

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

July 31, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Dr. Burl W. Haar 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 Dr. Haar:

Attached hereto, please find Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s Petition for Change in Contract Demand Entitlement for 2014-2015 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 2014-2015 Heating Season
Docket No.

filed this 31st day of July, 2014.

/s/ Kristine A. Anderson Kristine A. Anderson, Esq. Corporate Attorney Greater Minnesota Transmission, LLC

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Kristine	Anderson	Anderson kanderson@greatermngas. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.		202 S. Main Street Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, IncOfficial Service List
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.m n.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, IncOfficial Service List
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn .us	Department of Commerce 85 7th Place E Ste 500 Electronic Service No Saint Paul, MN 551012198		GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, IncOfficial Service List		
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, IncOfficial Service List
Nicolle	Kupser	nkupser@greatermngas.co m	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	202 South Main Street P.O. Box 68 Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, IncOfficial Service List
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@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, IncOfficial Service List
Greg	Palmer	gpalmer@greatermngas.co m	Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.	PO Box 68 202 South Main Stree Le Sueur, MN 56058	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Greater Minnesota Gas, IncOfficial Service List
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, IncOfficial Service List

STATE OF MINNESOTA

BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Beverly Jones Heydinger	Chair
David C. Boyd	Commissioner
Nancy Lange	Commissioner
Dan Lipschultz	Commissioner
Betsy Wergin	Commissioner
	MPUC Docket No.

PETITION FOR CHANGE IN CONTRACT DEMAND ENTITLEMENT FOR 2014-2015 HEATING SEASON

OVERVIEW

Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. ("GMG") submits this filing to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") to notify the Commission of a minor change in contract demand entitlement effective November 1, 2014. GMG will provisionally include the rate impact of these changes in GMG's Purchased Gas Adjustments effective November 1, 2014, pending Commission approval.

GMG's analysis demonstrates that with the proposed changes, GMG will have sufficient capacity to serve its firm customers during the 2014-2015 heating season without subjecting its ratepayers to paying unduly high amounts for maintaining its reserve. However, as it did prior to the last heating season, 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 at that time, GMG will undertake appropriate action to address that scenario.

Minnesota Rule 7825.2910 Subp. 2 requires GMG to identify four things when filing for a change in demand, namely: discussion of 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 it proposed level. This Petition addresses each of the requisite four 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

GMG's demand entitlement filings in recent years have reflected substantial change as a direct result of the Company's tremendous growth. In order to address both a narrow reserve margin and the uncertainty of predictive modeling for conversion customers, GMG's reserve margin was dramatically increased for the 2013-2014 heating season. Nonetheless, because of its increased customer base, GMG's ratepayers did not sustain any adverse rate impact as a result of GMG purchasing increased reserve capability. Despite experiencing a winter with historical low temperatures and a natural gas availability crisis, GMG's reserve margin was sufficient to ensure that its customers' needs were satisfied. Although GMG has continued to experience growth, that growth will not result in a substantial increase in reserve margin needs. Therefore, GMG continued to employ similar modeling theories in developing its contract demand entitlement proposal for the 2014-2015 heating season as those used in recent previous seasons. GMG again utilized a combination of analytical tools to balance the competing components of maintaining a sufficient reserve and maintaining reasonable customer rates. By combining statistical regression analysis based on its existing customer data, projected growth information, and budget year analysis, GMG's proposed demand entitlement is again soundly supported by its supporting data, attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

GMG seeks an increase in total demand entitlement as follows:

	Previous Proposed Entitlement (Dth)		Entitlement Changes (Dth)	% Change From Previous Year
9,559		9,659	100	1.05%

1. GMG Requires a Small Increase in Demand to Account for Increased Growth and the Corresponding Change in its Design Day Calculations to Assure Its Ability to Maintain an Adequate Reserve Margin.

A small increase in demand entitlement is requested by GMG to insure that it has sufficient reserve to meet its customers' needs. GMG's prior reserve margin level 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 firm's reserve margin. However, for the 2013-2014 heating season, the Department and Commission approved a reserve margin of 7.2%. GMG also prefers to utilize a conservative approach when allocating a reserve margin. GMG recognizes the Department's previously noted concern that, "[t]he reserve margin is necessary since it provides an extra cushion which ensures firm reliability on a peak day; however, carrying too great a reserve margin results in customers paying higher demand costs than are necessary to provide reasonable service." (Docket No. G022/M-10-1165, Comments of the Minnesota Office of Energy Security, January 3, 2011, p. 5.) Nonetheless, GMG believes that maintaining its reserve margin at a conservative level continues to be prudent and, importantly, that is can be maintained without undue cost burdens to its ratepayers. Therefore, GMG proposes a reserve margin of 7.7% for the upcoming heating season.

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

Existing Customer Base							
Design Day Requirement (Attachment A, Page 2 of 3, line 11)	8,969	Dth					
Reserve at 7.7%	690	Dth					
Design Day Requirement With 7.7% Reserve Margin	9,659	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, an small increase in GMG's contract demand entitlement is warranted.

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

GMG has historically relied on a single econometric model to forecast its supply needs for each upcoming heating season. However, the changes in GMG's growth and customer mix warranted employing a combination of quantitative and qualitative indicators for the last heating season analysis in order to enable GMG to make prudent distribution system and peak capacity planning decisions. Therefore, last year, GMG made use of qualitative data for its anticipated new customers and combined that information with historical quantitative data for its existing customers. GMG's system growth is not as remarkable as it was prior to the two most recent heating seasons. Therefore, GMG is able to return to relying more heavily on quantitative data for its current season analysis.

As it has done in the past, GMG employed an ordinary least square regression analysis methodology to predict peak day demand. 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 2014-2015 heating season is based on 8,969 Dth, which is an increase of 52 Dth over the 2013-2014 design day requirements. The derivation of the design day forecast can be seen in Attachment A, Page 2 of 3.²

¹. GMG acknowledges that its design day forecast was likely higher than necessary for the last heating season, when examined retrospectively. As the Commission may recall, GMG began serving two new areas with large commercial loads during 2013 and, since quantitative data for customer usage was not available, GMG incorporated qualitative data into its analysis. The current analysis is based on quantitative data alone.

². GMG notes that its regression analysis is based on combined customer classes. Given the recent acquisition of the bulk of GMG's commercial customers, there is not a sufficient amount of historical data to separate residential and commercial classes for regression purposes. As time passes and historical data builds, GMG intends to separate its customer classes for future regression analysis purposes.

GMG notes that the Department expressed concern about GMG's use of negative baseload (nonheat sensitive load) in its regression analysis. (Docket No. G022/M-13-730, Comments of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources, September 16, 2013, p. 5.) As such, the Department recommended that GMG should estimate baseload consumption by examining actual consumption data from the summer months rather than using a negative term for a constant in its regression analysis. GMG concurs that the Department is correct in its assertion that a negative constant should not generally be used in a regression analysis. GMG agrees that when there is sufficient data available, utilizing actual consumption data in the regression analysis will provide more precise predictive information. However, GMG's expanded system just began serving its large commercial customers (and, indeed, a large percentage of its customers in general) in late 2013. As a result, GMG does not have sufficient historical data on which to base a summer usage estimate. Hence, GMG respectfully requests that it continue to utilize its current methodology until it has three solid years of data upon which to calculate viable baseload consumption estimates. GMG recognizes that such a practice likely results in a more conservative reserve amount; but, since ratepayers are not being harmed in the process, GMG believes that it is most appropriate at this time in order to ensure a sufficient reserve.

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:

The analysis was completed by using historical firm sales volume data and actual temperature data for the heating season periods from November 2011 through March 2014. The firm sales volume data was correlated to geographic weather data by assigning town border station locations geographically to weather sites as follows:

Weather Site	TBS Location
Mankato	Rapidan
Mankato	Madison Links
Faribault	Heidelberg
Faribault	Forest
Faribault	Faribault 5
Shakopee	Marystown
Randall	Alexandria

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. The forecasted number of firm customers for the 2014-2015 heating season 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:

$$r = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum \left(\frac{x - \overline{x}}{S_x} \right) \left(\frac{y - \overline{y}}{S_y} \right)$$

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.

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 June 30, 2014.

Balance of page intentionally left blank due to size of the following table.

Seasonal Cus	tomer Usage By C	lass (Dth)	
	Winter	<u>Summer</u>	<u>Total</u>
Residential - Firm	398,959	121,722	520,732
Commercial - Firm	12,325	4,262	16,586
Industrial - Firm	247,323	87,279	334,602
Flexible Rate - Firm	<u>22,258</u>	<u>5,534</u>	27,792
Total Firm	680,865	218,846	899,711
Agricultural - Interruptible	57,800	13,611	71,411
Industrial - Interruptible	18,718	7,056	25,774
Flexible Rate - Interruptible	<u>3,528</u>	<u>29,645</u>	33,173
Total Interruptible (Non-Ag)	22,246	36,701	58,947
Total	760,911	269,158	1,030,069

For the upcoming heating season, GMG has taken permanent assignment of 1400 Dth of release capacity gas on the Viking Emerson line over a twelve month period, rather than the 1300 Dth of release capacity over a four month period. GMG is confident that the capacity over the entire year will ensure that it is able to meet needs throughout the summer and shoulder months as well as during the heating season.

GMG's proposed increase in its contract demand entitlement will 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 load to meet its customers' needs. In order to assure that it can meet all of its customers' needs throughout the year, GMG's proposal provides a balanced portfolio based on an integrated system. To that end, GMG has

secured a variety of gas supply sources. 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 pipeline system. Attachment C identifies the contracts GMG holds with Northern Natural Gas; and, it also specifically notes proposed changes to its Viking Emerson contracts for the 2014-2015 heating season and the corresponding change in contract demand costs.

While GMG's 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 anticipated customer growth for the remainder of the current year. As such, GMG again proposes that it essentially true-up its anticipated needs closer to the beginning of the heating season and that it make any necessary demand adjustments at that time. In that regard, GMG is currently exploring the option of purchasing 300 to 500 Dth of capacity release at minimal cost to its customers should the need arise. GMG will provide updated information with regard to any impact on its contract demand entitlement analysis to the extent that an adjustment is necessary prior to November 1, 2014.

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 not be subject to increased rates because of the increased reserve. As shown, the rate impact is actually anticipated to be a slight reduction in customer rates. 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 posits that its 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 2014-1015 heating season alongside consideration of previous Department and Commission concerns and recommendations and its broader corporate planning. GMG's proposal again 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 2014-2015 Heating Season.

GMG Petition July 31, 2014 Page 8

Dated: July 31, 2014

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

						innesota Gas, Ir					
			Contract	Demand Entitle	mer	nt Filing 2014 - 2	2015 Heating Se	eason			
				Des	ign	Day Information	1				
	Number o	f Sales Firm Cust	omers		Desig	n Day Requirement		Total Entitlement -	+ Storage + Peak	Shaving	Reserve Margir
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Number of	Change from	% Change from			Change from	% Change from	Total Entitlement	Change from	% Change from	% of Reserve
Heating Season	Customers	Pervious Year	Previous Year	Design Day (Dth)	-	Pervious Year	Previous Year	(Dth) 1/	Pervious Year	Previous Year	Margin [(7)-(4)]/(4)
2014-2015 Est (1/31)	5,900	595	11.22%	8,969		904	11.21%	9,659	300	3.21%	7.699
2013-2014 (1/6) 2012-2013 (1/31)	5,305 4,774	531 558	11.12% 13.24%	8,065 4,964		3,101 273	62.47% 5.83%	9,359 5,209	4,150 165	79.67% 3.27%	16.049
2012-2013 (1/31)	4,216	319	8.19%	4,691		241	5.41%	5,044	-	0.00%	7.549
2010-2011 (1/11)	3,897	175	4.70%	4,450	2/	239	5.66%	5,044	500	11.00%	13.359
2009-2010 (1/10)	3,722	162	4.55%	4,211		(71)	-1.65%	4,544	300	7.07%	7.909
2008-2009 (1/09)	3,560	182	5.39%	4,282		566	15.23%	4,244 3/	244	6.10%	-0.899
2007-2008 (1/08)	3,378	170	5.30%	3,716		166	4.68%	4,000	350	9.59%	7.649
2006-2007 (2/07)	3,208	237	7.98%	3,550		583	19.65%	3,650	350	10.61%	2.829
2005-2006 (2/06)	2,971	290	10.82%	2,967		271	10.05%	3,300	300	10.00%	11.229
2004-2005	2,681	336	14.33%	2,696		696	34.80%	3,000	600	25.00%	11.289
2003-2004	2,345	181	8.36%	2,000		(200)	-9.09%	2,400	(200)	-7.69%	20.009
2002-2003	2,164	300	16.09%	2,200		400	22.22%	2,600	400	18.18%	18.189
2001-2002	1,864	301	19.26%	1,800		400	28.57%	2,200	500	29.41%	22.229
2000-2001	1,563	393	33.59%	1,400		300	27.27%	1,700	300	21.43%	21.439
1999-2000	1,170	279	31.31%	1,100		250	29.41%	1,400	150	12.00%	27.279
1998-1999	891	289 339	48.01%	850 500		350 200	70.00%	1,250	750 200	150.00%	47.069
1997-1998 1996-1997	602 263	263	128.90%	300		300	66.67%	500 300	300	66.67%	0.009
1990-1997	203	203		300		300		300	300		
Average per Year:	2,406	264	23.12%	2,545		293	21.93%	2,824	315	24.62%	14.479
	7,144							_,,,			
		Peak Day Send o									
	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)		(15)	(16)	(17)			
	Firm Peak Day	Change from	% Change from	Excess per Customer		Design Day per	Entitlement per	Peak Day Send out			
Heating Season	Send out (Dth)	Pervious Year	Previous Year	[(7)-(4)]/(1)		Customer (4)/(1)	Customer (7)/(1)	per Customer (11)/(1)			
2014-2015	Unknown	0.055	F0.000/	0.117		1.5202	1.6371	Unknown			
2013-2014 2012-2013	7,880	2,855	56.82% 37.41%	0.244		1.5203 1.0398	1.7642 1.0911	1.4854			
2012-2013	5,025 3,657	1,368 (248)	-6.35%	0.051 0.084		1.0398	1.0911	1.0526 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 4/			
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 1997-1998	802 405	397 233	98.02% 135.47%	0.449		0.9540 0.8306	1.4029 0.8306	0.9001 0.6728			
1996-1997	172	172	133.47%	-		1.1407	1.1407	0.6726			
.000 1001	172	172		-		1.1407	1.1407	0.0040			
Average per Year:	2,210	260	30.50%	0.133	Н	1.0248	1.1574	0.8953			
. J- p	_,		22.3070	2.100				2.2300			
Notes:											
1/ Total Entitlement = To	otal Contract Entitlemen	t - Non-Recallable	Capacity Release								
2/ Reflects design day for											
3/ Adjusted to reflect 300	0 Dth not contracted as	originally planned	in Docket No. G02	22/M-08-1327.							

				eater Minneso	•			
				ay: Heating S				
			Derivation	of Design Day	/ Use Pe	r Customer		
	Linear Regression A	Analysis Period:	November thru	u March 2011-2	2014			
Line No.	Town Border Station(s)	Weather Area	Non- Heat Sensitive (Y Intercept)	Use Per HDD (Slope)	Design HDD	Estimated Design Dths	Regression Coefficient	Equation
1	Rapidan and Madison Links	Mankato	11.88	17.77	90	1,612	0.8646	Y Inter + Slope x Design HDD = Estimated Design Dth
2	Forest, Heidelberg, and Faribault 5	Faribault	-222.52	46.25	90	3,940	0.8136	
3	Marystown	Shakopee	-4.20	7.17	90	641	0.9321	
4	Randall	Alexandria	<u>394.75</u>	<u>16.86</u>	90	1,912	0.8491	
			179.92	88.05				
5					sign Dths			
6			Es	timated Interrupt		<u>40</u>		
7					sign Dths			Line 4 - Line 5
8				Customer Cou				Line C / Line 7
9			Estimated Fir	Design Dths/			*	Line 6 / Line 7
11			Estimated Firm Customers for 2014/2015 Design Dths 2014/2015					Line 8 x Line 9
11				Doorgii Duio		3,303		LING O'X LING O
	* Excludes individual ident	ified commercial cus	stomer loads					

		nnesota Gas, Inc.			
	Peak D	Day Analysis			
Line No.	Description	Design Day Calculation	Peak Day 2013 -14	Peak Day 2012 -13	Peak Day 2011 -12
1	Date of Peak Day		6-Jan-14	31-Jan-13	19-Jan-12
2	Day of the Week		Monday	Thursday	Thursday
3	Total Throughput (Dth)	9009	7895	5038	3710
4	Interruptible Customer Usage (Dth)	40	15	13	50
5	Firm Transportation Usage (Dth)	0	150	150	132
6	Firm Sales Throughput (Dth)	8969	7730	4875	3525
7	Average Actual Gas Day Temperature (Deg. F)	-25	-17	-1	
8	Heating Degree Days (HDD) 65 degree base	90	82	66	68
9	Non-HDD Sensitive Base (Dth)	180	180	-92	30
10	Total HDD Sensitive Firm Throughput (Dth)	8789	7550	4967	3224
11	Actual Firm Peak Day Dth/HDD (Dth)	98	93	75	47
12	Base + (Actual Dth/HDD * HDDs) (Dth)	8969	7730	4875	3525
13	Peak Month Firm Customers	5900	5305	4774	4216
14	Peak Day Use per Firm Customer	1.520	1.457	1.021	0.836
			Sales Jan '14	% of Total	
15	Firm Sales				
16	Residential		97,020	54.7%	
17	Commercial		14,289	8.1%	
18	Industrial		60,331	34.0%	
19	Flexible Rate Industrial		5,568	3.1%	
20	Total Firm Sales		177,208	100.0%	
21	Allocated Peak Day based on Dth Sales				
22	Residential	4,911	4,232	54.7%	
23	Commercial	723	623	8.1%	
24	Industrial	3,054	2,632	34.0%	
25	Flexible Rate Industrial	282	243	3.1%	
26	Total Firm Sales	8,969	7,730	100%	

ATTACHMENT B Demand Profile and Supply Comparison

		Greater Minnesota	•				
		Contract Demand Entit		ng			
		Demand Pro	file				
2012 2012 Heating Cooper	Overstitus	2042 2044 Heating Copper (spiced)	Ougatitus		2044 2045 Hasting Cooper	Ougatitus	Changa in
2012 - 2013 Heating Season	Quantity	2013 - 2014 Heating Season (revised)	Quantity		2014 - 2015 Heating Season	Quantity	Change in
TF-7 (Summer - Apr Oct.)	(Dth) 300	TF-7 (Summer - Apr Oct.)	(Dth)		TF-7 (Summer - Apr Oct.)	(Dth)	Quantity (Dth)
TF 12 (Nov Oct.)	210	TF 12 (Nov Oct.)	210		TF 12 (Nov Oct.)	210	<u>-</u>
TFX-7 (Oct Apr.))	665	TFX-7 (Oct Apr.))	665		TFX-7 (Oct Apr.))	665	-
TFX-7 (Oct Apr.))	4,244	TFX-5 (Nov Mar.)	6,344		TFX-7 (Oct Apr.))	6,344	_
Viking Zone 1	7,277	Viking Zone 1	2,000	(2)	Viking Zone 1	2,000	_
TFX-5 (Nov Mar.)	90	TFX-5 (Nov Mar.)	90	(2)	TFX-5 (Nov Mar.)	90	_
TI X 5 (NOV Mar.)	30	Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,300		Viking Forward Haul/Emerson	1,400	100
Delivery Contract		Delivery Contract	950	(3)	Delivery Contract	950	-
Capacity Release - Non-recallable	-	Capacity Release - Non-recallable	-	(0)	Capacity Release - Non-recallable	-	_
SMS	1,300	SMS	1,300		SMS	2,000	700
Heating Season Total Capacity	5,209	Heating Season Total Capacity	9,559		Heating Season Total Capacity	9,659	100
Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	510	Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	210		Non-Heating Season Total Capacity	210	-
Total Entitlement @ Peak	5,209	Total Entitlement @ Peak	9,559		Total Entitlement @ Peak	9,659	100
Total Annual Transportation	-	Total Annual Transportation	-		Total Annual Transportation	-	-
Total Season Transportation	5,209	Total Season Transportation	9,559		Total Season Transportation	9,659	100
Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	9.8%	Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	2.2%		Total Percent Summer Vs. Winter	2.2%	
Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%	Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%		Total Percent Seasonal	100.0%	
Notes:							
1/ Only items in bold affect capacity enti	tlement level.						
2/ Transport only. Does not increase peal	k day entitlemer	nt.					
3/ Company has contract for supply deliw	ered to TBS. No	demand charges are applicable, but the 95	0 dekatherms	is av	ailable on peak day.		

ATTACHMENT C Contract Entitlement Changes

E		Service Type Firm Throughput Forward Haul	Rate Schedule TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 15 TF - 5		Entitlement (Dth) 3,000 500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90 950 1,300	Expiration Date 3/31/2013 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2015 10/31/2015 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2015 3/31/2014
C	nts 2013-14 Contract No. 102985 102985 102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579 3P Contract	Service Type Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	Rate Schedule TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 15	Months Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Mar	Entitlement (Dth) 3,000 500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90 950	3/31/2011 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2011 10/31/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2011
C	Contract No. 102985 102985 102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579 BP Contract	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	3,000 500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90	3/31/2011 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2011 10/31/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2011
E	102985 102985 102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	3,000 500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90	3/31/2011 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2011 10/31/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2011
E	102985 102985 102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	3,000 500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90	3/31/2011 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2011 10/31/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2011
	102985 102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	500 500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90	3/31/2018 3/31/2014 3/31/2019 3/31/2019 10/31/2019 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 4/30/2019
	102985 102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	500 2,100 244 665 181 29 90	3/31/2014 3/31/2014 3/31/2015 10/31/2015 9/30/2017 9/30/2017 4/30/2015
	102985 102985 121534 120579 120579 120579 BP Contract	Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 5 TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	2,100 244 665 181 29 90 950	3/31/2014 3/31/2015 10/31/2015 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2015
	102985 121534 120579 120579 120579 BP Contract	Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TF - 12 TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Nov-Mar Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	244 665 181 29 90 950	3/31/2019 10/31/2019 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2019
	121534 120579 120579 120579 BP Contract	Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TFX - 7 TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Oct-Apr Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	665 181 29 90 950	10/31/2019 9/30/2011 9/30/2011 9/30/2019
	120579 120579 120579 3P Contract	Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TF - 12 TF - 12 TF - 5	Oct-Sep Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	181 29 90 950	9/30/201 9/30/201 9/30/201 4/30/201
	120579 120579 3P Contract	Firm Throughput Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TF - 12 TF - 5	Oct-Sep Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	29 90 950	9/30/201 ¹ 9/30/201 ¹ 4/30/201 ¹
	120579 BP Contract	Firm Throughput Contracted Delivery	TF - 5	Nov-Mar Nov-Sep	90 950	9/30/201 4/30/201
	3P Contract	Contracted Delivery		Nov-Sep	950	4/30/201
			TF-5			
Vik	king Emerson	Forward Haul	TF-5	Dec-Mar	1 200	3/31/2014
					1,500	5, 5 ., 201
			2013-14 Heating	Season Total Capacit	y 9,559	
			2013-14 Design [8,065	
			Reserve Margin		1,494	18.5%
					, -	
Proposed Contract	Entitlement Ch	hanges for 2014-15				
Start Date C	Contract No.	Service Type	Rate Schedule	Months	Entitlement (Dth)	Expiration Date
Vik	king Emerson	Forward Haul	TF-5	Dec-Mar	(1,300)	3/31/2014
	king Emerson	Forward Haul	TF-5	Nov-Oct	1,400	10/31/2018
VIII	ang Emoison	1 orward riddi	11 0	1107 001	1,400	10/01/2010
			2014-15 Heating	Season Total Capacit	y 9,659	
			2014-15 Design [8,969	
			Reserve Margin	Day Domana	690	7.7%
Proposed Change i	in Contract Der	mand Costs				
Contract No. Ra	ate Schedule	Volume Dth / Day	No. of Months	Monthly Demand Rates	Total Annual Cost	
Viking Emorgon	TE 6	(1 200)	4	\$ 3.7671	¢ (10.599.03)	
Viking Emerson Viking Emerson	TF-5	(1,300) 1,400	12	\$ 3.7671 \$ 3.3978	\$ (19,588.92) \$ 57,083.04	
VIKING EMEISON	11-0	1,400	12	ф 3.3976	\$ 57,063.04	
					\$ 37,494.12	
/1 This contract was	not renewed					
/2 This amount to be						
/3 Contracted amount /4 Increase to previous						

ATTACHMENT D Rate Impact of Proposed Contract Demand Entitlement

				reater Minneson	,							
				act Demand En								
			Ra	te Impact - Nov	ember 2014					T		
				ed Impact								
Residential	Last Rate Case 1/	Last Demand Change 2/	Current PGA w/o Demand Ent. Change (Nov. 1, 2013)	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	\$ 4.1212	\$ 4.1212	\$ 4.1212	\$ (1.7589)	-29.91%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%		
Demand Cost of Gas	\$ 0.8293	\$ 0.8303	\$ 0.8303	\$ 0.7546	\$ (0.0747)	-9.00%	\$ (0.0757)	-9.12%	\$ (0.0757)	-9.12%		
Total Cost of Gas	\$ 6.7094	\$ 4.9515	\$ 4.9515	\$ 4.8758	\$ (1.8336)	-27.33%	\$ (0.0757)	-1.53%	\$ (0.0757)	-1.53%		
Average Annual Usage (Dth)	101.1	101.1	101.1	101.1	, ,		1					
Average Annual Total Cost of Gas	\$ 678.54	\$ 500.76	\$ 500.76	\$ 493.10	\$ (185.44)	-27.33%	\$ (7.66)	-1.53%	\$ (7.66)	-1.53%		
	Annualized Impact											
Commercial & Industrial Firm	Last Rate Case 1/	Last Demand Change 2/	Current PGA w/o Demand Ent. Change (Nov. 1, 2013)	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	\$ 4.1212	\$ 4.1212	\$ 4.1212	\$ (1.76)	-29.91%	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	0.00%		
Demand Cost of Gas	\$ 0.8293	\$ 0.8303	\$ 0.8303	\$ 0.7546	\$ (0.07)	-9.00%	\$ (0.0757)	-9.12%	\$ (0.0757)	-9.12%		
Total Cost of Gas	\$ 6.7094	\$ 4.9515	\$ 4.9515	\$ 4.8758	\$ (1.83)	-27.33%	\$ (0.0757)	-1.53%	\$ (0.0757)	-1.53%		
Average Annual Usage (Dth)	3,031.8	3,031.8	3,031.8	3,031.8	, ,		` /		, ,			
Average Annual Total Cost of Gas	\$ 20,341.87	\$ 15,012.20	\$ 15,012.20	\$ 14,782.69	\$ (5,559.18)	-27.33%	\$ (229.51)	-1.53%	\$ (229.51)	-1.53%		
Notes:												
1/ Docket Nos. G022/GR-09-962 & G0												
1/ Docket Nos. G022/GR-09-962 & G0 2/ Docket No. G022/M-10-1165 & G02												

					Minnesota						
			Pu	rchased Gas	Adjustment	(PGA) Calculation	n				
Effective date of implementation:	Natural gas us	age on and after	November 1, 2013								
December the change	Change in seet o		nationated Increase in t	 	notived and from	- Ostobor 2012					
Reason for change:	Change in cost of	or gas due to an e	estimated Increase in t	ne market price of	natural gas from	n October 2013.					
This PGA is based on the following Northern Nat	ural Cae Tariffe		This PGA is based or	the following Viki	ng Gae Tranemi	secion Co. Tariffe:				+	
5th Revised Sheet No. 50	urar Gas Tarriis.		v.12.0.0 superseding		ig Cas Transiii	assion co. ranns.					
Issued: 8/1/13			Issued: 02/28/20								
Effective: 10/1/13			Effective: 4/1/13								
5th Revised Sheet No. 51											
Issued: 8/1/13											
Effective: 10/1/13											
Original Sheet No. 55											
Issued: 9/24/10											
Effective: 9/24/10											
I. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc Base Cost o	f Gas			November	1, 2010						
Approved in Docket No. G022/MR-10-949											
							Rate/				
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand	TEV 7	MCE	x Months	x Tariff Rate		Equals	Firm	Interruptible			
	TFX - 7	300		\$5.6830 \$15.1530		11,934	\$0.002773				
	TFX-5 SMS Demand	4,244				321,547	\$0.074711				
	owio Demand	1,300		\$2.1800 \$2.1800		763 22,672	\$0.000177 \$0.005268			-	
		1,300	0	\$2.1000		22,072	\$0.005266				
	Total Capacity C	ont				\$356,916					
	Total Capacity C	051				\$330,910				+	
	Rate Case 2009	Firm Sales Servi	ice Volume - CCF	4,303,890						+	
	Demand Base C			4,000,000			\$0.082929	\$0.000000			
	Domana Baco o	001 01 000 7 001					\$0.002020	\$0.00000			
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Commodi	tv										
	All Classes Com	modity				\$ 2,808,142					
	Rate Case Total		olume - CCF	4,775,650							
	Commodity Base			, .,			\$0.588013	\$0.588013			
	Total Base Cost	of Gas/CCF				\$3,165,058	\$0.670942	\$0.588013			
Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sale	s Service Volum	e - CCF		4,775,650							
Sales Service Volume - CCF			4,303,890								
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF			471,760								
II. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Curre	nt Cost of Gas E	ffective		Nove	mber 1, 2013						
	Commodity Cost	of Gas				\$0.412120	WACOG				
			Ļ		<u> </u>						
III. Annual Sales Volume - 2013-2014 Budge	t (September - A	ugust)		9,064,590							
Sales Service Volume - CCF			8,197,780								
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF			866,810								
	-				-						
IV Granter Minnesote Con Inc. In Comment	ont of Coo Ff' -	tive		A1,	mbor 1 2012					-	-
IV. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s - Current C	JUST OF GAS EFFEC	uve		NOVE	mber 1, 2013			Rate/CCF			
All Customer Sales Rate Classes		MCE	x Months	x Tariff Rate		Equals	Firm	Ag Interr	Gen Interr	-	
An Gustonier Sales Nate Classes	Viking Zone 1	2,000		\$3.4671		83,210	\$0.010150	Ay inten	Geninten		
	Viking Zone 1	1,300		\$3.4671		18,029	\$0.002199				
	TFX - 5	6,344		\$15.1530		480,653	\$0.058632				
	TF - 12	210		\$10.2300		10,742	\$0.001310				
	TF - 12	210		\$5.6830		8,354	\$0.001019				
	TF - 5	90		\$15.1530		6,819	\$0.000832				
	TFX - 7	665		\$15.1530		50,384	\$0.006146				
	TFX - 7	665		\$5.6830		7,558	\$0.000922				
	SMS Demand	50		\$2.1800		763	\$0.000093				
		1,300		\$2.1800		14,170	\$0.001729				
		.,000	Ĭ	\$2.7000		,	ψ0.001720				
	Current Demand	Cost of Gas				\$680,682	\$0.083032	\$0.000000	\$0.000000		1
						,					
		lity Cook of Cook	CCE	% of Total	85%	\$3,735,699	\$0.412120	\$0.412120	\$0.412120		
	Current Commod	ally Cost of Gas/	COI	70 OI 10tai	0070	\$3,133,099	Ψ0.712120	 	\$0.412120		
	Total Cost of Ga			70 OI 10tai	0376	\$4,416,381	\$0.495152		\$0.412120		

