

DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D23409

May 23, 2018

Ms. Sharon Schroder
Director Regulatory Operations
The Dayton Power and Light Company
1065 Woodman Drive
Dayton, OH 45432

Re: Notification of PIPP RFP Results

Dear Ms. Schroder:

Pursuant to the requirements of the April 4, 2018 Commission Finding and Order posted to case docket 17-1163-EL-UNC, please find attached a less redacted version of the post-RFP letter addressed to you (and cc'd to others) that the PIPP RFP Manager, CRA International, submitted on April 3, 2018 following the conclusion of the Supplemental Request for Proposals process to procure supply for Percentage of Income Payment Plan ("PIPP") program customers for the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities.

Compared to the redacted letter submitted on April 3, the attached letter has fewer redactions pursuant to the Finding and Order cited above.

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.



Bradley A. Miller
Vice President

cc:
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tamara Turkenton, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Attachment



DELIVERED BY EMAIL

CRA No. D23409

April 3, 2018

Ms. Sharon Schroder
Director Regulatory Operations
The Dayton Power and Light Company
1065 Woodman Drive
Dayton, OH 45432

Re: Notification of PIPP RFP Results

Dear Ms. Schroder:

This is to inform you that we have confirmed the results of the Supplemental Request for Proposals process to procure supply for Percentage of Income Payment Plan ("PIPP") program customers of The Dayton Power and Light Company. At least one bidder submitted a conforming bid in the RFP process during the Bid Window on Tuesday, April 3, 2018.

There are three tables attached to this letter.

- Table 1 summarizes the results of the RFP process.
- Table 2 provides the identities of all registered bidders.
- Table 3 provides the PIPP RFP Manager's assessment of the conduct of the RFP process.

In accordance with the Bidding Rules, bidders will be notified of their status (i.e., if they are the tentative winning bidder or not) as soon as practicable after the Bid Window closes. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO" or "Commission") may confirm or reject the results of the Supplemental PIPP RFP and select the winning bidder and the winning bid (if any). The winning bidder will be contacted directly by the Companies to execute the Master PIPP Supply Agreement no later than three (3) business days following the close of the RFP.

Sincerely yours,

CRA INTERNATIONAL, INC.



Robert J. Lee
Vice President

cc:

Asim Z. Haque, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Daniel Conway, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Lawrence Friedeman, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
M. Beth Trombold, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Thomas W. Johnson, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Ray Strom, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Tamara Turkenton, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Eric Brown, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Randall Griffin, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Chuck Hofmann, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Nathan Parke, The Dayton Power and Light Company
Frank Mossburg, Bates White, LLC

Table 1. Summary of Supplemental PIPP RFP Results

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Period of Delivery | June 1, 2018 - May 31, 2019 |
| Number of Registered Bidders | 2 |
| Number of Registered Bidders that submitted conforming bids during the Bid Window | |
| % of PIPP Load to procure in the RFP | 100% |
| % of PIPP Load procured in the RFP | 100% |
| Lowest bid price bidder | AEP Energy, Inc. |
| Lowest bid price | \$50.47 / MWh |

Table 3. PIPP RFP Manager's Assessment of the Conduct of the RFP

| | Question | |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Were the competitive bidding rules violated? | No |
| 2 | Does the PIPP RFP Manager believe the RFP was open, fair, transparent, and competitive? | Yes |
| 3 | Did bidders have sufficient information to prepare for the RFP? | Yes. Bidders received information from the RFP process documents, the Information Website, questions-and-answers posted to the Information Website, and bidder information sessions. |
| 4 | Was the information generally provided to bidders in accordance with the published timetable? Was the timetable updated appropriately as needed? | Yes |
| 5 | Were there any issues and questions left unresolved prior to the RFP that created material uncertainty for bidders? | We do not believe that there were any unresolved issues or questions that created material uncertainty for bidders. |
| 6 | Were there any procedural problems or errors with the RFP, including the electronic bidding process, the back-up bidding process, and communications between bidders and the PIPP RFP Manager? | No |
| 7 | Were protocols for communication between bidders and the PIPP RFP Manager adhered to? | Yes |
| 8 | Were there any hardware or software problems or errors, either with the RFP software or with its associated communications systems? | No |
| 9 | Were there any unanticipated delays during the RFP? | No |
| 10 | Did unanticipated delays appear to adversely affect bidding in the RFP? | No |
| 11 | Were appropriate data back-up procedures planned and carried out? | Yes |
| 12 | Were any security breaches observed with the RFP process? | No |

| | Question | |
|----|---|-------------------------------|
| 13 | Were protocols followed for communications among The Dayton Power and Light Company, the PIPP RFP Manager, the PUCO, and the PUCO's consultant during the RFP? | Yes |
| 14 | Were the protocols followed for decisions regarding changes in auction parameters (e.g., benchmark price)? | Yes |
| 15 | Were the calculations (e.g., the determination of the tentative winning bid price and winning bidder) produced by the RFP software double-checked or reproduced off-line by the PIPP RFP Manager? | N/A |
| 16 | Was there evidence of confusion or misunderstanding on the part of bidders that delayed or impaired the RFP? | No |
| 17 | Were the communications between the PIPP RFP Manager and bidders timely and effective? | Yes |
| 18 | Was there evidence that bidders felt unduly rushed during the process? | No |
| 19 | Was there any evidence of collusion or improper coordination among bidders? | No |
| 20 | Was there any evidence of anti-competitive behavior in the RFP? | No |
| 21 | Was information made public appropriately? Was confidential and sensitive information treated appropriately? | Yes |
| 22 | Were there factors exogenous to the RFP (e.g., changes in market environment) that materially affected the RFP in unanticipated ways? | No, not that we are aware of. |

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/23/2018 5:46:22 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-1163-EL-UNC

Summary: Report - Notification of PIPP RFP Results - Updated Redacted Version
electronically filed by Mr. Timothy W Benedict on behalf of PUCO Staff