

EXHIBIT TURN-42

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL RESPONSE OF
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS HOLDINGS, LLC
TO *CAL ADVOCATES DATA REQUEST 08***

Application 25-07-016

**Request Date: January 27, 2026
Response Date: February 10, 2026**

[PUBLIC VERSION]

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL RESPONSE OF
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND
CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS HOLDINGS, LLC
TO CAL ADVOCATES DATA REQUEST 08**

Charter Communications, Inc. and Charter Communications Holdings, LLC (collectively, “Charter”) hereby submit this response (“Response”) to the requests submitted by the Public Advocates Office (“Cal Advocates”) on January 27, 2026, as part of the Application (“A.”) 25-07-016 proceeding (“Data Requests”). Subject to the following request for confidential treatment, general and specific objections as applicable, and reservations of rights, Charter responds as set forth herein.

REQUEST FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT

Charter has designated certain information and data provided in response to the Data Requests as confidential and requests that all such information be protected from public disclosure. This includes outage and service quality information of the type protected from disclosure under California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) orders and state and federal law, and contains trade secrets and other highly competitively sensitive material that, if publicly disclosed, could cause competitive harm to Charter.¹ This request for confidential treatment is supported by the enclosed declaration of Torry R. Somers. Accordingly, Charter submits the Response subject to Public Utilities Code Section 583 and other applicable law. By accepting the attached data, Cal Advocates consents to maintain the data as confidential and to limit the use of such data to the purposes set forth herein. If Cal Advocates objects to the terms outlined in this Response regarding the use of Charter’s provided confidential data and information, Charter respectfully requests that Cal Advocates return or destroy the enclosed information and verify in writing to Charter that such destruction has occurred.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Cal Advocates has submitted instructions for Charter to follow in responding to the Data Requests. Propounding parties are not entitled to compliance with such instructions, however, and to the extent Charter has voluntarily complied with some or all of the instructions, such compliance does not constitute consent to the instructions and is not a waiver of any of Charter’s rights.² Charter objects to each and every instruction submitted with the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them exceed the requirements of applicable law and/or purport to impose on Charter any obligations greater than those set forth in the California Public Utilities Code, the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, Commission orders and decisions, and/or any other statutes, orders, rules, or laws governing the proper scope and extent of discovery in this proceeding.

¹ See, e.g., Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 583; General Order 66-D, § 3.2; 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(4); 47 C.F.R. § 0.457(d); Cal. Gov’t Code § 7927.605; Cal. Evid. Code § 1060.

² See, e.g., Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 2030.060(d) (“No preface or instruction shall be included with a set of interrogatories.”).

2. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them seek information and/or documents relating to (a) any other person, entity, or affiliate that is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission or that does not conduct regulated operations in the State of California; and/or (b) matters, including services, products, or technologies, that are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, are beyond the scope of this proceeding, or where the Commission’s authority is limited and such authority does not extend to the matter at hand under state and/or federal law. For example, the Commission has limited authority over video and broadband service,³ and such authority does not extend to those services in the context of this proceeding, including regulation of general video programming.⁴ In particular, video service is irrelevant to this proceeding. Cox California, the only transferee at issue in the Joint Application, does not provide video services; even if it did, the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act (“DIVCA”) governs the transfer of state video franchisees, and by law requires only notice and not Commission review.⁵ Furthermore, the Commission does not possess broad discovery authority over video service providers. Under DIVCA, “[t]he holder of a state [video] franchise shall not be deemed a public utility as a result of providing video service.”⁶ While the Joint Application referenced certain video-market benefits as context, it expressly stated such information is “outside the scope” of this proceeding.⁷ Additionally, the Commission lacks jurisdiction over broadband service,⁸ including over the cost of broadband service;

