

future years. The achievement indicators proposed in this notice are the same as the achievement indicators that the Secretary announced in the **Federal Register** and used for the FY 2002 ECEPD grant competition (67 FR 37406, May 29, 2002).

Achievement Indicators: The Secretary announces the following proposed achievement indicators for the ECEPD program, as required by section 2151(e)(6) of the ESEA:

Indicator 1: Increasing numbers of hours of high quality professional development will be offered. High-quality professional development must be ongoing, intensive, classroom-focused, and based on scientific research on cognitive and social development in early childhood and effective pedagogy for young children.

Indicator 2: Early childhood educators who work in early childhood programs serving low-income children will participate in greater numbers, and in increasing numbers of hours, in high-quality professional development.

Indicator 3: Early childhood educators will demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of effective strategies to support school readiness based on scientific research on cognitive and social development in early childhood and effective pedagogy for young children.

Indicator 4: Early childhood educators will more frequently apply research-based approaches in early childhood pedagogy and child development and learning domains, including using a content-rich curriculum and activities that promote language and cognitive development.

Indicator 5: Children will demonstrate improved readiness for school, especially in the areas of appropriate social and emotional behavior and early language and literacy competencies.

Intergovernmental Review

This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

This document provides early notification of our proposed achievement indicators for this program.

Electronic Access to This Document

You may review this document, as well as all other Department of Education documents published in the

Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site: <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister>.

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site. If you have questions about using PDF, call the U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), toll free, at 1-888-293-6498; or in the Washington, DC, area at (202) 512-1530.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/index.html>.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 84.349A, Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Program)

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 6651(e).

Dated: December 30, 2002.

Susan B. Neuman,

Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education.

[FR Doc. 03-159 Filed 1-3-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. EL00-111-002; Docket No. EL01-84-000]

Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton and Riverside, California. v. California Independent System Operator Corporation; Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District v. California Independent System Operator Corporation; Order Providing Guidance on the Appropriate Procedures for Approval of Settlement

Issued December 30, 2002.

Before Commissioners: Pat Wood, III, Chairman; William L. Massey, and Nora Mead Brownell.

1. This order provides guidance on procedural questions raised by certain parties in this proceeding relating to an Offer of Settlement filed while settlement judge procedures were ongoing.

Background

2. There is a lengthy procedural history in this case, some of which is not pertinent to the questions raised in the instant request for guidance; this order will relate only those events and facts necessary to address the request before us.

3. On September 15, 2000, the Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California (Southern Cities) filed a complaint against the California Independent System Operator Corporation (Cal ISO) regarding costs incurred by the Cal ISO and passed on to customers as neutrality adjustment charges. The Commission acted on the complaint on March 14, 2001, dismissing it in part and granting it in part.¹ Subsequently, the Commission granted in part and denied in part rehearing.² Parties sought further rehearing.

4. On June 1, 2001, the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP) filed a complaint against the Cal ISO in Docket No. EL01-84-000 challenging several aspects of the Cal ISO's neutrality adjustment charges. On June 22, 2001, the Cal ISO, Southern Cities, and SRP filed a motion to institute settlement judge procedures to resolve the issues raised in the two complaints and shortly thereafter, the Commission issued an order initiating settlement judge procedures.³ The order did not institute hearing proceedings or authorize designation of a presiding administrative law judge.

5. The parties participated in numerous settlement conferences to resolve the complaints, and on July 31, 2002, Southern Cities, SRP and Cal ISO (Settling Parties) submitted to the Commission an Offer of Settlement and Settlement Agreement (Offer of Settlement). In addition to comments supporting the Offer of Settlement from the Settling Parties and trial staff, Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (PG&E) filed comments opposing the Offer of Settlement, and the Commission received motions to intervene out-of-time, and protests or comments in opposition, from Enron Power Marketing, Inc. (Enron), Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (Puget Sound), IDACORP Energy, L.P. (IDACORP), and California Generators.⁴ Subsequently, participants

¹ Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California v. California Independent System Operator Corp., 94 FERC ¶61,268 (2001).

² Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California v. California Independent System Operator Corp., 95 FERC ¶61,197 (2001).

³ Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, and Riverside, California v. California Independent System Operator Corp., 96 FERC ¶61,024 (2001).

⁴ The California Generators are: Duke Energy North America, LLC; Duke Energy Trading and Marketing, L.L.C.; Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.; El Segundo Power LLC; Long Beach Generation LLC; Cabrillo Power I LLC; Cabrillo Power II LLC; Mirant Americas Energy Marketing, LP; Mirant California, LLC; Reliant Energy Power Generator, Inc.; Reliant Energy Services, Inc.; and Williams Energy Marketing & Trading Company. The California Generators took no position on the Offer of Settlement.