



85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198
main: 651.296.4026
tty: 651.296.2860
fax: 651.297.7891
www.energy.mn.gov

June 7, 2010

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2147

RE: **Response Comments of the Minnesota Office of Energy Security**
Docket Nos. G007/M-09-1282, G011/M-09-1283, G011/M-09-1284, and G011/M-09-1285

Dear Dr. Haar:

Attached are the *Response Comments* of the Minnesota Office of Energy Security (OES) in the following matter:

Requests (*Petitions*) submitted by Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-PNG and Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-NMU (MERC or Company) for approval of changes in demand entitlements on its NMU Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) system, Great Lakes Gas Transmission (Great Lakes) PGA system, Viking Gas Transmission (Viking) PGA system, and Northern Natural Gas (Northern) PGA system.

The *Petitions* were filed on November 2, 2009 by:

Greg Walters
Regulatory and Legislative Affairs Manager
Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
519 1st Avenue SW
P.O. Box 6538
Rochester, MN 55903-6538

The OES filed its *Comments* reviewing MERC's Great Lakes and Viking PGA system demand entitlement filings on March 10, 2010. The OES later filed its *Comments* reviewing MERC's NMU and Northern PGA system demand entitlement filings on April 2, 2010. In these filings, the OES requested that MERC provide additional information in *Reply Comments*. Based on its review of MERC's filings, the OES concludes that a response to MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG's *Reply Comments* is necessary to establish a complete record in this matter. As such, the OES requests that the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) accept these *Response Comments* to MERC's *Reply Comments*. Given similar recommendations in each filing, the OES files a single set of *Response Comments* for all four dockets.

Based on its review of MERC's *Reply Comments*, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- **require**, until actual daily transportation and interruptible data is available for all customers, that MERC use, for all its PGA systems, the modified non-firm gas use method as presented in its March 22, 2010 *Reply Comments* for the Great Lakes PGA system;
- **approve** the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-NMU's proposed demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009;
- **approve** MERC-NMU's demand entitlement level;
- **require** MERC-NMU to provide in its next demand entitlement filing a full discussion of how MERC intends to deal with the capacity limitations currently in place on the Northern Natural Gas system and how it intends to charge appropriate rates to Northern pipeline customers on both the MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG Northern PGA systems;
- **approve** the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's proposed Great Lakes PGA system demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009;
- **approve** MERC-PNG's Great Lakes PGA system demand entitlement level;
- **require** MERC-PNG to refund any, and all, over-recoveries associated with the Call Option rate impact calculation for its Great Lakes PGA system, discussed in the OES's *Comments*, in the Company's September 1, 2010 true-up filing and accompanying true-up factor;
- **approve** the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's Northern PGA system demand entitlement level, based on FDD storage costs being included in the commodity cost of gas, as presented in the Company's initial petition, Attachment 11, and OES Attachment 7 in its April 2, 2010 *Comments* effective November 1, 2009;
- **approve** MERC-PNG's Northern PGA system demand entitlement level;
- **approve** the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's proposed Viking PGA demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009 system cost recovery proposal, presented in the Company's initial petition; and
- **approve** MERC-PNG's Viking PGA system demand entitlement level.

The OES is available to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

Sincerely,

/s/ ADAM JOHN HEINEN
Rates Analyst
651-296-6329

AJH/ja
Attachment



BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

COMMENTS OF THE
MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ENERGY SECURITY

DOCKET NOS. G007/M-09-1282, G011/M-09-1283, G011/M-09-1284,
and G011/M-09-1285

I. BACKGROUND

The following rounds of comments have been submitted to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) in Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-NMU's and Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation-PNG's (MERC or Company) 2009-2010 demand entitlement filings for its NMU Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) system, Great Lakes Transmission (Great Lakes) PGA system, Viking Gas Transmission (Viking) PGA system, and Northern Natural Gas (Northern) PGA system:

- November 1, 2009, MERC's initial *Petition* in each PGA system demand entitlement filing;
- March 10, 2010, Minnesota Office of Energy Security's (OES) *Comments* in the Great Lakes and Viking PGA system demand entitlement filings;
- March 22, 2010, MERC's *Reply Comments* in the Great Lakes and Viking PGA system demand entitlement filings;
- April 2, 2010, OES *Comments* in the NMU and Northern PGA system demand entitlement filings;
- April 12, 2010, MERC's *Reply Comments* in the NMU and Northern PGA system demand entitlement filings;¹ and
- June 7, 2010, OES's *Response Comments*.

