

Kevin Scott Lepage



August 4, 2026

Lisa Wallace  
Chief Clerk of the Board  
Nova Scotia Energy Board  
1601 Lower Water Street, 3rd Floor  
Halifax, NS B3J 3S3

*Sent via TitanFile Secure Submit and email, copying all parties per Board direction.*

**Re: Matter No. M12942 / NSEB Appeal Reference #260703001**  
**Response to Nova Scotia Power Inc.'s July 20, 2026 Submission (Exhibit L-6)**  
**Account #** [REDACTED]

Dear Ms. Wallace:

This letter responds, within the deadline of Tuesday, August 4, 2026, to the submission filed by Nova Scotia Power Inc. ("NS Power") on July 20, 2026 and posted as Exhibit L-6 in the above matter. NS Power's submission asks the Board to uphold the Dispute Resolution Officer's ("DRO") June 23, 2026 decision that I have been billed appropriately. For the reasons below, I maintain my appeal and ask the Board to order the relief set out at the end of this letter.

**1. The meter test result is accepted as reported, but it does not resolve the dispute**

NS Power's July 20 letter relies heavily on the July 16, 2026 test result confirming that meter #2047502 "operates within prescribed accuracy limits." I do not dispute that NS Power's own accredited facility reported that result, and I am not asking the Board to disregard it. However, several points limit what that result can fairly be taken to prove:

- The underlying test record (NS Power's own Attachment 5, Screen Four) shows that only the Creep Test and Dial Check were performed and marked "P." The Phase Test, Short Test, and Hand Test fields are blank — i.e., not performed. A bench test that does not exercise all standard sub-tests is narrower than "the meter was fully tested and found accurate," and I ask that NS Power confirm in writing which specific tests were and were not run, and why.
- The "As Found" and "As Left" readings on that same record are 151,753.00 kWh and 151,754.00 kWh respectively — a difference of only 1 kWh. I ask NS Power to clarify what testing occurred between those two readings and over what load conditions, since the record as provided does not show the register moving through a meaningful test cycle.
- A meter can test as accurate at a point in time in July 2026 while still having over-registered consumption in prior years, particularly if firmware, configuration, or a fault condition changed at some point in the meter's service life. A passing bench test today is not proof that the meter read correctly in 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, or 2025.

For these reasons, I accept that the July 16 test reported a pass, but I do not accept that this result, standing alone, resolves the broader billing dispute. I am proceeding to request independent Measurement Canada testing, as NS Power's own July 16 letter and July 20 submission both confirm is available to me, and I ask that chain-of-custody documentation for meter #2047502 (removal date, handling, storage, and transport to the test facility) be provided and preserved pending that independent test.

## **2. The meter has since been replaced; consumption on the new meter is being independently verified**

Since NS Power's July 20 submission was filed, meter #2047502 was removed and replaced with new meter #2566678 on July 8, 2026. I have been reviewing actual daily consumption recorded under the new meter against historical billing periods. Based on that review, the new meter's daily readings recorded so far (approximately 80–115 kWh/day) fall within the same broad range already recorded by the prior meter in recent billing periods — for example, 85.8 kWh/day for the April 13 to June 11, 2026 billing period. I am not asking the Board to treat the meter replacement, by itself, as proof that meter #2047502 was inaccurate.

I raise the replacement so that the record reflects it, and so that NS Power can be asked to confirm, going forward, that the replacement meter's readings remain consistent with actual household consumption. I ask that NS Power provide a period-by-period comparison of consumption recorded by meter #2047502 against meter #2566678, so this can be verified rather than assumed by either party.

## **3. The July 3, 2026 outage anomaly warrants explanation**

On July 3, 2026, a transmission-level outage affected the property from approximately 8:00 PM to 11:30 PM. During that outage, when no power was flowing to the premises, meter #2047502 registered approximately 4 kWh of usage, compared to approximately 2 kWh registered on the neighbouring meter (#2047503) at 42 Aspenhill during the same outage window. Neither meter should have registered any usage while power was interrupted. This remains unexplained and NS Power's July 20 submission does not address it.

I note that the diagnostic code associated with meter #2047502 changed from rH05555 to rH0455 following the outage. Diagnostic codes of this general kind appear in the ordinary course on both meter #2047502 and the neighbouring meter #2047503, so I am not asking the Board to treat this code change, on its own, as evidence of tampering. I do ask that NS Power explain what this code change reflects in the ordinary course of the meter's operation, and confirm whether it had any bearing on the meter's readings or on the July 16 test result.

