

From: Karen Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: September 1, 2026 12:00 PM
To: Penney, Nicole <Nicole.Penney@novascotia.ca>
Subject: Re: M12915 - DRO Appeal IR Responses 1-3

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL / COURRIEL EXTERNE ****

Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links / Faites preuve de prudence si vous ouvrez une pièce jointe ou cliquez sur un lien

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

Matter M12915

IN THE MATTER OF: An Appeal of the Dispute Resolution Officer's Decision by Douglas J. Fulljames concerning Nova Scotia Power Inc.

REPLY TO NS POWER'S RESPONSES TO INFORMATION REQUESTS
IR-1 TO IR-3

We respectfully submit the following comments in reply to NS Power's Information Request responses filed September 1, 2026.

We accept the results of both NS Power's meter test and the independent Measurement Canada test. We do not allege that the meter was operating outside the permitted accuracy tolerances.

The remaining issue is whether NS Power's evidence adequately establishes the timing and circumstances of the extraordinary consumption recorded between its actual meter readings, particularly when its normal meter-data systems were unavailable following the cyber incident.

1. The September 2025 estimate does not explain the disputed consumption

NS Power has now explained that the September 2025 bill was estimated using the prior year's consumption of approximately 2.03 kWh per day. We accept that the estimate of 134 kWh for that 66-day billing period was calculated consistently with the prior year.

However, that explanation does not resolve the central issue raised in this appeal. The last actual reading before the September estimate was 12,329.00 on July 18, 2025. The next actual reading was 23,273.66 on May 20, 2026.

The difference between those two actual readings is 10,944.66 kWh over approximately 306 days, averaging approximately 35.8 kWh per day.

Consequently, the extraordinary increase exists independently of the September estimated reading. The estimate affects how the total consumption was allocated between the September and May bills, but it does not explain what caused the meter register to increase by approximately 10,945 kWh between the two actual readings.

2. The recorded consumption represents a substantial and sustained electrical load

Consumption of 10,811 kWh over 240 days averages 45.0 kWh per day. That is equivalent to an average electrical load of approximately 1.875 kilowatts operating continuously, 24 hours per day, throughout the disputed billing period.

By comparison, the July 2026 bill records 303 kWh over the 63 days immediately following the disputed period, averaging 4.8 kWh per day. That is equivalent to an average continuous load of approximately 0.2 kilowatts.

The recorded average load therefore fell by approximately 89 percent immediately following the disputed period.

There was no corresponding change in the property's occupancy or known electrical equipment that explains this reduction. The property is a small seasonal guest cabin and was unoccupied during the disputed period. Its baseboard heating was switched off at the breaker panel. Its conventional hot-water tank had been removed and had not been replaced. The known loads consisted of a standard refrigerator, a small chest freezer, and the shared water pump.

We recognize that an accurate cumulative meter reading indicates that the meter register advanced. Nevertheless, neither the meter test nor the subtraction of two register readings identifies when the consumption occurred, whether it was continuous or concentrated during a shorter period, or what evidence exists concerning the consumption pattern.

3. NS Power's response to IR-3 requires clarification

In response to IR-3, NS Power states:

“No. NS Power has no record of any anomalies, load spikes, or irregular meter readings associated with Mr. Fulljames’ account.”

That answer is ambiguous.

NS Power previously advised that, following the cyber incident, it was temporarily unable to access meter data and certain bills had to be estimated. Its September 1 response identifies April 24, 2025, as the last regular meter reading available in its data extract before the incident.

If daily or hourly interval-consumption data are unavailable for the disputed period, the absence of a record of an anomaly does not establish that no anomaly or load spike occurred. It may simply mean that NS Power does not possess the interval data necessary to identify one.

NS Power’s own customer portal also identifies the May 2026 consumption as:

- a 219.95 percent increase over the comparable prior period;
- the account’s recorded high; and
- 10,811 kWh compared with 3,379 kWh in May 2025.

We recognize that the portal may be comparing billing-period totals, while NS Power may be using a narrower technical meaning of “anomaly,” “load spike,” or “irregular meter reading.” If so, that distinction should be explained.

We respectfully request that the Board direct NS Power to clarify:

- a. Whether daily, hourly, or other interval-consumption data exist for meter [2238679](#) for the period July 18, 2025, through May 20, 2026;
- b. If such data exist, that NS Power provide them and identify when the approximately 10,944.66 kWh was recorded;
- c. If such data do not exist, the evidentiary basis upon which NS Power determined that there were no anomalies or load spikes during the disputed period;
- d. What definitions of “anomaly,” “load spike,” and “irregular meter reading” NS Power used when answering IR-3;

e. Whether NS Power's response to IR-3 means that it reviewed interval data and found no anomaly, or merely that no anomaly is recorded in the information presently available to it; and

f. How NS Power reconciles its IR-3 response with its customer portal's identification of the May 2026 consumption as a 219.95 percent increase and the account's recorded high.

4. Payment arrangements do not resolve the disputed evidentiary issue NS Power has offered either a 24-month Equal Billing Plan of approximately \$296 per month or a payment arrangement of approximately \$89 per month in addition to regular bills.

We appreciate that NS Power has identified these options. However, our concern is not presently an inability to select a payment schedule. We continue to dispute whether NS Power's evidence is sufficient to support charging the account for this extraordinary and unexplained consumption. Entering into a payment arrangement before that issue is determined could be understood as accepting the disputed balance.

We remain prepared to pay the amount ultimately determined by the Board to be properly owing.

5. Conclusion

We acknowledge that the meter tested within the permitted accuracy tolerances. We also acknowledge that the arithmetic difference between the cumulative meter readings is correct.

Those facts do not, however, answer the outstanding question: how and when did an unoccupied seasonal cabin with no active electric heating or conventional hot-water load record consumption equivalent to an average 1.875-kilowatt load operating continuously for eight months, followed immediately by an approximately 89 percent reduction?

NS Power has established the beginning and ending register values. It has not produced the interval data or other evidence necessary to explain the extraordinary increase between them. Its statement that it has "no record" of an anomaly should not be treated as affirmative evidence that no anomaly occurred unless NS Power demonstrates that it possessed and reviewed data capable of revealing one.

We respectfully request that the Board obtain the further information identified above before determining this appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas J. Fulljames
Karen Ward

Sent from my iPhone