¹ On April 28, 2010, MERC filed additional information for its NMU PGA system demand entitlement filing that was inadvertently omitted from the E-docketing system because of a technical issue when the *Reply Comments* were initially filed.

II. THE OES'S RESPONSE TO MERC'S REPLY COMMENTS

A. OES RECOMMENDATIONS COMMON TO EACH OF MERC'S PGA SYSTEM DEMAND ENTITLEMENT FILINGS

In its *Comments* in each of MERC's four PGA system demand entitlement filings, the OES made two similar recommendations:

- a full discussion detailing how MERC intends to install telemetry on its transportation customers and an estimate of how long it will be before it has adequate daily data to estimate its firm design day more accurately; and
- a full discussion explaining why MERC uses a wind chill calculation different than the National Weather Service's (NWS) wind chill calculation and what, if any, impact using the official wind chill calculation has on MERC's design-day forecast(s).

The OES discusses each of these recommendations separately below.

1. *MERC's Telemetry Installation Plan*

As noted above, the OES requested that MERC provide, in its *Reply Comments*, a full discussion of how the Company intends to implement its telemetry installation plan. In its *Reply Comments*, MERC states that, based on the current business schedules, it intends to have the installations completed sometime in late 2010 or early 2011. The OES is encouraged by this response, since it indicates that much improved firm sales data will be available either starting sometime during the upcoming 2010-2011 heating season or, at the latest, during the 2011-2012 heating season. It is important to note however that, based on its current design-day method, MERC will still need to estimate some amount of daily interruptible and transportation usage in the coming years. For example, assuming MERC is able to complete its telemetry installation by November 1, 2010, the Company will still be using some amount of estimated interruptible and transportation usage data through the 2012-2013 heating season demand entitlement filings. Thus, the 2013-2014 heating season will be the earliest possible filing year where the Company's design-day can be estimated with only firm specific daily usage.

On page 3 of its MERC Northern PGA system *Reply Comments*, the Company includes a footnote noting that the Commission's June 29, 2009 *Order* in Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-835 allows MERC to require telemetry for its transportation customers. MERC further explains that this *Order* also requires MERC to continue offering Small Volume Balancing Service to its interruptible customers. According to MERC, once telemetry is in place, the Company will no longer need to estimate daily interruptible and transportation usage. Based on this explanation, it would appear that the Small Volume Balancing Service allows MERC to monitor daily interruptible customer usage.

Based on the information provided by MERC in its *Reply Comments*, the OES believes that the Company has adequately addressed this issue. However, as discussed above, the OES reiterates that MERC will have to base its design day analysis, in part, on daily usage data based on estimated interruptible and transportation customer usage data for, at a minimum, three more heating season demand entitlement cycles. The concerns explained by the OES in its *Comments* will remain valid for the next few demand entitlement cycles but MERC is addressing the issue in a reasonable manner. As such, the OES does not anticipate raising these issues in future demand entitlement filings.

2. *MERC's Adjusted Heating Degree Day (HDD) Calculation Compared to the National Weather Service's Wind Chill Calculation*

In its *Comments*, the OES requested that MERC provide additional information about its adjusted HDD calculation, why it is different than the NWS's wind-chill calculation, and what impact using the NWS's wind-chill calculation would have on the Company's design-day forecasts. In its *Reply Comments*, MERC provided additional information about its wind-adjusted HDD calculation and compared this calculation to the NWS's wind-chill calculation.

