the indenture. Claims of creditors of our subsidiaries, including general trade creditors, will generally have priority over holders of the notes as to the assets of our subsidiaries. Additionally, any right we may have to receive assets of any of our subsidiaries upon such subsidiary's liquidation or reorganization will be effectively subordinated to the claims of the subsidiary's creditors, except to the extent, if any, that we ourselves are recognized as a creditor of such subsidiary, in which case our claims would still be subordinate to the claims of such creditors who hold security in the assets of such subsidiary to the extent of such assets and to the claims of such creditors who hold indebtedness of such subsidiary senior to that held by us. As of June 30, 2005, as adjusted to give effect to this offering, the aggregate amount of the debt and other liabilities of our subsidiaries reflected on our consolidated balance sheet as to which holders of the notes would have been effectively subordinated was approximately \$780.5 million and our subsidiaries would have had approximately \$548.1 million of unused credit commitments under the revolving credit portion of our subsidiary credit facility. Our subsidiaries may incur additional debt or other obligations in the future and the notes will be effectively subordinated to such debt or other obligations.

THE NOTES ARE OBLIGATIONS OF A HOLDING COMPANY WHICH HAS NO OPERATIONS AND DEPENDS ON ITS SUBSIDIARIES FOR CASH

As a holding company, we will not hold any assets other than our investments in and our advances to our operating subsidiaries. Consequently, our subsidiaries conduct all of our consolidated operations and own substantially all of our consolidated assets. Our only source of the cash we need to pay current interest on the notes and our other obligations and to repay the principal amount of these obligations, including the notes, is the cash that our subsidiaries generate from their operations and their borrowings. Our subsidiaries are not obligated to make funds available to us.

Our subsidiaries' ability to make payments to us will depend upon their operating results and will be subject to applicable laws and contractual restrictions. Our subsidiary credit facility permits our subsidiaries to distribute cash to us to pay interest on the notes, but only so long as there is no default under such credit facility. If there is a default under our subsidiary credit facility, we would not have any cash to pay interest on our obligations, including the notes.

OUR OWNERSHIP INTERESTS IN OUR SUBSIDIARIES ARE PLEDGED AS COLLATERAL UNDER OUR SUBSIDIARY CREDIT FACILITY AND MAY NOT BE AVAILABLE TO HOLDERS OF THE NOTES.

All of our ownership interests in our subsidiaries are pledged as collateral under our subsidiary credit facility. Therefore, if we were unable to pay principal or interest on the notes, the ability of the holders of the notes to proceed against the ownership interests in our subsidiaries to satisfy such amounts would be subject to the prior satisfaction in full of all amounts owing under our subsidiary credit facility. Any action to proceed against such interests by or on behalf of the holders of notes would constitute an event of default under our subsidiary credit facility entitling the lenders thereunder to declare all amounts owing thereunder to be immediately due and payable. In addition, as secured creditors, the lenders under our subsidiary credit

facility would control the disposition and sale of our subsidiaries' interests after an event of default under our subsidiary credit facility and would not be legally required to take into account the interests of our unsecured creditors, such as the holders of the notes, with respect to any such disposition or sale. There can be no assurance that our assets after the satisfaction of claims of our secured creditors would be sufficient to satisfy any amounts owing with respect to the notes.

WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO GENERATE ENOUGH CASH TO SERVICE OUR DEBT

Our ability to make payments on and to refinance our debt, including the notes, and to fund planned capital expenditures will depend on our ability to generate cash. This is subject, in part, to general economic, financial, competitive, legislative, regulatory and other factors that are beyond our control. Accordingly, we cannot assure you that our business will generate sufficient cash flows from operations or that future distributions will be available to us in amounts sufficient to enable us to pay our indebtedness, including the notes, or to fund our other liquidity needs.

We may need to refinance all or a portion of our indebtedness, including the notes, on or before maturity. We cannot assure you that we will be able to refinance any of our indebtedness on commercially reasonable terms or at all.

UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS MAY ALLOW COURTS TO VOID OR SUBORDINATE CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO THE NOTES OR TO MODIFY THE CONTRACTUAL OR STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIFFERENT CLASSES OF CREDITORS.

Under the federal Bankruptcy Code and comparable provisions of state fraudulent transfer laws, a court could void claims with respect to the notes, or subordinate them, if, among other things, we, at the time the notes were issued:

- received less than reasonably equivalent value or fair consideration for the notes; and
- was insolvent or rendered insolvent by reason of the incurrence;
- was engaged in a business or transaction for which its remaining assets constituted unreasonably small capital; or
- intended to incur, or believed that it would incur, debts beyond its ability to pay such debts as they became due.

The measures of insolvency for purposes of these fraudulent or preferential transfer laws vary depending upon the law applied in any proceeding to determine whether a fraudulent or preferential transfer has occurred. Generally, however, we would be considered insolvent if:

- the sum of its debts, including contingent liabilities, was greater than the fair saleable value of all of its assets;
- the present fair saleable value of its assets was less than the amount that would be required to pay its probable liability on its existing debts, including contingent liabilities, as they became absolute and mature; or
- it could not pay its debts as they became due.

Based upon information currently available to us, we believe that the notes are being incurred for proper purposes and in good faith.

In addition, if there were to be a bankruptcy of our parent and/or its subsidiaries, creditors of our parent may attempt to make claims against us and our subsidiaries, including seeking substantive consolidation of our and our subsidiaries' assets and liabilities with the liabilities of our parent, which (if successful) could have an adverse effect on holders of the notes and their recoveries in any bankruptcy proceeding.

OUR ABILITY TO PURCHASE YOUR NOTES ON A CHANGE OF CONTROL MAY BE LIMITED.

If we undergo a change of control, we may need to refinance large amounts of our debt, including our subsidiary credit facility, and we must offer to buy back the notes for a price equal to 101% of their principal amount, plus accrued and unpaid interest to the repurchase date. We cannot assure you that we will have sufficient funds available to make the required repurchases of the notes in that event, or that we will have sufficient funds to pay our other debts.

