

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



**FILED**  
05/04/26  
08:00 AM  
A2507016

Joint Application of Charter Communications, Inc., Charter Communications Holdings, LLC, and Cox Enterprises, Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 854 of the Indirect Transfer of Control of Cox California Telcom, LLC (U-5684-C)

A.25-07-016

**JOINT APPLICANTS' MOTION TO MODIFY THE DEADLINES TO  
COMMENT ON SETTLEMENTS**

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules"), Joint Applicants<sup>1</sup> hereby move to: (1) incorporate the recently filed settlement motions into the existing briefing schedule without changing the current briefing deadlines; and (2) consistent with the Commission's strong public policy favoring settlements, and the Assigned Commissioner's active encouragement<sup>2</sup> of settlement in this Proceeding,<sup>3</sup> identify dates for the proposed and final decisions, as the Commission has done in other similar proceedings. These proposed changes will give the parties ample time for briefing

---

<sup>1</sup> "Joint Applicants" reference, collectively, Charter Communications, Inc. ("Charter"), Charter Communications Holdings, LLC ("Charter Holdings"), Cox Enterprises, Inc. ("CEI"), and Cox California Telcom, LLC (U-5684-C) ("Cox California").

<sup>2</sup> *See, e.g.*, Prehearing Conference Transcript at 4:6-12, A.25-07-016 (Oct. 3, 2025) ("[O]ur office encourages the parties to look for any common ground; and we will work with Judge Ormond to dispose of any settlements in an efficient manner.") (statement of Stephen Neal, advisor to Commissioner Baker).

<sup>3</sup> "Proceeding" references Joint Applicants' submitted application (Joint Application of Charter Communications, Inc., Charter Communications Holdings, LLC, and Cox Enterprises, Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 854 of the Indirect Transfer of Control of Cox California Telcom, LLC (U-5684-C), A.25-07-016 (July 30, 2025) (the "Joint Application")) requesting Commission approval for the indirect transfer of control (the "Transfer") of Cox California to Charter on July 30, 2025. The Transfer is part of a larger national transaction, announced on May 16, 2025, between Charter, Charter Holdings, and CEI that will result in a combination of Charter and Cox Communications, Inc. ("Cox") under common ownership (the "Transaction").

and settlement comments, while providing the Commission with a reasonable opportunity to resolve this Proceeding by its August 13, 2026 voting meeting.<sup>4</sup>

## I. INTRODUCTION

After extensive negotiations, Charter reached an agreement with the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (“Cal Advocates”) on a settlement resolving all issues raised by Cal Advocates. Charter also reached agreement with the California Emerging Technology Fund (“CETF”) on a settlement resolving all of its issues. Together, these agreements are referred to as the “Settlements,”<sup>5</sup> and the parties to the Settlements are referred to as the “Settling Parties.”

On April 29, 2026, the Settling Parties held an appropriately noticed Rule 12.1(b) settlement conference. Prior to that settlement conference, the Settling Parties provided copies of the Settlements to all non-settling parties that, consistent with Rule 12.6, agreed to maintain the confidentiality of the Settlements. The Settlements were formally filed on April 30, 2026. CETF has authorized Joint Applicants to represent to the Commission that it does not oppose the relief requested in this motion. Cal Advocates has authorized the Joint Applicants to represent that it does not oppose the Proposed Decision and Final Decision dates requested in this motion. In the Settlements, CETF supported completion of the Transaction by June 30, 2026, and Cal Advocates

---

<sup>4</sup> See Section II.A. and Section II.E, *infra*. The Commission calendar currently has only one voting meeting date scheduled in August. With the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) Hart-Scott-Rodino Act (“HSR”) clearance ending on September 15, 2026, the next scheduled Commission meeting date before the HSR expiration is on September 3, 2026, which would present significant risk to Joint Applicants. A targeted completion date of September 3, 2026 leaves no room for unforeseen circumstances that might arise, putting the entire Transaction in jeopardy. For these reasons, Joint Applicants seek final consideration no later than the August 13, 2026 Commission voting meeting.

<sup>5</sup> See Joint Motion of Charter and Public Advocates Office for Adoption of Settlement, A.25-07-016 (filed Apr. 30, 2026) (“Cal Advocates Settlement”); see Joint Motion of Charter and CETF for Adoption of Settlement, A.25-07-016 (filed Apr. 30, 2026) (“CETF MOU”).

supported completion by August 13, 2026.<sup>6</sup> In the motions by the Settling Parties — formally filing the Settlements — the Settling Parties requested that the Commission complete its review and issue a final decision no later than August 13, 2026.<sup>7</sup>

Although Rule 12.2 generally would provide 30 days for any non-settling party to file opening comments and 15 days thereafter for reply comments on the Settlements, those deadlines would substantially overlap with the existing briefing schedule in this Proceeding, under which opening and reply briefs are due May 22, 2026 and June 5, 2026, respectively,<sup>8</sup> and under which parties' briefs and settlement comments will necessarily address closely interrelated issues. The Settlements resolve all disputed issues between the Settling Parties, in addition to many issues presented by non-settling intervenors in this Proceeding, and thereby, substantially narrow issues of other parties that may remain for briefing, if any. Aligning the Settlement comment periods and briefing deadlines would therefore avoid duplicative submissions, allow the Commission to consider the Settlements as it concurrently evaluates the comprehensive benefits associated with the Transfer, and promote an efficient resolution within a defined timeframe. At the same time, the proposed schedule preserves due process by providing parties with a meaningful opportunity to evaluate and comment on the Settlements without any modification to the briefing schedule.

Therefore, consistent with the Settling Parties' obligation under Rule 12.1(c) and for the reasons explained below, the Joint Applicants propose to incorporate the comment cycle on the Settlements into the existing briefing schedule and respectfully request that the Commission adopt specific dates for the proposed and final decisions in this Proceeding as follows:

---

<sup>6</sup> CETF MOU at 2; Cal Advocates Settlement at 2.

<sup>7</sup> *See id.*

<sup>8</sup> Under the standard Rule 12.2 comment cycle, due dates for such comments would fall on June 1, 2026 and June 16, 2026.

<b>Procedural Step</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>
Opening Briefs and Comments on Settlements	May 22, 2026 (no change to briefing date)
Reply Briefs and Reply Comments on Settlements	June 5, 2026 (no change to briefing date)
Proposed Decision	July 14, 2026 (currently no date identified)
Final Decision	August 13, 2026 (currently no date identified)

**II. THERE IS GOOD CAUSE TO MODIFY THE SCHEDULE**

Rule 11.1 authorizes an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) to modify the procedural schedule upon a showing of good cause. The multiple grounds explained further below support finding good cause to modify the Proceeding schedule as presented herein.

**A. A modest adjustment to the comment deadlines will help to avoid harm from delay and preserve the benefits of the Settlements.**

Joint Applicants’ proposed schedule modifications are limited and justified by the need to avoid harm associated with delay. They are supported by substantial public comments in the record from local and state government officials, community, digital inclusion, and consumer groups, and various business, ethnic and economic development organizations that want the benefits of the Transaction to expeditiously flow to their constituencies, as further evidenced by their statements and support as set forth in Attachment 1. These represent only some of the overwhelming majority of commenters who participated in the public hearings and submitted comments requesting approval by the Commission.

