

**UTILITIES COMMITTEE MINUTES
NOVEMBER 1, 2022**

The Utilities Committee meeting was held on November 1, 2022 at North Royalton City Hall, 14600 State Road. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Committee Members: Chair Dawn Carbone-McDonald, Joanne Krejci, Jeremy Dietrich; **Council:** Paul Marnecheck, Mike Wos, Linda Barath, John Nickell; **Administration:** Mayor Larry Antoskiewicz, Law Director Tom Kelly, Service Director Nick Cinquepalmi, Wastewater Superintendent Mark Smith, City Engineer Justin Haselton; **Other:** Michael McDonald, Joel Spatz, Connie Mayer, Jim Kulikowski, Nancy Murray, Gerry Costanzo, Dave Jankowski.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of October 4, 2022 Committee minutes. Moved by Ms. Carbone-McDonald, seconded by Ms. Krejci. Yeas: 3. Nays: 0. **Motion carried.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Inflow/Infiltration of Storm Water (I & I)

Mr. Smith reported that we are finished in Vista Drive and Valley Lane, which we will start back in the area of Vista development next year. We have had the camera truck in for repairs. We are likely finished for the year and will start back in that development, hopefully March to April; depending on the weather.

2. WW Treatment Plant B conversion

Mr. Smith advised that we received 50% of design drawings and we are in the process of going through them. We have a progress meeting next week therefore, we will be moving forward with that project. Last month, he had been asked at the meeting by Mr. Marnecheck how many gallons are treated, whereas Mr. Smith had indicated 2.2 M, however, that was *per day*. He wanted to clarify that we treat 803 M gallons per year. Mr. Marnecheck suggested amending the last minutes to reflect such, which would be done.

Mr. Dietrich asked for a possible estimated time frame for the final project to be completed. Mr. Smith stated he hoped to be out at first of the year for the force main; to bid. He felt that we were still two years out. As discussion ensued, Ms. Krejci asked if it would be close to five years by the time it is completed. Mr. Dietrich thought that the project was originally going to take 2-3 years. He felt like we may be behind from what we originally discussed. Mr. Smith, indicated that we are actually on schedule. If we get the force main in, hopefully in the next 8-12 months, we will be simultaneously working on the pump station at the same time. Mr. Dietrich inquired whether the year 2024 would be a rough estimate. Mr. Smith hoped that it would be 2024; the end of the year.

3. York Road Special Assessments – sanitary sewers

Mr. Haselton advised that the Council office is still working on the assessment portion of the project; the things that must happen before we can go to bid. Ms. Carbone-McDonald questioned if we have an estimated time of when we might hear something about it. Mr. Haselton believed we may be looking more toward December to January for the bidding, although he was uncertain.

NEW BUSINESS

1. NOPEC Representative presentation

Ms. Carbone-McDonald expressed her appreciation that her invitation was accepted to come here tonight. She shared that the residents are very concerned about their high electric bills and gas bills for the winter. She wanted to allow residents to hear directly from NOPEC (Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council) tonight.

SEE REPORT

NOPEC representatives were here by way of invitation to speak today. Mr. Jankowski, Chief Marketing and Communications Officer for NOPEC, as well as Ms. Costanzo, Relationship Manager, presented the following report:

Mr. Jankowski began by saying that basically, a year ago at this time, NOPEC remained competitive; as we have been for 21 ½ years in running the aggregation. Late last year to early Spring 2022, we began to see prices rise, driven by things; such as supply chain issues, inflation, the threat of the war in Ukraine, happenings in Europe, and things we are perceiving. When the war started, we saw an unprecedented raise in energy prices. There have been things putting us in an unprecedented situation; for example, gas lines being shut down, threats to shut down gas lines to Europe, along with the demand for gasoline, which is tied to electric. We watched the market while hoping perhaps, things would settle back down. We worked with our supply partner to try and forecast what we believed may happen. When it became clear that this was not going to be a short-term issue for NOPEC, or any other retailer, we made a difficult decision. We expedited the turn back of customers to a place where they could acquire the best prices available early. Typically, we would have run through this year and the customers would have naturally dropped back to the SSO (Standard Service Offer). However, in this instance, we accelerated that and started moving customers in August. We went down with the PUCO (Public Utilities Commission of Ohio), because again, this is an unprecedented time. We moved very carefully to untable many of our contractual obligations with our suppliers, to put residents in the best place they could be from a price perspective; which is roughly half of what the retail market and NOPEC was able to charge customers. They will be on that rate now through May of next year, because the auctions that supply the SSO all happen beforehand. Therefore, they were somewhat locked into contractual prices. Again, we made the difficult decision. We did receive a lot of calls from people to do this in the July and August time frame; as they were receiving bills at the 12-cent rate that we were at. When it became obvious what would be best for the customers, we did it for them so that people would not have to call. We started to turn customers back as of October 25th, in which all of the customers are on the new rate. From that point, it is our intent to re-solicit and to restart the electric aggregation in the spring. First Energy is out conducting auctions for the June 2023 through May 2024 window. They are auctioning now in the same market that we are auctioning in. To manage expectations, customers are currently on 5.5 cents to 6.5 cents, between now and next kilowatt hour. Next June, the SSO that we put them to, as well as, all of the other retail offers, will be more in the 10 to 12 cent range.