In addition, our subsidiary credit facility prohibits our subsidiaries from providing us with funds to finance a change of control offer after a change of control until our subsidiaries have repaid in full their debt under our subsidiary credit facility. If we fail to repurchase the notes upon a change of control, we will be in default under the indenture governing the notes and the indenture governing our existing senior notes. Any future debt that we incur may also contain restrictions on repurchases in the event of a change of control or similar event. These repurchase requirements may delay or make it harder to obtain control of our company.

The change of control provisions may not protect you in a transaction in which we incur a large amount of debt, including a reorganization, restructuring, merger or other similar transaction, because that kind of transaction may not involve any shift in voting power or beneficial ownership, or may not involve a shift large enough to trigger a change of control.

YOU SHOULD NOT EXPECT MEDIACOM BROADBAND CORPORATION TO PARTICIPATE IN MAKING PAYMENTS ON THE NOTES.

Mediacom Broadband Corporation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Mediacom Broadband LLC that was incorporated to accommodate the issuance of the existing senior notes by Mediacom Broadband LLC. Mediacom Broadband Corporation has no operations, revenues or cash flows and has no assets, liabilities or stockholders' equity on its balance sheet, other than a one-hundred dollar receivable from an affiliate and the same dollar amount of common stock on its consolidated balance sheets. You should not expect Mediacom Broadband Corporation to participate in servicing the interest or principal obligations on the notes.

THE CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF OUR MANAGER HAS THE ABILITY TO CONTROL ALL MAJOR CORPORATE DECISIONS, WHICH COULD INHIBIT OR PREVENT A CHANGE OF CONTROL OR CHANGE IN MANAGEMENT.

We are a wholly-owned subsidiary of our manager, Mediacom Communications. Rocco B. Comisso, Mediacom Communications' Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, controls approximately 76.1% of the combined voting power of Mediacom Communications' common stock. As a result, Mr. Comisso will generally have the ability to control the outcome of all matters

requiring stockholder approval, including the election of its entire board of directors, the approval of any merger or consolidation and the sale of all or substantially all of its assets.

AN ACTIVE LIQUID TRADING MARKET FOR THE NOTES MAY NOT DEVELOP.

Prior to this offering, there has been no public market for the notes. The notes are a new class of securities which have never been traded. We have applied to have the notes designated as eligible for trading in The PORTAL Market. However, we cannot assure you that the notes will be so designated for trading in The PORTAL Market at the time the notes are delivered to purchasers or at any other time. Each of the initial purchasers has informed us that it intends to make a market in the notes. However, none of them are obligated to do so, and any or all of them may discontinue such market making at any time without notice. Moreover, the initial purchasers' market making activities will be subject to limits imposed by the Securities Act or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the pendency of any exchange offer described under "Exchange Offer and Registration Rights Agreement." There can be no assurance that an active trading market for the notes will develop, or if one does develop, that it will be sustained.

Historically, the market for non-investment grade debt has been highly volatile in terms of price. It is possible that the market for the notes and the exchange notes will also be volatile. This volatility in price may affect your ability to resell your notes or exchange notes or the timing of their sale.

THERE ARE RESTRICTIONS ON RESALE OF THE NOTES.

The notes have not been registered under the Securities Act or any state securities laws, and may not be offered or sold except pursuant to an exemption from the registration requirements of the Securities Act and applicable state securities laws, or pursuant to an effective registration statement. We have agreed to commence a registered exchange offer for the notes or to register resales of the notes under the Securities Act, but no assurances can be given that such a registration will be completed or that any trading market will develop thereafter. See "Description of the Notes," "Exchange Offer and Registration Rights Agreement" and "Notice to Investors."

BUSINESS

The section entitled "Business--Competition" in Part I, Item I of the 2004 Annual Report is updated by adding as a new second paragraph thereof the following:

We also face growing competition from municipal entities that construct facilities and provide cable television, HSD, telephony and/or other related services. In addition to hard-wired facilities, some municipal entities are exploring building wireless fidelity networks to deliver these services. In Iowa, our largest market, an organization named Opportunity Iowa, is actively encouraging Iowa municipalities to construct facilities that could be used to provide services that compete with the services we offer.

The section entitled "Business--Competition--Telephone Companies" in Part I, Item I of the 2004 Annual Report is updated and modified in its entirety with the following:

TELEPHONE COMPANIES

The 1996 Telecom Act eliminated many restrictions on the ability of local telephone companies to offer video programming. In addition to their joint-marketing alliances with DBS service providers, certain local telephone companies have recently announced that they are now constructing new fiber networks to replace their existing networks, which will enhance their ability to offer video services in addition to improved voice and high speed data services. If these and other telephone companies decide to rebuild their networks in our markets and offer video services they will compete with us and other video providers, which includes DBS service providers.

Local telephone companies may have a number of different ways to enter the video programming business, some of which do not require obtaining a local franchise. Local telephone companies and other potential competitors have the ability to certify their competing video service as an "open video" system. Open video system operators are not subject to certain requirements imposed by the 1984 Cable Act upon more traditional cable operators. Legislation recently passed in one state (in which we do not currently operate cable systems) and similar legislation is pending or has been proposed in certain other states and in Congress that could allow local telephone companies to deliver services that would compete with our cable service without obtaining equivalent local franchises.

The section entitled "Business--Competition--High Speed Data" in Part I, Item I of the 2004 Annual Report is updated and modified in its entirety with the following:

HIGH SPEED DATA

We offer HSD, or cable modem service, in many of our cable systems. Our cable modem service competes mainly with the high-speed Internet access services offered by local and long distance telephone companies. These competitors have substantial resources.

DSL services offered by telephone companies provide Internet access at data transmission speeds greater than that of standard telephone line or "dial-up" modems, putting DSL service in direct competition with our cable modem service. Telephone companies that have made the necessary plant investment have introduced DSL services in many of our markets, however, we believe their serviceable areas currently do not match our network reach in those markets. The FCC has an ongoing rulemaking proceeding that may materially reduce existing regulation of DSL service, essentially freeing such service from traditional telecommunications regulation.

Federal legislation or judicial decisions may also reduce regulation of Internet services offered by incumbent telephone companies.

As discussed above, certain major telephone companies are currently constructing new fiber networks. These companies have indicated that this will create a new platform that will allow them to offer significantly faster high-speed data services compared to the offerings available under current DSL technology.

