

From: Sevall, Scott (UTC) <scott.sevall@utc.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 6:59 AM
To: Mike Moore <mmoore@pmsaship.com>
Cc: LaRue, Ann (UTC) <ann.larue@utc.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Tonnage Used for Tariff Calculations

Mike,

The error was on two ships (which I cannot remember the names), when compared to the gross tonnage of the case I do not believe it moved the needle. I believe the appeal/petition for clarification period for the final order had closed. There can be no additional information into the order at that point. Minor errors happen but at least there is a process in place that they can be corrected and all parties have a chance to view the information.

The main concern from PSP's point of view was that the invoices for pilotage service to that ship were going to increase more than what the ship would expect. My view was that it did not matter which tariff (old/new) if a ship has been invoiced incorrectly because the stated tonnage for that ship was wrong then future invoices will be different. It really had nothing to do with the tonnage rate and everything to do with the fact that the ship had been invoiced incorrectly.

With Canada closing cruise ships for 2021 season. How will our local cruise ship market be effected? I think I heard Holland was cancelling at least a portion of their scheduled cruises?

Scott

From: Mike Moore <mmoore@pmsaship.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 4:21 PM
To: Sevall, Scott (UTC) <scott.sevall@utc.wa.gov>
Cc: LaRue, Ann (UTC) <ann.larue@utc.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Tonnage Used for Tariff Calculations

External Email

Thanks Scott.

We never saw any filed document regarding any tonnage errors; were they significant enough to appreciably change the revenue produced by the tariff?

Mike

From: Sevall, Scott (UTC) <scott.sevall@utc.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 7:21 AM
To: Mike Moore <mmoore@pmsaship.com>
Cc: LaRue, Ann (UTC) <ann.larue@utc.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: Tonnage Used for Tariff Calculations

Hi Mike,

Yes the tonnage I used was from Exhibit WTB-11, which listed the tonnage for each ship. I had sampled the 7033 invoices when we did a site visit. I believe I testified to my random sample in my first testimony.

Does that answer your question?

I remember during the compliance filing PSP found a tonnage error for two vessels, but you would have to get those details from PSP.

Is there an issue with how the tariff is being billed? Or is it something else?

I figured there would be some internal movement after reading the final order.

Sincerely,

Scott

From: Mike Moore <mmoore@pmsaship.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2021 3:21 PM
To: Sevall, Scott (UTC) <scott.sevall@utc.wa.gov>
Cc: LaRue, Ann (UTC) <ann.larue@utc.wa.gov>
Subject: Tonnage Used for Tariff Calculations

External Email

Scott,

Can you confirm that in developing your schedules and then evaluating compliance with the UTC Order that you used the tonnage amounts that PSP submitted in their pro forma – I did as that was the most accurate way to evaluate the proposed tariff but just wanted to double check that with you as we evaluate how the tariff is functioning now per the Order and all.

Also, FYI, the PSP President (Ivan) announced that Linda Styrk is no longer with PSP and they are doing some sort of office review; hopefully on business tasks/efficiencies etc.

Regards,

Mike