Sinclair Responds To Senators' Letter to FCC Regarding Mediacom Negotiation

BALTIMORE (January 31, 2007) - Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc. (Nasdaq: SBGI) today sent the attached letter to U.S. Senators, Daniel Inouye and Ted Stevens, Chairmen of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation in response to a letter the Senators sent yesterday to Kevin Martin, Chairman of the U.S. Federal Communications Commission regarding the negotiations between Sinclair Broadcast Group and Mediacom Communications Corp. (Nasdaq: MCCC) over carriage of Sinclair's television stations.

The impacted stations are:

Des Moines/Ames (KDSM-FOX), Cedar Rapids (KGAN-CBS), Mobile-Pensacola (WEAR-ABC/WFGX-MNT), Peoria/Bloomington (WYZZ-FOX), Greenville/Spartanburg/Asheville (WLOS-ABC/WMYA-MNT), Lexington (WDKY-FOX), Madison (WMSN-FOX), Nashville (WZTV-FOX/WUXP-MNT/WNAB-CW), Minneapolis (WUCW-CW), Paducah/Cape Girardeau (KBSI-FOX/WDKA-MNT), Springfield/Champaign/Decatur (WICS-ABC/WICD-ABC), St. Louis (KDNL-ABC), Tallahassee (WTWC-NBC), Birmingham (WTTX-CW/WABM-MNT), Norfolk (WTVZ-MNT) and Milwaukee (WCGV-MNT/WVTV-CW).

Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc., one of the largest and most diversified television broadcasting companies, currently owns and operates, programs or provides sales services to 58 television stations in 36 markets. Sinclair's television group reaches approximately 22% of U.S. television households and is affiliated with all the major networks.

The following is Sinclair's letter to the Chairmen of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation in response to a letter the Senators sent yesterday to Kevin Martin, Chairman of the U.S. Federal Communications Commission regarding the negotiations between Sinclair Broadcast Group and Mediacom Communications Corp. over carriage of Sinclair's television stations.

January 31, 2007

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman
The Honorable Ted Stevens, Vice Chairman
The United States Senate
Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senators Inouye and Stevens:

I have received a copy of the letter, dated yesterday, that you both
sent to Federal Communications Commission Chairman Kevin Martin regarding
the negotiations between Sinclair Broadcast Group and Mediacom. While I
share your frustration that these negotiations have not resulted in an
agreement, I do ask that you keep the following points in mind in your
consideration of this issue:

1. 47 USC §325(b)(i), the most applicable Federal law on this
subject provides that "[n]o cable system or other multichannel programming
distributor shall retransmit the signal of a broadcasting station, or any
part thereof, except with the express authority of the originating
station."

2. Allowing Mediacom the right to retransmit the signals of
Sinclair's stations without Sinclair's consent, whether through binding
arbitration or otherwise, would be tantamount to removing the need for
Mediacom to obtain Sinclair's consent, in direct contravention of the
statute cited above governing retransmission consent.

3. The only ruling that has been made by the FCC to date on this
matter is one in which the FCC concluded, after a thorough review of the
record, that Sinclair has acted in a completely lawful manner during
negotiations with Mediacom.

4. Virtually all residents in the markets where Mediacom
historically retransmitted the signals of Sinclair stations have
alternative means for watching these stations, whether through free over-
the-air delivery or from one of Mediacom's direct competitors, such as
DirecTV, the Dish Network or McLeod USA (a cable overbuilder which serves
many of the same residents of Cedar Rapids, Iowa as does Mediacom), all
of which were able to negotiate for the right to carry the Sinclair
stations without any need for government intervention.

5. A primary intent of Congress in enacting the retransmission
consent laws contained in the 1992 Cable Act was to allow broadcasters to
be paid by cable operators consistent with the manner in which owners of
cable-only channels were compensated. Fifteen years later this intent is
only now starting to be realized and only as a result of broadcasters being
willing to take the position that their signal cannot be retransmitted in
the absence of adequate compensation.

While I can appreciate your desire to make sure that the public is
not inconvenienced by this situation, I hope you can understand the danger of
suggesting the government should order private parties to enter into an
agreement when they are not able to reach agreement on their own. Although
the laws surrounding retransmission consent imposes on the parties an
obligation to negotiate in good faith (something Sinclair has been found to
have done), the laws clearly do not require an agreement to be reached.
Moreover, the laws also expressly contemplate that consistent with all
private negotiations (whether personal or business), the government cannot
order the parties to reach an agreement. Requiring Sinclair to submit to
binding arbitration and to accept a result therefrom with which Sinclair
does not agree would not only be contrary to the intent of the 1992 Cable
Act but, would be the equivalent of allowing Mediacom to retransmit the
signals of Sinclair's stations without Sinclair's consent. The law does
not permit such a result.

Finally, I would like to make you aware that I believe that any
suggestion, such as the one contained in your letter, that government
intervention will be forthcoming has had a chilling effect on the ability
of the parties to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on their own.
Unfortunately it appears that Mediacom's interest in reaching agreement has
been tempered by a belief that it need not complete a deal because the
government will step in to remedy such a failure. Accordingly, I
respectfully suggest that the best way to increase the likelihood that the
free market for negotiations will yield a successful result would be for Mediacom to understand that, consistent with the clear intent of 47

USC §325(b)(i), it will only be permitted to retransmit the signals of Sinclair's television stations if it (and not the government) obtains Sinclair's express authority to do so.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss this issue with me in greater detail, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Barry M. Faber
Vice President/General Counsel