

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



FILED

06/22/26

04:59 PM

R2103002

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update
Surcharge Mechanisms to Ensure Equity and
Transparency of Fees, Taxes, and Surcharges
Assessed on Customers of Telecommunications
Services in California.

Rulemaking 21-03-002

**REPLY COMMENTS OF CTIA ON
PROPOSED DECISION CLOSING RULEMAKING 21-03-002**

Geoffrey G. Why
Partner
Verrill Dana LLP
One Federal St., 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (857) 233-3275
Email: gwhy@verrill-law.com

Attorneys for CTIA

June 22, 2026

Pursuant to Rule 14.3 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”), CTIA submits this reply to the comments on the Proposed Decision of Administrative Law Judge Hazlyn Fortune Closing Rulemaking 21-03-002 (“PD”).

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.

As discussed below, the PD correctly concludes that the docket should be closed. The Center for Accessible Technology’s (“CforAT’s”) assertions that closing the docket could lead to bill increases for consumers is baseless and contrary to the factual record.

CTIA supports the California Broadband and Video Association’s (“Cal Broadband’s”) proposed minor changes to the PD to confirm that the Commission retains discretion to determine whether a successor proceeding is needed. CTIA also supports CforAT’s suggestion that Commission should clarify that its user fee collection mechanism remains unchanged.

II. THE PD CORRECTLY CONCLUDES THAT THE DOCKET SHOULD BE CLOSED.

The initial comments confirm that this proceeding has achieved its intended purposes and should be closed. There is no basis for CforAT’s allegation that closing the docket could result in bill increases for consumers as a result of “excessive,” “undisclosed provider-imposed surcharges.”¹ To the contrary, the record shows that existing provisions of California law, Commission rules, and federal law require that wireless providers’ fees and charges are reasonable and fully disclosed to consumers.² Such disclosure is further required by CTIA’s

¹ Center for Accessible Technology’s Comments on Proposed Decision Closing Rulemaking 21-03-002, at 1-3 (Jun. 16, 2026) (“CforAT Comments”).

² See, e.g., Reply Comments of CTIA on Assigned Commissioner’s Phase Two Scoping Memo and Ruling at 5 & n.18 (July 18, 2025).

Consumer Code for Wireless. Furthermore, intense competition for wireless services creates an inherent imperative for providers' charges to align with consumers' expectations.³ The record further shows that numerous wireless plans are available with no fees at all.⁴ There is therefore no basis for CforAT's opposition, and the Commission should close the docket as the PD proposes.

III. CAL BROADBAND PROPOSES REASONABLE MINOR CHANGES TO THE PD TO CONFIRM THAT THE COMMISSION RETAINS DISCRETION TO DETERMINE WHETHER A FURTHER PROCEEDINGS IS NEEDED.

CTIA agrees with Cal Broadband's proposed minor changes to the PD to confirm that the Commission retains discretion to determine whether a successor proceeding is needed. As Cal Broadband points out, the PD initially indicates that the Commission "may" choose to re-examine issues raised in Phase 2 of this proceeding at some point in the future, while other statements in the PD seem to suggest that it will do so.⁵ As Cal Broadband points out, the record shows that regulation of provider fees was outside the scope of the proceeding and would raise significant legal issues.⁶ CTIA thus concurs that the Commission should make the minor changes that Cal Broadband proposes to affirm that the Commission may correctly conclude that it need not, and should not, pursue these issues further.⁷ For similar reasons, CTIA agrees that

³ *Id.* at 6.

⁴ *Id.* at 6 & n.19.

⁵ Comments of the California Broadband & Video Association on Proposed Decision Closing Rulemaking 21-02-002 at 1, 3 (July 16, 2026) ("Cal Broadband Comments").

⁶ *Id.*, see also Comments of CTIA on Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Concerning Phase 2 of the Proceeding at 7-8 (Apr. 5, 2023).

⁷ Cal Broadband Comments at 2-3, App.

the Commission may wish to clarify that the user fee collection mechanism remains unchanged despite termination of Phase 2 of this docket, as CforAT suggests.⁸

* * *

Respectfully submitted June 22, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

By: /s/ Geoffrey G. Why
Geoffrey G. Why
Partner
Verrill Dana LLP
One Federal St., 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
Email: gwhy@verrill-law.com

Attorneys for CTIA

⁸ CforAT Comments at 4.