³ See Cal. Const. art. XII, § 6 (limiting the Commission’s plenary jurisdiction to “public utilities”); Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 216(a)(1) (defining public utilities as including “every common carrier, toll bridge corporation, pipeline corporation, gas corporation, electrical corporation, telephone corporation, telegraph corporation, water corporation, sewer system corporation, and heat corporation” but not cable or broadband companies). Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(3) (“[V]ideo service providers are not public utilities or common carriers”); see also *In re Restoring Internet Freedom*, Declaratory Ruling, Report and Order, and Order, 33 FCC Rcd 311, 429 ¶ 199 (2018) (“As a preliminary matter, it is well-settled that Internet access is a jurisdictionally interstate service”), *vacated in part*, *Mozilla Corp. v. FCC* (D.C. Cir. 2019) 940 F.3d 1; *Ohio Telecom Ass’n v. FCC (In re MCP No. 185)* (6th Cir. 2025) 124 F.4th 993, 1004 (quoting 47 U.S.C. § 230(b)(2) (“[T]he policy of the United States is ‘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.’”)).

⁴ See 47 U.S.C. § 544(b)(1).

⁵ Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5840(m)(1); General Order 169, § VII.F.1.

⁶ Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5820(c); see also *id.* § 5810(a)(3) (noting “video service providers are not public utilities or common carriers”).

⁷ 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) at 22, A.25-07-016 (July 30, 2025) (“Joint Application”). The Transfer is part of the transaction that will result in a combination of Charter and Cox under common ownership (the “Transaction”).

⁸ The Commission has held that “Internet service is classified for state and federal regulatory purposes as an ‘information service’ and [] state commissions such as the California Public Utilities Commission *do not have jurisdiction over information services* even if the providers also provide ‘communications services’ that are subject to state regulation.” *In re Arthur G. Peterson, Complainant, vs. Verizon*

therefore, the broadband services offered by the California operating subsidiaries of Charter and Cox are not subject to cost-of-service or other rate regulation by the Commission. Unless stated otherwise, Charter limits its Response to data and information pertaining directly to the transfer of control described in the Joint Application⁹ submitted in A.25-07-016 (the “Transfer”), which excludes matters relating to mobile, video, and broadband services. Nothing in this Response should be construed as conceding that Spectrum Pacific West, LLC—Charter’s unregulated broadband and cable affiliate that is not a party to the Joint Application nor subject to the Transfer—is a “[p]ublic utility” as defined by Public Utilities Code Section 216, or that either broadband or mobile are within the scope of this proceeding. Furthermore, nothing in this Response should be construed as conceding that Spectrum Mobile, LLC—Charter’s mobile affiliate that is not a party to the Joint Application nor subject to the Transfer—is within the scope of this proceeding. Charter likewise limits its Response to data and information in the possession, custody, or control of Charter’s subsidiaries and affiliates registered in California, unless stated otherwise.

3. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them seek or purport to seek the disclosure of information or documents from both Charter and Cox. Charter responds to the Data Requests with respect to Charter only.
4. Charter objects to the Data Requests as improper, overbroad, and unduly burdensome to the extent that all or any of them seek the disclosure of information or documents containing privileged communications, attorney work product, and/or other protected information on the ground that such discovery is not permissible under the California Code of Civil Procedure, California Evidence Code, or applicable rules in the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure. Demand is hereby made that any such inadvertently produced documents or items be returned to Charter immediately together with any copies.
5. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them improperly request or purport to require access to confidential, competitively sensitive, and/or proprietary business information and trade secrets belonging to Charter, including information subject to protection under the California Public Records Act (“CPRA”) and other provisions of substantive law that restrict public access to sensitive and proprietary information.
6. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them seek the production of information and/or documents not in Charter’s possession, custody, or control, or in the requested format, not readily available to Charter, or produced and kept by Charter in its ordinary course of business.
7. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them seek the production of information and/or documents that were not prepared by Charter and/or which Charter is not entitled to disseminate to a third party.

California, Inc. (U1002C) and Pacific Bell Telephone Company, dba AT&T California (U1001C), Defendants, D.13-12-005 at 2, 2013 Cal. PUC LEXIS 677, at *2. (emphasis added) (footnotes omitted).

⁹ Joint Application at 1.

8. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them seek the production of information and/or documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter involved in this proceeding, admissible in evidence, nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
9. Charter objects to the Data Requests to the extent all or any of them, either on their own or when read in conjunction with the instructions contained therein, seek confidential and proprietary materials relating to Charter's customers or business practices whose probative value in this proceeding is substantially outweighed by the risk of prejudice or other potential harm to Charter.
10. Charter objects to the Data Requests insofar as all or any of them are vague, ambiguous, cumulative, duplicative, overly broad and unduly burdensome, imprecise, or utilize terms that are subject to multiple interpretations and are not properly defined or explained for purposes of the information request.

RESERVATIONS OF RIGHTS

1. Any information or materials provided in response to these Data Requests shall be without prejudice to Charter's right to object to the admissibility of such information or materials as evidence, or its right to object to further discovery of documents, other information, or materials relating to the same or similar subject matter upon any valid ground, nor be deemed a waiver of objections or applicable privileges. Charter reserves the right to interpose further objections at the time of producing data or documents or to withdraw any objection interposed herein.
2. The fact that any response is given to the Data Requests is not an admission or concession that the substance of the Data Request is permissible discovery or inquiry.
3. Charter's Response is not an admission or concession as to any matter of law, including, without limitation, the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction or authority over any matter being investigated or considered by the Commission.
4. Charter's investigation and discovery of the matters relating to the Data Requests are continuing. The responses and objections herein are based upon information and or documents presently known to, and in the possession of, Charter. Charter reserves the right to rely on any documents or other evidence that may develop or subsequently come to its attention, to assert additional objections should Charter discover that there is information or grounds for objections, and to supplement or amend these responses at any time.
5. Nothing contained in these responses is intended to be or should be considered a waiver of the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product doctrine, or other applicable privilege, immunity, the right of privacy, or other exemption from discovery. Charter specifically reserves the right to assert privileges for any privileged or otherwise protected information that is disclosed inadvertently in response to these Data Requests.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

9. **Question No. 9**

Please refer to Charter's response to DR-06 Question 1[.]

- a. *Please confirm that the "Residential" and "Small and Medium Business" passings for December 2024 and June 2025 are comparable to the corresponding nationwide "passings" data provided on Slide 11 of the May 16, 2025, Presentation discussed and distributed at the investor webcast of that date where the details of the Charter/Cox merger were announced. A Copy of the referenced Slide 11 is provided below.*

[slide omitted]

- b. *If your Response to (a) is that these nationwide and California-specific figures are not comparable, please explain in detail any and all differences in methodology, data sources, time frame or other attributes of these data series that operate to render them not comparable.*
- c. *Please provide all Charter data on a California basis corresponding to the nationwide figures for Charter that were provided on that Slide 11.*

Response to Question No. 9

Charter incorporates the above-stated Objections and Reservations of Rights into this response, including but not limited to those set forth in Objections 1, 2, 6, 8, and 10, and Reservations of Rights 1-5.

Subject to the foregoing and without waiver of its Objections or Reservations of Rights, Charter responds as follows:

- a. *Please confirm that the "Residential" and "Small and Medium Business" passings for December 2024 and June 2025 are comparable to the corresponding nationwide "passings" data provided on Slide 11 of the May 16, 2025, Presentation discussed and distributed at the investor webcast of that date where the details of the Charter/Cox merger were announced. A Copy of the referenced Slide 11 is provided below.*

Yes, the data provided for the "Residential" and "Small and Medium Business" passings for December 2024 and June 2025 in Charter's response to DR-06, Question 1 are comparable to the corresponding nationwide "passings" data provided on Slide 11 of the referenced presentation.

- b. *If your Response to (a) is that these nationwide and California-specific figures are not comparable, please explain in detail any and all differences in methodology, data sources, time frame or other attributes of these data series that operate to render them not comparable.*

Not applicable.

c. Please provide all Charter data on a California basis corresponding to the nationwide figures for Charter that were provided on that Slide 11.

Table 6 below identifies the California data for the information provided on a Nationwide basis on Slide 11 of the May 16, 2025 Presentation.