Ms. Costanzo of NOPEC described their strategy. As your supplier, we have to buy some of our load in real time; we have done that for 21 years. That has worked wonderfully for us, up until March. We went from the 5 - 6 cents, to 10 - 12 cents, because we have to buy a portion in real time. We are looking. She continued that we see the utility. The utility has its own portion of supply and they have enough for roughly 13%. They are not a supplier, but when the PUCO set up with deregulation, they must have enough for 13% of the Ohio population; consumers. To reiterate, we are not a supplier. They said to us, we are going to buy roughly 2 years for example, however they missed what we did, what happened to us in real time; the 12 cents. Here we are in a different market. Just like gas prices at the pump were drastically different last fall than they were in the spring. Our CEO conveyed that NOPEC is a non-profit and we are here for you; the community. In order to do that, we have to do something that no other company would do, if it were for a profit. We have to take all of our customers and move them to this rate, that we know for at least six to eight months, will save them *half* of their electric bill. That is what we did when we moved everybody to the 6.9 cent rate. There have been a lot of miscommunications, however, that is what we did.

Ms. Carbone-McDonald raised question pertaining to if someone were to call to opt out, how long would it take to take effect. Mr. Jankowski indicated that it would take one to two billing cycles; depending on when they call and the cycle. There are approximately 22 meter reads per month. If you call and just miss yours, you would have to wait another meter read cycle. They have to have a cutoff point where they read your meter, and indicate that this rate stops and the new rate starts that day. Ms. Costanzo pointed out that is for electric. However, for gas, which is what we do also, can take anywhere from 3 to 5 months.

Ms. Costanzo mentioned legislations having been done in other cities, whereas their residents can pick up the phone and opt into gas right away; as opposed to waiting three to five months. That has been a big problem as well. Mr.

Nickell asked about the option of opting out online. Ms. Costanzo indicated that a number can be called 24 hours a day and you can opt out at any time. She pointed out that online, you really cannot opt out because of the State rules; they need to record calls, etc. Mr. Nickell brought up events that have happened, stating that this is not just due to the war. Ms. Costanzo agreed, however, it goes back to what we have to buy it at. If you watch the commodity market, we have to buy at the commodity market; the same as gas at the pump. Mr. Jankowski stated it involves a combination of factors.

Ms. Carbone-McDonald asked about how long we should expect the high electric and gas bills. Mr. Jankowski explained that everyone is going to be on this rate through May, and in June we are expecting that the market is going to be about double to what customers are on at this time. Ms. Carbone-McDonald brought up concern whether there are any programs for residents on fixed incomes. Mr. Jankowski indicated those are offered through the utility supplier. Ms. Costanzo added that they do offer programs, such as payment plans and assistance programs.

Mr. Nickell discussed cities getting the NOPEC grants for different things, in which we have used it for things such as Christmas decorations. He wanted to know why that money does not go back to the customer. Ms. Costanzo felt that was a great question. She clarified that NOPEC gives dollars back to each community. If you are a dual utility community, gas and electric, you will get 4 dollars per gas customer, and 6 dollars per electric customer. NextEra Energy Services, who is our supplier, has their large headquarters in Florida. If they were to go out and get a customer, they made us aware that it costs on average \$29.00 to ascertain each one of these customers; therefore, they do not have to have people standing in the grocery store saying come and get this \$50.00. We said to them, we are saving you all of that money; we are bringing you 500,000 electric customers. We said to them, let's make it better for our communities; that is how they got the grant money. Mr. Nickell asked if that is coming off of the revenue of what people are paying. Ms. Costanzo reiterated that it costs them money if they were to go out and try to get individual customers; pertaining to the supplier.