## **4. The comparison to the neighbouring meter remains unaddressed**

Meter #2047503, serving [REDACTED] is the same make, model, and firmware as meter #2047502, installed the same month (August 2019). That property has more occupants than mine (two couples, a basement apartment, and air conditioning), yet its cumulative reading (approximately 49,505 kWh) is roughly one-third of what has been billed on my account over the comparable period. NS Power's July 20 submission does not address this comparison at all, despite it having been raised in my original June 22, 2026 dispute letter. I ask that NS Power be directed to respond specifically to this comparison, including whether rate code, meter configuration, or any other factor could account for the discrepancy.

## **5. The rate code discrepancy has not been explained**

My account is billed under rate code 03B, while the neighbouring account at [REDACTED] is billed under rate code 02B. NS Power has not explained why these two comparable residential properties are on different rate codes, or whether that difference has any bearing on billed consumption or pricing. This difference is also visible in the meter data itself: my meter's registers are split by time-of-use tier (A/B/C), while the neighbouring meter under rate code 02B records a single undivided cumulative total — consistent with the two accounts being on different rate structures. I renew my request that NS Power provide a clear explanation of the rate code assigned to my account and confirm whether it has been correctly applied throughout the disputed period.

#### **6. NS Power's submission does not address the 2020–2021 usage doubling**

NS Power's July 20 submission focuses entirely on reconciling the estimated bills issued after the March 2025 cyberattack. It does not address the anomaly at the center of my original dispute: billed usage on meter #2047502 essentially doubled from 2020 (approximately 24 kWh/day) to 2021 (approximately 48 kWh/day) with no change in occupants, equipment, or household circumstances, and remained elevated in 2022 and 2023 before any EV was acquired. This predates the cyberattack by several years and cannot be explained by NS Power's estimated-billing narrative. I ask that NS Power directly address this 2020–2021 change and provide any technical explanation, including whether any meter configuration, firmware, or multiplier change occurred at that time.

#### **7. The reconciliation argument assumes the accuracy it has not yet established**

NS Power's letter argues that the June and August 2025 estimated bills were fully reconciled once the October 2025 actual reading was obtained, and that the December 2025 estimate resulted in no overbilling once the February 2026 actual reading came in higher. This reasoning is only sound if the underlying actual readings themselves are accurate. Given the points above — the unexplained 2021 doubling, the July 3 outage anomaly, and the stark contrast with the neighbouring meter — I do not accept that the actual readings NS Power relies on to "reconcile" the estimated bills have been shown to be accurate. Reconciling an estimate to a potentially inflated actual reading does not establish that the account has been billed correctly; it simply carries the same unresolved accuracy question forward.

#### **Relief Requested**

I ask the Board to order the following:

1. Independent testing of meter #2047502 by Measurement Canada, including its calibration certificate, with NS Power to preserve and provide full chain-of-custody documentation for the meter from the date of its July 8, 2026 removal onward.
2. A written explanation from NS Power addressing the July 3, 2026 outage anomaly (meter #2047502 registering roughly double the neighbouring meter's ghost consumption with no power flowing), and confirmation of what the diagnostic code change from rH05555 to rH0455 reflects and whether it affected the meter's readings.
3. A period-by-period comparison of consumption recorded by meter #2047502 versus replacement meter #2566678 for comparable billing periods.
4. A written explanation of the rate code (03B) applied to my account as compared to the neighbouring property's rate code (02B), and confirmation of whether it has been correctly applied throughout the disputed period.

5. A full audit and recalculation of billed consumption from 2021 forward, in light of the unexplained doubling of usage that year and the absence of any corresponding change in household circumstances.
6. A determination of any refund owing once the foregoing has been addressed.

I remain prepared to resolve this matter directly, but I do not accept that NS Power's July 20 submission, or the July 16 meter test standing alone, resolves the underlying dispute. I reserve the right to supplement this response as independent testing and further documentation become available.

Sincerely,

Kevin Scott Lepage

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Kevin Scott Lepage.

*cc: Nova Scotia Power Inc. (Kathleen Murray, Regulatory Counsel)*