



**FILED**

06/03/26

09:15 AM

R2602017

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking  
Proceeding to Consider Service  
Quality Rules for Wireless Carriers.

Rulemaking 26-02-017

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING**

This Scoping Memo and Ruling sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

**1. Procedural Background**

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) opened this rulemaking to consider proposed amendments to the Commission's General Order (GO) 133, in particular whether to apply GO 133, or similar standards to wireless voice service. GO 133 sets minimum service quality standards for wireline telecommunications services and includes an enforcement mechanism. As part of Rulemaking (R.) 22-03-016, the Commission considered revisions to GO 133-D, and in approving Decision (D.) 25-09-031, adopted GO 133-E.

A prehearing conference in this proceeding was held on April 8, 2026, to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other items as necessary. After considering comments on the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR), the discussion at the prehearing conference, and the filings of AT&T, T-Mobile and Verizon in

response to the OIR's order to submit data and information,<sup>1</sup> I have determined the issues and initial schedule of the proceeding to be set forth in this Scoping Memo.

## **2. Issues**

This proceeding will consider the following issues:

1. Should the Commission apply the service quality requirements in GO 133-E to wireless voice services?
2. Should the Commission modify any of the existing service quality metrics, standards and reporting requirements applicable to wireless voice services? Are there reporting requirements or metrics that the Commission should not mandate?
3. Should the Commission apply the GO 133-E customer service metrics and standards to wireless voice, or develop new customer service standards and reporting requirements? Are there reporting requirements or metrics that the Commission should not mandate?
4. Are there impacts on environmental and social justice communities, including the extent to which wireless outages and other service quality challenges impact the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan?
5. Are there impacts on Tribal communities, including the extent to which wireless outages and other service quality challenges specifically impact Tribal governments, Tribal members, and Tribal businesses?

In response to comments at the prehearing conference made by the California Broadband and Video Association,<sup>2</sup> this Scoping Memo and Ruling clarifies that broadband service is not included in the scope of this proceeding.

---

<sup>1</sup> OIR at 11-16, Ordering Paragraph 8.

<sup>2</sup> Reporters' Transcript, at 27:1-18.

Additionally, the service of Mobile Virtual Network Operators (MVNOs) is not in the scope of this proceeding. Further, given the conflicting comments made by Verizon,<sup>3</sup> AT&T,<sup>4</sup> CTIA,<sup>5</sup> and the Utility Reform Network (TURN), in particular TURN's statement that there is "evidence that cellular networks are used to provide voice fixed wireless..."<sup>6</sup> it is premature to exclude mobile voice service that uses fixed wireless in a categorical manner. Finally, the Commission is aware that AT&T has applied to the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) to discontinue plain old telephone service (POTS) for approximately 184,000 residential customers in portions of 360 wire centers in California, and proposing to replace their service with its Phone-Advanced product<sup>7</sup> though, as of the date of issuance, the FCC has not yet accepted the filing. The Commission does not have sufficient information at this time to determine whether AT&T's Phone-Advanced product is a wireless service or some other technology. Thus, it would be inappropriate at this time to exclude any service offered by AT&T, T-Mobile, Verizon and other facilities-based mobile voice services.

As the Commission considers customer service rules for wireless voice providers, we will monitor the FCC's rulemaking focused on onshoring of call centers, improving customer service and security of communications, and

---

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, at 20:2-7

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, at 21:7-10.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, at 25:3-5.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, at 26:1-5.

<sup>7</sup> *See*, In the Matter of Section 63.71 Application of AT&T Services, Inc., on behalf of its affiliate; Pacific Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T California Authority Pursuant to Section 214 of The Communications Act of 1934, As Amended, To Discontinue the Provision of Service. AT&T filed this application on May 20, 2026.

addressing robocall scams that originate inside foreign call centers<sup>8</sup> to ensure our proposed rules do not conflict with rules the FCC may adopt.

### **3. Need for Evidentiary Hearing**

Parties have not identified material disputed facts, nor have parties requested an evidentiary hearing. Accordingly, no evidentiary hearing is needed at this time. Parties may still file a motion for evidentiary hearing. However, any motion must identify the specific disputed material facts. Motions must be filed not later than 10 days after Workshop #1, as noted in the schedule in Section 4 of this Scoping Memo and Ruling.

As a reminder to all parties, the Commission will make a decision based on the record. Parties should exercise the opportunity to inform the record with credible information when directed to do so. At the PHC, the three wireless carriers (T-Mobile, Verizon and AT&T) stated that it was premature to identify disputed facts. These parties requested the opportunity to submit evidence *after* one or more of the following events in this proceeding: 1) the issuance of the Staff Proposal; 2) the issuance of a workshop report; or 3) workshops.<sup>9</sup> Not following the Commission's standard process for building a record and allowing carriers to avoid submitting evidence or information until after a workshop or even later is not a reasonable request and will delay this proceeding. Furthermore, the three wireless carriers must not submit in a piecemeal manner the information and

---

<sup>8</sup> *In the Matter of: Improving Customer Service and Protecting Consumers through Onshoring* (CG Docket No. 26-52), *Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls* (CG Docket No. 17-59), and *Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991* (CG Docket No. 02-278), FCC-CIRC2603-01, released March 5, 2026.