MERC explains that the NWS's wind-chill calculation is intended to compute how cold a specific combination of ambient temperature and wind speed feels on exposed human skin and how long it will take before frostbite occurs. The Company's wind-adjusted HDD calculation is a means of estimating wind's influence on heating load which, according to MERC, has been indicated empirically as improving usage estimates. Since the two calculations attempt to measure a similar phenomenon (wind's impact on a living creature and wind's impact on an inanimate object), MERC states that it is possible that wind chill may produce better results and, as such, it conducted an updated design-day analysis for each of its PGA systems using HDDs adjusted for wind chill instead of its wind adjusted HDD factor.

As part of its analysis, MERC explained that there are two generally accepted factors that determine whether a regression analysis reasonably "explains" the information at hand, in this case natural gas consumption. The Company states that these two metrics are the standard error of regression, or sigma, which measures how far a given estimate deviates from the projected regression line, and, a related statistic, the R-squared value, which measures how well changes in the dependent variable (usage) are explained by the set of independent variables (*e.g.*, HDDs, day of the week, month) in the model. For each PGA system, when comparing these metrics for the regression models with HDDs adjusted for wind chill as calculated by the NWS to the regression models using MERC's wind-adjusted HDD factor, the Company found that its wind-adjusted HDD factor produced more robust regression outputs, which indicates that MERC's wind-adjusted HDD factor may be a better predictor of wind's impact on heating load than the NWS's wind-chill factor. Based on MERC's reply, the OES does not have any additional concerns related to this topic.

B. OES RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN INDIVIDUAL PGA SYSTEM DEMAND ENTITLEMENT FILINGS.

In addition to the recommendations that the OES made in its *Comments* in each PGA system demand entitlement filing, the OES also made specific recommendations related to individual PGA system filings. The OES discusses these recommendations separately, by PGA system, below.

1. MERC's Response to OES Recommendations for the NMU PGA System (Docket No. G007/M-09-1282)

Based on concerns associated with MERC-NMU's design-day calculations, the OES withheld recommendations on the Company's demand entitlement filing until MERC provided certain information in its *Reply Comments*. Specifically, the OES recommended that the Company provide the following:

- a) a full justification of the peak-day calculations the Company used to procure total entitlements for the Great Lakes and Centra pipelines;
- b) a full explanation of whether there are sufficient entitlements to serve MERC-NMU's Northern pipeline firm customers on a peak day; and
- c) a full explanation of how firm entitlements shift between MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG on the Northern pipeline system.

MERC provided a response to each issue in its April 12, 2010 *Reply Comments*.²

a) Total entitlements for the Great Lakes and Centra pipelines

In its *Reply Comments*, MERC provides a detailed discussion of its peak-day calculations for its Centra and Great Lakes pipeline systems. The Company begins its discussion by stating that it appears that the deficient entitlement levels on these two systems are indicative of the need to incorporate daily metering from all non-firm customers into the process of forecasting peak-day demand on the system. MERC further states that, based on usage graphs, the deficient entitlement days on the Centra and Great Lakes pipelines are likely the result of non-heating, or process-driven load, as evidenced by demand placed on the system during those days by interruptible or transportation customers. Based on calculations and graphs, MERC states that it is possible that this high non-firm load may have exceeded the non-firm usage estimates used by the Company and the OES in their analyses. As a result, MERC concludes that use of actual non-firm loads in the calculation would mean that firm entitlements were reasonably calculated.

² Based on a technical error, MERC was unable to file all of the information in its *Reply Comments*. This additional information was filed with the Commission on April 28, 2010.

The OES appreciates MERC's response and, based on this response, the OES is confident that the Company is committed to firm reliability and is attempting to estimate peak-day use in the best way available based on the data available at this time. Further, the OES is aware that MERC is in the process of installing telemetry for non-firm customers. However, despite firm entitlements being reasonably estimated, over-stated estimates of usage by non-firm customers can still negatively impact firm reliability on a peak day. As such, while these issues will not be an issue in the near future, as long as estimated non-firm usage is included in the Company's peak day calculations, the non-firm usage concerns discussed in this proceeding are still relevant. In addition, it is important for MERC to enforce its interruptible and transportation tariffs, and interrupt customers as needed, so that non-firm usage does not impact firm reliability of a peak day. Given the issues identified in this proceeding, and the relatively short period of time before MERC's current analysis will become obsolete given non-firm telemetry, the OES does not recommend any further action on this issue.