As explained in Charter’s February 17, 2026 filing, Joint Applicants’ HSR clearance period expires September 15, 2026. As the Settling Parties explained in the recently filed motions to adopt the Settlements,<sup>9</sup> if that period were to expire before the Commission completes its review, Joint Applicants would face, at a minimum, a new HSR filing fee of approximately \$2.5 million

---

<sup>9</sup> See Cal Advocates Settlement; CETF MOU.

plus substantial additional legal fees, submission of an entirely new merger notification, a new 30-day waiting period, and the risk that the DOJ could issue a Second Request, causing months of further delay and costs.<sup>10</sup> More fundamentally, as Charter also explained, if the HSR clearance were to expire before California’s review is completed, requiring Joint Applicants to submit a new HSR notification and restart the process of obtaining clearance, Joint Applicants would necessarily reconsider the Transaction due to multiple potential costs and risks associated with further delay beyond the sixteen months that would have already passed since the Transaction agreement was signed in mid-May 2025.<sup>11</sup>

Most importantly, if the Transaction does not close, California consumers would lose access to the substantial public interest benefits of the Transfer, including those stemming from the Settlements. Additionally, further delay would cause material operational and business disruptions from the extended gap between signing and closing the Transaction, including key personnel turnover, paused investment decisions, disruption to day-to-day operations from integration planning uncertainty,<sup>12</sup> and would further defer the benefits that Cox employees stand to gain upon closing of the Transaction, including a more robust education benefit and Charter’s employee stock purchase program, both of which represent material improvements for affected employees that are postponed or jeopardized with each month of delay.

As Charter previously explained, and as the Commission has found in other instances, reaching a final decision before expiration of an HSR clearance period (i.e., approximately 30 to

---

<sup>10</sup> Response to Administrative Law Judge Inquiry at 4-5, A.25-07-016 (Feb. 17, 2026) (“Response to ALJ Inquiry”).

<sup>11</sup> Response to ALJ Inquiry at 5.

<sup>12</sup> Response to ALJ Inquiry at 5-6.

60 days in advance) is critical to ensure the timely completion of a transaction.<sup>13</sup> As applied to this Transaction, the Commission calendar currently has only one meeting date in August. After its August meeting, the next scheduled Commission voting meeting (before the September 15, 2026 HSR expiration) is on September 3, 2026, which would present significant risk to Joint Applicants. Any completion date after August 13, 2026 therefore leaves insufficient room for unforeseen circumstances that might arise, putting the entire Transaction in jeopardy.

For these reasons, Joint Applicants respectfully seek final consideration no later than August 13, 2026. The same good cause that warrants modification of a proceeding schedule — and that the Commission has found in other instances necessary to ensure timely resolution in advance of a deadline for DOJ clearance<sup>13</sup> — applies here. A modest adjustment to the Rule 12.2 comment deadlines would preserve the Commission’s ability to consider the Settlements and the merits efficiently, avoid unnecessary delay, and protect the public interest benefits at stake.

**B. Retaining the current settlement comment timelines would, by causing delay, effectively penalize Joint Applicants for entering into the Settlements.**

If Joint Applicants had not reached the Settlements, the case would be deemed submitted on June 5, 2026, upon the filing of reply briefs, with no further procedural steps necessary before issuance of a proposed and a final Commission decision. However, because Joint Applicants, consistent with the Commission’s strong public policy interest favoring settlements and the

---

<sup>13</sup> In proceeding A.24-10-006, applicants sought a final decision approximately 60 days in advance of the HSR expiration. *See* Joint Applicants Motion to Modify the Procedural Schedule, A.24-10-006 (Sept. 5, 2026). The Commission acknowledged the need for timely resolution of the proceeding in advance of the HSR expiration. Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Granting in Part the Motion to Modify the Proceeding Schedule and Providing Briefing Instructions to Parties, A.24-10-006 at 3 (Sep. 18, 2025) (“we acknowledge the concern of the Joint Applicants and the parties that support their Motion that this proceeding should be resolved timely and in advance of the February 13, 2026 deadline for DOJ clearance”). Ultimately, the Commission adopted its final decision approximately 30 days in advance of the HSR expiration. *Re Verizon Communications Inc.* D.26-01-023 (Jan. 15, 2026).

<sup>13</sup> *See id.*

Assigned Commissioner's active encouragement of settlement,<sup>14</sup> pursued and were able to reach settlements resolving all disputes with Cal Advocates and CETF, the default Rule 12.2 comment schedule could otherwise extend the Proceeding's schedule beyond June 5, 2026. That result would effectively penalize Joint Applicants for having reached the Settlements and for having followed the procedures in Rule 12.1(b) to discuss potential settlements with the other parties.<sup>15</sup> Such a result would be *inconsistent* with the Commission's policy favoring settlement; parties should not be forced to choose between reaching and filing settlements that successfully eliminate disputed issues, and foregoing settlements altogether to avoid unnecessary procedural delay. The Commission can and should avoid that outcome here by incorporating the comment cycle on the Settlements into the existing briefing schedule.

**C. Modifying the comment timeline will allow the Commission to consider the Settlements and merits issues efficiently and holistically on the current briefing schedule.**

The Settlements resolve all issues raised by multiple participants in this Proceeding and fundamentally address the core subjects that have been central to the record, including robust commitments and public benefits for consumers across the company's post-Transaction California footprint, including within Environmental and Social Justice ("ESJ") communities, related to broadband affordability and adoption; sales practices and advertising of low-income offers; promotional pricing practices; financial support for digital inclusion; infrastructure upgrades, network evolution, and expansion investments; Tribal and other stakeholder consultation and outreach; small business and workforce development investments; workforce and supplier

---

<sup>14</sup> See *supra*, note 2.

<sup>15</sup> Rule 12.1(b) requires that "Prior to signing any settlement, the settling parties shall convene at least one conference with notice and opportunity to participate provided to all parties for the purpose of discussing settlements in the proceeding."

diversity; and public safety and resiliency. As a result, both Cal Advocates and CETF agreed to support Commission approval of the Settlements without modification by August 13, 2026, if such a time frame was reasonably possible.<sup>16</sup>

Because the Settlements address the core disputed issues in this Proceeding, the briefing is likely to focus heavily, if not entirely, on issues that are closely interrelated with, and comprehensively addressed by, the Settlements. As a result, substantial overlap is expected. Requiring separate, sequential rounds of briefing and comments on the Settlements would therefore not only risk unnecessary delay but also result in substantial duplication. By contrast, aligning the deadlines would allow the Commission to evaluate the parties' positions on the Settlements and the merits together, on a coordinated schedule, while preserving a meaningful opportunity for all parties to be heard.