DBS service providers are currently offering two alternatives of satellite-delivered high-speed data. The first is a one-way service that utilizes a telephone return path, in contrast to our two-way, high-speed service, which does not require a telephone line. The other alternative is a two-way, high-speed service, which requires additional equipment purchases by the customer and is offered at higher prices than our own equivalent service. Due to these differences we believe our high-speed data service is superior to the satellite-delivered service.

Some Internet service providers, or ISPs offer dial-up Internet access service over standard telephone lines in our markets. Dial-up service operates at much lower speeds than cable modem service and is therefore not competitive with our high-speed data service. A number of these ISPs have asked local authorities and the FCC to give them rights of access to cable systems' broadband infrastructure so that they can deliver their services directly to cable systems' customers. This kind of access is often called "open access". Many local franchising authorities have examined the issue of open access and a few have required cable operators to provide such access. Several Federal courts have ruled that localities are not authorized to require open access. The FCC has classified cable modem service as an "information service," not as a "telecommunications service." As an information service, the FCC has held that cable systems are not required to open their networks for use by others to provide ISP services. Although the United States Supreme Court recently held that cable modem service was properly classified by the FCC as an "information service," freeing it from regulation as a "telecommunications service," it recognized that the FCC has jurisdiction to impose regulatory obligations on facilities based Internet Service Providers. The FCC has an ongoing rulemaking to determine whether to impose regulatory obligations on such providers, including us. While we cannot predict the outcome of this proceeding, we do note that the FCC recently removed the requirement that telecommunications carriers provide access to competitors to resell their DSL Internet access service citing the need for competitive parity with cable modem service which has no similar access requirement. If we were required to provide open access to ISPs as a result of FCC action, other companies could use our cable system infrastructure to offer Internet services competitive with our own.

Certain telecommunications companies are seeking to provide high-speed broadband services, including interactive online services, using wireless technologies that may transcend present service boundaries and avoid certain regulatory restrictions. Moreover, some electric utilities have announced plans to deliver broadband services over their electrical distribution networks. The FCC has an on-going rulemaking which, to date, appears limited to basic regulations to avoid technical interference with existing services. If electric utilities provide broadband services over their existing electrical distribution networks, they could become formidable competitors given their resources.

LEGISLATION AND REGULATION

The section entitled "Business--Legislation and Regulation" in Part I, Item I of the 2004 Annual Report is updated and modified in its entirety with the following:

GENERAL

Federal, state and local laws regulate the development and operation of cable communications systems. In the following paragraphs, we summarize the federal laws and regulations materially affecting us and other cable operators and the level of competition that we face. We also provide a brief description of certain relevant state and local laws. Currently few laws or regulations apply to Internet services. Existing federal, state and local laws and regulations and state and local franchise requirements are currently the subject of judicial proceedings, legislative hearings and administrative proceedings that could change, in varying degrees, the manner in which cable systems operate. Neither the outcome of these proceedings nor their impact upon the cable industry or our business or operations can be predicted at this time.

FEDERAL REGULATION

The principal federal statutes governing the cable industry, the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 and the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (collectively, the "Cable Act"), establish the federal regulatory framework for the industry. The Cable Act allocates principal responsibility for enforcing the federal policies among the Federal Communications Commission, or FCC and state and local governmental authorities.

The Cable Act and the regulations and policies of the FCC affect significant aspects of our cable system operations, including:

- subscriber rates;
- the content of the programming we offer to subscribers, as well as the way we sell our program packages to subscribers;
- the use of our cable systems by the local franchising authorities, the public and other unrelated companies;
- our franchise agreements with local governmental authorities;
- cable system ownership limitations and prohibitions; and
- our use of utility poles and conduit.

The FCC and some state regulatory agencies regularly conduct administrative proceedings to adopt or amend regulations implementing the statutory mandate of the Cable Act. At various times, interested parties to these administrative proceedings challenge the new or amended regulations and policies in the courts with varying levels of success. Further court actions and regulatory proceedings may occur that might affect the rights and obligations of various parties under the Cable Act. The results of these judicial and administrative proceedings may materially affect the cable industry and our business and operations.

SUBSCRIBER RATES

The Cable Act and the FCC's regulations and policies limit the ability of cable systems to raise rates for basic services and customer equipment. No other rates are subject to regulation. Federal law exempts cable systems from all rate regulation in communities that are subject to effective competition, as defined by federal law and where affirmatively declared by the FCC. Federal law defines effective competition as existing in a variety of circumstances that historically were rarely satisfied but are increasingly likely to be satisfied with the recent increase in DBS penetration and the announced plans of some local phone companies to offer comparable video service. Although the FCC is conducting a proceeding that may streamline the process for obtaining effective competition determinations, neither the outcome of this proceeding nor its impact upon the cable industry or our business or operations can be predicted at this time.

Where there is no effective competition to the cable operator's services, federal law gives local franchising authorities the ability to regulate the rates charged by the operator for:

- the lowest level of programming service offered by the cable operator, typically called basic service, which includes, at a minimum, the local broadcast channels and any public access or governmental channels that are required by the operator's franchise;
- the installation of cable service and related service calls; and
- the installation, sale and lease of equipment used by subscribers to receive basic service, such as converter boxes and remote control units.

Local franchising authorities who wish to regulate basic service rates and related equipment rates must first affirmatively seek and obtain FCC certification to regulate by following a simplified FCC certification process and agreeing to follow established FCC rules and policies when regulating the cable operator's rates. Currently, the majority of the communities we serve have not sought such certification to regulate our rates.

Several years ago, the FCC adopted detailed rate regulations, guidelines and rate forms that a cable operator and the local franchising authority must use in connection with the regulation of basic service and equipment rates. The FCC adopted a benchmark methodology as the principal method of regulating rates. However, if this methodology produces unacceptable rates, the operator may also justify rates using either a detailed cost-of-service methodology or an add-on to the benchmark rate based on the additional capital cost and certain operating expenses resulting from qualifying upgrades to the cable plant. The Cable Act and FCC rules also allow franchising authorities to regulate equipment rates on the basis of actual cost plus a reasonable profit, as defined by the FCC.