- b) *Entitlements to serve MERC-NMU's Northern pipeline firm customers; and*
- c) *How firm entitlements shift between MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG on the Northern system*

MERC also provides a full discussion in its *Reply Comments* responding to the OES's concerns related to peak day reliability on MERC's Northern pipeline system and how the Company transfers entitlements between MERC-PNG's Northern PGA system and MERC-NMU's Northern pipeline system. In its discussion, MERC notes that Attachment 5 in its Northern PGA system initial filing (Docket No. G011/M-09-1284) indicates that MERC-PNG Northern has a large positive reserve margin of 13.62 percent and MERC-NMU Northern has a negative reserve margin of -4.33 percent. MERC further states that capacity is allocated between MERC-PNG and MERC-NMU based upon contractual delivery points and, even though Attachment 5 indicates that MERC-NMU has a negative reserve margin, excess capacity from MERC-PNG can be used to meet design-day requirements on MERC-NMU. Therefore, there is sufficient firm capacity to ensure reliability on the MERC-NMU Northern pipeline in the event of a peak day.

Since MERC can transfer capacity between the MERC-PNG and MERC-NMU PGA system on its Northern pipeline system, and based on its design-day analysis in the Northern PGA system docket, the OES believes that there is sufficient capacity to ensure peak-day reliability for firm customers served by the Northern pipeline. However, the OES is concerned that MERC is carrying demand capacity on its Northern PGA system to account for design-day use by firm customers on the NMU PGA system. This is a concern since it appears that customers on the Northern PGA system are paying higher rates to subsidize NMU PGA customers and that customers on the MERC-NMU PGA system are paying demand rates that are lower than what is appropriate. MERC states in its *Reply Comments* that Northern Natural Gas does not have additional space available in the NMU region to allow the Company to shift capacity between MERC-PNG and MERC-NMU. Given this limitation, the OES recommends that MERC provide a full discussion in its next demand entitlement filing explaining how MERC intends to deal with

this limitation imposed by Northern Natural Gas and how MERC intends to charge appropriate rates to Northern pipeline customers on both the MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG Northern PGA systems.

Based on its analysis, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- approve the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-NMU's proposed demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009;
 - approve MERC-NMU's demand entitlement level; and
 - require MERC-NMU to provide in its next demand entitlement filing a full discussion of how MERC intends to deal with the capacity limitations currently in place on the Northern Natural Gas system, and how MERC intends to charge appropriate rates to Northern pipeline customers on both the MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG Northern PGA systems.
2. *MERC's Response to OES Recommendations for the Great Lakes PGA System (Docket No. G011/M-09-1283)*

Based on concerns associated with MERC's Great Lakes PGA system design-day calculations, the OES withheld recommendations on the Company's demand entitlement filing until MERC provided certain information in its *Reply Comments*. Specifically, the OES recommended that the Company provide the following:

- a full discussion explaining how the Company arrived at its estimates of use by interruptible and transportation customers that MERC incorporates into its design-day analysis;
- a full discussion of whether MERC-PNG is examining other techniques to improve its interruptible customer usage estimates;
- a full discussion explaining why it chose the 97.5 percent confidence level that it uses in its design-day analysis;
- a full analysis, including supporting calculations, comparing demand costs at the 97.5 percent confidence level and at the 99.9 percent confidence level in its volume risk adjustment; and
- a full discussion explaining the circumstances surrounding the peak-day sendout during the 2008-2009 heating season.

MERC provided a response to each of these requests in its March 10, 2010 *Reply Comments*.

In its *Reply Comments*, MERC provided a detailed, step-by-step explanation of its current estimates of energy use by interruptible and transportation customers as requested by the OES in its *Comments*. Based on the Company's explanation, the OES concludes that MERC used a

reasonable approach to estimate non-firm peak-day use. However, the OES notes that in MERC's discussion of the circumstances surrounding the 2008-2009 heating season peak day, which is evaluated below, the Company, after further analysis, decided to use an improved means to estimate energy use by non-firm customers in its 2008-2009 peak-day estimate. Given the telemetry installations and small volume interruptible balancing service, as discussed in Section A above, the OES notes that estimating non-firm usage will be significantly easier in the near future and, given MERC's explanation in *Reply Comments*, the OES does not have any further concerns related to this issue.

The Company provides a thorough discussion of its volume risk adjustment and decision to use a 97.5 percent confidence level instead of a 99.9 percent confidence level in its *Reply Comments*. MERC states that its decision to choose the 97.5 percent was based on the premise of striking a reasonable balance between the probability of design-day weather resulting in requirements higher than the forecast and the incremental cost of providing additional peak-day supply and capacity. Further, the Company's decision to select the 97.5 percent confidence level has some support from the practices of other natural gas local distribution companies (LDC).

In addition, MERC provides, in its *Reply Comments*, an estimate of the additional volumes needed to serve firm customers at the 99 percent confidence level and the additional costs that firm customers would pay. Using its peak-day analysis, modified with a 99 percent confidence level, MERC estimates that it would need to add an incremental 478 Mcf/day of capacity to serve Great Lakes firm customers. Assuming procurement of additional twelve month capacity at \$3.548 per Mcf, MERC calculates incremental costs of approximately \$19,835 which when divided by the number of firm customers (6,068) translates into roughly \$3.27 a year per firm customer.

While the incremental cost of using a 99 percent confidence level is relatively small, the OES does not believe this additional amount of capacity is necessary. Based on information in the OES's *Comments*, Attachment 3, it does not appear that, even with the additional 478 Mcf/day of capacity needed to reach this confidence level, firm customers would be at significant risk of reliability issues on a peak day. Given the information in the record, the OES believes that MERC's 97.5 percent confidence level is reasonable and, as such, the OES no longer has any concerns with this issue.

In its *Comments*, the OES asked that MERC provide an explanation discussing the circumstances surrounding the peak-day sendout during the 2008-2009 heating season. The OES requested this information since peak-day usage during the 2008-2009 heating season was significantly higher than during the same day in the 2007-2008 heating season. In its *Reply Comments*, MERC states that it does not have daily usage capabilities for all of its interruptible and transportation customers; therefore, the Company has to estimate these customers' use before determining firm peak day usage. While reviewing its peak-day calculations, MERC observed that its original peak-day calculation was probably not the best way to estimate actual non-firm volumes. The

Company now believes that a more reasonable approach is to subtract actual usage by interruptible and transportation customers where available from total actual peak-day throughput, and then subtract out the estimates of non-firm usage for those customers where actual daily data is unavailable. Based on this new calculation, MERC determined that actual firm peak-day usage during the 2008-2009 heating season was 8,064, not 9,777 Mcf as originally estimated. In addition, based on this modified approach, MERC believes that its original firm peak-day usage calculation for the 2007-2008 heating season was inaccurate. Using its new approach, MERC calculates a 2007-2008 heating season peak day firm usage of 8,127 Mcf.³ After reviewing MERC's discussion and explanation, the OES no longer has concerns associated with peak-day use during the 2008-2009 heating season.

Based on MERC's Great Lakes PGA System *Reply Comments*, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- approve MERC's Great Lakes demand entitlement level;
 - approve MERC's proposed cost recovery proposal as presented in the Company's initial petition; and
 - require, until actual daily transportation and interruptible data is available for all customers, that MERC use the modified non-firm gas use method as presented in its March 22, 2010 *Reply Comments* for the Great Lakes PGA system.
3. *MERC's Response to OES Recommendations for the Northern PGA System (Docket No. G011/M-09-1284)*

Based on concerns associated with MERC's Northern PGA system design-day calculations, the OES withheld recommendations on the Company's demand entitlement filing until MERC provided certain information in its *Reply Comments*. Specifically, the OES recommended that the Company provide:

- an updated design-day analysis, and all supporting models and data, that corrects the data error referenced by the Company in its discussions with the OES;
- a discussion clarifying whether the TFX contract included in the Company's November 2009 PGA filing should be a seven-month or a twelve-month contract; and
- a full discussion justifying the large reserve margin on its Northern PGA system.

³ These modified calculations are incorporated into a revised OES Attachment 4. This revised attachment is included as OES Attachment R-1 to these *Response Comments*.

The OES also recommended that, on a going-forward basis, MERC conduct its design-day analysis using weather data from the following weather stations: Cloquet, MN; Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN; Rochester, MN; and Worthington, MN. MERC discussed these issues in its April 12, 2010 *Reply Comments*.

As discussed in the OES's *Comments*, MERC incorrectly calculated its Northern PGA system design day and was directed by the OES to update this analysis in its *Reply Comments*. MERC corrected this data error, and made adjustments to its non-firm usage estimates based on unexpected sales in December 2008, and calculated a revised design-day estimate of 206,333 Mcf/day. This revised design-day estimate represents a small increase compared to MERC's originally calculated design-day figure; however, it is important to note, that this increase does not bring MERC's design-day figure above the Company's total entitlement estimate. Using information and peak-day calculations provided by MERC in its *Reply Comments*, the OES conducted further peak-day analyses to determine whether the Company will have sufficient capacity on a peak-day to serve firm customers. Based on the OES's analysis, it appears that MERC has contracted for sufficient capacity to ensure firm reliability on a day with conditions similar to the Company's all-time peak day sendout (OES Attachment R-2). Therefore, the OES does not have any further concerns related to this issue.

MERC provides an explanation in its *Reply Comments* clarifying the contract length for a TFX contract discussed in the OES's *Comments*. MERC states in its *Reply Comments* that the OES was correct when it noticed that this contract was incorrectly labeled as TFX7 when it is a TFX12 contract. The Company further states that the OES correctly designated this capacity in its attachments. Given this explanation, the OES does not have further concerns related to this TFX contract.

In its *Comments*, the OES noted that MERC proposes a 13.62 reserve margin for its Northern PGA system. This level represented an issue for the OES since it was a significant increase in the reserve margin from the last heating season and was above the five percent threshold that the OES generally considers an adequate reserve margin. Given this observation, the OES recommended that MERC provide a discussion justifying the large reserve margin in its *Reply Comments*. MERC states in its *Reply Comments* that its total Northern firm entitlement figure includes an agreement with LS Power for an option to call on capacity for up to 20 days between December and February. The Company further states that it pays \$392,022 on an annual basis to procure this option. If MERC were to contract for a five percent reserve margin, it would be required to terminate its LS Power contract and instead procure seasonal capacity which, in MERC's analysis, would mean approximately 8,839 Mcf/day of TFX5. Based on current Northern tariff rates, according to the Company, this approach would result in an annual cost of \$669,687, which is approximately \$277,665 greater than current demand costs with the LS Power contract. Given the significant cost savings, the OES concludes that, for the circumstances surrounding this PGA system, MERC's reserve margin is reasonable and, as such, the OES does not have any additional concerns related to this issue.

In its *Reply Comments*, MERC agrees with the OES's recommendation that the Company use weather data from Worthington, MN in its design-day calculations. The OES appreciates the Company's agreement on this issue. On a matter related to future rate case sales forecasts, it may be productive for MERC to conduct its future rate case sales forecasts with weather data collected from Worthington, MN instead of Sioux Falls, South Dakota. The OES will not, however, make a specific recommendation on this issue at this time, since it is not clear if Worthington, MN has sufficient data to complete a robust test year sales forecast. The OES would appreciate hearing from MERC on this matter prior to when MERC files its next rate case.

Based on MERC's Northern PGA System *Reply Comments*, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- approve MERC's Northern PGA system demand entitlement level; and
- approve MERC's proposed cost recovery proposal, based on FDD storage costs being included in the commodity cost of gas, as presented in the Company initial petition, Attachment 11, and OES Attachment 7 in its April 2, 2010 *Comments*.