Mr. Marnecheck remarked the supplier is passing the savings onto them. Ms. Costanzo concurred; it is passing the savings onto the community. Mr. Jankowski noted they do not have to solicit for customers; we bring them the customers. The dollars come back to us in the form of grants to offer to our communities, to make them more energy efficient. Therefore, the grants are specifically designated for energy infrastructure or energy efficiency improvements; such as solar panels, new thermal doors, and LED lights. Ms. Costanzo reiterated that if you have a customer who is both gas and electric, it will be \$10.00 back to the City per customer. Ms. Carbone-McDonald stated that she would rather see it back to the residents. Ms. Costanzo reiterated that unfortunately, if NextEra, who is our supplier, has to go and get a customer, it is going to cost them \$29.00 on average. Therefore, we told them we have a good deal. We can bring 500,000 customers and we know what we are saving you; and make sure that you give us some of that money back. Let's have it go for our communities! Ms. Costanzo continued that we can help them do things that they cannot normally do. Her territory is Ashtabula County, where they have put 25 wonderful solar blinking stop signs throughout the city; great to have at night. She shared that it is saving lives.

Mr. Dietrich was curious about who decides how those grants can be spent for improvements for energy. Ms. Costanzo stated that would be Council. Mr. Jankowski added that we do have stipulations and there are exceptions. Mr. Dietrich shared the idea of perhaps opening that up to allow those grants to be used for people that are having hardships, and then Council could decide that internally; for people with certain income, etc. Ms. Costanzo commented that if you were to do that, it would be challenging; it would be something to manage and something you do equitable. Mr. Dietrich noted that he knows projects that we have used the grants for and they worked out. He stated that the grants are working out great and are appreciated. He felt the stipulations made sense; we are talking about rates doublings. Ms. Costanzo added that it is going to be that way from next spring onward.

As discussion ensued, Mr. Jankowski pointed out that they have some communities doing things such as, buying LED light bulbs for households, to go directly into residents' homes; the utility will do that. Mr. Dietrich liked that idea and asked if they would approve those if Council were to decide to do that for the residents; for the Light Bulb Program. Ms. Costanzo agreed. Mr. Jankowski clarified that it would fit their criteria. Ms. Costanzo added that you have sponsorship funds, which you could use some of and buy your residents LED lights and give them away. That is another vast thing you could do; these were just ideas.

RESIDENTS:

Resident Nancy Murray, of 5355 Riverview Drive wanted to speak. All summer she received estimated bills, but never got an actual reading. Then when she called CEI to have the meter read, so that she could get back to CEI out of NOPEC, she had a huge bill. She wanted to know if this was because NOPEC does not read them, or is CEI responsible for reading it.

Mr. Jankowski explained that CEI actually does all of the billing, reading, and maintenance on the lines. We are just the supply choice. He helped clarify some things on her bill. The meter reading is actually done by the utility. Ms. Costanzo added that each resident is welcome to read their own meter. If you look and see when your billing cycle is, she highly suggested that you go outside and look at that meter read, and rather than having them do the estimates, to call it in. Ms. Murray indicated that she did that, she called the reading in. However, they still had to come out and read it in order for her to go to CEI and get out of NOPEC, and that was an additional long delay.

Resident Michael McDonald, of 14599 Bennett Road, had questions. He is not particular happy with NOPEC for a number of reasons. Long ago here in the City, public utilities were deregulated by the government. Shortly thereafter, over twenty years ago now, North Royalton voters approved two ballot issues, which require residents and businesses to automatically be enrolled in NOPEC. For this automatic enrollment, NOPEC agreed to provide the City with an annual rebate; based on residents and business usage. Now the rebate the City receives is usually used for certain upgrades, which was mentioned. However, the amount that the City receives from the rebate program is not fixed, based on a formula solely used on the usage of businesses and residents in the City. The rebate is a proportionate based on a grant amount approved by NOPEC's Board, which is then divided by the usage of all NOPEC member communities. Mr. McDonald went on to ask that as NOPEC adds member communities, what happens to our City rebate? It goes down significantly over the years. We have seen the rebate awarded to the City drop sharply. Today there are numerous options for the residents of our City to choose from. Is NOPEC the low-cost provider, no. NOPEC does not claim to be. They claim to provide a fair average rate over a long period of time. Each of us have a choice to choose our suppliers and have opportunities to lower our utility costs, but are required to opt out of NOPEC, which usually charges a fee to do so. His point was that twenty years ago, the voters approved using NOPEC and requiring an opt out. He felt it was time that Council considers placing this back on the ballot for the residents to decide whether they have an opt out program or not.