**D. Parties were informed of the settlement terms prior to formal filing, reducing any prejudice from a modified comment cycle.**

All active parties in this Proceeding were informed of the Settlements on April 17, 2026, and all non-settling parties that agreed to maintain the confidentiality of the Settlements, including those that became parties after April 17, 2026, were provided final draft copies of the Settlements on April 28, 2026. Moreover, the parties had the opportunity to attend the April 29, 2026 Rule 12.1(b) settlement conference, at which the Settlements were discussed before they were filed with the Commission. Accordingly, parties had both advance notice of the Settlements and an opportunity to begin evaluating their positions before the start of any comment or briefing period. The targeted revisions to the schedule therefore provide parties with a reasonable opportunity to

---

<sup>16</sup> CETF MOU at 1-2 (“CETF agrees that it will withdraw any request for evidentiary hearing that it has made, and work with the Joint Applicants in good faith to accelerate the Commission’s consideration of this Agreement and facilitate a final Commission decision by June 30, 2026.”); Cal Advocates Settlement at 13 (“The Settling Parties agree to use their best efforts to obtain Commission approval by August 13, 2026.”).

file comments on the Settlements concurrently with opening briefs, while recognizing that the Settlements have substantially narrowed the scope of the disputed issues. In addition, the parties' positions on the core merits are already well developed through multiple rounds of testimony, extensive discovery, and the evidentiary hearing.<sup>17</sup>

**E. Defining dates for the proposed and final decisions would provide necessary certainty and reduce the harm of an indefinite schedule.**

In nearly all major contested telecommunications transactions before the Commission over the last decade, the Commission has identified at least a proposed decision date, and typically also a final decision date.<sup>18</sup> Particularly now that the Settlements have been formally filed, it is appropriate for the Commission to set those dates here. Specific dates for a proposed decision and final decision provide predictability to all parties and promote efficient resolution of the Proceeding. Establishing a proposed decision date of July 14, 2026, and a final vote at the Commission's August 13, 2026 voting meeting, is justified because the current schedule does not include a proposed decision date, which could create a risk that a final decision could move beyond the September 15, 2026 HSR clearance deadline. Although CETF and Charter committed to work in good faith to facilitate a final Commission decision by June 30, 2026,<sup>19</sup> both parties understood

---

<sup>17</sup> See Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, A.25-07-016 (Dec. 9, 2025) (setting testimony and hearing schedule); Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Providing Log-In Information and Instructions for Evidentiary Hearings, A.25-07-016 (Mar. 2, 2026).

<sup>18</sup> See *In re Joint Application of Verizon Communications Inc. et al.*, Assigned Commissioner's Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling, A.24-10-006 (May 29, 2025) (setting proposed decision date of November 14, 2025); *In re Joint Application of Sprint Communications Company L.P. (U-5112) et al.*, Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, A.18-07-012 (Sept. 28, 2018) (setting final decision date in June 2019); *In re Joint Application of TracFone Wireless, Inc. (U4321C) et al.*, Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, A.20-11-001 (Feb. 24, 2021) (setting proposed decision date in September 2021); *In re Joint Application of Charter Communications, Inc. et al.*, Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Ruling, A.15-07-009 (Nov. 13, 2015) (setting proposed decision date for May 13, 2016, and final decision date for June 10, 2016).

<sup>19</sup> CETF MOU at 2.

that such a schedule would not have afforded sufficient time for Administrative Law Judge Ormond to reasonably complete a proposed decision and could have placed undue strain on the Commission. Accordingly, in their respective motions requesting that the Commission adopt the Settlements,<sup>20</sup> the Settling Parties respectfully asked that the Commission complete its review and issue a final decision no later than August 13, 2026.

The Commission should take advantage of this consensus among key parties to the Proceeding to set firm milestones and provide all parties with greater certainty regarding the path to resolution.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Joint Applicants respectfully request that the Commission adopt a modified schedule as follows:

<b>Procedural Step</b>	<b>Proposed Date</b>
Opening Briefs and Comments on Settlements	May 22, 2026 (no change to briefing date)
Reply Briefs and Reply Comments on Settlements	June 5, 2026 (no change to briefing date)
Proposed Decision	July 14, 2026 (currently no date identified)
Final Decision	August 13, 2026 (currently no date identified)

---

<sup>20</sup> Cal Advocates Settlement; CETF MOU.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Margaret L. Tobias

Margaret L. Tobias  
Tobias Law Office  
1459 18th Street, No. 284  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Tel: (415) 641-7833  
Email: marg@tobiaslo.com

*Counsel for Cox Enterprises, Inc.*

/s/ Zeb C. Zankel

Zeb C. Zankel  
Jenner & Block LLP  
525 Market Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: (628) 267-6812  
Email: ZZankel@jenner.com

*Counsel for Charter Communications, Inc.  
and Charter Communications Holdings, LLC*

May 1, 2026

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Public Comments Expressing Support for Swift Commission Approval  
of the  
Charter-Cox Transaction**

## **CONTENTS**

<b>List of Commenters Supporting Swift Commission Approval.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Public Comments and Statements.....</b>	<b>5</b>

## **LIST OF COMMENTERS**

State Senator Megan Dahle (CA-1)  
State Senator Josh Becker (CA-13)  
State Senator Anna Caballero (CA-14)  
State Senator Susan Rubio (CA-22)  
State Senator Brian Jones (CA-40)  
Assemblymember Heath Flora (CA-9)  
Assemblymember Patrick Ahrens (CA-26)  
Assemblymember John Harabedian (CA-41)  
Assemblymember Blanca Pacheco (CA-64)  
Assemblymember Avelino Valencia (CA-68)  
Assemblymember Tri Ta (CA-70)  
Mayor of the City of Cerritos, Frank Aurelio Yokoyama  
Mayor of the City of Industry Cory Moss  
Mayor of the City of Huntington Park Eddie Martinez  
Mayor of the City of Rosemead, Sandra Armenta  
Deputy Mayor of Escondido, Joe Garcia  
Vice Mayor of the City of Claremont, Ed Reece  
Anaheim City Councilmember Natalie Rubalcava  
Anaheim City Councilmember Norma Campos Kurtz  
Carlsbad City Councilmember Melanie Burkholder  
Cudahy City Councilmember Martin Fuentes  
Long Beach City Councilmember Kristina Duggan  
Los Angeles City Councilmember John Lee  
Lynwood City Councilmember Luis Gerardo Cuellar  
Pomona City Councilmember Victor Preciado  
Montebello City Councilmember Sal Melendez  
Monterey Park City Councilmember Thomas Wong  
San Diego City Councilmember Stephen Whitburn  
Orange County Supervisor Donald P. Wagner  
Yorba Linda City Councilmember Janice Lim  
West Basin Municipal Water Dist. Board Member Tommy Faave  
American Fashion Network | Jackie Ferrari, CEO & Founder  
Black Chamber of Orange County | Bobby McDonald CalAsian Chamber of Commerce | Pat Fong Kushida, President & CEO  
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce | Julian Canete, President & CEO  
California Contract Cities Association | Marcel Rodarte, Executive Director  
Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce | Marcy Weaver, President and CEO  
Competitive Enterprise Institute | Jessica Melugin

