

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

<b>Cities of Anaheim, Azusa</b>	)	
<b>Banning, Colton, and</b>	)	
<b>Riverside, California</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Docket No. EL00-111-000 and</b>
	)	<b>EL00-111-002</b>
<b>California Independent System</b>	)	
<b>Operator Corporation</b>	)	
<b>Salt River Project Agricultural</b>	)	
<b>Improvement and</b>	)	
<b>Power District</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Docket No. EL01-84-000</b>
	)	
<b>California Independent System</b>	)	
<b>Operator Corporation</b>	)	

**[Not Consolidated]**

**MOTION FOR EXPEDITED ISSUANCE OF ORDER  
PROVIDING CLARIFICATION**

On June 22, 2001, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (“ISO”), on behalf of itself, the Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California (“Southern Cities”), and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (collectively, the “June 22 Movants”) filed a motion to initiate settlement proceedings in the above-referenced dockets. Among other things, the June 22 Movants requested that the Commission issue

a tolling Order concerning the requests for rehearing filed in response to the Commission's May 14, 2001 Order in Docket No. EL00-111-001, 95 FERC ¶ 61,197, to ensure that the requests for rehearing would not be deemed to be denied automatically by operation of law.

On July 6, 2001, the Commission issued an Order initiating settlement proceedings in the above-referenced dockets, 96 FERC ¶ 61,024 ("July 6 Order"). In the July 6 Order, the Commission explained that "the Commission will not address the merits of the requests for rehearing in Docket No. EL00-111-002 at this time, but rather will consider such matters, if necessary, at a later date." July 6 Order, slip op. at 3. The Commission also ordered that "[t]he requests for rehearing in Docket No. EL00-111-002 are hereby deferred while the parties pursue settlement." *Id.* at 4.

The ISO, on behalf of itself and the City of Vernon, California ("Vernon") (collectively, the "July 10 Movants"), hereby files this Motion for Expedited Issuance of Order Providing Clarification concerning the July 6 Order.<sup>1</sup> The July 10 Movants thank the Commission for initiating settlement proceedings, and for the action the Commission took in the July 6 Order as described above. However, in order to make absolutely clear that the requests for rehearing referenced in the July 6 Order will not be deemed to be denied automatically by operation of law,<sup>2</sup> the July 10 Movants respectfully request that the Commission

---

<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the Southern Cities indicate their support of the present Motion.

<sup>2</sup> Requests for rehearing are deemed to be denied 30 days after they were filed, unless the Commission acts upon the requests for rehearing within that 30-day period. See 18 C.F.R. § 385.713(f).

issue an Order providing clarification that the directives in the July 6 Order constitute Commission action upon the requests for rehearing as required by 18 C.F.R. § 385.713(f) (e.g., by stating that the Commission has granted rehearing for further consideration). The July 10 Movants also request that the Commission issue the Order prior to July 13, 2001, so as to provide timely guidance on this issue. Please contact the undersigned with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kenneth G. Jaffe  
Bradley R. Miliauskas  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5116  
Tel. No.: (202) 424-7500

Counsel for the California  
Independent System Operator  
Corporation

---

Channing D. Strother, Jr.  
McCarthy, Sweeney & Harkaway, P.C.  
2175 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel. No.: (202) 393-5710

Attorney for the City of Vernon,  
California

Dated: July 10, 2001