2026 **M12661**

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: **THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT**

and

IN THE MATTER OF: **An Application by Nova Scotia Power Inc. ("NS Power") for approval of an Extra Large Industrial Dispatchable Above-the-Line Tariff applicable to Port Hawkesbury Paper**

NON-CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: **Bates White**

From: **Port Hawkesbury Paper LP**

Responses Due: **June 18, 2026**

Contact Person:
James MacDuff
McInnes Cooper
P.O. Box 730
Purdy's Wharf Tower II
1300 – 1969 Upper Water Street
Halifax, NS B3J 2V1
Phone: 902-444-8619
Email: james.macduff@mcinnescooper.com

IR-1

Reference: Testimony, Section III, Page 15, Lines 2–13. Bates White states that the net PHP load used in deriving the Extra Large Industrial Dispatchable (ELID) Energy Charge is too high because it fails to incorporate PHP's updated lower estimate for gross load (774 GWh) and the full 168 MW capacity output of the Goose Harbour Wind Farm (653 GWh). Bates White calculates that a more appropriate net load would be 121 GWh instead of the 304 GWh applied by NSPI.

(a) Under the proposal would PHP’s net load of 121 GWh be used for both COS and rate design purposes? Please explain.

IR-2

Reference: Testimony, Section IV, Page 28, Lines 18-21. "It may be that, with additional elaboration, revisions, reporting requirements, and verifiability guardrails, the mechanism may achieve these objectives, but as proposed, it is our view that the DR credit is too vague, uncertain, unverifiable, and at risk of failing to match rider payments to load-shifting service to be recommended for approval."

(a) Please provide Bates White's suggested additional elaboration, revisions, reporting requirements and verifiability guardrails that would satisfy Bates White's concerns.

IR-3

Reference: Testimony, Section V, Page 33, Lines 11–18. Bates White outlines an extreme but plausible scenario where PHP's annual net load subject to the tariff rate drops to zero, meaning the mill would pay no Energy Charge and fail to cover any embedded fixed costs reflected in that charge.

(a) Does Bates White agree that if a customer class uses no energy from NSP's system as a result of a sleeving arrangement, the customer class should not be subject to NSP's embedded fixed energy costs? Please explain.

IR-4

Reference: Testimony, Section VI, page 35, lines 23-25. "… we recommend that a true-up mechanism be created to address substantial deviations of PHP net load from expectations…"

(a) Please quantify the term "substantial" in this context.

(b) Please confirm that this true-up mechanism is meant to operate in both directions and could provide a credit per MWh in favour of PHP if the actual PHP net load is higher than used in the forecast for the COS. If not confirmed, please explain.

(c) Please confirm Bates White's understanding of how the forecast energy usage is determined by NSP for the LIIR class of customers.