4. *MERC's Response to OES Recommendations for the Viking PGA System (Docket No. G011/M-09-1285)*

Based on concerns associated with MERC's Viking PGA system design day calculations, the OES withheld recommendations on the Company's demand entitlement filing until MERC provided certain information in its *Reply Comments*. Specifically, the OES recommended that the Company provide:

- a detailed explanation justifying the reasonableness of its design-day calculations for its Viking PGA system;
- a full discussion explaining why it chose the 97.5 percent confidence level that it uses in its design day analysis; and
- a full analysis, including supporting calculations, comparing demand costs at the 97.5 confidence level and at the 99.9 percent confidence level in its volume risk adjustment.

In its March 10, 2009 *Comments*, the OES voiced concern that, based on its calculations, MERC's Viking PGA system design day calculations may not be sufficient to ensure firm peak day reliability. As stated in MERC's March 22, 2010 *Reply Comments*, the Company contacted the OES seeking clarification of the OES's calculations and, based on this conversation, the OES noticed that it had an error in its calculation of MERC's estimated peak day throughput. After correcting this error, the OES's new calculation only has one date where estimated peak day use exceeded total entitlements on the Viking PGA system (OES Attachment R-3). These calculations indicate that peak day firm reliability is likely not endangered by MERC's design

day analysis. Given the calculations in OES Attachment R-3, the OES concludes that MERC's design-day analysis is acceptable and, as such, the OES does not have further concerns at this time.

The Company provides a thorough discussion of its volume risk adjustment and decision to use a 97.5 percent confidence level instead of a 99.9 percent confidence level in its *Reply Comments*. MERC states that its decision to choose the 97.5 percent was based on the premise of striking a reasonable balance between the probability of design-day weather resulting in requirements higher than the forecast and the incremental cost of providing additional peak-day supply and capacity. Further, the Company's decision to select the 97.5 percent confidence level has some support from the practices of other natural gas LDCs, as noted above.

In addition, MERC provides, in its *Reply Comments*, an estimate of the additional volumes need to serve firm customers at the 99 percent confidence level and the additional costs that firm customers would pay. Using its peak-day analysis, modified with a 99 percent confidence level, MERC estimates that it would need to add an incremental 199 Mcf/day of capacity to serve Great Lakes firm customers. Assuming procurement of additional twelve months of capacity at \$3.4671 per Mcf, MERC calculates incremental costs of approximately \$8,279 which when divided by the number of firm customers (4,408) translates into roughly \$1.88 a year per firm customers.

Even though the incremental cost of using a 99 percent confidence level is relatively small, the OES does not believe it is necessary. Based on information in Attachment R-3, it does not appear that, even with the additional 199 Mcf/day of capacity needed to reach this confidence level, firm customers are at significant risk of reliability issues on a peak day.⁴ Further, based on MERC's discussion, it appears that the Company is using an industry standard approach, in terms of the risk adjustment, for estimating a design day. Given the information in the record, the OES believes that MERC's 97.5 percent confidence level is reasonable and, as such, the OES no longer has any concerns with this issue.

Based on the MERC's Viking PGA System *Reply Comments*, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- approve MERC's Viking PGA system demand entitlement level; and
- approve MERC's proposed Viking PGA system cost recovery proposal, presented in the Company initial petition.

⁴ Even with the additional 199 Mcf/day, there is no change in final results in OES Attachment R-3.

III. THE OES'S CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its review of MERC's *Reply Comments*, the OES recommends that the Commission:

- require, until actual daily transportation and interruptible data is available for all customers, that MERC use, for all its PGA systems, the modified non-firm gas use method as presented in its March 22, 2010 *Reply Comments* for the Great Lakes PGA system;
- approve the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-NMU's proposed demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009;
- approve MERC-NMU's demand entitlement level;
- require MERC-NMU to provide in its next demand entitlement filing a full discussion of how MERC intends to deal with the capacity limitations currently in place on the Northern Natural Gas system and how it intends to charge appropriate rates to Northern pipeline customers on both the MERC-NMU and MERC-PNG Northern PGA systems;
- approve the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's proposed Great Lakes PGA system demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009;
- approve MERC-PNG's Great Lakes PGA system demand entitlement level;
- require MERC-PNG to refund any, and all, over-recoveries associated with the Call Option rate impact calculation for its Great Lakes PGA system, discussed in the OES's *Comments*, in the Company's September 1, 2010 true-up filing and accompanying true-up factor;
- approve the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's Northern PGA system demand entitlement level, based on FDD storage costs being included in the commodity cost of gas, as presented in the Company's initial petition, Attachment 11, and OES Attachment 7 in its April 2, 2010 *Comments* effective November 1, 2009;
- approve MERC-PNG's Northern PGA system demand entitlement level;
- approve the PGA recovery of costs associated with MERC-PNG's proposed Viking PGA demand entitlement level effective November 1, 2009 system cost recovery proposal, presented in the Company's initial petition; and
- approve MERC-PNG's Viking PGA system demand entitlement level.