Mr. Jankowski wanted to make two clarifications. There was never a guaranteed rebate involved with NOPEC membership. The grant programs started in 2010. When our supplier was First Energy Solutions, they started a grant program. That grant program had a fixed amount. So, the City of North Royalton would get \$50,000, a township would get 10,000, for example. They were fixed amounts based on the size of the community's total population. In 2018, we started the second generation of the grant program called the Energize Community Grants; NEC grants. It is based on the formula that was talked about and it is based on enrollment. The number of people in the gas program in North Royalton, the number of people in the electric program receive a per dollar amount that is awarded. That will fluctuate based on increases or decreases of enrollment. It is not a rebate program based on load or participation. It is solely tied to that and it is the grant program. As it relates to the idea of the ballot initiative, yes it was voted on a long time. At no time, were there ever fees to leave NOPEC. That is not correct. That never happened for the community or the residents no matter when it is changed. We have made it easy, there are a lot of options. You can go on the website Apples to Apples and find a cheaper rate; we always encourage to be cautious.

Ms. Costanzo mentioned deregulating. Her experience with NOPEC is that when we deregulate it, we opened ourselves up, in her vision, to the wild wild west. She shared a personal story whereas, in 2009, somebody knocked on her door and communicated she got the best price, and she took it. She was with Direct Energy Services. She discovered she was paying \$8.63 per mcf in 2018. That day, NOPEC's price was \$2.74; like all the other market offers. After twelve months of giving her their rate that was supposed to be great, the company sent her something that looked exactly like the dollar circular that we get. She threw it out. Yes, the burden is on us to go and check these other suppliers. There are a lot of older people that do not know and will be having similar things happen. Mr. Jankowski noted that is the way the State set it up about opting out, it is not NOPEC's choice to make you opt out. It is a State set up government. They set up government aggregation twenty years ago as an opt out methodology; because they looked

around the country and said there were states doing opt in with very little participation. The successful aggregators were people who did opt out. He reiterated that at any time, if you discover you are in NOPEC and do not wish to be, you can get out at *no fees*. Mr. Dietrich inquired about grants, wanting to know if there was a set dollar amount for every city, and also, he wanted to know how it changed and why. Mr. Jankowski explained that we changed suppliers. We negotiated that.

Resident Kathy Obracay, of 10522 Independence Drive, had questions about her bill, in which the representative's assisted with her questions.

Resident Michael McDonald questioned, in November of 2021, NOPEC and the Ohio Consumer Council (OCC) reached a settlement, whereby NOPEC would pay back consumers \$306,000,000 through defined rebates and nominal reductions in monthly bills through 2025. The settlement comes from significantly, excessive profits that occurred from 2017 – 2019 under the 2008 utility rate making law; Senate Bill 221. Basically, NOPEC's profits came from overcharges to the consumers. He asked how do we, as consumers, know that we are not still being overcharged. Or that some of the overcharges in the current year were just a way to get back some portion of that \$306,000,000.

Mr. Jankowski clarified more on the negotiation we were a part of with the OCC, where we went and won \$306,000,000 from excessive profits for First Energy. First Energy put a Rider in place for creating good modernization and they did not spend the money. We went to the PUCO, up to the Supreme Court with the OCC to say this is not right. He reiterated that we are a non-profit, we do not have profits to waste. We basically went and said this is not right. We got that money back and there will be rebates for the next four years on customers' bills; roughly \$85.00 for the average resident, over four years coming back from First Energy; in billed credits because of what NOPEC did. Mr. Marnecheck noted it was flowing through you as the supplier; the rebates. He asked if it would be right on his bill. Mr. Jankowski indicated, no. We went, we fought to get it back for the consumers and First Energy is doing it. Mr. Marnecheck asked to clarify, First Energy overcharged and had excessive profits; not NOPEC. Mr. Jankowski stated that is correct. Mr. Marnecheck wanted to reiterate that there are no termination fees. Mr. Jankowski agreed 100%.