Inland Engineering | Carlos Mongello  
Laguna Hills Chamber of Commerce | Hon. Daniel Sohn, Executive Director  
Lake Forest Chamber of Commerce | Constance Visconte  
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce | Carlos Singer, Chief Policy Officer  
Los Angeles County Business Federation (BizFed) | Chris Wilson  
Mission Viejo Chamber of Commerce | Doug Zielasko, CEO  
Orange County Business Council | Amanda Walsh  
Regional Cal Black Chamber of Commerce |  
San Clemente Chamber of Commerce | Susie Lantz, CEO  
San Diego North Economic Development Council | W. Erik B., CEO  
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership | Luis Portillo  
Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce | Dustin Hoiseth, Director of Economic  
Development  
U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce | Ramiro Cavazos, President & CEO  
U.S. Hispanic Business Council | Javier Palomarez, President & CEO  
Wiring Connection, Inc. | Luis Cardenas, President  
American Council of the Blind | Claire Stanley  
Asian Pacific American Advocates | Thu Nguyen  
Avance Integral Latino Community Development Corp. | Josue Rincon  
Brotherhood Crusade | Eric Aguiar  
Center for New Liberalism | Colin Mortimer  
Central City Association | Nella McOsker, President & CEO  
Court Appointed Special Advocates of Imperial County (CASA) | Alex Cardenas  
DIY Girls | Cristina Gutierrez Medina, Executive Director  
Equality California | Tony Hoang, Executive Director  
Feeding San Diego | AnnMarie Gabaldon  
GLAAAC | Gene Hale, Chairman  
Hispanic Heritage Foundation | Jose Antonio Tijerino  
LA's BEST | Michele Broadnax  
Latino Equality Alliance (LEA) | Eddie Martinez  
League of United Latin American Citizens | Ray Serrano  
LearningQuest | Michelle Jasper, Executive Director  
Living Coast Discovery | Ben Vallejos, Center Executive Director  
Loves Fishes & Computers | Delia Leal  
Metropolitan Area Advisory Committee on Anti-Poverty of San Diego County | Adolfo Ventura,  
Move LA | Eli Lipman  
Mt. San Antonio Community College District | Dr. Robert Hidalgo, Board President  
Multicultural, Media, Telecom and Internet Council (MMTC) | Robert Branson, President &  
CEO  
National Action Network, LAX Chapter | Pastor Oliver Buie, President

National Hispanic Media Coalition | Brenda Castillo, President & CEO  
National Hispanic Foundation for the Arts | Felix Sanchez, Co-Founder & Chair  
Partners in Education |  
Progressive Policy Institute | Lindsey Lewis, CEO  
San Diego Futures Foundation | Brandon Harrison, Executive Director  
SER National | Ignacio Salazar, President & CEO  
The Latino Coalition | Carlos Orta  
The Wall Las Memorias | Richard Zaldivar, Executive Director & Founder  
United Boys & Girls Club of Santa Barbara County | Taylor Swan

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND STATEMENTS**<sup>21</sup>

### **State Senator Megan Dahle (CA-1) | CPUC Comment, 1/20/26**

*“The Department of Justice granted Hart-Scott-Rodino antitrust clearance in mid-September 2025, meaning the transaction must receive CPUC approval in late spring 2026 to close before that federal approval expires in mid-September 2026. Unless the Commission’s schedule is amended, there is a real risk that DOJ clearance will lapse before the CPUC issues a decision, jeopardizing the transaction and the substantial benefits it would deliver for consumers.” [...] “I respectfully request that the Commission amend its procedural schedule to include a clear proposed decision and final decision date to ensure that California’s review can be completed in a reasonable timeframe consistent with other jurisdictions.”*

### **State Senator Josh Becker (CA-13) | CPUC Comment, 1/23/26**

*“While I believe the substantive merits of this transaction are strong, I am concerned that the Commission’s current procedural schedule risks allowing administrative timing to determine the outcome.” [...] “I respectfully urge the Commission to revisit its procedural schedule and adopt a timeline that allows California’s review to conclude within a reasonable period following other approvals. This would preserve rigorous oversight while ensuring that investment, infrastructure expansion, and workforce commitments are not jeopardized by avoidable delay.”*

### **State Senator Anna Caballero (CA-14) | CPUC Comment 1/28/26**

*“I respectfully urge the California Public Utilities Commission to conduct a transparent and timely review process that recognizes the public-interest benefits of this transaction. With appropriate oversight, this merger has the potential to bring real, lasting advantages to California residents and businesses, particularly those in rural and agricultural regions like the 14th Senate District.”*

### **State Senator Susan Rubio (CA-22) | CPUC Comment, 1/18/26**

*“I write in support of the Charter-Cox transaction and with encouragement to rethink the Commission’s current proposed timeline. As the State Senator for the 22nd Senate District, I am committed to finding ways to make utilities more affordable for my constituents and for all California residents. As such, I believe the Charter-Cox merger will help us offer California residents affordable options and quality service. I*

---

<sup>21</sup> The list of comments compiled herein represents only a subset of comments that specifically requested the Commission take swift action to approve the Transaction. The record demonstrates an even larger and broader set of public support for Commission approval of the Transaction and its resulting benefits in California.

*respectfully ask that the Commission reconsider its procedural schedule and work toward a more expedited approval process that reflects the straightforward nature of the Charter-Cox merger. California families need relief from high costs, and efficient regulatory processes that deliver consumer benefits serve the public interest. Charter and Cox operate in separate markets without competing against each other, neither owns utility infrastructure, and both maintain strong service records.”*

**State Senator Brian Jones (CA-40) | CPUC Comment, 1/15/26**

*“I appreciate that it is the Commission's responsibility to protect consumers. However, allowing regulatory processes to delay or even effectively deny critical benefits and savings to my constituents runs counter to that purpose. When a transaction presents limited regulatory complexity, the process should reflect that reality. I respectfully urge the Commission to reconsider the current timeline and instead align it with all other federal, state, and local approvals, all of which are scheduled to conclude by spring 2026. Thank you for your consideration.”*

**Assemblymember Heath Flora (CA-9) | CPUC Comment, 1/14/26**

*“In reviewing this transaction, I respectfully urge the Commission to ensure that its procedural timeline allows for a thorough yet efficient evaluation that concludes within a reasonable period following the completion of other required local, state, and federal approvals. The transaction has already undergone significant review by other authorities, including federal antitrust clearance, and prolonged administrative delay risks undermining a transaction that could deliver tangible benefits for California consumers, workers, and businesses. A timely resolution would demonstrate that California can both protect the public interest and support responsible private investment in critical infrastructure.”*

**Assemblymember Patrick Ahrens (CA-26) | CPUC Comment, 2/4/26**

*“Given these facts, I respectfully request that the Commission reconsider and amend its procedural schedule to include a proposed decision date and a final decision timeline that allows the transaction to close in late spring 2026. Doing so would preserve rigorous regulatory review, protect consumers and employees, and demonstrate that California remains committed to fair, timely, and predictable regulatory processes.”*

**Assemblymember John Harabedian (CA-41) | CPUC Comment 3/2/26**

*“My request is straightforward: that the Commission consider providing greater procedural clarity so that the outcome of this proceeding is determined by substantive analysis rather than by open-ended timing. A transparent and well-defined schedule will reinforce public confidence in the process and ensure that affected communities have appropriate visibility into what comes next.”*

**Assemblymember Blanca Pacheco (CA-64) | CPUC Comment, 1/30/26**

*“As Chair of the Assembly Rules Committee and former mayor of the City of Downey, I am keenly aware of the importance of regulatory oversight that both protects consumers and ensures California remains a place where responsible investment and job creation can move forward in a timely and predictable manner. In this instance, I am concerned that the current CPUC schedule unnecessarily places this transaction, and the benefits it will deliver to consumers and workers, at risk. [...] “This timeline places the transaction at risk of missing the Department of Justice’s approval window, which expires in mid-September 2026. Administrative delay should not be the reason this transaction fails, particularly when there is ample opportunity to conduct a thorough review within a more reasonable timeframe.”*

**Assemblymember Avelino Valencia (CA-68) | CPUC Comment, 1/30/26**

*“I write in support of the proposed transaction between Charter Communications (Charter) and Cox Communications (Cox) and to respectfully urge the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to amend the current procedural schedule to ensure the proceeding concludes within a reasonable and responsible timeframe.”*