If the local franchising authority concludes that a cable operator's rates are too high under the FCC's rate rules, the local franchising authority may require the cable operator to reduce rates and to refund overcharges to subscribers, with interest. The cable operator may appeal adverse local rate decisions to the FCC.

The FCC's regulations allow a cable operator to modify regulated rates on a quarterly or annual basis to account for changes in:

- the number of regulated channels;
- inflation; and

- certain external costs, such as franchise and other governmental fees, copyright and retransmission consent fees, taxes, programming fees and franchise-imposed obligations.

The Cable Act and/or the FCC's regulations also:

- require cable operators to charge uniform rates throughout each franchise area that is not subject to effective competition;
- prohibit regulation of non-predatory bulk discount rates offered by cable operators to subscribers in multiple dwelling units; and
- permit regulated equipment rates to be computed by aggregating costs of broad categories of equipment at the franchise, system, regional or company level.

The FCC recently conducted an inquiry into the advisability of mandating the a la carte offering of programming, as opposed to the cable industry's practice of packaging numerous channels into tiers. Although the FCC recommended against an a la carte mandate, it is possible that in the future rate regulation on the cable industry could be expanded to include new restrictions on the retail pricing or packaging of cable programming. Such restrictions could adversely impact our business.

CONTENT REQUIREMENTS

MUST CARRY AND RETRANSMISSION CONSENT

The FCC's regulations contain broadcast signal carriage requirements that allow local commercial television broadcast stations to elect once every three years whether to require a cable system:

- to carry the station, subject to certain exceptions; or
- to negotiate the terms by which the cable system may carry the station on its cable systems, commonly called retransmission consent.

The Cable Act and the FCC's regulations require a cable operator to devote up to one-third of its activated channel capacity for the carriage of local commercial television stations. The Cable Act and the FCC's rules also give certain local non-commercial, educational television stations mandatory carriage rights, but not the option to negotiate retransmission consent. Additionally, cable systems must obtain retransmission consent for carriage of:

- all distant commercial television stations, except for certain commercial satellite-delivered independent superstations such as WGN;
- commercial radio stations; and
- certain low-power television stations.

Under legislation enacted in 1999, Congress barred broadcasters from entering into exclusive retransmission consent agreements (through 2006) and required that broadcasters negotiate retransmission consent agreements in "good faith." In November 2004, Congress extended the ban on exclusive retransmission consent agreements to cover all multi-channel video programming distributors, including cable operators.

The FCC has opened an inquiry into the impact on competition in the multichannel video programming distribution market of the Cable Act's provisions and the FCC's rules on retransmission consent, network nonduplication, syndicated exclusivity and sports blackouts.

The FCC's inquiry will form the basis for a report to Congress mandated by the Satellite Home Viewer Extension and Reauthorization Act of 2004 ("SHVERA"), which is due September 8, 2005. Neither the outcome of this proceeding nor its impact upon subsequent legislation, FCC regulations or the cable industry or our business or operations can be predicted at this time.

Recently, the FCC imposed "reciprocal" good faith retransmission consent negotiation obligations on cable operators. These rules identify seven types of conduct that would constitute "per se" violations of the new requirements. Thus, even though we may have no interest in carrying a particular broadcaster's programming, we may be required under the new rules to engage in negotiations within the parameters of the FCC's rules. While noting that the parties in retransmission consent negotiations were now subject to a "heightened duty of negotiation," the FCC emphasized that failure to ultimately reach an agreement is not a violation of the rules. The impact of these rules on our business cannot be determined at this time.

Must-carry obligations may decrease the attractiveness of the cable operator's overall programming offerings by including less popular programming on the channel line-up, while cable operators may need to provide some form of consideration to broadcasters to obtain retransmission consent to carry more popular programming. We carry both broadcast stations based on must-carry obligations and others that have granted retransmission consent.

The FCC has issued a decision that effectively requires mandatory carriage of local television stations that surrender their analog channel and broadcast only digital signals. These stations are entitled to request carriage in their choice of digital or converted analog format. Stations transmitting in both digital and analog formats ("Dual Format Broadcast Stations"), which is permitted during the current several-year transition period, have no carriage rights for the digital format during the transition unless and until they turn in their analog channel. The FCC has recently reaffirmed that cable operators are not required to carry the digital signal of Dual Format Broadcast Stations that currently have must-carry rights for their analog signals, however, changes in the composition of the Commission as well as proposals currently under consideration could result in an obligation to carry both the analog and digital version of local broadcast stations or to carry multiple digital program streams. In addition to rejecting a "dual carriage" requirement during the transition, the FCC also confirmed that a cable operator need only carry a broadcaster's "primary video" service (rather than all of the digital "multi-cast" services), both during and after the transition. In addition, in November 2004, Congress passed a non-binding resolution urging that legislation be considered in 2005 that would set a firm date for the broadcasters to return their analog spectrum. The adoption, by legislation or FCC regulation, of additional must-carry requirements would have a negative impact on us because it would reduce available channel capacity and thereby could require us to either discontinue other channels of programming or restrict our ability to carry new channels of programming that may be more desirable to our customers.

TIER BUY THROUGH

The Cable Act and the FCC's regulations require our cable systems, other than those systems which are subject to effective competition, to permit subscribers to purchase video programming we offer on a per channel or a per program basis without the necessity of subscribing to any tier of service other than the basic service tier.

The FCC has opened a matter with respect to another cable operator to determine whether certain charges routinely assessed by many cable operators, including us, to obtain access to

digital services, violate this "anti-buy-through" provision. An adverse decision that could require us to restructure or eliminate such charges would have an adverse effect on our business.

PROGRAM ACCESS

To increase competition between cable operators and other video program distributors, the Cable Act and the FCC's regulations:

- preclude any satellite video programmer affiliated with a cable company, or with a common carrier providing video programming directly to its subscribers, from favoring an affiliated company over competitors;
- require such programmers to sell their programming to other unaffiliated video program distributors; and
- limit the ability of such programmers to offer exclusive programming arrangements to their related parties.

OTHER PROGRAMMING

Federal law actively regulates other aspects of our programming, involving such areas as:

- our use of syndicated and network programs and local sports broadcast programming;
- advertising in children's programming;
- political advertising;
- origination cablecasting;
- adult programming;
- sponsorship identification; and
- closed captioning of video programming.