Mr. Dietrich recapped, you caught that problem and saved us a bunch of money, versus charging us. Mr. Marnecheck remarked if First Energy still had their way, they would still have the money in their pockets. Ms. Costanzo concurred, yes. Mr. Jankowski was glad to share that we have a very robust consumer advocacy, as a non-profit; as the largest aggregator in the state. We do a lot of consumer advocacy in Columbus and Washington. Mr. Dietrich asked how long that legal battle took. He felt it must have taken a long time. Mr. Jankowski clarified it took approximately 18 months. Yesterday we announced with the OCC again, Columbia Gas is putting through a rate increase. He did not think it affects us here, however, a large portion of our foot print. We negotiated down what they are asking because we held them accountable for how that money is going to be used and what were profit margins.

Mr. Nickell was curious as to how many participate in North Royalton. Ms. Costanzo agreed to send that number in an e-mail. Mr. Jankowski indicated they would be able to communicate how many people dropped back on the electric and how many are existing on the gas; as of the end of last month.

Ms. Barath raised question about the people that you took off, whether they will be picked back up in February. Mr. Jankowski agreed; if the PUCO approves us moving forward. It is our intent to be mailing the traditional opt out letters around April. Those basically say you are eligible for the aggregation. If you do not want to be, then you have 21 days to call us. We will make sure you never get enrolled, however, if you miss that letter for some reason and you are back with NOPEC again, he instructed to call, and it will take a billing cycle or two to change it back again. He reiterated that you can do so without any termination fees.

Mr. Marnecheck felt that a great tool was briefly mentioned. He was wondering if they could elaborate on the Apples-to-Apples website, especially who hosts the site. Ms. Costanzo explained it is the State of Ohio. The PUCO hosts a site called Apples to Apples. It is for consumer, and it changes daily, however it has all of the suppliers. They are given an option on a day to enroll in either gas or electric. She continued that it is a long excel spreadsheet and she would caution from experience, to make sure that you look at that spreadsheet. Make sure that you do not want termination fees, and that you do not want a monthly fee. She suggested setting yourself a reminder for that 11th month,

to ensure that you call them and renegotiate; because they will raise your rate significantly that 13th month. Ms. Costanzo shared the website energychoice@ohio.gov, however, you can also go to Apples to Apples.

Mr. Marnecheck added that it also tells you if it is variable, fixed, etc. We have used it, and it is a wealth of information. He noted that it is put out by the State therefore, it is neutral. Ms. Costanzo, wanted to point out, you will notice NOPEC is not on that, because we are not allowed to be on it by the State; although we have asked many times. Mr. Marnecheck brought up that it is two steps; look at NOPEC's, go to the website and compare. Mr. Jankowski noted there is always the price to compare on your bill, the price the utility is offering that month; that is the price we put everybody back to.

Mr. Dietrich expressed his appreciation for NOPEC coming here tonight because he learned a ton. He believed that lack of communication causes frustration. He expressed his gratitude that they caught things, and also thanked them for the grants. He personally has a better grasp on this and can better speak to the residents. He asked a last question, if a resident is already out and they want to come back, how easy that process would be. Mr. Jankowski explained that it is two different processes for electric and gas. Again, the gas was first and electric was second. They never set up gas to allow for instantaneous opting in; we are trying to work on that now. The plan of government that you signed 20 years ago for gas does not allow that instance. Therefore, what has to happen now on gas is to call your retailer supplier, and let them know you want out and want to join NOPEC. You have to wait for your contract to terminate. He went on to say you fall back to the SCO, which is the price to compare for gas. You go into that pool, and we will pick you up. That is the eligibility pool for the aggregation. We do them every other month usually; gas and electric. We will pick you up eventually, that is why it could take 3 to 5 months to get from your retail supplier to NOPEC. Ms. Costanzo offered to meet with anyone to share legislation samples that have been done in other cities; such as Conneaut, Madison, and Bedford Heights.

