

KERMIT A. BRASHEAR^{†*}
SCOTT E. DANIEL[§]
MARK J. DALY
JAMES S. PIEPER, PH.D.
KERMIT A. BRASHEAR III^{†*}
DAVID M. HOHMAN[♦]
KURTH A. BRASHEAR[•]
AMY R. BEHNKE[‡]
ERICA L. BARNARD

BRASHEAR LLP
LAWYERS & COUNSELORS

NORTH OLD MILL
711 NORTH 108TH COURT
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68154-1714

WWW.BRASHEARLAW.COM

402.348.1000
FAX 402.348.1111
888.232.1000

July 20, 2011

OF COUNSEL
MARYBETH FRANKMAN
MARY P. GALLIGAN*

ALSO ADMITTED IN
*ARIZONA
§ ARKANSAS
♦ CALIFORNIA
† COLORADO
‡ IOWA
◇ MISSOURI
• SOUTH DAKOTA
* TEXAS

VIA DELIVERY

The Hon. Buster Brown
City Clerk
City of Omaha, Nebraska
1819 Farnam Street
Suite LC-1
Omaha, Nebraska 68183

Re: Cox Communications Omaha, L.L.C.
(OMA Franchise Renewal '11)
File 10269-19

RECEIVED
11 JUL 20 PM 3:29
CITY CLERK
OMAHA, NEBRASKA

Dear Mr. Clerk:

As you know, by action of the Omaha City Council taken on June 21, 2011, Cox Communications Omaha, LLC ("Cox") was granted a sixty (60) day extension of time in which to respond to the Request for Formal Renewal Proposal for a Cable Franchise ("RFRP") issued by the City of Omaha ("City") on May 10, 2011. Despite such extension, as communicated last month to Thomas O. Mumgaard, Cox is eager to resume substantive negotiations on an informal basis prior to any applicable deadline being reached.

To that end, enclosed please find the following submissions in response to the RFRP, as well as ten (10) copies thereof, which submissions are intended to supplement those previously made with the City on June 20, 2011:

- Executive Summary describing the position of Cox and the facts underlying same;
- Response of Cox to Forms IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI requested pursuant to the RFRP;
- Exhibits 1-4 in support of the responses submitted;
 - Please note that Exhibit 2 is being provided under separate cover due to the confidential nature thereof; and
- Legal memorandum setting forth the law applicable to this renewal process and the impact thereof on the submission being made.

BRASHEAR LLP
LAWYERS & COUNSELORS

The Hon. Buster Brown
July 20, 2011
Page 2

With these submissions, Cox has now provided all of the information required pursuant to the RFRP except for the information relating to Cox's "financial qualifications" (Form III). Given the burdensome nature of Form III and the fact that the financial condition of Cox is not in question, we believe such information is not necessary in order to allow substantive negotiations to recommence.

To that end, and as previously discussed, now that these submissions have been made, Cox management and its representatives are prepared to meet with the City on an expedited basis in order to "informally" determine whether a cooperative resolution of the RFRP process can be obtained. Accordingly, we will be contacting Mr. Mumgaard yet today to determine when such a meeting can be scheduled.

In the interim, if you or Mr. Mumgaard should have any questions in regard to the foregoing or the submissions made, please contact us. Thank You!

Respectfully,



Kermit A. Brashear
kab@brashearlaw.com
402.916.4303 (DIRECT)
For the Firm

Enclosures

cc: T. O. Mumgaard, Esq.