

Decision 26-07-033

July 2, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking  
Proceeding to Consider Amendments to  
General Order 133.

Rulemaking 22-03-016

**ORDER MODIFYING DECISION 25-09-031 AND  
DENYING REHEARING OF THE DECISION AS MODIFIED**

This Order addresses the application for rehearing of Decision (D.) 25-09-031 (Decision) filed by USTelecom-the Broadband Association and Pacific Bell Telephone Company D/B/A AT&T California, AT&T Enterprises, LLC, and Teleport Communications America, LLC (collectively, the VoIP Providers) and the application for rehearing of the Decision filed by CTIA and T-Mobile West LLC (collectively, the Wireless Parties). The Decision adopted amendments to the Commission’s General Order (GO) 133, which sets service quality standards for telecommunications services.

The VoIP Providers and the Wireless Parties both timely filed applications for rehearing on October 27, 2025. The VoIP Providers allege that the Decision erred by (1) not adequately establishing the need for, and not assessing the economic implications of, the service quality rules adopted in the Decision; (2) lacking substantial evidence for the service quality rules adopted;<sup>1</sup> and (3) improperly addressing issues relating to Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) Installation and Out of Service Standards, which the VoIP Providers argue was deferred to Phase 2 of the proceeding. The VoIP Providers also allege that three of the individual rules adopted in the Decision are erroneous.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrary to the VoIP Providers’ allegation, the abuse of discretion standard under Public Utilities Code section 1757.1, rather than the substantial evidence standard under Public Utilities Code section 1757, applies to rulemaking proceedings such as this one. (*See Cal. Community Choice Assn. v. Public Utilities Com.* (2024) 103 Cal.App.5th 845, 845.) Under the abuse of discretion standard, a Commission decision will only be reversed if it is “arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support.” (*Id.* at p. 856.)

Specifically, the VoIP Providers claim that the Corrective Action Plan rule is an improper duplicative penalty; that the Installation Standard is arbitrary and capricious and lacks substantial evidence supporting it; and that the fines and credits for the plain old telephone service and VoIP Out of Service Standards are not supported by the evidence and are therefore unlawful.

The Wireless Parties allege that the Decision erred: (1) because the Decision's references to wireless service, which the Wireless Parties refer to as "Extraneous Wireless Material," are inconsistent with the Commission's choice to defer all wireless issues to Phase 2 and prejudicial to the issues deferred to Phase 2; and (2) because the alleged "Extraneous Wireless Material" contains factual and legal errors.

The Center for Accessible Technology filed responses to both rehearing applications on November 12, 2025.

We have carefully considered all the allegations of error raised in both rehearing applications. We find that one modification to the Decision is warranted to correct a citation error. As modified, we do not find grounds for rehearing. (See Pub. Util. Code, § 1732; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 16.1, subd. (c).) Therefore, rehearing of the Decision is denied.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Decision 25-09-031 is modified as follows:

On page 115, the first sentence in the last paragraph, which reads as follows: "Frontier and the Small LECs argue the proposed customer refund violates Pub. Util. Code Section 453.5(a) and Pub. Util. Code Section 453.5(b), which require refunds to apply equally to all customers." is deleted.

The following is added in its place:

"Frontier and the Small LECs argue the proposed customer refund violates Pub. Util. Code Sections 453(a) and (b), which require refunds to apply equally to all customers."

2. As modified, the applications for rehearing of Decision 25-09-031 are denied.

3. Rulemaking 22-03-016 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated: July 2, 2026, at Fort Bragg, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS  
President

DARCIE L. HOUCK  
KAREN DOUGLAS  
Commissioners

Commissioner Matthew Baker recused himself  
and did not participate in the vote of this item.

Commissioner Christine Harada being absent  
did not participate in the vote of this item.