<sup>9</sup> *See*, Reporters' Transcript, at 36:1-8, 38:21-40:6, and 42:3-11.

data the Commission orders them to provide,<sup>10</sup> as that also unreasonably delays this proceeding.

**4. Schedule**

The following schedule is adopted here and may be modified by the assigned Commissioner or Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the rulemaking.

Event	Date
Workshop # 1	June 25, 2026
Informal Tribal Consultation	Following Workshop #1
Remote Public Participation Hearings	July 15, 2026 and July 23, 2026
Staff Proposal, filed and served	August 2026
Workshop #2	August 2026
Opening Comments, filed and served	20 days after Staff Proposal issued
Reply Comments, filed and served [matter submitted]	10 days after Opening Comments
Commissioner Led Tribal Consultation	Prior to issuance of the Proposed Decision
Proposed decision	no later than 90 days after submission
Commission decision	no sooner than 30 days after Proposed Decision

---

<sup>10</sup> *Supra*, footnote 1. *See also*, Reporters’ Transcript, at 80:18-81:21, where AT&T admits to not filing the verifications ordered by the Commission. *See also*, Procedural Communication from Leon Bloomfield, attorney for T-Mobile, April 17, 2026, where Mr. Bloomfield writes that “T-Mobile has now been able to collect and analyze its Cal OES Community Isolation Reports that predate April 14, 2021, by ZIP Code, date and duration.”

The proceeding will stand submitted upon the filing of reply comments, unless the ALJ requires further evidence or argument. Based on this schedule, the proceeding will be resolved within 18 months as required by Public Utilities Code Section 1701.5.

**5. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions**

This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary determination<sup>11</sup> that this is a quasi-legislative proceeding. Accordingly, ex parte communications are permitted without restriction or reporting requirement pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

**6. Public Outreach**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1711(a), where feasible and appropriate, before determining the scope of the proceeding, the Commission sought the participation of those likely to be affected, including those likely to derive benefit from, and those potentially subject to, a decision in this proceeding. This matter was noticed on the Commission's daily calendar. Where feasible and appropriate, this matter was incorporated into engagements conducted by the Commission's External Affairs Division with local governments and other interested parties.

In addition, the Commission served the Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Service List of R.22-03-016.

**7. Intervenor Compensation**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1804(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve a notice of intent to claim compensation by May 8, 2026, 30 days after the prehearing conference.

---

<sup>11</sup> OIR at 17.

## **8. Response to Public Comments**

Parties may, but are not required to, respond to written comments received from the public. Parties may do so by posting such response using the “Add Public Comment” button on the “Public Comment” tab of the online docket card for the proceeding.

## **9. Public Advisor**

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission’s procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/about-cpuc/divisions/news-and-public-information-office/public-advisors-office> or contact the Commission’s Public Advisor at 866-849-8390 or 866-836-7825 (TTY), or send an e-mail to [public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov).

## **10. Filing, Service, and Service List**

The official service list has been created and is on the Commission’s website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list is correct and serve notice of any errors on the Commission’s Process office, the service list, and the ALJ. Interpreted persons and entities may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4.<sup>12</sup>

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the current official service list on the Commission’s website.

This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the

---

<sup>12</sup> The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>.

date scheduled for service to occur. Unless otherwise instructed, parties also must serve on the assigned ALJ only electronic copies of filed or served documents.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

All filings that parties docket in this proceeding, such as comments, briefs, and motions, shall be verified consistent with Rule 1.11.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceeding may contact the Process Office at [process\\_office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:process_office@cpuc.ca.gov) to request addition to the “Information Only” category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

The Commission encourages those who seek information-only status on the service list to consider the Commission’s subscription service as an alternative. The subscription service sends individual notifications to each subscriber of formal e-filings accepted by the Commission. Notices sent through subscription service are less likely to be flagged by spam or other filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

#### **11. Receiving Electronic Service from the Commission**

Parties and other persons on the service list are advised that it is the responsibility of each person or entity on the service list for Commission proceedings to ensure their ability to receive emails from the Commission. Please add “@cpuc.ca.gov” to your email safe sender list and update your email

screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of emails from the Commission.

**12. Assignment of Proceeding**

Darcie L. Houck is the assigned commissioner and Thomas J. Glegola is the assigned ALJ for the proceeding.

**IT IS RULED** that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above and is adopted.
2. The schedule of this proceeding is set forth above and is adopted.
3. Evidentiary hearing is not needed.
4. The category of the proceeding is quasi-legislative.

Dated June 3, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DARCIE L HOUCK

Darcie L. Houck  
Assigned Commissioner