2025 **M12282**

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: **The *Public Utilities Act***

IN THE MATTER OF: **An Application by EfficiencyOne for approval of a New Benefit-Cost Analysis Test for Evaluating Demand Side Management Plans**

INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: Melissa Whitten
Small Business Advocate (SBA)

From: The Industrial Group

Responses Due: August 21, 2025

Contact Person Nancy G. Rubin, K.C.
Brianne Rudderham
Stewart McKelvey
Suite 600-1741 Lower Water Street
P.O. Box 997
Halifax NS B3J 2X2
Telephone: (902) 420-3200 / Fax (902) 420-1417

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 31st day of July 2025.

Request IR-1:

Reference: Exhibit E-13, page 5-6.

Ms. Whitten indicates that "a well-crafted DSM plan can be successful in reducing or delaying an increase in peak demand that then should translate into customer bill savings" and that "the BCA test must not result in customers facing increased costs from the DSM rider in the absence of benefits and in addition to any rate increase that may result from a future general rate applications ('GRA')"

(a) Please provide a detailed description of the use of the word "benefits" in the sentence noting that small business customers understand they may face increased costs to achieve benefits (which appear to be linked to "customer bill savings").

(i) Does this mean energy system benefits (e.g., increased reliability, avoided new investment in generation, etc.), or does it include other societal benefits, such as the comfort and pride of E1 program participants?

(b) Does Ms. Whitten's testimony indicate support for the concept that DSM costs are appropriately incurred and paid for by NSPI customers in support of broad societal (and participant-specific) non-utility benefits?

(c) Is the above cited excerpt suggestive that Ms. Whitten is more conceptually aligned with a BCA such as the PAC test rather than the test proposed by E1 (i.e., a test focused on utility and customer bill benefits, rather than broader social and participant-specific benefits)

Request IR-2:

Reference: Exhibit E-13, page 8.

Ms. Whitten indicates: "I recommend that E1's proposed BCA test not be approved until E1 has completed a thorough assessment of the proposed non-energy benefits presented in this Application. In addition, I respectfully submit that the Board direct E1 to do the following: 1. Obtain from an independent third party, not associated with this Application, evidence that shows the following non-energy benefits can be quantified: Comfort; Amenity; Empowerment'; and Pride. (collectively the "Unquantified Non-Energy Benefits")".

(a) Assuming these benefits can be fully and defensibly quantified, does Ms. Whitten consider it appropriate that these be included in the BCA, if they are not aligned with the emphasis at page 5 of the evidence regarding "customer bill savings" (i.e., these may be benefits to the participant, but not to the utility bills paid by NS Power customers, including small businesses)?

(b) Would the concerns of Ms. Whitten be equally addressed or mitigated by adoption of the PAC test as the primary BCA test for E1, rather than the proposed test, as this would eliminate the need to quantify the proxy values and hard-to-quantify benefits?