**Assemblymember Tri Ta (CA-70) | CPUC Comment, 1/29/26**

*“Without an expedited timeline, there is a real risk that federal clearance will lapse before a final CPUC decision, jeopardizing the transaction due to delay rather than substantive concerns. [...] Administrative delay should not undermine a transaction that advances affordability, service quality, workforce investment, and competition. Thank you for your consideration and service to the people of California. I urge the Commission to act promptly so this matter can be resolved in a timely and responsible manner.”*

**Frank Aurelio Yokoyama, Mayor of the City of Cerritos | Public Hearing, 2/25/26**

*“I’m also encouraged by Charter’s approach to prices. They offer affordable plans, including options for qualifying low-income households with no contracts. Residents of Cerritos appreciate knowing exactly what services they are getting for what price, and all Charter plans have the flexibility to cancel when life happens. These are the kind of consumer-friendly practices that benefit our community. This transaction serves a public interest. Without competition concerns or other obligations, the deal should be approved as soon as possible. Approval at the CPUC July 2026 meeting keeps this entire transaction on track.”*

**Cory Moss, Mayor of the City of Industry | CPUC Comment, 2/25/26**

*“I understand the PUC’s duty to carefully review each transaction and its impact on the public. I want to highlight that this transaction presents limited complexity. Charter and*

*Cox serve separate areas, meaning there are no competition concerns or overlap issues. There are also no carriers of last resort requirements involved. That being said, the PUC has sufficient opportunity to review and approve this deal no later than July 2026 while protecting consumers and demonstrating that California remains a state where business can thrive. I encourage the Commission to approve this transaction.”*

**Eddie Martinez, Mayor of the City of Huntington Park** | CPUC Comment, 2/25/26

*“The CPUC has had ample time to review this transaction, and I implore the Commission to wrap up its reviews and approve this deal.”*

**Sandra Armenta, Mayor of the City of Rosemead** | CPUC Comment, 4/21/26

*“I want to thank CPUC for your work reviewing transactions and ensuring they serve the public interest, and I encourage you to approve this deal sooner than later. [...] I respectfully request that the California Public Utilities Commission act on this proposed transaction by July 2026 to enable this service to reach more people as soon as possible.”*

**Joe Garcia, Deputy Mayor of Escondido** | CPUC Comment, 2/24/26

*“A speedy approval of this merger will greatly benefit the constituents and businesses in Escondido and beyond. [...] Given all the positives of this merger, I hope the Commission will approve it without delay and my constituents can begin to take advantage of its many benefits.”*

**Ed Reece, Vice Mayor of the City of Claremont** | CPUC Comment, 4/22/26

*“The CPUC should approve this transaction expeditiously and waste no time expanding consumer benefits to more Charter-Cox customers.”*

**Anaheim City Councilmember Natalie Rubalcava** | CPUC Comment 3/18/26

*“On behalf of the residents of Anaheim, I respectfully urge you to approve this transaction without delay so our communities can continue to benefit from strong and reliable connectivity.”*

**Anaheim City Councilmember Norma Campos Kurtz** | CPUC Comment 3/23/26

*“For the sake of the hard-working people and world-famous businesses of Anaheim, I humbly ask you to greenlight this merger without delay, and I thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.”*

**Carlsbad City Councilmember Melanie Burkholder** | CPUC Comment, 2/4/26; Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“This deal will deliver real benefits for the families and small businesses I represent. The sooner you approve it, the sooner they will be able to take advantage of them. [...] Given how this merger will improve the lives of my constituents, I hope that you will approve it soon. Delays will prevent families and job creators in Carlsbad from gaining access to more affordable options and expanded choices.”*

*“On behalf of my constituents in Carlsbad, I ask you to speedily approve the merger between Charter Communications and Cox Enterprises. This deal will deliver real benefits for the family and families of small businesses I represent. The sooner you approve it, the sooner they will be able to take advantage of those benefits.” [...] “Carlsbad from gaining access to more affordable options and expanded choices. Thank you for your attention to this important matter, and for your commitment to the people of California.”*

**Cudahy City Councilmember Martin Fuentes | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26**

*“California is an expensive state to live and saving money whenever possible is helpful to any family. As part of the merger, prices will go down for Cox customers if they choose to move to a Charter plan.” [...] “Lastly, the new Charter Cox would adopt the Charter's 100 percent U.S. workforce and bring Cox overseas functions back to the U.S. That means that each time a customer reaches out via phone or chat, they will be connected with someone in the U.S. and have access to bilingual representatives or someone to help customers with disabilities. This customer-first value driven company culture is what makes this merger right. The CPUC should approve this transaction expeditiously and waste no time expanding customer benefits to more Charter Cox customers.”*

**Long Beach City Councilmember Kristina Duggan | CPUC Comment, 2/9/26**

*“The combination of Charter and Cox is a pro-competitive move that strengthens their ability to compete against global providers. Their service footprints have minimal overlap, ensuring the transaction will not reduce consumer choice. Instead, Cox customers will gain access to Charter’s contract-free, bundled offerings and 100 percent U.S.-based customer service.” [...] “I respectfully request that the Commission amend the procedural schedule to ensure a final decision is reached within a reasonable timeframe.”*

**Los Angeles City Councilmember John Lee | CPUC Comment, 3/20/26**

*“I support this transaction and respectfully urge a reasonable review timeline and approval. [...] Given the scale and significance of this transaction, a timely review and approval should be a priority. Prolonged regulatory uncertainty can delay investments in modernization efforts and service reliability improvements that customers and communities depend on. An efficient review process and approval of this merger would*

*allow for thorough oversight while ensuring that potential public-interest benefits are not unnecessarily postponed and can be realized.”*

**Lynwood City Councilmember Luis Gerardo Cuellar** | CPUC Comment, 4/16/26

*“On behalf of my constituents in the City of Lynwood, I am writing to request that the review and approval of the Charter-Cox transaction be expedited. [...] Holding up the review and approval of this merger will hold back the benefits it provides for consumers, like putting money back in their pockets and expanding choice.”*

**Pomona City Councilmember Victor Preciado** | CPUC Comment, 4/23/26

*“The CPUC has had ample time to review this transaction, and I implore the Commission to wrap up its reviews and approve this deal before July.”*

**Montebello City Councilmember Sal Melendez** | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“One of my goals has been to empower residents to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The combined Charter-Cox Company will adopt Charter's minimum starting wage of at least \$20 per an hour. Jobs can become careers through their onsite training, tuition reimbursement, retirement matches, and much more.” [...] “And I encourage you to approve this deal sooner than later.”*

**Monterey Park City Councilmember Thomas Wong** | CPUC Comment 3/3/26

*“I urge the CPUC to expeditiously review and act on this proposal, and work to ensure our communities have cost effective choices that serve our needs.”*

**San Diego City Councilmember Stephen Whitburn** | CPUC Comment, 1/22/26

*“For these reasons, I respectfully encourage the California Public Utilities Commission to approve this application and allow these benefits to reach Californians without delay.”*

**Orange County Supervisor Donald P. Wagner** | CPUC Comment, 1/26/26

*“I respectfully request that the Commission amend the current procedural schedule to include a proposed decision and final decision date and to ensure the review concludes within a reasonable time following the completion of other required approvals. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued service to the people of California.”*

**Yorba Linda City Councilmember Janice Lim** | CPUC Comment, 4/3/26

*“I want to encourage the Commission to move forward with the Charter-Cox transaction. This deal has already cleared federal review, and California is the final step. If approval doesn't come by July, the entire transaction could fall through, and with it, the benefits and savings it would bring to residents across the state.”*