USE OF OUR CABLE SYSTEMS BY THE GOVERNMENT AND UNRELATED THIRD PARTIES

The Cable Act allows local franchising authorities and unrelated third parties to obtain access to a portion of our cable systems' channel capacity for their own use. For example, the Cable Act:

- permits franchising authorities to require cable operators to set aside channels for public, educational and governmental access programming; and
- requires a cable system with 36 or more activated channels to designate a significant portion of its channel capacity for commercial leased access by third parties to provide programming that may compete with services offered by the cable operator.

The FCC regulates various aspects of third party commercial use of channel capacity on our cable systems, including:

- the maximum reasonable rate a cable operator may charge for third party commercial use of the designated channel capacity;
- the terms and conditions for commercial use of such channels; and

- the procedures for the expedited resolution of disputes concerning rates or commercial use of the designated channel capacity.

FRANCHISE MATTERS

We have non-exclusive franchises in virtually every community in which we operate that authorize us to construct, operate and maintain our cable systems. Although franchising matters are normally regulated at the local level through a franchise agreement and/or a local ordinance, the Cable Act provides oversight and guidelines to govern our relationship with local franchising authorities.

For example, the Cable Act and/or FCC regulations and determinations:

Provide guidelines for the exercise of local regulatory authority that:

- affirm the right of franchising authorities, which may be state or local, depending on the practice in individual states, to award one or more franchises within their jurisdictions;
- generally prohibit us from operating in communities without a franchise;
- permit local authorities, when granting or renewing our franchises, to establish requirements for cable-related facilities and equipment, but prohibit franchising authorities from establishing requirements for specific video programming or information services other than in broad categories; and
- permit us to obtain modification of our franchise requirements from the franchise authority or by judicial action if warranted by commercial impracticability.

Generally prohibit franchising authorities from:

- imposing requirements during the initial cable franchising process or during franchise renewal that require, prohibit or restrict us from providing telecommunications services;
- imposing franchise fees on revenues we derive from providing telecommunications or information services over our cable systems;
- restricting our use of any type of subscriber equipment or transmission technology; and
- requiring payment of franchise fees to the local franchising authority in excess of 5.0% of our gross revenues derived from providing cable services over our cable system.

Encourage competition with existing cable systems by:

- allowing municipalities to operate their own cable systems without franchises; and
- preventing franchising authorities from granting exclusive franchises or from unreasonably refusing to award additional franchises covering an existing cable system's service area.

Provide renewal procedures:

- The Cable Act contains renewal procedures designed to protect us against arbitrary denials of renewal of our franchises although, under certain circumstances, the franchising authority could deny us a franchise renewal. Moreover, even if our franchise is renewed, the franchising authority may seek to impose upon us new and more onerous requirements, such as significant upgrades in facilities and services or increased franchise fees as a condition of renewal to the extent permitted by law. Similarly, if a franchising authority's consent is required for the purchase or sale of our cable system or franchise, the franchising authority

may attempt to impose more burdensome or onerous franchise requirements on the purchaser in connection with a request for such consent. Historically, cable operators providing satisfactory services to their subscribers and complying with the terms of their franchises have almost always obtained franchise renewals. We believe that we have generally met the terms of our franchises and have provided quality levels of service. We anticipate that our future franchise renewal prospects generally will be favorable.

- Various courts have considered whether franchising authorities have the legal right to limit the number of franchises awarded within a community and to impose substantive franchise requirements. These decisions have been inconsistent and, until the U.S. Supreme Court rules definitively on the scope of cable operators' First Amendment protections, the legality of the franchising process generally and of various specific franchise requirements is likely to be in a state of flux.

The Cable Act and the FCC allow cable operators to pass franchise fees on to subscribers and to separately itemize them on subscriber bills. In 2003 an appellate court affirmed an FCC ruling that franchise fees paid by cable operators on non-subscriber related revenue (such as cable advertising revenue and home shopping commissions) may be passed through to subscribers and itemized on subscriber bills regardless of the source of the revenues on which they were assessed.

In connection with its decision in March 2002 classifying high-speed Internet services provided over a cable system as interstate information services, the FCC stated that revenues derived from cable operators' Internet services should not be included in the revenue base from which franchise fees are calculated. Although the United States Supreme Court recently held that cable modem service was properly classified by the FCC as an "information service," freeing it from regulation as a "telecommunications service," it recognized that the FCC has jurisdiction to impose regulatory obligations on facilities based Internet Service Providers. The FCC has an ongoing rulemaking to determine whether to impose regulatory obligations on such providers, including us. Because of the FCC's decision, we are no longer collecting and remitting franchise fees on our high-speed Internet service revenues. We are unable to predict the ultimate resolution of these matters but do not expect that any additional franchise fees we may be required to pay will be material to our business and operations.

OWNERSHIP LIMITATIONS

The FCC previously adopted nationwide limits on the number of subscribers under the control of a cable operator and on the number of channels which can be occupied on a cable system by video programming in which the cable operator has an interest. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit overturned the FCC's rules implementing these statutory provisions and remanded the case to the FCC for further proceedings.

The 1996 amendments to the Cable Act eliminated the statutory prohibition on the common ownership, operation or control of a cable system and a television broadcast station in the same service area. The identical FCC regulation has been invalidated by a federal appellate court. The FCC has eliminated its regulatory restriction on cross-ownership of cable systems and national broadcasting networks.

The 1996 amendments to the Cable Act made far-reaching changes in the relationship between local telephone companies and cable service providers. These amendments:

- eliminated federal legal barriers to competition in the local telephone and cable communications businesses, including allowing local telephone companies to offer video services in their local telephone service areas;
- preempted legal barriers to telecommunications competition that previously existed in state and local laws and regulations;
- set basic standards for relationships between telecommunications providers; and
- generally limited acquisitions and prohibited joint ventures between local telephone companies and cable operators in the same market.

Pursuant to these changes in federal law, local telephone companies may now provide service as traditional cable operators with local franchises or they may opt to provide their programming over open video systems, subject to certain conditions, including, but not limited to, setting aside a portion of their channel capacity for use by unaffiliated program distributors on a non-discriminatory basis. Open video systems are exempt from certain regulatory obligations that currently apply to cable operators. The decision as to whether an operator of an open video system must obtain a local franchise is left to each community.

