

From: Schwartz, Andrew
Sent: 12/3/2012 2:06:59 PM
To: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Panoche related questions

Thanks!

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 3, 2012, at 1:51 PM, "Allen, Meredith" <MEAe@pge.com> wrote:

> Hi Andy,
>
> That is correct. It forces the parties to be realistic on their proposals and bring them together. If we win in arbitration, we are still willing to cut a deal with Panoche. Of course, it would be better if we could do that now so we wouldn't want to tell them that.
>
> On the second item that is correct as well. It is the up to that does not cause a problem.
>
> Please let me know if you need additional information.
>
> Thanks,
> Meredith

> On Dec 3, 2012, at 12:45 PM, "Schwartz, Andrew"
<andrew.schwartz@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:andrew.schwartz@cpuc.ca.gov>>> wrote:

> Hi, Meredith,
>
> A couple of things:
>
> 1.) In the Starwood Application, PG&E describes the arbitration process as one in which the parties (PG&E and Starwood) would present their proposal on how they think the dispute should be resolved, with the arbitrator having to choose one of those options in resolving the issue. Is that true for Panoche as well? Arbitration would be essentially a binary choice between the proposals from the parties, with no ability to arrive at a middle ground?
>
>
> 2.) The Moody's report you provided me, is there a more detailed report regarding their analysis? Also, I'm not sure how to interpret the results...you indicated to me that at if Panoche were forced to take on up to \$15 per ton (is this metric tonne?) it "wouldn't affect their debt service". In the report Moody's indicates that at \$15 their rating would be adversely affected. Just to be clear, then, you are interpreting this as meaning that if Panoche were required to take on anything less than \$15, their debt rating would not be affected. Is that correct? That makes sense, but I just want to make sure I understand that point.
>
>
> Thanks,
>
> Andy Schwartz

- > Supervisor
- > Emerging Procurement Strategies
- > California Public Utilities Commission
- > 505 Van Ness Avenue
- > San Francisco, CA 94102
- >
- > Telephone: 415.703.5131
- > Email: andrew.schwartz@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:andrew.schwartz@cpuc.ca.gov>>
- >
- >
- >
- > PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
- > To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>