		Charter - Nationwide	[BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
1Q25 Customers ¹⁵	Passings	57.2M	
	Customer Relationships ¹⁶	31.4M	
	Internet	30.0M	
	Video	12.7M	
	Mobile Lines	10.4M	
	Voice	6.6M	
1Q25 Penetration ¹⁷	Customer Relationships ¹⁶	55%	
	Internet	53%	
	Video	22%	
	Voice	12%	
FY24 Financials	Revenue	\$55.1B	
	Adj. EBITDA	\$22.6B	
	Capital Expenditures	\$11.3B	
	Adj. EBITDA - Capex	\$11.3B	
			[END CONFIDENTIAL]



¹⁵ This includes residential and commercial customers.

¹⁶ Customer relationships include the number of customers that receive one or more levels of service, encompassing internet, video, mobile, and voice services, without regard to which service(s) such customers receive. Total customer relationships excludes mobile-only customer relationships.

¹⁷ Penetration is based on total passings, which includes residential and commercial passings.

**DECLARATION OF TORRY R. SOMERS SEEKING CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT
OF CHARTER'S RESPONSE TO *CAL ADVOCATES DATA REQUEST 08***

I, Torry R. Somers, declare as follows:

1. I am Vice President, State Regulatory Affairs for Charter Communications, Inc., and I am authorized by Adam Falk, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs for Charter Communications, Inc., to make this declaration on behalf of Charter Communications, Inc. and Charter Communications Holdings, LLC (collectively, "Charter").
2. I have reviewed the information provided in this Response to *Cal Advocates Data Request 08*.
3. Charter requests confidential treatment of all of the information marked as confidential in the Response.
4. This request for confidential treatment is made pursuant to Sections 3.2 and 3.3 of General Order ("GO") 66-D. This document addresses the requirements of Section 3.2, including the Section 3.2(c) declaration. The referenced information has been marked as confidential.
5. Based on my knowledge, experience, and review of the data submitted by Charter, I make this declaration seeking confidential treatment of the information contained therein.

Subscriber Data

6. I am informed and believe that the responses to Question Nos. 1-3, and 9 contain exactly the type of subscriber data that the Commission has previously determined is competitively sensitive and should be afforded confidential treatment. I am informed and believe that state and federal law protect against public disclosure of subscriber information.
7. I am informed and believe that the California Public Records Act and California Evidence Code protect against public disclosure of trade secret information.¹ The above-referenced deployment and subscriber data is trade secret because it is information that: (i) is not generally known to the public; (ii) derives independent value from not being generally known because Charter has numerous competitors in the communications service marketplace that could use its information to learn more about Charter's investment and competitive strategies in California and for competitive marketing and targeting customers, thereby gaining an unfair competitive advantage over Charter; and (iii) Charter makes significant efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy, including not disclosing to the public, and only disclosing to the government with request for confidential treatment. I have been informed, and on this basis believe, that established

¹ See Cal. Gov't Code § 7927.605(a) ("Nothing in this division requires the disclosure of records that are ... corporate proprietary information including trade secrets"); Cal. Evid. Code § 1060 ("If he or his agent or employee claims the privilege, the owner of a trade secret has a privilege to refuse to disclose the secret, and to prevent another from disclosing it").

case law has determined that data does not lose its trade secret status simply due to limited or partial disclosure.

Financial Information

8. I am informed and believe that the response to Question No. 9 contains exactly the type of financial data that the Commission has previously determined is protected from disclosure under the California Public Records Act, including Government Code Section 7927.605, as it is competitively sensitive, is the type of data that the Commission has granted confidential treatment for in the past,² and that should be afforded confidential treatment and protection from disclosure under state and federal law.
9. I am informed and believe that the California Public Records Act exempts from disclosure any records the disclosure of which is prohibited or exempted pursuant to federal or state law, including, but not limited to, provisions of the Evidence Code.
10. I am informed and believe that the Commission has previously found that disclosure of financial data and instruments, such as the information contained in the response to Question No. 9, is “likely to display sensitive financial information relating to a provider’s bank accounts, cash deposits and transactions to prove financial fitness” and that it can “reveal their expenditures and market share, which their competitors could use to obtain a competitive advantage over them,” thereby warranting the Commission’s protection from disclosure.³