The 1996 amendments to the Cable Act allow registered utility holding companies and subsidiaries to provide telecommunications services, including cable television, notwithstanding the Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended. In 2004, the FCC adopted rules: 1) that affirmed the ability of electric service providers to provide broadband Internet access services over their distribution systems; and 2) that seek to avoid interference with existing services. Electric utilities could be formidable competitors to cable system operators.

Legislation was recently passed in one state (in which we do not currently operate cable systems) and similar legislation is pending or has been proposed in certain other states and in Congress to allow local telephone companies to deliver services would compete with our cable service without obtaining equivalent local franchises. Such a legislatively granted advantage to our competitors could adversely affect our business. The effect of such initiatives, if any, on our obligation to obtain local franchises in the future or on any of our existing franchises, many of which have years remaining in their terms, cannot be predicted.

The Cable Act generally prohibits us from owning or operating a satellite master antenna television system or multichannel multipoint distribution system in any area where we provide franchised cable service and do not have effective competition, as defined by federal law. We may, however, acquire and operate a satellite master antenna television system in our existing franchise service areas if the programming and other services provided to the satellite master antenna television system subscribers are offered according to the terms and conditions of our local franchise agreement.

CABLE EQUIPMENT

The Cable Act and FCC regulations seek to promote competition in the delivery of cable equipment by giving consumers the right to purchase set-top converters from third parties as long as the equipment does not harm the network, does not interfere with services purchased by other customers and is not used to receive unauthorized services. Over a multi-year phase-in period, the rules also require multichannel video programming distributors, other than direct

broadcast satellite operators, to separate security from non-security functions in set-top converters to allow third party vendors to provide set-tops with basic converter functions. Beginning July 1, 2007 cable operators will be prohibited from leasing digital set-top terminals that integrate security and basic navigation functions.

To promote compatibility of cable television systems and consumer electronics equipment the FCC recently adopted rules implementing "plug and play" specifications for one-way digital televisions. The rules require cable operators to provide "CableCard" security modules and support for digital televisions equipped with built-in set-top functionality.

POLE ATTACHMENT REGULATION

The Cable Act requires certain public utilities, defined to include all local telephone companies and electric utilities except those owned by municipalities and co-operatives, to provide cable operators and telecommunications carriers with nondiscriminatory access to poles, ducts, conduit and rights-of-way at just and reasonable rates. This right to access is beneficial to us. Federal law also requires the FCC to regulate the rates, terms and conditions imposed by such public utilities for cable systems' use of utility pole and conduit space unless state authorities have demonstrated to the FCC that they adequately regulate pole attachment rates, as is the case in certain states in which we operate. In the absence of state regulation, the FCC will regulate pole attachment rates, terms and conditions only in response to a formal complaint. The FCC adopted a new rate formula that became effective in 2001 which governs the maximum rate certain utilities may charge for attachments to their poles and conduit by companies providing telecommunications services, including cable operators.

Increases in attachment rates due to the FCC's new rate formula are phased in over a five-year period in equal annual increments, beginning in February 2001. This new formula will result in higher attachment rates than at present, but they will apply only to cable television systems which elect to offer telecommunications services. The FCC ruled that the provision of Internet services will not, in and of itself, trigger use of the new formula. The Supreme Court affirmed this decision and also held that the FCC's authority to regulate rates for attachments to utility poles extended to attachments by cable operators and telecommunications carriers that are used to provide Internet service or for wireless telecommunications service. The recent Supreme Court decision upholding the FCC's classification of cable modem service as an information service, should strengthen our ability to resist such rate increases based solely on the delivery of cable modem services over our cable systems. As we continue our deployment of cable telephony and certain other advanced services, utilities may continue to invoke the higher rates.

OTHER REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS OF THE CABLE ACT AND THE FCC

The FCC has adopted cable inside wiring rules to provide a more specific procedure for the disposition of residential home wiring and internal building wiring that belongs to an incumbent cable operator that is forced by the building owner to terminate its cable services in a building with multiple dwelling units.

The Cable Act and/or FCC rules include provisions, among others, regulating other parts of our cable operations, involving such areas as:

- equal employment opportunity;
- consumer protection and customer service;

- technical standards and testing of cable facilities;
- consumer electronics equipment compatibility;
- registration of cable systems;
- maintenance of various records and public inspection files;
- microwave frequency usage; and
- antenna structure notification, marking and lighting.

The FCC may enforce its regulations through the imposition of fines, the issuance of cease and desist orders or the imposition of other administrative sanctions, such as the revocation of FCC licenses needed to operate transmission facilities often used in connection with cable operations. The FCC routinely conducts rulemaking proceedings that may change its existing rules or lead to new regulations. We are unable to predict the impact that any further FCC rule changes may have on our business and operations.

COPYRIGHT

Our cable systems typically include in their channel line-ups local and distant television and radio broadcast signals, which are protected by the copyright laws. We generally do not obtain a license to use this programming directly from the owners of the programming, but instead comply with an alternative federal compulsory copyright licensing process. In exchange for filing certain reports and contributing a percentage of our revenues to a federal copyright royalty pool, we obtain blanket permission to retransmit the copyrighted material carried on these broadcast signals. The nature and amount of future copyright payments for broadcast signal carriage cannot be predicted at this time.

In a report to Congress, the U.S. Copyright Office recommended that Congress make major revisions to both the cable television and satellite compulsory licenses. In 1999, Congress modified the satellite compulsory license in a manner that permits DBS service providers to become more competitive with cable operators. Congress recently adopted legislation extending this authority through 2009. The possible simplification, modification or elimination of the cable communications compulsory copyright license is the subject of continuing legislative review. The elimination or substantial modification of the cable compulsory license could adversely affect our ability to obtain suitable programming and could substantially increase the cost of programming that remains available for distribution to our subscribers. We are unable to predict the outcome of this legislative activity related to either the cable compulsory license or the right of direct broadcast satellite providers to deliver local broadcast signals.