**West Basin Municipal Water Dist. Board Member Tommy Faave** | CPUC Comment, 3/27/26

*“The Commission has had ample time to review this transaction, and the record reflects a straightforward combination with meaningful benefits for consumers, infrastructure resilience, and longterm investment. I respectfully urge the Commission to move forward and approve this application in a timely manner.”*

**American Fashion Network** | Jackie Ferrari, CEO & Founder | CPUC Comment, 3/17/26

*“The combined Charter-Cox company will uphold Charter's current commitment to operations on American soil. Therefore, this deal has our approval, and we ask that you do the same by expediting its review and approval.”*

**Black Chamber of Orange County** | Bobby McDonald | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“Reliable broadband access and investment in modern communications are essential to those goals. That's why we welcome any opportunity to lower costs for our local businesses in this region. The Charter/Cox deal with help to do this for three reasons. Number one, first, Charter offers affordable prices compared to other large competitors, with savings up to \$1,000 a year. Number two, because Charter and Cox aren't competitors, the joint company will be able to better compete, driving down prices and improving services for everyone. And number three, the combined company will return Cox overseas sales positions to the United States, declaring a 100 percent US-based employee workforce. Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts. I hope that this transaction will be approved quickly to give Californians better access and better options.”*

**CalAsian Chamber of Commerce** | Pat Fong Kushida, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/13/26

*“We look forward to continuing this relationship under the combined company and urge your swift approval of CPUC Proceeding A-2507016 – delaying review and approval beyond spring 2026 could upend this entire transaction to the detriment of California residents and businesses.”*

**California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce** | Julian Canete, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 1/5/26

*“As California's premier organization for Hispanic and diverse small business advocacy, the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce urges the CPUC to promptly approve this application, ensuring that these vital benefits reach our communities without delay. Your swift action is essential to support a stronger, more inclusive digital economy in California.”*

**California Contract Cities Association** | Marcel Rodarte, Executive Director | CPUC  
Comment, 4/2/26

*“The federal government has already approved this deal, and this approval from the PUC is the final step. Without it, this transaction is at risk of falling through. We respectfully urge the PUC to complete its review efficiently and approve this deal.”*

**Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce** | Marcy Weaver, President and CEO | CPUC Comment,  
1/29/26; Public Participation Hearing, 2/19/26

*“The CPUC's latest timeline, released earlier this month, could put the transaction at risk and fails to adequately take into consideration the benefits this transaction would deliver to Californians. [...] For these reasons, we strongly encourage the CPUC to revise its procedural timeline for this straightforward transaction. Other recent and far more complex transactions like the Sprint-T-Mobile and Verizon-Frontier review periods took significantly less time. With strong service records and no overlap in footprints, there is no reason to allow this Charter-Cox transaction to be slowed by administrative delay.”*

*“This combined company will also bring back all of Cox sales and customer service functions to the U.S. and offer employees higher starting wages and impressive benefits. For these reasons, we strongly encourage the CPUC to approve this transaction in a timely manner.”*

**Competitive Enterprise Institute** | Jessica Melugin | CPUC Comment, 2/4/26

*“With very little risk of anticompetitive effects, a competitive marketplace, and potential benefits to consumers, we urge the California Public Utilities Commission to approve the merger of Cox and Charter quickly and with no supplementary conditions. The record does not justify delay or additional information requests; prompt approval will best serve the public interest.”*

**Inland Engineering** | Carlos Mongello | CPUC Comment, 2/13/26

*“We also ask that you expedite the review timeline to better align with other states and federal review procedures. As it currently stands, California could derail this transaction singlehandedly if it does not review the proceeding by Spring 2026.”*

**Laguna Hills Chamber of Commerce** | Hon. Daniel Sohn, Executive Director | CPUC  
Comment, 2/3/26

*“The Laguna Hills Chamber of Commerce respectfully requests that the CPUC update the review schedule to include a proposed decision date no later than spring 2026, providing clarity and certainty for companies operating within the state.”*

**Lake Forest Chamber of Commerce** | Constance Visconte | CPUC Comment, 2/3/26

*“We urge the CPUC to revisit this timeline and ensure that clerical delays do not impact the potential benefits for business and residents in our community.”*

**Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce** | Carlos Singer, Chief Policy Officer | CPUC Comment, 2/19/26

*“We encourage you to approve this transaction with an updated timeline so that California consumers and businesses can benefit sooner from bundled services, lower prices, and a stronger communications provider in the state.”*

**Los Angeles County Business Federation (BizFed)** | Chris Wilson | CPUC Comment, 1/26/26

*“Any delay in review and approval beyond spring 2026 could upend this entire transaction to the detriment of Los Angeles County residents and businesses.”*

**Mission Viejo Chamber of Commerce** | Doug Zielasko, CEO | CPUC Comment, 1/22/26

*“The Mission Viejo Chamber of Commerce requests that the CPUC amends the schedule to include a proposed decision date to provide clarity to companies doing business in California, and we would urge CPUC to ensure that timeline allows Cox and Charter to finalize this transaction by late spring 2026. California's businesses and customers shouldn't be made to wait needlessly.”*

**Orange County Business Council** | Amanda Walsh | CPUC Comment, 12/29/25

*“Absent an expedited schedule, Charter’s DOJ approval could expire before the Commission issues a final decision. Administrative delay should not stand in the way of a transaction that has already cleared federal antitrust review and presents clear benefits to Orange County. These benefits include lower-cost bundled service options with no contracts or early termination fees, improved service reliability, and access to Charter’s 100% U.S.-based customer service, available 24/7 with strong outage response commitments. The combined company will also strengthen the regional workforce, providing a minimum starting wage of \$20 per hour and transitioning Cox service jobs to Charter’s fully onshore workforce. For these reasons, OCBC respectfully urges the Commission to amend the procedural schedule to include a proposed decision date and adopt a timeline that allows Charter and Cox to close this transaction [...] well in advance of the DOJ approval expiration.”*

**Orange County Business Council** | Paulina Alvarez | Public Participation Hearing, 2/12/26

*“The benefits of this transaction are straightforward, and, as such, it deserves a quick review. OCBC supports advancing Orange County's economic engine and respectfully requests the CPUC to approve the transaction without further delay.”*

**Regional Cal Black Chamber of Commerce** | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“Therefore, on behalf of our members here at the Regional Cal Black Chamber in Southern California, we respectfully ask you to, certainly, approve this transaction by this spring of 2026 and deliver the workforce economic benefits to California expeditiously; and, of course, as usual, the Regional Cal Black Chamber stands always committed and remains available for your service at any time.”*

**San Clemente Chamber of Commerce** | Susie Lantz, CEO | CPUC Comment, 1/21/26

*“While we support thorough regulatory review, the current CPUC schedule risks undermining the very benefits this transaction will deliver. We understand that all other local, state and federal approvals are expected by early March, yet under the existing timeline, the CPUC proceeding would extend at least six months beyond that point. Charter and Cox have already received most of their federal clearance, which is set to expire in mid-September 2026. Without an adjusted timeline, the entire transaction could be at risk.”*

**San Diego North Economic Development Council** | W. Erik B., CEO | CPUC Comment, 1/26/26

*“For these reasons the Council feels the merger should be approved by the Commission in an expeditious fashion and respectfully ask for your approval.”*

