

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER
GENERATION AS PART OF THE FOURTH
ELECTRIC SECURITY PLAN FOR
CUSTOMERS OF OHIO EDISON
COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC
ILLUMINATING COMPANY, AND THE
TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY.

CASE NO. 16-776-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF
DAYTON POWER & LIGHT COMPANY.

CASE NO. 17-957-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF OHIO
POWER COMPANY.

CASE NO. 17-2391-EL-UNC

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROCUREMENT
OF STANDARD SERVICE OFFER
GENERATION FOR CUSTOMERS OF DUKE
ENERGY OHIO, INC.

CASE NO. 18-6000-EL-UNC

ENTRY

Entered in the Journal on January 30, 2023

{¶ 1} Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and The Toledo Edison Company (collectively, FirstEnergy); the Dayton Power and Light Company d/b/a AES Ohio (AES Ohio); Ohio Power Company d/b/a/ AEP Ohio; and Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Duke) each qualify as an electric utility as defined by R.C. 4928.01(A)(11) and as an electric distribution utility (EDU) as defined by R.C. 4928.01(A)(6).

{¶ 2} R.C. 4928.141 provides that electric utilities shall provide consumers a standard service offer (SSO) of all competitive retail electric services in accordance with R.C. 4928.142 or 4928.143. The SSO functions to make generation supply available to customers that are not receiving this supply from a competitive retail electric services provider and is

sometimes referred to as default supply. The Commission has approved the above EDUs' electric security plans, each of which implemented a competitive auction-based SSO format, as well as a competitive bid procurement process for the EDUs' auctions, to procure generation supply for customers of each EDU for a certain period of time. *In re Ohio Edison Co., The Cleveland Elec. Illuminating Co., and The Toledo Edison Co.*, Case No. 14-1297-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order (Mar. 31, 2016); *In re Dayton Power & Light Co.*, Case No. 16-395-EL-SSO, Opinion and Order (Oct. 20, 2017); *In re The Dayton Power and Light Co.*, Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO, et al., Proposed Revised Tariffs (Nov. 26, 2019) *In re Ohio Power Co.*, Case No. 16-1852-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Apr. 25, 2018); and *In re Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case. No. 17-1263-EL-SSO, et al., Opinion and Order (Dec. 19, 2018). The use of this competitive bidding process is conducive to Ohio's legal framework that is designed to ensure that all retail electric customers served by EDUs have reliable access to electric generation supply at market-based prices.

{¶ 3} Over the past year, SSO prices resulting from the EDUs' SSO procurement auctions have significantly increased. *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation as Part of the Fourth Elec. Sec. Plan for Customers of FirstEnergy*, Case No. 16-776-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 9, 2022), (Oct. 5, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for Customers of AES Ohio*, Case No. 17-957-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 23, 2022), (Apr. 20, 2022), (Nov. 30, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for the Customers of Ohio Power Company*, Case No. 17-2391-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Mar. 9, 2022), (Nov. 2, 2022); *In re the Procurement of Std. Serv. Offer Generation for Customers of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.*, Case No. 18-6000-EL-UNC, Finding and Orders (Feb. 23, 2022), (Sept. 21, 2022).

{¶ 4} By Entry issued January 3, 2023, the attorney examiner solicited comments from stakeholders regarding the Commission's investigation into whether directing the EDUs to implement certain SSO auction modifications would help significantly reduce prices resulting from SSO auctions. The attorney examiner directed stakeholders to file initial comments by January 24, 2023, and reply comments by February 3, 2023.

{¶ 5} On January 24, 2023, numerous stakeholders filed comments in the above dockets. Ohio Consumers' Counsel filed comments on the same date within which it stated that additional time is needed to adequately address the issues raised in the January 3, 2023 Entry.

{¶ 6} At this time, the attorney examiner finds it appropriate to extend both the initial and reply comment periods in order to provide stakeholders additional time to respond to the potential auction modifications specified in the January 3, 2023 Entry. Initial comments are now due on or before March 1, 2023.¹ Reply comments are now due on or before March 16, 2023.

{¶ 7} It is, therefore,

{¶ 8} ORDERED, That the deadline to file initial and reply comments be extended, with initial comments being due on or before March 1, 2023, and reply comments being due on or before March 16, 2023. A copy of the comments should be filed in each of the above-captioned case dockets.

{¶ 9} ORDERED, That a copy of this Entry be served upon all parties of record to the above-captioned cases.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

/s/Matthew J. Sandor

By: Matthew J. Sandor
Attorney Examiner

MJA/dmh

¹ Interested stakeholders who filed initial comments on January 24, 2023, are welcome to supplement them by the March 1, 2023 deadline.

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

1/30/2023 12:18:04 PM

in

**Case No(s). 16-0776-EL-UNC, 17-0957-EL-UNC, 17-2391-EL-UNC, 18-6000-EL-
UNC**

Summary: Attorney Examiner Entry that the deadline to file initial and reply comments be extended, with initial comments being due on or before March 1, 2023, and reply comments being due on or before March 16, 2023 electronically filed by Ms. Donielle M. Hunter on behalf of Matthew J. Sandor, Attorney Examiner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio