



202 S. Main Street
Le Sueur, MN 56058
Toll Free: (888) 931-3411
Fax (507) 665-2588
www.greatermngas.com

May 18, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Mr. Daniel P. Wolf
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2147

RE: Petition for Change in Contract Demand Entitlement
Docket No. _____

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Attached hereto, please find Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s Petition for Change in Contract Demand Entitlement for 2017-2018 Heating Season for filing in a new docket.

All individuals identified on the attached service list have been electronically served with the same.

Thank you for your assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or concerns or if you require additional information. My direct dial number is (507) 665-8657 and my email address is kanderson@greatermngas.com.

Sincerely,

GREATER MINNESOTA GAS, INC.

/s/

Kristine A. Anderson
Corporate Attorney

Enclosure

cc: Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kristine Anderson, hereby certify that I have this day served a true and correct copy of the following document to all persons at the addresses indicated on the attached list by electronic filing, electronic mail, or by depositing the same enveloped with postage paid in the United States Mail at Le Sueur, Minnesota:

**Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s Petition for Change in Contract Demand
Entitlement for 2017-2018 Heating Season
Docket No. _____**

filed this 18th day of May, 2017.

/s/ Kristine A. Anderson
Kristine A. Anderson, Esq.
Corporate Attorney
Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Kristine	Anderson	kanderson@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	202 S. Main Street Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Ian	Dobson	Residential.Utilities@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Brian	Gardow	bgardow@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	PO Box 68 Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Nicolle	Kupser	nkupser@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	202 South Main Street P.O. Box 68 Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Greg	Palmer	gpalmer@greatermngas.com	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	PO Box 68 202 South Main Street Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc._Official Service List 2017

STATE OF MINNESOTA

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Nancy Lange	Chair
Dan Lipschultz	Commissioner
Matt Schuerger	Commissioner
Katie Sieben	Commissioner
John Tuma	Commissioner

**PETITION FOR CHANGE IN CONTRACT
DEMAND ENTITLEMENT FOR 2017-2018
HEATING SEASON**

MPUC Docket No. _____

OVERVIEW

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. (“GMG”) submits this filing to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) to notify the Commission of a change in contract demand entitlement for the 2017-2018 heating season. GMG plans to include the rate impact of these changes in GMG’s Purchased Gas Adjustments November 1, 2017.

GMG remains committed to providing sufficient capacity to serve its firm customers throughout the heating season while simultaneously protecting its ratepayers from paying unduly high amounts for maintaining its reserve. GMG has again employed a combined analytical framework that has proven to be sound and provide sufficient protection for GMG’s customers. As it has done in recent years, GMG anticipates informally reviewing its projections, demand entitlement, and reserve margin immediately prior to the heating season to ensure that adequate capacity will be available to meet projected peak day demand and design day conditions. In the event that an adjustment of its contract demand request is necessary in the fall of 2017, GMG will undertake appropriate action to address that scenario at that time.

Minnesota Rule 7825.2910 Subp. 2 requires GMG to assess four areas when requesting a change in demand entitlement, namely: the factors contributing to the need for changing demand; GMG’s design day demand analysis; a summary of GMG’s customers’ winter and summer usage for all customer classes; and, a description of GMG’s design day gas supply from all sources under its proposed level. This Petition addresses each of the requisite areas based on GMG’s analysis of its current customer usage and patterns, the impact GMG’s current and anticipated growth on the upcoming heating season, and forecasting the size and expected load of new and recently acquired customers.

DISCUSSION

A review of GMG's demand entitlement filings over the last several years demonstrates that some have included substantial changes as a direct result of the Company's growth; and, others have been minimal as a result of utilization of GMG's balanced supply portfolio and proactive actions to protect its customers. In order to address both a narrow reserve margin and the uncertainty of predictive modeling for conversion customers, GMG's reserve margin was increased for the 2013-2014 heating season, was maintained at a similar level for the majority of the 2014-2015 heating season, and was slightly increased for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 heating seasons. GMG's increased customer base resulted in preventing any adverse rate impact on GMG's ratepayers despite GMG purchasing increased reserve capability. GMG's growth in recent years enabled it to successfully employ purchasing strategies that increased its reserve capability without resulting in a substantial rate impact. GMG's reserve margin has consistently been sufficient to ensure that its customers' needs were satisfied through the duration of the heating season, including on unseasonably cold days. GMG's supply portfolio changes assured reliable firm supply for its customer base.

GMG's analysis of its needs for the 2017-2018 heating season is based on its adjusted demand requirements for the 2016-2017 heating season. GMG previously advised the Commission that GMG's largest customer transitioned some of its locations from firm retail service to transportation service.¹ GMG and the customer agreed that GMG would provide the customer with one year of recallable capacity release equal to the customer's proportionate amount of GMG's demand entitlement capacity. GMG's current demand entitlement analysis is predicated the proposed² entitlement for the 2016-2017 heating season as adjusted by the impact of the recallable release.

GMG employed a combination of analytical tools to balance the competing components of maintaining a sufficient reserve and maintaining reasonable customer rates in assessing its demand entitlement needs for the 2017-2018 heating season.³ By combining statistical regression analysis based on its existing customer data, mathematical analysis, projected growth

¹. Docket No. G022/M-16-522, October 27, 2016 letter at 3.

². As of the submission of this Petition, the Commission has not considered GMG's contract demand entitlement petition for the 2016-2017 heating season, Docket No. G022/M-16-522. Since the Department recommended approval of GMG's requested entitlement level and cost recovery, GMG utilized its proposed entitlement as the basis for calculating entitlement and reserve margin changes herein.

³. GMG was ordered to use three years of data and separate its regression analysis by type of customer beginning with its 2016-2017 demand entitlement filing. As discussed in that year's filing, GMG has sparse data from the first year of that regression timeline, and data based on three years is skewed and does not provide a meaningful result. GMG believes that the analysis it relied on herein is appropriate, given the totality of the circumstances. GMG intends to rely on three years of data in a separated regression analysis as soon as three years of comprehensive, meaningful data is available. GMG will continue to expand the data upon which it relies, as it has done in the instant analysis, until that time.

information, and budget year analysis, GMG’s current proposed demand entitlement is again soundly supported by its supporting data, attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

GMG seeks an adjustment of its total demand entitlement as follows:

Previously Proposed Entitlement for 2016-17 (Dth)	Entitlement Portion Assigned to Transport Conversion Customer as Recallable Release (Dth)	2016-17 Entitlement After Adjustment (Dth)	Proposed Entitlement 2017-18 (Dth)	Entitlement Changes (Dth)	% Change From Previous Year
13,009	(1,235)	11,774	12,609	835	7.09%

1. GMG’s Adjusted Demand Entitlement Reflects Corresponding Changes to Its Portfolio and Its Customer Needs and Assures Its Ability to Maintain an Adequate Reserve Margin Throughout the Heating Season Without Adversely Impacting Customer Rates.

A general increase in demand entitlement is requested by GMG to enable it to continue to provide sufficient reserve to meet its customers’ needs. GMG’s reserve margin levels over the last several years have satisfactorily balanced the necessity of a sufficient reserve margin against protection for its ratepayers from an unreasonable reserve cost. The Department has previously noted that the OES generally uses a gauge of five percent to determine the appropriateness of a company’s reserve margin. However, in recent years, the Commission has approved higher reserve margins for GMG. GMG agrees that utilizing a conservative approach when allocating a reserve margin is appropriate. GMG believes that maintaining its reserve margin at a conservative level continues to be prudent and has again utilized its portfolio in a manner that allows its reserve margin to be maintained without undue cost burdening its ratepayers. GMG’s proposed demand entitlement would again result in a slight decrease in customer rates. Therefore, GMG proposes a reserve margin of 5.99% for the upcoming heating season.

GMG’s predictive modeling calculations reflect a need for a small change in its design day entitlement. The table below summarizes GMG’s design day and reserve calculations:

Planned Customer Base fo 2017-2018 Heating Season	
Design Day Requirement (Attachment A, Page 2 of 3, line 9)	11,896 Dth
Reserve Margin at 5.99%	713 Dth
Design Day Requirement With 5.99% Reserve Margin	12,609 Dth

The ultimate objective of a design day analysis is to forecast anticipated firm customer demand at design temperatures to predict the necessary level of firm resources to sufficiently serve customer in the unlikely event that design day weather occurs. In order to meet that objective but balance it against the desire to protect ratepayers from paying for too much reserve, a small increase in GMG’s contract demand entitlement is appropriate.

2. GMG's Design Day Analysis Ensures Viable Forecasting Given Available Customer Data and Predictive Information.

GMG's current design day projection is based on a two-stage process whereby it analyzed two separate econometric models to forecast its supply needs for the upcoming heating season: one based on statistical regression and one based solely on mathematics without interpretation. Consistent with previous Commission directives and Department requests, GMG employed both a regression model separating residential and commercial customers' needs and a mathematical model in its design day analysis. As with GMG's findings in its prior demand entitlement filing, performance of the regression analysis using three years of data produces a flawed result because there is still not sufficient data to rely on a three-year data sample. Hence, GMG determined that relying only on the most recent two years of usage and weather data in its regression analysis produces the result most likely to provide sufficient protection for its customers.

Statistical Regression Analysis Based on Historic Data

For its statistical modeling, GMG employed an ordinary least square regression analysis methodology to predict peak day demand, as it has done for several years. As discussed herein, GMG ultimately relied on a regression based on two heating seasons of data in its final modeling because the results of the three-year data model suggest that the ability to apply such a model is still in its infancy. Given the limited data available for the early part of the previous three years, a three-year regression analysis does not provide a result that will adequately protect GMG's customers should design day weather conditions occur. GMG's regression analysis is predicated on a 90 heating degree day as its basis, based on an average design day temperature of -25°F. GMG's design day forecast for its existing customers for the 2017-2018 heating season is based on 11,896 Dth, which is an increase of 835 Dth from GMG's adjusted 2016-2017 design day requirements. The derivation of the separated class regression design day forecast can be seen in Attachment A, Page 2 of 3.

Attachment A details the regression analysis calculations upon which GMG's contract demand entitlement petition is based, insofar as it relates to its existing customers and quantitative historical data. In conducting its least square regression analysis, GMG employed the following methodology:

Data is provided for residential customers and for commercial customers. Each analysis was completed in the same fashion, by using historical firm sales volume data and actual temperature data for the heating season periods from November 2015 through March 2017 for the reasons discussed above. The firm sales volume data was correlated to geographic weather data for Minneapolis.⁴

⁴. Although GMG historically assigned its town border stations geographically to a variety of weather sites, GMG now has multiple town border stations located in a variety of areas across the state. Consequently, GMG predicated its modeling on weather conditions in Minneapolis.

Employing widely-accepted statistical analysis, a linear equation was derived from the linear regression model that was used to calculate the design day usage per customer. For each regression group, the forecasted number of firm customers for the 2017-2018 heating seasons was then multiplied by the design day usage per customer to derive the design day requirements.

The linear regression models the linear relationship between heating degree day data and firm customer natural gas usage by fitting a linear equation to observed data. The linear regression line has an equation of the form:

$$Y = a + b X$$

Where X (Heating Degree Days) is the explanatory variable and Y (Firm Sales Volume) is the dependent variable. The slope of the line is b, and a is the intercept (Firm Non-Temp Sensitive Volume).

The strength of the linear association is quantified by the correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient takes a positive value between 0 and 1, with 1 indicating perfect correlation (all points would lay along a straight line in this case). A correlation value close to 0 indicates no association between the variables. The formula for computing the correlation coefficient is given by:

$$r = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum \left(\frac{x - \bar{x}}{s_x} \right) \left(\frac{y - \bar{y}}{s_y} \right)$$

The reliance on accepted statistical modeling methodology to obtain quantitative data for forecasting purposes is intended to mitigate discrepancies between actual resource utilization and planned supply needs. Hence, GMG has attempted to secure all available information to gauge likely customer sendout during a design day weather occurrence.

GMG attempts to adequately predict growth; however, it does use a conservative approach. Nonetheless, as the GMG's prior demand entitlement submissions have demonstrated, GMG's design day modeling, taken in its entirety, has been appropriate. Empirical evidence suggests that, when GMG brings natural gas to a previously unserved area, many new customers ultimately avail themselves of the benefits that come with converting to gas use. Hence, sometimes actual throughput exceeds forecasted needs. However, when weather is unseasonably

Similar methodology is employed by larger natural gas utilities with service throughout the state. GMG appreciates the Department's Comments last year that encouraged GMG to return to using multiple weather stations; and, GMG agrees that doing so makes sense in the future. GMG's intent is to use multiple weather zones as soon as three solid years of regression data is available. Given new customer lag in conversion, the changing customer mix, and the fact that one of GMG's largest customers switched to transport service, using multiple weather stations for the current analysis would provide a nonsensical result lacking validity.

warm and/or propane prices are low, both of which occurred during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 heating seasons, new customers wait longer to convert to natural gas usage. Since such anomalies are unpredictable, they too can impact actual throughput. Such phenomena support GMG's continued use of a conservative reserve margin.

In order to provide a well-rounded analysis and as previously recommended by the Department, GMG also utilized a mutually exclusive mathematical analysis based on actual throughput as a separate modeling tool for a second stage in its design day analysis, which appears below. GMG mathematically examined its peak day sendout from last year.

Mathematical Analysis Based on Prior Heating Season and All-Time Peak

GMG's peak day during the last heating season occurred on January 5, 2017 at 68 HDD and resulted in a firm sales throughput of 9,246 Dth/Day, as shown in Attachment A, Page 3. The firm customer count on that date was 7,378 and the resulting use per customer was 1.253 Dth. GMG's all-time peak day usage was 1.457 per customer on January 6, 2014. GMG applied a mathematical analysis that shows two estimated peak day requirements – one based on last heating season's peak day usage and anticipated customer additions, and one based on GMG's all-time high peak day usage and 2017-2018 anticipated customer additions, as shown below.

Mathematical Peak Day Analysis		
	2017-18 Estimated Peak Day Use	All-Time Peak Day Use
Actual Peak Day Throughput	9,246	
/ Customer Count on Peak Day	7,378	
= Use Per Customer on Peak Day	1.253	
x Adjustment for 90 HDD	90/68	90/82
Peak Day Usage Per Customer if 90 HDD	1.4663*	1.457
Additional Residential Customers	705	705
Additional Commercial Customers	30	30
x Total Anticipated Customer Count	8,113	8,113
= Total Projected Peak Day Requirement	11,896	11,821
Proposed Contract Demand Entitlement	12,609	12,609
Reserve Margin	713	788
Reserve Margin %	6.0%	6.7%

* GMG's historic peak day use per customer was 1.457 Dth per customer during the 203-14 heating season, based on 82 HDD. At the beginning of the 2016-17 heating season, eight large former firm customers changed to transport customers. For purposes of this analysis and estimate, GMG utilized the calculated design day use.

GMG’s mathematical analysis confirms that its requested demand entitlement will provide sufficient reserve to protect its customers if unseasonably cold conditions strike in the coming year.

3. The Summary of Winter Versus Summer Usage for All GMG Customer Classes Supports a Change in Demand Entitlement.

A summary of GMG’s customer usage for both the winter and summer seasons is provided below, broken down by customer class. The summary is based on usage for the twelve month period ending December 31, 2016.⁵

Seasonal Customer Usage by Class (Dth)			
	<u>Winter</u>	<u>Summer</u>	<u>Total</u>
Residential - Firm	388,049	124,563	512,612
Commercial - Firm	15,709	4,894	20,603
Industrial - Firm	259,874	152,977	412,852
Flexible Rate - Firm	7,649	6,235	13,883
<i>Total Firm</i>	<i>671,280</i>	<i>288,669</i>	<i>959,949</i>
<i>Agricultural - Interruptible</i>	<i>46,288</i>	<i>37,103</i>	<i>83,391</i>
Industrial - Interruptible	21,958	32,557	54,515
Flexible Rate - Interruptible	5,507	38,571	44,078
<i>Total Interruptible (Non-Ag)</i>	<i>27,465</i>	<i>71,128</i>	<i>98,593</i>
Total	745,033	396,900	1,141,933

GMG’s proposed change in its contract demand entitlement will continue to assure sufficient supply and reliability for its customers throughout the heating season. GMG’s contract arrangements secure supply for both the summer months and the winter months to sufficiently serve its firm customer base throughout the year. GMG’s proposal strikes the ideal balance for both cost and efficiency protections for its customers.

4. The Anticipated Design Day Gas Supply is in the Best Interest of Ratepayers Because it Provides for an Adequate Reserve Margin While Minimizing the Rate Impact.

GMG recognizes that the primary concerns of the Commission and the Department with regard to natural gas suppliers are sufficient assurance of reliability and reasonable rates for customers. It is critical that GMG is fully prepared to provide enough firm supply to meet its customers’ needs. In order to assure that it can meet all of its customers’ needs throughout the year, GMG’s

⁵ . GMG notes that previous demand entitlement dockets filed during the second half of the year incorporated data for the twelve month period ending June 30th of the filing year. However, since this Petition is being submitted prior to June 30th, GMG utilized seasonal customer usage data for the 2016 calendar year.

proposal provides a balanced portfolio based on an integrated system. To that end, GMG has secured a variety of gas supply sources. In keeping with its continued commitment to act in its customers' best interests, GMG will be implementing a gas storage program with Northern Natural Gas beginning in June, 2017. The cost for the NNG storage will be included in the commodity cost, akin to accounting for the cost of GMG's BP storage, based on the Department's recommendation and direction of the Commission in a previous docket. GMG's use of cost-effective options such as gas storage contribute to its ability to protect its customers from potentially volatile and increased gas costs by optimizing its purchasing ability at seasonably reduced gas prices.

A summary of GMG's demand profile shows the changes in GMG's supply sources, as compared to the supply sources for the two previous heating seasons, as seen in Attachment B. GMG is primarily served by the Northern Natural Gas and Viking Gas Transmission pipeline systems. Attachment C identifies the contracts GMG holds with its sources; and, it also specifically notes proposed changes to its contracts for the 2017-2018 heating season and the corresponding change in contract demand costs. GMG respectfully requests that the Commission approve inclusion of the associated demand entitlement costs effective November 1, 2017. GMG will incorporate the charges in its PGA pending Commission approval.

While GMG's relatively early submission of its Petition herein allows for substantial time to consider its request prior to the heating season, it also necessarily requires GMG to engage in prediction regarding both anticipated customer usage and anticipated customer growth for the remainder of the current year. As such, GMG intends to analyze its demand entitlement needs as the 2017-2018 heating season nears, essentially to true-up its anticipated needs and make any necessary demand adjustments at that time.

GMG's supply contract scheme is designed so that gas can be delivered to alternate points and can be used elsewhere in GMG's integrated system if necessary at any given time. Thus, GMG has the ability to move supply throughout its service area on a day to day basis as market demand and supply options dictate.

Attachment D provides a summary of the rate impact to firm customers with the contract changes. It demonstrates that GMG's customers will again benefit from a reduction in cost due to GMG's supply portfolio changes. Therefore, there is no adverse impact to customer rates as a result of the increased demand entitlement, which further supports its approval.

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

GMG's proposed change in contract demand entitlement serves the best interest of its customers.. As the supporting information demonstrates, GMG coordinated its gas-supply planning for the 2017-2018 heating season alongside consideration of previous Department and Commission concerns and recommendations and its broader corporate planning. GMG's proposal strikes the appropriate balance between assuring physical reliability with sufficient supply to serve all customers in the event that design day weather occurs with minimizing the rate impact of maintaining a sufficient reserve on GMG customers. Therefore, GMG

respectfully requests that the Commission approve its Petition for Change in Contract Demand Entitlement for the 2017-2018 Heating Season.

Dated: May 18, 2017

Respectfully submitted,
/s/
Kristine A. Anderson
Corporate Attorney
Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.
202 S. Main Street
Le Sueur, MN 56068
Phone: 888-931-3411

ATTACHMENT A Design Day Regression Analysis Background Information

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.										
Contract Demand Entitlement Filing 2017 - 2018 Heating Season										
Design Day Information										
	Number of Sales Firm Customers			Design Day Requirement			Total Entitlement + Storage + Peak Shaving			Reserve Margin
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Heating Season	Number of Customers	Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year	Design Day (Dth)	Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year	Total Entitlement (Dth) 1/	Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year	% of Reserve Margin [(7)-(4)]/(4)
2017-2018 Est (1/31)	8,113	735	9.96%	11,896	1,078	9.96%	12,609	(400)	-3.07%	5.99%
2016-2017 (1/31)	7,378	735	11.06%	10,818	-308	-2.77%	13,009	500	4.00%	20.25%
2015-2016 (1/17)	6,643	791	13.52%	11,126	2,157	24.05%	12,509	2,850	29.51%	12.43%
2014-2015 (2/18)	5,852	547	10.31%	8,969	904	11.21%	9,659	300	3.21%	7.69%
2013-2014 (1/6)	5,305	531	11.12%	8,065	3,101	62.47%	9,359	4,150	79.67%	16.04%
2012-2013 (1/31)	4,774	558	13.24%	4,964	273	5.83%	5,209	165	3.27%	4.94%
2011-2012 (1/19)	4,216	319	8.19%	4,691	241	5.41%	5,044	-	0.00%	7.54%
2010-2011 (1/11)	3,897	175	4.70%	4,450 2/	239	5.66%	5,044	500	11.00%	13.35%
2009-2010 (1/10)	3,722	162	4.55%	4,211	(71)	-1.65%	4,544	300	7.07%	7.90%
2008-2009 (1/09)	3,560	182	5.39%	4,282	566	15.23%	4,244 3/	244	6.10%	-0.89%
2007-2008 (1/08)	3,378	170	5.30%	3,716	166	4.68%	4,000	350	9.59%	7.64%
2006-2007 (2/07)	3,208	237	7.98%	3,550	583	19.65%	3,650	350	10.61%	2.82%
2005-2006 (2/06)	2,971	290	10.82%	2,967	271	10.05%	3,300	300	10.00%	11.22%
2004-2005	2,681	336	14.33%	2,696	696	34.80%	3,000	600	25.00%	11.28%
2003-2004	2,345	181	8.36%	2,000	(200)	-9.09%	2,400	(200)	-7.69%	20.00%
2002-2003	2,164	300	16.09%	2,200	400	22.22%	2,600	400	18.18%	18.18%
2001-2002	1,864	301	19.26%	1,800	400	28.57%	2,200	500	29.41%	22.22%
2000-2001	1,563	393	33.59%	1,400	300	27.27%	1,700	300	21.43%	21.43%
1999-2000	1,170	279	31.31%	1,100	250	29.41%	1,400	150	12.00%	27.27%
1998-1999	891	289	48.01%	850	350	70.00%	1,250	750	150.00%	47.06%
1997-1998	602	339	128.90%	500	200	66.67%	500	200	66.67%	0.00%
1996-1997	263	263		300	300		300	300		
Average per Year:	2,406	264	23.12%	2,545	293	21.93%	2,824	315	24.62%	14.47%
Firm Peak Day Send out										
	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)			
Heating Season	Firm Peak Day Send out (Dth)	Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year	Excess per Customer [(7)-(4)]/(1)	Design Day per Customer (4)/(1)	Entitlement per Customer (7)/(1)	Peak Day Send out per Customer (11)/(1)			
2017-2018	Unknown			0.088	1.4663	1.5542	Unknown			
2016-2017	9,246	(249)	-2.98%	0.297	1.4663	1.7632	1.2532			
2015-2016	9,495	1,126	13.45%	0.208	1.6748	1.8830	1.4293			
2014-2015	8,369	489	6.21%	0.118	1.5326	1.6505	1.4301			
2013-2014	7,880	2,855	56.82%	0.244	1.5203	1.7642	1.4854			
2012-2013	5,025	1,368	37.41%	0.051	1.0398	1.0911	1.0526			
2011-2012	3,657	(248)	-6.35%	0.084	1.1126	1.1964	0.8674			
2010-2011	3,905	251	6.87%	0.152	1.1419	1.2943	1.0021			
2009-2010	3,654	(374)	-9.29%	0.089	1.1315	1.2208	0.9817			
2008-2009	4,028	(72)	-1.75%	(0.011)	1.2028	1.1921	1.1315			
2007-2008	4,100	550	15.49%	0.084	1.1001	1.1841	1.2137			
2006-2007	3,550	738	26.24%	0.031	1.1066	1.1378	1.1066			
2005-2006	2,812	285	11.28%	0.112	0.9987	1.1107	0.9465			
2004-2005	2,527	185	7.90%	0.113	1.0056	1.1190	0.9426			
2003-2004	2,342	587	33.45%	0.171	0.8529	1.0235	0.9987			
2002-2003	1,755	747	74.11%	0.185	1.0166	1.2015	0.8110			
2001-2002	1,008	(180)	-15.15%	0.215	0.9657	1.1803	0.5408			
2000-2001	1,188	291	32.44%	0.192	0.8957	1.0877	0.7601			
1999-2000	897	95	11.85%	0.256	0.9402	1.1966	0.7667			
1998-1999	802	397	98.02%	0.449	0.9540	1.4029	0.9001			
1997-1998	405	233	135.47%	-	0.8306	0.8306	0.6728			
1996-1997	172	172		-	1.1407	1.1407	0.6540			
Average per Year:	2,210	260	30.50%	0.133	1.0248	1.1574	0.8953			

Notes:
1/ Total Entitlement = Total Contract Entitlement - Non-Recallable Capacity Release
2/ Reflects design day forecast method change to linear regression model.
3/ Adjusted to reflect 300 Dth not contracted as originally planned in Docket No. G022/M-08-1327.
4/ Reflects extraordinary send out due to temporary construction heat load.

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.								
Design Day: Heating Season 2017 - 2018								
Derivation of Design Day Use Per Customer								
Linear Regression Analysis Period: November 2015 thru March 2017								
Line No.	Customer Type	Weather Area	Non- Heat Sensitive (Y Intercept)	Use Per HDD (Slope)	Design HDD	Estimated Design Dths	Regression Coefficient	Equation
1	Residential	Minneapolis MN	343.44	60.57	90	5,794	0.9145	Y Inter + Slope x Design HDD = Estimated Design Dth
2	Firm Commercial	Minneapolis MN	495.43	50.32	90	5,024	0.9147	
			838.87	110.88				
3				Total Design Dths		10,818		Line 1 + Line 2
4				Estimated Interruptible Load		0		
5				Net Design Dths		10,818		Line 3 - Line 5
6				Customer Count 1/2017		7,378		
7				Design Dths/Customer		1.4663		Line 5 / Line 6
8				Estimated Firm Customers for 2017/2018		8,113		
9				Design Dths 2017/2018		11,896		Line 7 x Line 8

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.
Peak Day Analysis

Line No.	Description	Design Day Calculation	Peak Day 2016 -17	Peak Day 2015 -16	Peak Day 2014 -15	Peak Day 2013 -14
1	Date of Peak Day		1/5/2017	1/17/2016	2/18/2015	1/6/2014
2	Day of the Week		Thursday	Sunday	Wednesday	Monday
3	Total Throughput (Dth)	11896	9246	9495	8464	7895
4	Interruptible Customer Usage (Dth)	0	0	0	95	15
5	Firm Transportation Usage (Dth)	0	0	0	0	150
6	Firm Sales Throughput (Dth)	11896	9246	9495	8369	7730
7	Average Actual Gas Day Temperature (Deg. F)	-25	-3	-8	-5	-17
8	Heating Degree Days (HDD) 65 degree base	90	68	73	70	82
9	Non-HDD Sensitive Base (Dth)	839	407	839	321	180
10	Total HDD Sensitive Firm Throughput (Dth)	11057	8839	8656	8048	7550
11	Actual Firm Peak Day Dth/HDD (Dth)	123	130	119	115	92
12	Base + (Actual Dth/HDD * HDDs) (Dth)	11896	9246	9495	8369	7730
13	Peak Month Firm Customers	8113	7378	7378	5852	5305
14	Peak Day Use per Firm Customer	1.466	1.253	1.287	1.430	1.457

ATTACHMENT B Demand Profile and Supply Comparison

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Demand Profile								
2015 - 2016 Heating Season	Quantity (Dth)		2016 - 2017 Heating Season	Quantity (Dth)	Change in Quantity (Dth)	2017 - 2018 Heating Season	Quantity (Dth)	Change in Quantity (Dth)
TF 12 (Nov. - Oct.)	210		TF 12 (Nov. - Oct.)	210	-	TF 12 (Nov. - Oct.)	210	-
TFX-7 (Oct. - Apr.)	665		TFX-7 (Oct. - Apr.)	665	-	TFX-7 (Oct. - Apr.)	665	-
TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	6,344		TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	6,344	-	TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	6,344	-
TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	90		TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	90	-	TFX-5 (Nov. - Mar.)	90	-
Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,400	(4)	Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,400	-	(4) Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,400	-
Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,200	(5)	Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,200	-	(5) Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,200	-
			TF 12 (Nov. - Oct.)	500	500	(6) TF 12 (Nov. - Oct.)	500	-
FT-A Capacity Release - Non-recallable	2,600		FT-A Capacity Release - Non-recallable	2,600	-	FT-A Capacity Release - Non-recallable	-	(2,600)
					-	FT-1 Viking	2,200	2,200
								-
Viking Zone 1	2,000	(2)	Viking Zone 1	2,000		(2) Viking Zone 1	2,000	-
TFX-1 (Purchased Oct. 2014)	1,000	(3)	TFX-1 (Purchased Oct. 2014)	1,000		(3) TFX-1 (Purchased Oct. 2014)	1,000	-
SMS	2,000		SMS	2,000	-	SMS	2,000	-
Heating Season Total Capacity	12,509		Heating Season Total Capacity	13,009	500	Heating Season Total Capacity	12,609	(400)
Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	210		Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	210	-	Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	210	-
Total Entitlement @ Peak	12,509		Total Entitlement @ Peak	13,009	500	Total Entitlement @ Peak	12,609	(400)
Total Annual Transportation	-		Total Annual Transportation	-	-	Total Annual Transportation	-	-
Total Season Transportation	12,509		Total Season Transportation	13,009	500	Total Season Transportation	12,609	(400)
Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	1.7%		Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	1.6%		Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	1.7%	
Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%		Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%		Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%	
Notes:								
1/ Only items in bold affect capacity entitlement level.								
2/ Transport only. Does not increase peak day entitlement.								
3/ 1,000 Dth of TFX purchased for October, 2014 only to replace capacity loss due to Viking's Force Majeur. Does not affect peak day entitlement.								
4/ 1,400 Dth disrupted in October, 2014 only due to Viking Force Majeur								
5/ 1,200 Dth of FT-A purchased during Viking open season beginning February 1, 2015.								
6/ Company has secured 500 DKT of release capacity in Northern Natural Gas Zone E-F effective July 1, 2016. The capacity is permanently released to GMG and non recallable. The capacity was available at Northern's existing tariff rate.								

ATTACHMENT D

Rate Impact of Proposed Contract Demand Entitlement

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.										
Rate Impact - November 2017										
Annualized Impact										
Residential	Last Rate Case 1/	Last Demand Change 2/	Current PGA w/o Demand Entitlement Change (May 1, 2017)	Proposed Demand Entitlement Change	Change from Last Rate Case	% Change from Last Rate Case	Change from Last Demand Change	% Change from Last Demand Change	Change from Most Recent PGA	% Change from Most Recent PGA
Commodity Cost of Gas (WACOG)	\$ 5.8801	\$ 2.8701	\$ 2.8701	\$ 2.8701	\$ (3.0100)	-51.19%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%
Demand Cost of Gas	\$ 0.8293	\$ 0.9025	\$ 0.9025	\$ 0.8553	\$ 0.0260	3.14%	\$ (0.05)	-5.22%	\$ (0.0471)	-5.22%
Total Cost of Gas	\$ 6.7094	\$ 3.7726	\$ 3.7726	\$ 3.7254	\$ (2.9840)	-44.47%	\$ (0.0471)	-1.25%	\$ (0.0471)	-1.25%
Average Annual Usage (Dth)	73.0	73.0	73.0	73.0						
Average Annual Total Cost of Gas	\$ 489.65	\$ 275.32	\$ 275.32	\$ 271.88	\$ (217.77)	-44.47%	\$ (3.44)	-1.25%	\$ (3.44)	-1.25%
Annualized Impact										
Commercial & Industrial Firm	Last Rate Case 1/	Last Demand Change 2/	Current PGA w/o Demand Entitlement Change (May 1, 2017)	Proposed Demand Entitlement Change	Change from Last Rate Case	% Change from Last Rate Case	Change from Last Demand Change	% Change from Last Demand Change	Change from Most Recent PGA	% Change from Most Recent PGA
Commodity Cost of Gas (WACOG)	\$ 5.8801	\$ 2.8701	\$ 2.8701	\$ 2.8701	\$ (3.01)	-51.19%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%
Demand Cost of Gas	\$ 0.8293	\$ 0.9025	\$ 0.9025	\$ 0.8553	\$ 0.03	3.14%	\$ (0.0471)	-5.22%	\$ (0.0471)	-5.22%
Total Cost of Gas	\$ 6.7094	\$ 3.7726	\$ 3.7726	\$ 3.7254	\$ (2.98)	-44.47%	\$ (0.0471)	-1.25%	\$ (0.0471)	-1.25%
Average Annual Usage (Dth)	3,106.5	3,106.5	3,106.5	3,106.5						
Average Annual Total Cost of Gas	\$ 20,842.89	\$ 11,719.53	\$ 11,719.53	\$ 11,573.06	\$ (9,269.83)	-44.47%	\$ (146.47)	-1.25%	\$ (146.47)	-1.25%
Notes:										
1/ Docket Nos. G022/GR-09-962 & G022/MR-10-949										
2/ Docket No. G022/M-10-1165 & G022/AA-10-1186										

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.									
Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) Calculation									
Effective date of implementation:	Natural gas usage on and after May 1, 2017								
Reason for change:	Change in cost of gas due to an estimated decrease in the market price of natural gas from April 2017.								
This PGA is based on the following Northern Natural Gas Tariffs:					This PGA is based on the following Viking Gas Transmission Co. Tariffs:				
11th Revised Sheet No. 50					v.26.0.0 superseding v.25.0.0				
Issued: 2/1/2017					Issued: 3/1/2017				
Effective: 4/1/2017					Effective: 4/1/2017				
12th Revised Sheet No. 51									
Issued: 2/1/2017									
Effective: 4/1/17									
1st Revised Sheet No. 55									
Issued: 6/30/14									
Effective: 9/30/14									
I. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. - Base Cost of Gas									
Approved in Docket No. G022/MR-10-949									
November 1, 2010									
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand	MCF	x Months	x Tariff Rate	Equals	Rate/CCF				
					Firm	Interruptible			
TFX - 7	300	7	\$5.6830	11,934	\$0.002773				
TFX-5	4,244	5	\$15.1530	321,547	\$0.074711				
SMS Demand	50	7	\$2.1800	763	\$0.000177				
	1,300	8	\$2.1800	22,672	\$0.005268				
Total Capacity Cost				\$356,916					
Rate Case 2009 Firm Sales Service Volume - CCF			4,303,890						
Demand Base Cost of Gas / CCF					\$0.082929	\$0.000000			
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Commodity									
All Classes Commodity				\$ 2,808,142					
Rate Case Total Sales Service Volume - CCF			4,775,650						
Commodity Base Cost of Gas/CCF					\$0.588013	\$0.588013			
Total Base Cost of Gas/CCF				\$3,165,058	\$0.670942	\$0.588013			
Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF									
Sales Service Volume - CCF			4,303,890						
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF			471,760						
II. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective									
May 1, 2017									
Commodity Cost of Gas				\$0.287010	WACOG				
III. Annual Sales Volume - 2016-2017 Budget (September - August)									
Sales Service Volume - CCF			11,416,400	13,264,350					
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF			1,847,950						
IV. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s - Current Cost of Gas Effective									
May 1, 2017									
All Customer Sales Rate Classes	MCF	x Months	x Tariff Rate	Equals	Rate/CCF				
					Firm	Ag Interr	Gen Interr		
Viking Zone 1	2,000	12	\$4.3706	104,894	\$0.009188				
Viking Zone 1	1,400	12	\$4.3706	73,426	\$0.006432				
Viking Zone 1	1,200	12	\$4.3706	62,937	\$0.005513				
Viking Zone 1-2	2,600	12	\$5.7394	179,069	\$0.015685				
TFX - 5	6,344	5	\$15.1530	480,653	\$0.042102				
TF - 12	210	5	\$10.2300	10,742	\$0.000941				
TF - 12	210	7	\$5.6830	8,354	\$0.000732				
TF - 12	500	5	\$10.2300	25,575	\$0.002240				
TF - 12	500	7	\$5.6830	19,891	\$0.001742				
TF - 5	90	5	\$15.1530	6,819	\$0.000597				
TFX - 7	665	5	\$15.1530	50,384	\$0.004413				
TFX - 7	665	2	\$5.6830	7,558	\$0.000662				
				0	\$0.000000				
Current Demand Cost of Gas				\$1,030,302	\$0.090247	\$0.000000	\$0.000000		
Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF			% of Total 79%	\$3,807,001	\$0.287010	\$0.287010	\$0.287010		
Total Cost of Gas/CCF				\$4,837,303	\$0.377257	\$0.287010	\$0.287010		

FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.										
Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) Calculation - Illustrative										
Effective date of implementation:		Natural gas usage on and after 11-1-17 Illustrated								
Reason for change:		Change in cost of gas due to an estimated decrease in the market price of natural gas from April 2017.								
This PGA is based on the following Northern Natural Gas Tariffs:					This PGA is based on the following Viking Gas Transmission Co. Tariffs:					
11th Revised Sheet No. 50 Issued: 2/1/2017 Effective: 4/1/2017					v.26.0.0 superseding v.25.0.0 Issued: 3/1/2017 Effective: 4/1/2017					
12th Revised Sheet No. 51 Issued: 2/1/2017 Effective: 4/1/17										
1st Revised Sheet No. 55 Issued: 6/30/14 Effective: 9/30/14										
I. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. - Base Cost of Gas					November 1, 2010					
Approved in Docket No. G022/MR-10-949										
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand						Rate/CCF				
	MCF	x Months	x Tariff Rate	Equals	Firm	Interruptible				
TFX - 7	300	7	\$5.6830	11,934	\$0.002773					
TFX-5	4,244	5	\$15.1530	321,547	\$0.074711					
SMS Demand	50	7	\$2.1800	763	\$0.000177					
	1,300	8	\$2.1800	22,672	\$0.005268					
Total Capacity Cost				\$356,916						
Rate Case 2009 Firm Sales Service Volume - CCF				4,303,890						
Demand Base Cost of Gas / CCF					\$0.082929	\$0.000000				
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Commodity										
All Classes Commodity				\$ 2,808,142						
Rate Case Total Sales Service Volume - CCF				4,775,650						
Commodity Base Cost of Gas/CCF					\$0.588013	\$0.588013				
Total Base Cost of Gas/CCF				\$3,165,058	\$0.670942	\$0.588013				
Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF				4,775,650						
Sales Service Volume - CCF		4,303,890								
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF		471,760								
II. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective					11-1-17 Illustrated					
Commodity Cost of Gas				\$0.287010	WACOG					
III. Annual Sales Volume - 2017-2018 Budget (September - August)					13,190,500					
Sales Service Volume - CCF		11,300,900								
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF		1,889,600								
IV. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s -- Current Cost of Gas Effective					11-1-17 Illustrated					
All Customer Sales Rate Classes						Rate/CCF				
	MCF	x Months	x Tariff Rate	Equals	Firm	Aq Interr	Gen Interr			
Viking Zone 1	2,000	12	\$4.3706	104,894	\$0.009282					
Viking Zone 1	1,400	12	\$4.3706	73,426	\$0.006497					
Viking Zone 1	1,200	12	\$4.3706	62,937	\$0.005569					
Viking Zone 1	2,200	12	\$4.3706	115,384	\$0.010210					
TFX - 5	6,344	5	\$15.1530	480,653	\$0.042532					
TF - 12	210	5	\$10.2300	10,742	\$0.000950					
TF - 12	210	7	\$5.6830	8,354	\$0.000739					
TF - 12	500	5	\$10.2300	25,575	\$0.002263					
TF - 12	500	7	\$5.6830	19,891	\$0.001760					
TF - 5	90	5	\$15.1530	6,819	\$0.000603					
TFX - 7	665	5	\$15.1530	50,384	\$0.004458					
TFX - 7	665	2	\$5.6830	7,558	\$0.000669					
				0	\$0.000000					
Current Demand Cost of Gas				\$966,616	\$0.085532	\$0.000000	\$0.000000			
Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF				% of Total 80%	\$3,785,805	\$0.287010	\$0.287010	\$0.287010		
Total Cost of Gas/CCF				\$4,752,422	\$0.372542	\$0.287010	\$0.287010			