Two recently filed petitions for rulemaking with the United States Copyright Office propose revisions to certain compulsory copyright license reporting requirements and seek clarification of certain issues relating to the application of the compulsory license to the carriage of digital broadcast stations. The petitions seek, among other things: (1) clarification of the inclusion in gross revenues of digital converter fees, additional set fees for digital service and revenue from required "buy throughs" to obtain digital service; (2) reporting of "dual carriage" and multicast signals; and (3) revisions to the Copyright Office's rules and Statement of Account forms, including increased detail regarding services, rates and subscribers, additional information regarding non-broadcast tiers of service, cable headend location information, community definition clarification and identification of the county in which the cable community is located

and the effect of interest payments on potential liability for late filing. We understand that the Copyright Office intends to open one or more rulemakings in response to these petitions. We cannot predict the outcome of such rulemakings, however, it is possible that certain changes in the rules or copyright compulsory license fee computations could have an adverse affect on our business by increasing our copyright compulsory license fee costs or by causing us to reduce or discontinue carriage of certain broadcast signals that we currently carry on a discretionary basis.

Copyrighted material in programming supplied to cable television systems by pay cable networks and basic cable networks is licensed by the networks through private agreements with the copyright owners. These entities generally offer through to-the-viewer licenses to the cable networks that cover the retransmission of the cable networks' programming by cable television systems to their customers.

Our cable systems also utilize music in other programming and advertising that we provide to subscribers. The rights to use this music are controlled by various music performing rights organizations from which performance licenses must be obtained. Cable industry representatives negotiated standard license agreements with the largest music performing rights organizations covering locally originated programming, including advertising inserted by the cable operator in programming produced by other parties. These standard agreements require the payment of music license fees for earlier time periods, but such license fees have not had a significant impact on our business and operations.

INTERACTIVE TELEVISION

The FCC has issued a Notice of Inquiry covering a wide range of issues relating to interactive television ("ITV"). Examples of ITV services are interactive electronic program guides and access to a graphic interface that provides supplementary information related to the video display. In the near term, cable systems are likely to be the platform of choice for the distribution of ITV services. The FCC posed a series of questions including the definition of ITV, the potential for discrimination by cable systems in favor of affiliated ITV providers, enforcement mechanisms, and the proper regulatory classification of ITV service.

PRIVACY

The Cable Act imposes a number of restrictions on the manner in which cable television operators can collect, disclose and retain data about individual system customers and requires cable operators to take such actions as necessary to prevent unauthorized access to such information. The statute also requires that the system operator periodically provide all customers with written information about its policies including the types of information collected; the use of such information; the nature, frequency and purpose of any disclosures; the period of retention; the times and places where a customer may have access to such information; the limitations placed on the cable operator by the Cable Act; and a customer's enforcement rights. In the event that a cable television operator is found to have violated the customer privacy provisions of the Cable Act, it could be required to pay damages, attorneys' fees and other costs. Certain of these Cable Act requirements have been modified by certain more recent federal laws. Other federal laws currently impact the circumstances and the manner in which we disclose certain customer information and future federal legislation may further impact our obligations. In addition, some states in which we operate have also enacted customer privacy statutes that are in some cases more restrictive than those in federal law.

CABLE MODEM SERVICE

There are currently few laws or regulations that specifically regulate communications or commerce over the Internet. Section 230 of the Communications Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to promote the continued development of the Internet and other interactive computer services and interactive media, and to preserve the vibrant and competitive free market that presently exists for the Internet and other interactive computer services, unfettered by federal or state regulation. One area in which Congress did attempt to regulate content over the Internet involved the dissemination of obscene or indecent materials.

The Digital Millennium Copyright Act is intended to reduce the liability of online service providers for listing or linking to third-party Websites that include materials that infringe copyrights or other rights or if customers use the service to publish or disseminate infringing materials. The Children's Online Protection Act and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act are intended to restrict the distribution of certain materials deemed harmful to children and impose additional restrictions on the ability of online services to collect user information from minors. In addition, the Protection of Children From Sexual Predators Act of 1998 requires online service providers to report evidence of violations of federal child pornography laws under certain circumstances.

A number of ISPs have asked local authorities and the FCC to give them rights of access to cable systems' broadband infrastructure so that they can deliver their services directly to cable systems' customers, which is often called "open access". Many local franchising authorities have examined the issue of open access and a few have required cable operators to provide such access, although several federal courts have ruled that localities are not authorized to require open access. The FCC, in connection with its review of the AOL-Time Warner merger, imposed, together with the Federal Trade Commission, limited multiple access and other requirements related to the merged company's Internet and Instant Messaging platforms.

In March of 2002, the FCC announced that it was classifying Internet access service provided through cable modems as an interstate information service, a classification that is currently under review by the United States Supreme Court. At the same time, the FCC initiated a rulemaking proceeding designed to address a number of issues resulting from this regulatory classification, including the following:

- the FCC confirmed that there is no current legal requirement for cable operators to grant open access now that cable modem service is classified as an information service. The FCC is considering, however, whether it has the authority to impose open access requirements and, if so, whether it should do so, or whether to permit local authorities to impose such a requirement.
- the FCC found that cable modem service is an information service, not a cable service, which has resulted in several court rulings that local franchise authorities may not collect franchise fees on cable modem service revenues under existing laws and regulations.
- the FCC concluded that federal law does not permit local franchise authorities to impose additional franchise requirements on cable modem service. It is considering, however, whether local franchise authorities nonetheless have the authority to impose restrictions, requirements or fees because cable modem service is delivered over cable using public rights of way.
- the FCC is considering whether cable operators providing cable modem service should be required to contribute to a "universal service fund" designed to support making service

available to all consumers, including those in low income, rural and high-cost areas at rates that are reasonably comparable to those charged in urban areas.

- the FCC is considering whether it should take steps to ensure that the regulatory burdens on cable systems providing cable modem service are comparable to those of other providers of Internet access service, such as telephone companies. One method of achieving comparability would be to make cable operators subject to some of the regulations that do not now apply to them, but are applicable to telephone companies.