Operational and Business Information

11. I am informed and believe that the responses to Question Nos. 12-14 contain the type of operational and business information that the Commission has previously determined is competitively sensitive and should be afforded confidential treatment. I am informed and believe that state and federal law protect against public disclosure of this information.
12. I am informed and believe that the California Public Records Act and California Evidence Code protect against public disclosure of trade secret information.⁴ The above-referenced operations data is trade secret because it is information that: (i) is not generally known to

² See, e.g., *Re Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission’s own Motion into the alleged failure of TracFone Wireless, Inc. (U4321C) to collect and remit public purpose program surcharges and user fees on revenue from its sale of intrastate telephone service to California consumers, in violation of the laws, rules and regulations of this State; Order to Show Cause why Respondent should not immediately be ordered to pay all such outstanding sums plus interest, and be subject to penalties for such violations*, D.14-01-037, 2014 Cal. PUC LEXIS 39, at *77-79.

³ *Order Instituting Rulemaking Proceeding to Consider Changes to Licensing Status and Obligations of Interconnected Voice over Internet Protocol Carriers*, D.24-11-003, 2024 Cal. PUC LEXIS 623 at *60-61.

⁴ See Cal. Gov’t Code § 7927.605(a) (“Nothing in this division requires the disclosure of records that are ... corporate proprietary information including trade secrets.”); Cal. Evid. Code § 1060 (“If he or his agent or employee claims the privilege, the owner of a trade secret has a privilege to refuse to disclose the secret and to prevent another from disclosing it.”).

the public; (ii) derives independent value from not being generally known because Charter has numerous competitors in the communications service marketplace that could use its information to learn more about Charter's investment and competitive strategies in California and for competitive marketing and targeting customers, thereby gaining an unfair competitive advantage over Charter; and (iii) Charter makes significant efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy, including not disclosing to the public, and only disclosing to the government with request for confidential treatment. I have been informed, and on this basis believe, that established case law has determined that data does not lose its trade secret status simply due to limited or partial disclosure.

Mobile Data Information

13. I am informed and believe that the California Public Records Act and California Evidence Code protect against public disclosure of trade secret information.⁵ The mobile data information set forth in response to Question No. 15 is trade secret because it is information that: (i) is not generally known to the public; (ii) derives independent value from not being generally known because Charter has numerous competitors and major content company counter-parties in the mobile data marketplace that could use this sensitive information to learn more about Charter's negotiation and competitive strategies that could interfere with Charter's ability to effectively negotiate agreements and compete with other mobile data providers on content and price, thereby gaining an unfair competitive advantage over Charter; and (iii) Charter makes significant efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy, including not disclosing to the public, including non-disclosure provisions in business arrangements regarding this information, and only disclosing to the government with request for confidential treatment.
14. I am informed and believe that the California Public Records Act protects against disclosure when "the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure."⁶ The public interest in preserving the confidentiality of this information far outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Disclosure would undermine Charter's competitive advantage and therefore diminish the benefits that flow from a competitive communications service marketplace. This could undermine the functioning of competitive markets, produce unfair competition conditions that harm consumers, and lead to abuse of the regulatory process to obtain confidential information. Further, a failure to preserve the confidentiality of the information would discourage voluntary disclosure and undermine the Commission's ability to perform its duties. The risk of such harm outweighs any public interest in disclosure.
15. To the extent that there is a need to make contact regarding potential release of information, please contact Torry Somers, torry.somers@charter.com and Camillie Landrón (counsel for Charter), clandron@jenner.com.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *See* Cal. Gov't Code § 7922.000.

16. I affirm and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, including Rule 1.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, that, to the best of my knowledge, all of the statements and representations made in this declaration are true and correct.

Executed on this 10th day of February, 2026, in El Segundo, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Torry R. Somers", written over a horizontal line.

Torry R. Somers
Vice President, State Regulatory Affairs