Summary of Cost												
All Customer Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)												
			rm Sales			l Interruptible				nterruptible		
	Total	Total	_		Total	Total	_		Total	Total	_	
	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total
1) Base Rate	\$0.082929	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.670942	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013
2) Prior PGA	\$0.017508	(\$0.206513)	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.193525)	\$0.000000	(\$0.206513)	\$0.065020	(\$0.141493)	\$0.000000	(\$0.206513)	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.226043
3) Current Adj	(\$0.017405)	\$0.030620	\$0.000000	\$0.013215	\$0.000000	\$0.030620	\$0.000000	\$0.030620	\$0.000000	\$0.030620	\$0.000000	\$0.030620
4) PGA Billed (2+3)	\$0.000103	(\$0.175893)	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.180310)	\$0.000000	(\$0.175893)	\$0.065020	(\$0.110873)	\$0.000000	(\$0.175893)	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.195423
5) Average Cost of Gas	\$0.000103	\$0.412120	(\$0.004520)	\$0.490632	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	\$0.065020	\$0.477140	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	(\$0.019530)	\$0.392590
5) Average Cost or Gas	\$0.083032	\$0.412120	(\$0.004520)	\$0.490632	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	\$0.065020	\$0.477140	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	(\$0.019530)	\$0.392590
	Prior Cumulative Adjustments	Demand & Commodity Change Filed Herein	True-up Adjustment Factor Change Eff. September 1, 2013 (G022/AA-13)	Current PGA Adjustment								
All Firm Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.189005)	\$0.013215	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.180310)								
Ag Inter. Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.206513)	\$0.030620	\$0.065020	(\$0.110873)								
Gen. Inter. Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.206513)	\$0.030620	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.195423)								
		1	2	3	4	5	7					
November 1, 2013	Tariff	Non-gas	Commodity	Demand	Total Cost	True-up	Total					
, 2010	Rate	Commodity	Cost	Other PGA	of Gas	Factor	Billing					
	Designation	Margin	(\$/CCF)	Expenses	(\$/CCF)	(\$/CCF)	Rate					
Rate Class		(\$/CCF)	,	(\$/CCF)	(2)+(3)+(4)	,	(\$/CCF)					
Residential	RS1	\$0.444330	\$0.412120	\$0.083032	\$0.495152	(\$0.004520)	\$0.934962					
Small Commercial CS1	SCS1	\$0.426330	\$0.412120	\$0.083032	\$0.495152	(\$0.004520)	\$0.916962					
Commercial CS1	CS1	\$0.396330	\$0.412120	\$0.083032	\$0.495152	(\$0.004520)	\$0.886962					
Commercial/Industrial MS1	MS1	\$0.376330	\$0.412120	\$0.083032	\$0.495152	(\$0.004520)	\$0.866962					
Commercial/Industrial LS1	LS1	\$0.361330	\$0.412120	\$0.083032		(\$0.004520)	\$0.851962					
Agricultural - Interruptible	AG1	\$0.231310	\$0.412120	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	\$0.065020	\$0.708450					
General Interruptible	IND1	\$0.251310	\$0.412120	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	(\$0.019530)	\$0.643900					
General Interruptible - Flex	IND1 - FL	\$0.030000	\$0.412120	\$0.000000	\$0.412120	(\$0.019530)	\$0.422590					
Estimated Gas Volumes - November, 2013	859,580	Ccf										

FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Content Minimental Case March Ma				FOR ILL					•			
Record for Charge Control Cont												
Reason for change: Change in cost of gap due to an estimated Decrease in the motital part of inches along young Gap Transmission Co. Turtle:				Pu	rchased Gas /	Adjustment	(PGA) Calculation	n				
Reason for change: Change in cost of gap due to an estimated Decrease in the motital part of inches along young Gap Transmission Co. Turtle:												
The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the post Tariffs: The PCA is based on the Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA	Effective date of implementation:	Natural gas us	age on and after	November 1, 2014								
The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Northern Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the following Natural Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the post Tariffs: The PCA is based on the Cost Tariffs: The PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA is based on the PCA is the PCA												
The Review Sheet No. 50	Reason for change:	Change in cost of	of gas due to an e	estimated Decrease in t	he market price of	f natural gas fro	m June 2014.					
The Review Sheet No. 50												
The Review Sheet No. 50												
The Related Sheet No. 10												
The Related Sheet No. 10	This PGA is based on the following Northern Na	tural Gas Tariffs:		This PGA is based on	the following Vikir	ng Gas Transm	ission Co. Tariffs:					
Beside 179114 Brook 2027/4 February 17914 Februar												
Effective 4/1/4												
7th Recesser Sheet No. 51 Instruct. 1731/14 Cingrad Plant No. 55 Cingrad	Effective: 4/1/14											
Bissect 13714	7th Revised Sheet No. 51											
Organic Minimension Gas, Inc Baser Cost of Gas												
Circular Manual Sales Volume - 2010 9 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF	Effective: 4/1/14											
Instance 19/41/10	Original Sheet No. 55											
Effective 304 10												
Constant Minnesoti Gia, Inc Size Court of Gas Approved in Dockset No. 0022/Min-10-649 Approved in Dockset												
ABI Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand More	211001110. 0/21/10											
ABI Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand More												
ABI Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand More	I Greater Minnesota Gas Inc Rase Cost of	of Gas			November	1 2010						
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand From Fig. 2					Jvciiibei	., _0.0						
All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand MC MC MC MC MC MC MC M								Doto/	CCE			
TFX-7 300 7 \$5.6803 11.934 \$5.00773	All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Demand		MCE	y Monthe	v Tariff Pata		Fausle				-	
TFK6	All Gustomer Gales Nate Glasses - Dellialiu	TEX.7							interruptible		-	
SMS Demand												
1,300 8 \$2,1900 22,672 \$0,000008											-	
Total Capacity Cost		SIVIS Demand										
Rate Case 2009 Firm Sales Service Volume - CCF			1,300	8	\$2.1800		22,672	\$0.005268				
Rate Case 2009 Firm Sales Service Volume - CCF		T					00=0.010					
Demand Base Cot of Gas / CCF		lotal Capacity C	OST				\$356,916					
Demand Base Cot of Gas / CCF												
All Classes Commodity Base Cost of Gas/CCF Total Base Cost of Gas/CCF Total Base Cost of Gas/CCF A303,890 A,775,650 Sales Service Volume - CCF A303,890 A1,775,650 Sales Service Volume - CCF A1,775,650 A1,77					4,303,890							
All Classes Commodity S		Demand Base C	ost of Gas / CCF					\$0.082929	\$0.000000			
All Classes Commodity S												
Rate Case Total Sales Service Volume - CCF Commodity Cost of Gas CCF A775,650 Sales Service Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF A303,850 Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF A471,756 Sales Service Volume - CCF A771,7560 A771	All Customer Sales Rate Classes - Commod											
Commodity Base Cost of Gas/CCF		All Classes Com	modity				\$ 2,808,142					
Total Base Cost of Gas/CCF S3,165,058 S0,670942 S0,588013					4,775,650							
Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF Sales Santce Volume - CCF A 303,880 471,780 III. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective Commodity Cost of Gas III. Annual Sales Volume - 2014-2015 Budget (September - August) Sales Service Volume - CCF Interruptible Service Volume - COF		Commodity Bas	e Cost of Gas/C0	F				\$0.588013	\$0.588013			
Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sales Service Volume - CCF Sales Santce Volume - CCF A 303,880 471,780 III. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective Commodity Cost of Gas III. Annual Sales Volume - 2014-2015 Budget (September - August) Sales Service Volume - CCF Interruptible Service Volume - COF												
Sales Service Volume - CCF		Total Base Cost	of Gas/CCF				\$3,165,058	\$0.670942	\$0.588013			
Sales Service Volume - CCF												
Sales Service Volume - CCF	Annual Sales Volume - 2009 Rate Case Sale	s Service Volum	e - CCF		4,775,650							
II. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective November 1, 2014				4,303,890								
II. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc. Rates - Current Cost of Gas Effective												
Commodity Cost of Gas \$0.479740 WACOG	,											
Commodity Cost of Gas S0.479740 WACOG S0.479740 WACOG S1.479740 WACOG S2.4800 S2.479740 S2.479	II. Greater Minnesota Gas. Inc. Rates - Curre	ent Cost of Gas E	fective		Nove	mber 1, 2014						
III. Annual Sales Volume - 2014-2015 Budget (September - August) 10,924,800	,,											
III. Annual Sales Volume - 2014-2015 Budget (September - August) 10,924,800		Commodity Cos	of Gas				\$0.479740	WACOG				
Sales Service Volume - CCF Interruptible Service Volume - Se		Johnnoully COS	UI Gas				ψυ.413140	WACCO				
Sales Service Volume - CCF Interruptible Service Volume - Se	III. Annual Calas Volume. 2014 2015 Building	t (Conto	Lucuset)		10 024 000			-				
Interruptible Service Volume - CCF		t (September - A	ugusi <i>j</i>	0.247.000	10,324,000							
IV. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s - Current Cost of Gas Effective November 1, 2014 Rate/CCF												
All Customer Sales Rate Classes MCF x Months x Tariff Rate Equals Firm Ag Interr Gen Interr	interruptible Service Volume - CCF			1,000,940								
All Customer Sales Rate Classes MCF											-	
All Customer Sales Rate Classes MCF	IV Greater Minnesota Coo loo lo Communication	Coat of Car Eff	tivo		Merro	mbor 1 2011					-	
All Customer Sales Rate Classes Viking Zone 1 2,000 12 \$3.3978 81,547 \$0.008752 Viking Zone 1 1,400 12 \$3.3978 57,083 \$0.006126 TFX - 5 6,344 5 \$15.1530 480,653 \$0.051584 TF - 12 210 5 \$10.2300 10,742 \$0.001153 TF - 12 210 7 \$5.6830 8,354 \$0.00897 TF - 5 90 5 \$15.1530 6,819 \$0.000997 TF - 5 90 5 \$15.1530 50,384 \$0.00997 TFX - 7 665 5 \$15.1530 50,384 \$0.000997 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.00011 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.000000 Current Demand Cost of Gas Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740 \$0.479740	iv. Greater Minnesota Gas, Inc.'s - Current	COST OF Gas Effec	tive		Nove	mper 1, 2014			Deta/COT		-	
Viking Zone 1 2,000 12 \$3.3978 81,547 \$0.008752 Viking Zone 1 1,400 12 \$3.3978 57,083 \$0.006126 TFX - 5 6,344 5 \$15,1530 480,663 \$0.051584 TF - 12 210 5 \$10,2300 10,742 \$0.001153 TF - 12 210 7 \$5,6830 8,354 \$0.000897 TF - 5 90 5 \$15,1530 6,819 \$0.000732 TFX - 7 665 5 \$15,1530 50,384 \$0.005407 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0.00811 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0.00081 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 \$0.000000 Current Demand Cost of Gas \$703,140 \$0.075462 \$0.000000 Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740	All Overtone and Only a Date Office		MOE				F	F*		0		
Viking Zone 1 1,400 12 \$3,3978 57,083 \$0,006126 TFX - 5 6,344 5 \$15,1530 480,663 \$0,051584 TF - 12 210 5 \$10,2300 10,742 \$0,001153 TF - 12 210 7 \$5,6830 8,354 \$0,000897 TF - 5 90 5 \$15,1530 6,819 \$0,000732 TFX - 7 665 5 \$15,1530 50,384 \$0,005407 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,000811 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,00001 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,000001 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,000001 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,000000 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 7,558 \$0,000000 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 \$0,000000 \$0,000000 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 \$0,000000 \$0,000000 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5,6830 \$0,000000 \$0,000000 TFX - 7 665 <	All Customer Sales Rate Classes	\(\(\tau\)\(\tau\)\(\tau\)							Ag interr	Gen interr		
TFX - 5												
TF - 12												
TF - 12												
TF - 5 90 5 \$15.1530 6,819 \$0.000732 TFX - 7 665 5 \$15.1530 50,384 \$0.005407 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.000811 TEX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.000811 Current Demand Cost of Gas Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740 \$0.479740												
TFX - 7 665 5 \$15.1530 50,384 \$0.005407 TFX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.00081												
TFX - 7 665 2 \$5.6830 7,558 \$0.000811 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.000000 0 \$0.0000000 \$0.000000 \$0.00000 \$0.000000 \$0.000000 \$0.000000 \$0.0000000 \$0.												
Current Demand Cost of Gas \$703,140 \$0.075462 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 \$0.00000												
Current Demand Cost of Gas \$703,140 \$0.075462 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 \$0.000000 \$0.		TFX - 7	665	2	\$5.6830							
Current Demand Cost of Gas \$703,140 \$0.075462 \$0.00000 \$0.00000 Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740 \$0.479740												
Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740							0	\$0.000000				
Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740												
Current Commodity Cost of Gas/CCF % of Total 88% \$5,241,064 \$0.479740 \$0.479740		Current Demand	Cost of Gas				\$703,140	\$0.075462	\$0.000000	\$0.000000		
		Current Commod	dity Cost of Gas/	CCF	% of Total	88%	\$5,241,064	\$0.479740	\$0.479740	\$0.479740		
Total Cost of Gas/CCF \$5.044.000 \$0.655002 \$0.470740 \$0.470740												
		Total Cost of Ga	s/CCF				\$5,944,203	\$0.555202	\$0.479740	\$0.479740		

FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY

Summary of Cost												
All Customer Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)												
			rm Sales				I Interruptible				terruptible	
	Total	Total			Total	Total			Total	Total		
	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total	Demand	Commodity	True-up	Total
1) Base Rate	\$0.082929	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.670942	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013	\$0.000000	\$0.588013
2) Prior PGA	(\$0.001731)	(\$0.009853)	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.016104)	\$0.000000	(\$0.009853)	\$0.065020	\$0.055167	\$0.000000	(\$0.009853)	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.029383
3) Current Adj	(\$0.005736)	(\$0.098420)	\$0.000000	(\$0.104156)	\$0.000000	(\$0.098420)	\$0.000000	(\$0.098420)	\$0.000000	(\$0.098420)	\$0.000000	(\$0.098420
4) PGA Billed (2+3)	(\$0.007467)	(\$0.108273)	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.120260)	\$0.000000	(\$0.108273)	\$0.065020	(\$0.043253)	\$0.000000	(\$0.108273)	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.127803
5) Average Cost of Gas	\$0.075462	\$0.479740	(\$0.004520)	\$0.550682	\$0.000000	\$0.479740	\$0.065020	\$0.544760	\$0.000000	\$0.479740	(\$0.019530)	\$0.460210
	Prior Cumulative Adjustments	Demand & Commodity Change Filed Herein	True-up Adjustment Factor Change Eff. September 1, 2013 (G022/AA-13-)	Current PGA Adjustment								
	Adjustments	Herein	(GU22/AA-13)	Adjustment								
All Firm Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.011584)	(\$0.104156)	(\$0.004520)	(\$0.120260)								
Ag Inter. Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.009853)	(\$0.098420)	\$0.065020	(\$0.043253)								
Gen. Inter. Sales Rate Classes (/CCF)	(\$0.009853)	(\$0.098420)	(\$0.019530)	(\$0.127803)								
Gen. Inter. Sales Rate Glasses (CCF)	(\$0.009653)	(\$0.096420)	(\$0.019550)	(\$0.127603)								
		1	2	3	4	5	7					
November 1, 2014	Tariff	Non-gas	Commodity	Demand	Total Cost	True-up	Total					
	Rate	Commodity	Cost	Other PGA	of Gas	Factor	Billing					
	Designation	Margin	(\$/CCF)	Expenses	(\$/CCF)	(\$/CCF)	Rate					
Rate Class		(\$/CCF)		(\$/CCF)	(2)+(3)+(4)		(\$/CCF)					
Residential	RS1	\$0.444330	\$0.479740	\$0.075462	\$0.555202	(\$0.004520)	\$0.995012					
Small Commercial CS1	SCS1	\$0.426330	\$0.479740	\$0.075462		(\$0.004520)	\$0.977012					
Commercial CS1	CS1	\$0.396330	\$0.479740	\$0.075462	\$0.555202	(\$0.004520)	\$0.947012					
Commercial/Industrial MS1	MS1	\$0.376330	\$0.479740	\$0.075462		(\$0.004520)	\$0.927012					
Commercial/Industrial LS1	LS1	\$0.361330	\$0.479740	\$0.075462		(\$0.004520)	\$0.912012					
Agricultural - Interruptible	AG1	\$0.231310	\$0.479740	\$0.000000	\$0.479740	\$0.065020	\$0.776070					
General Interruptible	IND1	\$0.251310	\$0.479740	\$0.000000	\$0.479740	(\$0.019530)	\$0.711520					
General Interruptible - Flex	IND1 - FL	\$0.030000	\$0.479740	\$0.000000	\$0.479740	(\$0.019530)	\$0.490210					
Estimated Gas Volumes July, 2014	246,920	Ccf										