Challenges to the FCC's classification of cable Internet access service as an information service and not a cable service or a telecommunications service have been filed in federal court. Although the United States Supreme Court recently held that cable modem service was properly classified by the FCC as an "information service," freeing it from regulation as a "telecommunications service," it recognized that the FCC has jurisdiction to impose regulatory obligations on facilities based Internet Service Providers. The FCC has an ongoing rulemaking to determine whether to impose regulatory obligations on such providers, including us. The adoption of new rules by the FCC could impose additional costs and regulatory burdens on us, reduce our anticipated revenues or increase our anticipated costs for this service, complicate the franchise renewal process, result in greater competition or otherwise adversely affect our business. While we cannot predict the outcome of this proceeding, we do note that the FCC recently removed the requirement that telecommunications carriers provide access to competitors to resell their DSL Internet access service citing the need for competitive parity with cable modem service which has no similar access requirement. Any such requirements could adversely affect our results of operations.

VOICE-OVER-INTERNET PROTOCOL TELEPHONY

The 1996 amendments to the Cable Act created a more favorable regulatory environment for cable operators to enter the phone business. Currently, numerous cable operators are exploring, planning or have commenced offering Voice-over-Internet-Protocol ("VoIP") telephony as a competitive alternative to traditional circuit-switched telephone service. Various states, including states where we operate, have adopted or are considering differing regulatory treatment, ranging from minimal or no regulation to full-blown common carrier status. As part of the proceeding to determine any appropriate regulatory obligations for VoIP telephony, the FCC recently decided that alternative voice technologies, like certain types of VoIP telephony, should be regulated only at the federal level, rather than by individual states. Many implementation details remain unresolved, and there are substantial regulatory changes being considered that could either benefit or harm VoIP telephony as a business operation. While the final outcome of the FCC proceedings cannot be predicted, it is generally believed that the FCC favors a "light touch" regulatory approach for VoIP telephony, which might include preemption of certain state or local regulation.

STATE AND LOCAL REGULATION

Our cable systems use local streets and rights-of-way. Consequently, we must comply with state and local regulation, which is typically imposed through the franchising process. Our cable systems generally are operated in accordance with non-exclusive franchises, permits or licenses granted by a municipality or other state or local government entity. Our franchises generally are granted for fixed terms and in many cases are terminable if we fail to comply with material

provisions. The terms and conditions of our franchises vary materially from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Each franchise generally contains provisions governing:

- franchise fees;
- franchise term;
- system construction and maintenance obligations;
- system channel capacity;
- design and technical performance;
- customer service standards;
- sale or transfer of the franchise;
- territory of the franchise;
- indemnification of the franchising authority;
- use and occupancy of public streets; and
- types of cable services provided.

In the process of renewing franchises, a franchising authority may seek to impose new and more onerous requirements, such as upgraded facilities, increased channel capacity or enhanced services, although protections available under the Cable Act require the municipality to take into account the cost of meeting such requirements. The Cable Act also contains renewal procedures and criteria designed to protect incumbent franchisees against arbitrary denials of renewal.

A number of states subject cable systems to the jurisdiction of centralized state governmental agencies, some of which impose regulation of a character similar to that of a public utility. Attempts in other states to regulate cable systems are continuing and can be expected to increase. To date, other than Delaware, no state in which we operate has enacted such state-level regulation. State and local franchising jurisdiction is not unlimited; it must be exercised consistent with federal law. The Cable Act immunizes franchising authorities from most monetary damage awards arising from regulation of cable systems or decisions made on franchise grants, renewals, transfers and amendments.

Legislation was recently passed in one state (in which we do not currently operate cable systems) and similar legislation is pending or has been proposed in certain other states and in Congress to allow local telephone companies to deliver services that would compete with our cable service without obtaining equivalent local franchises. Such a legislatively granted advantage to our competitors could adversely affect our business. The effect of such initiatives, if any, on our obligation to obtain local franchises in the future or on any of our existing franchises, many of which have years remaining in their terms, cannot be predicted.

DESCRIPTION OF THE NOTES

The following was reported in this section:

As of July 1, 2005, the total amount available for making Restricted Payments under the indenture was approximately \$325.0 million.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT:
INVESTOR RELATIONS
Matt Derdeyn
Group Vice President,
Corporate Finance and Treasurer
(845) 695-2612

MEDIACOM BROADBAND LLC ANNOUNCES
PROPOSED OFFERING OF SENIOR NOTES DUE 2015

Middletown, NY --- August 16, 2005 --- Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation, wholly-owned subsidiaries of Mediacom Communications Corporation (NASDAQ: MCCC), announced today that they intend to offer \$300.0 million in aggregate principal amount of senior notes due 2015 (the "Senior Notes"). Mediacom Broadband LLC will use the net proceeds of the offering for working capital and other general corporate purposes and, until needed for a specific application, will apply a portion to repay all borrowings outstanding under its subsidiaries' revolving credit facility, which are expected to total approximately \$220 million on the issue date of the Senior Notes. Up to \$70.0 million of the net proceeds of the offering may be used to make loans to Mediacom LLC, an affiliate of Mediacom Communications, and/or one or more of its subsidiaries. Mediacom Broadband LLC might also temporarily invest some or all of such net proceeds in short-term marketable securities.

The Senior Notes will be offered to qualified institutional buyers under Rule 144A and to persons outside the United States under Regulation S. The Senior Notes will not be registered under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the "Securities Act"), and, unless so registered, may not be offered or sold in the United States except pursuant to an exemption from, or in a transaction not subject to, the registration requirements of the Securities Act and applicable state securities laws. This press release shall not constitute an offer to sell, or the solicitation of an offer to buy, the Senior Notes nor shall there be any sale of the Senior Notes in any state in which such offer, solicitation, or sale would be unlawful prior to registration or qualification under the securities laws of any such state.

Any statements in this press release that are not historical facts are forward-looking statements within the meaning of Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. These forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from historical results or those Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation anticipate. For a discussion of such risks and uncertainties, which could cause actual results to differ from those contained in the forward-looking statements, see the reports and documents Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation file from time to time with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Statements included in this press release are based upon information known to Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation as of the date of this press release, and Mediacom Broadband LLC and Mediacom Broadband Corporation assume no obligation to (and expressly disclaim any such obligation to) publicly update or alter their forward-looking statements made in this press release, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as otherwise required by applicable federal securities laws.