**San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership** | Luis Portillo | CPUC Comment, 1/13/26

*“We look forward to continuing this relationship under the combined company and urge your swift approval of CPUC Proceeding A-2507016. Delaying review and approval beyond spring 2026 could upend this entire transaction to the detriment of San Gabriel Valley residents and businesses.”*

**Santa Barbara South Coast Chamber of Commerce** | Dustin Hoiseth, Director of Economic Development | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“We support the proposed transaction between Charter Communications and Cox and encourage the Commission to authorize this transaction in a timely manner, so our communities can realize the benefits as soon as possible.”*

**U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce** | Ramiro Cavazos, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/27/26

*“We are submitting comments in California because the state's timely review is critical for this transaction's approval. It is important that small businesses across the combined Charter-Cox footprint can start reaping the benefits of consistent, affordable service sooner. We respectfully ask the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to commit to a final order by its July meeting to keep this deal on track.”*

**U.S. Hispanic Business Council** | Javier Palomarez, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/20/26

*“Timely approval of this merger will provide certainty, accelerate infrastructure investment and deliver meaningful benefits to California's consumers, entrepreneurs and rural communities. Delaying approval risks slowing the deployment of enhanced services and limiting the ability of providers to respond to evolving technological and economic demands.” [...] “For these reasons, the United States Hispanic Business Council respectfully urges the California Public Utilities Commission to approve the Charter–Cox merger by July 2026 and avoid any unnecessary delay.”*

**Wiring Connection, Inc.** | Luis Cardenas, President | CPUC Comment, 1/29/26

*“Wiring Connection, Inc. respectfully submits this comment in support of the application by Charter Communications and Cox Communications, and to encourage the CPUC to review this transaction quickly to better align with other states and federal review timelines.”*

**American Council of the Blind** | Claire Stanley | CPUC Comment, 2/18/26

*“We are pleased to support Charter Communications’ merger with Cox because Charter has shown its commitment to making its products, services, and customer service available to all customers, including those who are blind or have low vision. As a membership organization of persons who are blind, we have heard repeated positive experiences from Charter customers.” [...] “Charter’s award-winning Accessibility Center of Excellence team has developed fully accessible products like the Spectrum Access App, an innovative technology that makes film and TV more accessible by providing audio descriptions of what’s happening on screen or closed captioning on a user’s mobile device, which means the user can take it anywhere he or she goes. Charter also made the app free and available to anyone in the U.S. In fact, the app earned Charter an award from our Audio Description Awards Gala in its inaugural year in 2021. Charter also received the Helen Keller Achievement Award in 2023. Moreover, Forbes recognized Spectrum in its 2025 “Accessibility 100” list, which “highlights the top innovators and impact-makers in the field of accessibility for people with disabilities and was compiled on the basis of more than 400 interviews and conversations with industry experts, with input from an expert advisory board.” Importantly, the merger will make Charter’s 24/7 Spectrum Disability Support center available for Cox customers. This is a phone and chat service that’s staffed by 100%-US based English and Spanish speaking employees who have extensive training to assist customers with vision, hearing, and other disabilities. Consequently, an even larger number of people will have access to this helpful resource. We support this transaction and encourage the CPUC to approve it quickly so that more blind and visually impaired Californians can access all the company’s services. We urge you to support this merger.”*

**Asian Pacific American Advocates** | Thu Nguyen | CPUC Comment, 2/20/26

*“California shouldn't keep these benefits on hold, and we're asking the CPUC to commit to final approval of the transaction no later than July of this year. We implore the CPUC to vote in favor of consumer choice and affordability and approve the Charter and Cox merger.”*

**Avance Integral Latino Community Development Corp.** | Josue Rincon | CPUC Comment, 1/5/26

*“Charter Communications is one of our trusted partners, and they continually ensure that Los Angeles and Orange County families and businesses have access to high-speed connectivity to fuel growth and connection, whether with loved ones or customers.” [...] “We are writing in support of Charter and Cox Communications’ application to combine companies, and we urge the CPUC to approve this transaction quickly so that Los Angeles and Orange Counties can begin seeing the benefits sooner.”*

**Brotherhood Crusade** | Eric Aguiar | CPUC Comment, 2/11/26

*“The Brotherhood Crusade has been working in and with the South Los Angeles community for the past 57 years – serving 25,000 community residents per year. Through programs such as at-risk youth prevention outreach, employment readiness training, and financial education, we are dedicated to improving the quality of life of low-income and underserved individuals. Charter has been a valuable partner in our work to expand youth access to essential technological resources. With this in mind, we write in support of the Charter-Cox transaction and urge the PUC to approve it. Throughout our partnership with Charter, we have witnessed their dedication to bridging the digital divide and making internet and mobile connectivity more accessible to the families who need it the most.” [...] “We urge the Commission to approve this transaction as quickly as possible so that the underserved families across California can access more affordable and reliable services.”*

**Center for New Liberalism** | Colin Mortimer | CPUC Comment, 2/17/26

*“What concerns us is the pace of the CPUC's review. Federal antitrust clearance was granted last September and expires this September. If California's process runs so far behind that the deal collapses over scheduling, not substance, that's a problem. We've seen this dynamic play out in housing, in permitting, in infrastructure: good projects dying not because anyone objected to the merits but because the process itself became the obstacle. The Commission should set a clear timeline and complete its review accordingly.”*

**Central City Association** | Nella McOsker, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/1/26

*“CCA is grateful for partners like Charter who are reliable service providers and consistent community partners. We look forward to continuing this relationship under the combined company and urge your swift approval of CPUC Proceeding A-2507016.”*

**Court Appointed Special Advocates of Imperial County (CASA)** | Alex Cardenas | CPUC Comment, 1/24/26

*“The Court Appointed Special Advocates of Imperial County (CASA) respectfully urges the CPUC to revise the procedural timeline for the pending Charter Communications and Cox Communications proceeding.” [...] We respectfully request that the Commission amend the procedural timeline to include a proposed decision date of Spring 2026 and ensure timely review, allowing Californians, especially those in Imperial County, to access the enhanced services and community benefits this deal will deliver.”*

**DIY Girls** | Cristina Gutierrez Medina, Executive Director | CPUC Comment, 1/16/26

*“For these reasons, we respectfully encourage the California Public Utilities Commission to swiftly approve this application and unleash its potential to expand educational opportunity, workforce readiness and digital inclusion for learners and families across California.”*

**Equality California** | Tony Hoang, Executive Director | CPUC Comment, 12/19/25

*“We previously sent the below letter to signal our support for the proposed transaction between Charter Communications and Cox Communications. We write now with concerns over how the Commission's current schedule could put the entire deal in jeopardy.” [...] “We ask that the Commission reevaluate this procedural schedule to establish a definitive proposed decision date and ensure California's review concludes in sync with all other federal, state, and local reviews in the spring of 2026. The benefits this merger would offer to California workers, consumers, and businesses should not be lost to lengthy administrative processes.”*

**Feeding San Diego** | AnnMarie Gabaldon | CPUC Comment, 1/26/26

*“We look forward to the opportunity this transaction’s success will bring for San Diego. Please review and approve it promptly.”*

**GLAAAC** | Gene Hale, Chairman | CPUC Comment, 12/18/25

*“We respectfully urge the CPUC to revise the proceeding timeline and to approve this merger expeditiously in the interest of California's businesses, workers, and consumers.”*