Ms. Carbone-McDonald inquired about, if she has elderly residents who may not quite understand and have further questions, if there is a certain number they can call to talk to someone. Mr. Jankowski expressed that we are very proud of the fact that we have a tremendous call center, which is in Michigan. That is a domestic call center, in which a live person answers 24/7; here in the states with multiple languages available. They will thoroughly explain the process to you. Ms. Costanzo shared the contact number, which was 1-855-667-3201; which is also on the bill.

Ms. Costanzo offered her assistance if any challenging situations were to come about, she is willing to call and talk to them for a resident; she wished she could do it for everyone, but cannot. Mr. Marnecheck remarked, you want us to be the gate keeper on that, and Ms. Costanzo agreed. Her job is to come to these meetings; however, she can do it and make calls, and has been.

Mr. Jankowski concluded that he welcomes these opportunities and was glad to be able to come out. He appreciated the invitation. He made known that we did the best thing for your customers that we could.

Ms. Carbone-McDonald remarked that she learned a lot today as well. She can take things back to her residents and that is important to her. She shared that October 31st, she received correspondence from the residents at 9857 Silverleaf Drive, North Royalton. The subject matter is NOPEC, whereas this correspondence will be attached to the Utilities Committee minutes dated November 1, 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Mr. Dietrich, seconded by Ms. Krejci to adjourn the November 1, 2022, meeting. Yeas: 3. Nays: 0. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Understanding NOPEC's Decision to Temporarily Return Electric Customers to Utility Default Service

Updated: October 4, 2022

The Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council (NOPEC) is the largest nonprofit governmental energy aggregator in Ohio, providing electricity and natural gas aggregation services for more than 20 years to about 1 million residential and small business accounts in 242 communities and 19 counties. NOPEC is regulated by the PUCO, but as a nonprofit council of governments, it does not answer to shareholders and is not driven by profit.

NOPEC has always been a consumer-focused organization that operates and advocates for what's best for our member communities and customers. For 20-plus years, NOPEC's aggregation programs have resulted in competitive pricing to the benefit of our customers. Unfortunately, this year, worldwide events created an unpredictable and unprecedented energy price spike. This resulted in our customers experiencing much higher rates.

A year ago at this time, NOPEC's rate was competitive in the Ohio retail markets and with the default offer rates offered by utilities -- also called SSO rates (traditionally, only about 15% of customers in NOPEC's service area are on the SSO rate). Then, like everyone in the energy industry, we watched as the cost of energy began to rise globally driven by prices in Europe, the war in Ukraine, supply chain issues and other forces outside of NOPEC's control. By July 2022, NOPEC prices were nearly double the utility's default SSO rate, driven up additionally by the hotter weather across the country this summer.

We proactively informed the PUCO of market developments and our response plan and then moved as quickly as possible to return our electric customers to the SSO. We acted in compliance with Ohio law and rules in returning our electric customers swiftly and decisively to the lower utility rate so our customers would pay less for their electric supply through Spring 2023.

This action is proof that NOPEC's aggregation program works. We took action that lowered customers' rates, even when our rates were temporarily higher due to events clearly out of our control. No for-profit company is incentivized to help its consumers obtain lower rates even if it means transitioning them to another supplier.

NOPEC is not alone in taking this step. Across Ohio, approximately 40 other aggregations have made the same move, returning about 100,000 customers to the SSO this year. Nonprofit governmental electric aggregation can provide the ability to put consumers first. Not everyone in the energy industry shares those values.

NOPEC intends to resume electric aggregation service in June 2023, pending PUCO approval. The current locked-in SSO rate will be reset in mid-2023 and is likely to closely reflect current market rates, meaning NOPEC's electric rates are likely again to be competitive with the utility rate.

Recently, a competitor of NOPEC filed a complaint with the PUCO claiming, among other things, that moving customers to lower-rate utility SSO service disrupts the Ohio energy markets and asked the PUCO to revoke NOPEC's electric aggregation certificate. Revoking our certificate would effectively put NOPEC out of the electric aggregation business -- and ensure that our customers would not have access to our service in the future. Be clear - this complaint is based on NOPEC's decision to put our consumers first. NOPEC did the right thing in doing so, in compliance with Ohio law. We are vigorously fighting this attack.

Don't be fooled by what competitors claim: NOPEC is a nonprofit governed by an unpaid Board of Directors. We are focused on the consumer, not on profit, and we will continue fighting for consumers and defending our 20+ year excellent track record.