SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor



Action Request Response

To: Public Service Commission of Utah

From: Utah Division of Public Utilities

Chris Parker, Director

Brenda Salter, Assistant Director

Abdinasir Abdulle, Utility Technical Consultant Supervisor

Kelley O'Connor, Utility Analyst

Date: September 5, 2025

Re: Docket No. 25-999-03, Utah Universal Service Fund Overpayment by WWT, Inc.

Recommendation (Approve)

The Division of Public Utilities (Division) has investigated the suspected overpayment by Commpliance Group (Agent) on behalf of WWT, Inc. (Company) and recommends the Public Service Commission (Commission) approve the Company's request for a refund of the May and June, 2025 Universal Service Fund (USF) payments that were received, totaling \$1,539.72.

Issue

On July 30, 2025, Agent contacted the Commission regarding Universal Surcharge remittal payments for May and June, 2025 totaling \$1,628.70. Agent stated these remittances were made in error and should be refunded in the amount of \$1,089.99 attributed to the May, 2025 remittance and \$538.71 attributed to the June, 2025 remittance. The Commission issued an Action Request on August 11, 2025, for the Division to investigate the claims made by Agent. This memorandum represents the Division's response to the Commission's Action Request.



Background

Utah Administrative Code R746-8 governs the Utah Universal Public Telecommunications Service Support Fund (UUSF). Section 301 provides for the Calculation and Application of UUSF Surcharge.

R746-8-301(1)(a):

Unless Subsection R746-8-301(3) applies, providers shall remit to the Commission \$0.98 per month per access line that, as of the last calendar day of each month, has a place of primary use in Utah in accordance with the Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act, 4 U.S.C. Sec. 116 et seq.

R746-8-301(1)(c) (c):

A provider may collect the surcharge:

- (i) as an explicit charge to each end-user; or
- (ii) through inclusion of the surcharge within the end-user's rate plan.

Utah Code makes a distinction between how the surcharge is remitted to the Commission and collected via a surcharge. Even if a company does not collect the surcharge for an access line, they are not excused from remitting the surcharge when the requirements are met.

Discussion

The Division contacted Agent on August 13, 2025, for additional information regarding Company's telecommunication service in Utah. Agent provided documentation of registration to conduct business in Utah effective May 9, 2025. Agent stated that a data error caused it to believe there were a total of 1,684 Utah customer access lines subject to UUSF surcharge; 1,127 access lines in May 2025 and 557 access lines in June 2025. Additionally, Agent stated that Company did not collect the surcharge and therefore was not required to remit the surcharge. The Division contacted Company to verify the information provided by Agent. On August 25, 2025, Company confirmed that only 46 access lines subject to UUSF surcharge under R746-8-301(1)(a) were operating during each month of May and June, but no surcharge was collected for the 92 access line customers due to the

data error. Company agreed that even though it did not collect any surcharge from its 92 access line customers for May and June, the Commission should retain \$88.98 (\$90.16, less the allowed administrative fees of \$1.18) from its requested refund. Company does not anticipate its future UUSF remittals to be large enough to allow Commission retention of the remaining overpayment as a credit against future UUSF remittals and requests repayment of the balance as soon as practical.

Conclusion

The Division recommends the Commission approve a refund of \$1,539.72 for the May and June, 2025 Universal Surcharge remittals. The refund represents the incorrect amount remitted, \$1,628.70, less the correct amount remitted, \$88.98.

cc: Karen Hyde, Commpliance Group Richard Butler, VoIP Networks