

NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

- and -

IN THE MATTER OF: AN APPLICATION by the TOWN OF LUNENBURG ELECTRIC UTILITY for Approval of Revisions to its Schedule of Rates, for Electric Supply and Services (Flow Through Rate Application)

INFORMATION REQUESTS

To: **Town of Lunenburg**
Lisa Dagley
Finance Director
By email: ldagley@townoflunenburg.ca

From: Board Staff
Nova Scotia Energy Board

Responses Due: **Friday, July 17, 2026**

Copies: 1 electronic copy (PDF searchable)

Contact Person: **Eric Kirby, CPA, CMA**
Senior Advisor
Nova Scotia Energy Board
3rd Floor, 1601 Lower Water Street
Halifax, NS B3J 3S3
Tel: (902) 424-9292
Email: eric.kirby@novascotia.ca

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 10th day of July, 2026.

Pamela McGarrigle

for Crystal Henwood, Clerk of the Board

IR-1 to IR-2 refer to the Data Sources Tab from Exhibit L-1(iv).

Request IR-1:

Cell E131 suggests there is an embedded FAM charge in the approved rates from the past General Rate Application (GRA), matter M12179, of 0.107¢/kwh. However, the rates approved in the 2025AA/BA matter for NS Power for the municipal class were 0.418 and 0.105, respectively, totalling 0.523¢/kwh.

In the Utility's response to Synapse's IR-10 in the GRA, the utility suggested they include 0 for the AA and 0.105¢/kwh for the BA.

- a) Please reconcile the amounts approved for the municipal rate class with what the utility is applying for in this application and the amount noted in response to IR-10. If the numbers in the Excel file require changes, please refile with the changes, and include any updated schedules and exhibits as required.

Request IR-2:

The energy rate of 0.11705 in Cell I128 looks like the approved amount of 0.11600 plus the FAM amount of 0.00105.

- a) Should the rate in Cell I128 have included the FAM amount, or was that a mistake?
- b) If it was a mistake, please refile the worksheet with the corrected amounts, and update any worksheet or rates that flow from the correction.

IR-3 to IR-7 refer to the Test Year Load Forecast Tab from Exhibit L-1(iv).

Request IR-3:

Rows 14-19 in Column J look like actual energy consumption from 25/26 was adjusted by a growth factor that was based on an average of the growth rates estimated in the GRA and actual year over year growth the previous year.

- a) Please confirm if this is how the growth factors were set.
- b) Please explain why the utility took this approach to setting growth for the coming year, as opposed to some other estimate?

Request IR-4:

The distribution line loss factor calculated in Cell C30 looks to be the average line loss over the past three years and the line loss used in the GRA. The Board understands that the GRA line loss factor was based on a rolling average from April 2022 to March 2024, so the line losses for 2023/24 would have been included in that number.

- 1 a) By using this methodology, are line losses for 2023/24 being included twice, making them
2 overrepresented in the average used?
3 b) Please explain the rationale for this methodology to estimate line losses.
4

5 **Request IR-5:**

6 Looking at Cells C26 to C28:

- 7 a) Please explain the large increases in line losses from 2023/24 to 2024/25, and the even
8 larger increase from 2024/25 to 2025/26.
9 b) Is the increase in 2025/26 a new normal amount of line loss, or is it a one-off caused by
10 factors that are not expected to recur every year?
11 i. If it is not the “new normal”, should this number be excluded when calculating the
12 average line loss factor for this application?
13

14 **Request IR-6:**

15 The split in the estimated purchased energy in 2026/27 in Cells D38 and D39 appears to be based
16 on the timing of actual purchases in a past period, but the factor for energy from April to December
17 does not appear to come from calculations in the Data and Sources tab, cell D71 (67% vs the
18 calculated 66.42%).

- 19 a) Is the 67% used in the formula the calculated 66.42% rounded to 67%, or did this number
20 come from somewhere else?
21 b) If the 67% came from somewhere else, please explain how it was developed.
22

23 **Request IR-7:**

24 Regarding the reduced demand shown in Cell C38 relative to C37, please explain why the
25 historical number is more appropriate than the January 2026 number.
26

27 **Request IR-8:**

28 Referring to the Retail Rates 2026 Tab:

29 In column O, Rows 51-76, the GRA Billing Determinants from column T were scaled for growth.
30 This scaling appears to have used the energy growth rates calculated in the Test Year Load
31 Forecast tab (this also seems to be the case for the 2027 rates).

- 32 a) Please explain the reasonableness of the assumption that demand and the number of
33 customers change at the same rate as energy consumption, as is shown in the application.
34

1 **Request IR-9:**

2 Referring to the Retail Rates 2027 Tab, the calculation of the rates seems to be using the same
3 billing determinants as 2026, so it does not appear that growth was taken into account for
4 projecting the revenue for 2027, yet it appears to have taken into account year over year changes
5 in determining the cost of the power increase in 2027 (Data and Sources tab, Cells K122-K417
6 and L122 to L147)

7 a) Please confirm if year-over-year changes in consumption, demand and customer charges
8 were not considered on the revenue side.

9 i. If this is the case, please explain why not.

10 b) If it should have considered the revenue side of the equation, please update and refile all
11 affected tabs, exhibits, and schedules, taking this into account.

12
13 **Request IR-10:**

14 a) Please confirm the billing cycle dates.

15 b) If the decision on this application is made later this month and effective on July 1, 2026,
16 will the utility have issued bills since July 1, with usage that went past July 1, 2026, and
17 therefore have to retroactively adjust them?