

# Energy and Technology Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5473 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE SATISFACTION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
QUALITY OF SERVICE STANDARDS AND SETTLEMENTS IN  
CONTESTED PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES

**Title:** REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

**Vote Date:** 3/19/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/12/2026

**File No.:**

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

## **SPONSORS OF BILL:**

Energy and Technology Committee

## **REASONS FOR BILL:**

This bill ensures that Connecticut residents who rely on wireless telephone services to make important phone calls are protected by ensuring that Voice over Internet Protocol ("VoIP") services are included in quality of service standard reporting requirements. Both the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) and the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) would then be able to evaluate if Connecticut residents are being protected and have access to wireless phone services.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE (IF APPLICABLE):**

Removes the word "tower" from line 34.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

**[Claire Coleman, Counsel, Office of Consumer Counsel \(OCC\):](#)**

The OCC strongly supports this bill and state that a refresh of the statute is needed due to changes in transmission technology since its original implementation in the late 1990s.

They endorse Section 2 to the bill, the proposed changes to C.G.S. Section 16-247p, stating it will help secure consumer protections and quality of service. They support the proposed changes to § 16-41(a), which enforces penalties for failing to comply with semiannual report requirements or exception report requirements.

They also address how this bill is legal and aligns with state policy. They state that the bill meets the requirements of authorized state action under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and encourages one of the statutorily designated goals of the state, to ensure telecommunication service providers provide high quality customer service and high-quality technical service. Regarding the argument that the FCC doesn't classify VoIP service as a "telecommunications service" they state that if VoIP stays an information service, the FCC has no authority to manipulate the proposed bill. They advocate for one important revision, to explain that the intent of the bill is to apply only to wireline voice service providers, not wireless commercial mobile radio service providers. They suggest the word, "towers" should be removed from the definition of "facilities-based carrier" at line 34.

The OCC expresses support for Sections 3 and 4. They state that it allows parties more options to other ways of resolving contested matters, conserving administrative resources and potentially lead to beneficial outcomes for ratepayers that otherwise wouldn't be possible through adjudication. They strongly approve of Section 4, even recommending the committee striking the automatic "deemed approved" language altogether.

#### **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

##### **[John Erlingheuser, Senior Director of Advocacy, AARP CT:](#)**

The AARP supports this bill, believing that this bill will strengthen the state's telecommunications framework and state that older adults are more vulnerable to poor service. They claim that the bill's requirement for semiannual service quality reporting is an important consumer protection measure.

#### **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

##### **[Michael Blank, Director of Legislative Affairs, CTIA:](#)**

The CTIA is in opposition to this bill. They state that the bill can weaken the stable national regulatory structure that wireless providers operate under today. They also cite research to support their claim that public-utility-style regulations on wireless service will harm Connecticut consumers. In addition, they claim that the FCC has recognized that the internet is an inherently interstate network and is therefore not amendable to state-specific regulation. They also insist that the state's consumers have benefitted from wireless competition as well.

##### **[Anna Lucey, Executive Vice President, New England Connectivity & Telecommunications Association, Inc. \(NECTA\):](#)**

NECTA opposes this bill, stating that traditional-service quality regulation is unnecessary for the current communications marketplace because consumers can switch providers when they find the service unsatisfactory.

##### **[Amanda Trinsey, Counsel, Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers \(CIEC\):](#)**

The CIEC believes the legal parameters guiding PURA's settlement process needs more changes to improve the clarity and inclusivity of proceedings before it pursues the best interests of all customers. They are also supportive of creating and implementing structured guidelines that would govern the settlement process and agreements reached in proceedings.

They bring attention to settlement procedures that New York has, which requires all parties/intervenors to a proceeding to receive notice that settlement negotiations are beginning and be included from the beginning of all settlement discussions. They state that this has worked well for New York, grants parties more time to begin the settlement process, and incentivizes more cooperation. They continue that PURA can provide deadlines to be followed if needed. They provide proposed revisions to C.G.S.A. § 16-19jj as well.

[Percy Faith](#) opposes this bill.

**Peter Myers, Senior Policy Director, Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA):**

CBIA opposes this bill because of the wide regulatory framework it would put on the telecommunications and digital communications industry. They state that subjecting internet-based VoIP services to state-level quality-of-service regulation may create confusion, raise compliance costs, and slow innovation.

**Reported by: Tatyana Massa, Abigail Lockwood      Date: 4/1/2026**