**Hispanic Heritage Foundation** | Jose Antonio Tijerino | CPUC Comment 2/26/26

*“This transaction is simple – it delivers for our workforce and customer value and choice. Thank you for your consideration, and I urge you to see the timely value for consumers and approve this deal.”*

**LA’s BEST** | Michele Broadnax | CPUC Comment, 1/7/26

*“The CPUC should easily recognize the community benefits of this transaction and the simplicity of the application. LA’s BEST encourages your prompt support for Proceeding A2507016.”*

**Latino Equality Alliance (LEA)** | Eddie Martinez | CPUC Comment, 1/13/26

*“We are writing today to support Charter’s combination with Cox Communications.”  
[...] “We think the evidence of Charter’s contributions to California are clear, and combining with Cox will only strengthen its community commitment. LEA respectfully asks the CPUC to quickly review the Charter and Cox proceeding.”*

**League of United Latin American Citizens** | Ray Serrano | CPUC Comment, 2/19/26

*“We are submitting these comments because it is critical that the CPUC commit to a final order by July 2026, which is a full 14 months after the transaction announcement and 12 months after Charter filed with the CPUC, which is certainly a sufficient timeframe to allow for meaningful review. [...] This merger has the ability to deliver measurable progress for families that deserve equitable access to opportunity and we ask that the CPUC do its part to get these benefits to the families that need them by committing to a final order no later than July 2026.”*

**LearningQuest** | Michelle Jasper, Executive Director | CPUC Comment, 2/9/26

*“Learning Quest supports equitable outcomes for students and families across California, and we believe this transaction complements our mission. We encourage the PUC’s swift support to keep this deal on schedule so California can reap the benefits.”*

**Living Coast Discovery** | Ben Vallejos, Center Executive Director | CPUC Comment, 1/27/26

*“We hope you will make swift review of their proposed transaction so we can continue to partner with them - for our business needs as well as our outreach and education programming.”*

**Loves Fishes & Computers** | Delia Leal | CPUC Comment, 3/17/26

*“We are writing in support of the merger between Charter Communications and Cox Communications to respectfully urge its swift review and approval at the Commission’s July 2026 meeting.”*

**Metropolitan Area Advisory Committee on Anti-Poverty of San Diego County** | Adolfo Ventura, Interim President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/2/26

*“MAAC strongly urges the Commissioners to approve this application in a timely manner so this process can come to a close. Together, we can ensure that every family, regardless of zip code or income across San Diego County, has access to the connectivity, tools and opportunities needed to thrive today.”*

**Move LA** | Eli Lipman | Public Participation Hearing, 2/12/26

*“...it's this understanding that we learned during the pandemic that digital access has to be affordable and available to all, and that motivates our support for this transaction that is being considered today and our encouragement for the Commission to quickly approve it.”*

**Mt. San Antonio Community College District** | Dr. Robert Hidalgo, Board President | CPUC Comment, 2/25/26

*“I believe this transaction serves the public interest. Without competition concerns or other obligations, this deal should be approved as soon as possible. Approval at the CPUC July 2026 meeting keeps this entire transaction on track.”*

**Multicultural, Media, Telecom and Internet Council (MMTC)** | Robert Branson, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/13/26

*“We think the benefits of the Charter and Cox merger are clear, and we urge the CPUC to commit to approval by July, which will be 12 months after their filing at the CPUC.”*

**National Action Network, LAX Chapter** | Pastor Oliver Buie, President | Public Participation Hearing, 2/25/26

*“This transaction brings together two companies that have a track record of positive impact in the communities they serve, and with no overlap. They can continue this work as a combined entity. NAN LAX urges the CPUC to quickly approve this deal. You cannot keep California waiting on these benefits.”*

**National Hispanic Media Coalition** | Brenda Castillo, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/27/26

*“I am writing today to ensure transparency and consistency are applied to the Charter-Cox proceeding in California on par with similar transactions and reviews. Charter-Cox filed an Application for Transfer of Control at the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) in July 2025. To align with the integrity of CPUC's practices, I urge the Commission to commit to producing a Final Order by July 2026 – 12 months after Charter-Cox's initial filing. [...] “To keep this transaction on schedule and deliver certainty on internet and mobile service providers, the California Public Utilities*

*Commission should have a proposed decision issued by mid-June 2026 and to host a vote on that decision at its July 2026 meeting. I encourage the Commission to treat this transaction fairly compared to recent, similar deals and deliver transparency on its review and decision timeline for the sake of all impacted Californians.”*

**National Hispanic Foundation for the Arts** | Felix Sanchez, Co-Founder & Chair | CPUC Comment, 3/2/26

*“After reviewing the proposed Charter–Cox transaction, NHFA supports this merger and encourages the CPUC timely approval. We appreciate the CPUC's thorough review of this transaction. However, we also recognize that federal merger clearance expires on September 15, 2026, and delays at the state level could require the companies to restart the entire federal review process.”*

**Partners in Education** | CPUC Comment, 1/28/26

*“At Partners in Education, we strive to empower thousands of TK-12 students for the world ahead through collaboration among business, schools, and the community. Our members and volunteers depend on digital devices with internet capabilities to develop professional skills. One of the key services we provide at PIE is access to these technologies for families who need them most.” [...] “The Partners in Education encourages the Commission to authorize this transaction quickly and on schedule other state and federal reviews. We believe a combined Charter-Cox company will help provide numerous benefits to our community, which will ensure the educational success of students in Santa Barbara County.”*

**Progressive Policy Institute** | Lindsey Lewis, CEO | CPUC Comment, 2/23/26

*“Our concern is the timeline. Federal clearance expires in September 2026, and the CPUC's schedule risks running well past that. California has the fourth-largest economy in the world - its regulatory process should reflect that stature, not contradict it. We’d encourage the Commission to set clear decision dates and ensure this review wraps up in a timeframe that doesn't put a pro-competitive transaction at risk for procedural reasons.”*

**San Diego Futures Foundation** | Brandon Harrison, Executive Director | CPUC Comment, 1/29/26

*“From our perspective, the proposed transaction would make the combined company a stronger competitor in the marketplace, ensure affordable pricing options, and continue investing in innovation, customer support, and communities – benefits that directly deliver for Californians. But these assurances cannot be realized unless the current CPUC timeline is immediately adjusted. It's with this in mind that we respectfully urge you to support this transaction by Spring 2026.”*

**SER National** | Ignacio Salazar, President & CEO | CPUC Comment, 3/16/26

*“The benefits that Charter currently provides its employees and future workforce align with SER’s goals for our community. Hence, we support this merger and respectfully urge that you do the same by expediting its review and approval at the Commission’s July 2026 meeting.”*

**The Latino Coalition** | Carlos Orta | CPUC Comment, 2/25/26

*“We’re writing to the CPUC to urge timely support of the Charter-Cox merger because this transaction will be helpful to Latinos who want to start and grow a business in California. [...] Please support this transaction and vote for its approval by your July 2026 meeting.”*

**The Wall Las Memorias** | Richard Zaldivar, Executive Director & Founder | CPUC Comment, 1/5/26

*“We hope the CPUC sees the impact these two companies independently have on California and understands the potential of a combined Charter-Cox. We encourage you to speed up the approval timeline so this transaction can move forward and California can begin to reap the benefits.”*

**United Boys & Girls Club of Santa Barbara County** | Taylor Swan | Public Participation Hearing, 2/4/26

*“We support this proposed transaction between Charter Communications and Cox and encourage the Commission to authorize the transaction as quickly as possible.”*