

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

City of Vernon, California	Docket No. EL00-105-006
California Independent System Operator, Corporation	ER00-2019-005
City of Azusa, California	EL03-14-000
City of Anaheim, California	EL03-15-000
City of Riverside, California	EL03-20-000
City of Banning, California	EL03-21-000

STATUS REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

(Issued May 22, 2003)

TO THE COMMISSION:

1. On May 6, 2003, a Joint Motion to Terminate Settlement Proceedings was filed in the above-captioned proceeding by Southern California Edison (“Edison”), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (“SDG&E”), Pacific Gas & Electric Company (“PG&E”), and the City of Vernon, California (“Vernon”) (collectively “Movants”) seeking to terminate the above-captioned settlement proceedings only with respect to the outstanding issues concerning Vernon’s Transmission Revenue Requirement (“TRR”). On May 19, 2003, the California Department of Water Resources, State Water Project (“SWP”) filed an Answer in Support of Joint Motion to Terminate Settlement Proceedings (“Answer”).¹

2. On May 20, 2003, the Chief Administrative Law Judge issued [an](#) Order temporarily suspending settlement negotiations with respect to Vernon. The Chief Administrative Law Judge noted in the Order that no progress has been made in the settlement proceedings with respect to the issues concerning Vernon. The Order further notes that the Movants stated in their motion that no progress on the Vernon issues can be

¹ SWP’s Answer was filed directly with the Commission, but a copy was also sent to the undersigned Settlement Judge, who reviewed it and forwarded the Joint Motion and a copy of the Answer to the Chief Administrative Law Judge, with a recommendation to grant the motion.

made without further guidance from the Commission. As further noted in the Order, Vernon's January 22, 2003, Request for Rehearing and Clarification was granted by the Commission on February 21, 2003, with a final Commission order on the merits to be issued by a date that has now passed.

3. On May 21, 2003, the parties to the above-captioned settlement proceeding, other than Vernon, met with the undersigned Settlement Judge. At the conclusion of the settlement discussions, the parties present had reached a settlement in principle of the non-Vernon related issues, with the exception of a single issue, which the parties agreed should be set for hearing.

4. The parties present on May 21 agreed to circulate a proposed draft agreement on May 28 and to exchange comments on the draft on June 4. The parties propose to have a final settlement agreement ready for filing on June 27, 2003.

5. I will keep the Commission apprised of all further developments in this proceeding as they arise. If the parties do not file a settlement on June 27th, as stated, I will file a report with the Commission at that time.

Judith A. Dowd
Settlement Judge