

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D14673

January 25, 2010

James W. Burk FirstEnergy Corp. 76 South Main Street Akron, OH 44308

Re: Notification of CBP Auction Results

Dear Mr. Burk:

This is to inform you that we have confirmed the results of the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities' Competitive Bidding Process Auction ("Auction") to procure supply for Standard Service Offer (SSO) customers for the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities. The Auction began on Tuesday, January 25, 2010 and concluded the same day.

There are three tables attached to this letter.

- Table 1 summarizes the results of the Auction.
- Table 2 shows, for each winning bidder, the number of tranches won for each contract in the auction.
- Table 3 provides the CBP Manager's assessment of the conduct of the auction.

In accordance with the Bidding Rules, winning bidders will be contacted directly by the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities to execute the Master SSO Supply Agreement no later than three (3) business days following the close of the auction.



Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Bradley a. Mille

Bradley A. Miller Vice President

cc:

Steven D. Lesser, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Valerie A. Lemmie, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Paul A. Centolella, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Cheryl L. Roberto, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Kim Bojko, Chief of Staff, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Charles E. Jones, President, FirstEnergy Utilities
Steven E. Strah, Regional President, Ohio Edison Company Trent A. Smith, Regional President, The Toledo Edison Company Dennis M. Chack, Regional President, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company Frank Mossburg, Boston Pacific Company



Table 1. Summary of SSO Auction Results

			Delivery Period	
		June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012	June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2013	June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2014
Number of Registered Bidders	10			
Total initial eligibility of Registered Bidders (# tranches)				
Total initial eligibility divided by tranche target				
Number of bidders that submitted bids in round 1				
Number of tranches bid in round 1				
Number of tranches bid in round 1 divided by tranche target				
Number of tranches to procure in auction (tranche target)	50	17	17	16
Number of tranches procured in auction	50	17	17	16
Number of rounds in the auction	12			
Number of winning bidders	7	6	5	5
Starting price range (\$/MWh)		\$70.00-\$95.00	\$70.00-\$95.00	\$70.00-\$95.00
Starting price (\$/MWh)				
Clearing price (\$/MWh)		\$56.13	\$54.92	\$57.47



Table 2. Winning Bidders and Tranches Won

		Number of W	inning Tranch	nes
		D	elivery Perio	d
		June 1, 2011 to	June 1, 2011 to	June 1, 2011 to
Winning Bidder	Total	May 31, 2012	May 31, 2013	May 31, 2014
TOTAL	50	17	17	16



Table 3. CBP Manager's Assessment of the Conduct of the Auction

	e o. Obi manager a Assessment of the oblidate	
	Question	
1	Were the competitive bidding rules violated?	
2	Does the CBP Manager believe the auction was open, fair, transparent, and competitive?	
3	Did bidders have sufficient information to prepare for the auction?	
4	Was the information generally provided to bidders in accordance with the published timetable? Was the timetable updated appropriately as needed?	
5	Were there any issues and questions left unresolved prior to the auction that created material uncertainty for bidders?	
6	Were there any procedural problems or errors with the auction, including the electronic bidding process, the back-up bidding process, and communications between bidders and the CBP Manager?	
7	Were protocols for communication between bidders and the CBP Manager adhered to?	
8	Were there any hardware or software problems or errors, either with the auction system or with its associated communications systems?	
9	Were there any unanticipated delays during the auction?	
10	Did unanticipated delays appear to adversely affect bidding in the auction?	



 Question Were appropriate data back-up procedures planned and carried out? Were any security breaches observed with the auction process? Were protocols followed for communications among FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities, the CBP Manager, the PUCO, and the Auction Monitor during the auction? Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
planned and carried out? Were any security breaches observed with the auction process? Were protocols followed for communications among FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities, the CBP Manager, the PUCO, and the Auction Monitor during the auction? Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
auction process? 13 Were protocols followed for communications among FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities, the CBP Manager, the PUCO, and the Auction Monitor during the auction? 14 Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? 15 Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? 16 Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? 17 Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
among FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities, the CBP Manager, the PUCO, and the Auction Monitor during the auction? 14 Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? 15 Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? 16 Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? 17 Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., volume adjustments and price decrements)? 15 Were the calculations (e.g., for price decrements or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? 16 Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? 17 Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
or bidder eligibility) produced by the auction software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the CBP Manager? 16 Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? 17 Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the auction? 17 Were the communications between the CBP Manager and bidders timely and effective?
Manager and bidders timely and effective?
18 Was there evidence that bidders felt unduly rushed during the process?
19 Was there any evidence of collusion or improper coordination among bidders?
Was there any evidence of anti-competitive behavior in the auction?
21 Was information made public appropriately? Was confidential and sensitive information treated appropriately?
Were there factors exogenous to the auction (e.g., changes in market environment) that materially affected the auction in unanticipated ways?

REDACTED VERSION



This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

1/26/2011 4:44:50 PM

in

Case No(s). 10-1284-EL-UNC

Summary: Report (Redacted Version) Auction Manager Report electronically filed by Raymond W. Strom on behalf of PUCO Staff