**Minnesota Office of Energy Security Attachment R-1
MERC-PNG's Great Lakes Purchased Gas Adjustment Area Demand Entitlement Analysis**

Heating Season *	Number of Firm Customers			Design Day Requirement			Total Entitlement + Peak Shaving			Reserve Margin (10)
	(1) Number of DD Customers	(2) Change From Previous Year	(3) % Change From Previous Year	(4) Design Day (Mcf)	(5) Change From Previous Year	(6) % Change From Previous Year	(7) Total Entitlement (Mcf)	(8) Change From Previous Year	(9) % Change From Previous Year	
2009-2010	6,068	194	3.30%	10,802	503	4.88%	11,500	1,000	9.52%	6.46%
2008-2009	5,874	58	1.00%	10,299	749	7.84%	10,500	500	5.00%	1.95%
2007-2006#	5,816	69	1.20%	9,550	7	0.07%	10,000	314	3.24%	4.71%
2006-2007	5,747	68	1.20%	9,543	33	0.35%	9,686	0	0.00%	1.50%
2005-2006	5,679	165	2.99%	9,510	61	0.65%	9,686	0	0.00%	1.85%
2004-2005	5,514	103	1.90%	9,449	(198)	-2.05%	9,686	0	0.00%	2.51%
2003-2004	5,411	133	2.52%	9,647	1,659	20.77%	9,686	1,186	13.95%	0.40%
2002-2003	5,278	172	3.37%	7,988	(123)	-1.52%	8,500	0	0.00%	6.41%
2001-2002	5,106	134	2.70%	8,111	(254)	-3.04%	8,500	0	0.00%	4.80%
2000-2001	4,972	175	3.65%	8,365	92	1.11%	8,500	0	0.00%	1.61%
1999-2000**	4,797	341	7.65%	8,273	588	7.65%	8,500	2,422	39.85%	2.74%
1998-1999	4,456	241	5.72%	7,685	416	5.72%	6,078	0	0.00%	-20.91%
1997-1998	4,215	386	10.08%	7,269	665	10.07%	6,078	0	0.00%	-16.38%
1996-1997	3,829	336	9.62%	6,604	579	9.61%	6,078	0	0.00%	-7.96%
1995-1996	3,493			6,025			6,078			
Average Change Per Year:			4.12%			4.44%			5.11%	-0.74%

Per Peoples, the 2001-02 Design Day declined due to a downward trend in consumption and heat factor possibly due to high gas costs in 2000-01 and more energy efficient housing.

Firm Peak Day Sendout

Heating Season *	(11) Number of Peak Day Customers	(12) Firm Peak Day Sendout (Mcf)	(13) Sendout Change from Previous Year	(14) % Change From Previous Year	(15) Excess per Customer [(7)-(4)]/(1)	(16) Design Day per Customer (4)/(1)	(17) Entitlement per Customer (7)/(1)	(18) Peak Day Sendout per DD Customer (12)/(11)	(19) Peak Day Sendout per DD Customer (12)/(11)
2008-2009^	6,144	8,064	(63)	-0.78%	0.0342	1.7533	1.7875	1.3125	1.3728
2007-2008	unknown	8,127	1,355	20.01%	0.0774	1.6420	1.7194	unknown	1.3974
2006-2007	unknown	6,772	(959)	-12.40%	0.0249	1.6505	1.6854	unknown	1.1784
2005-2006 ***	unknown	7,731	1,608	26.26%	0.0310	1.6746	1.7056	unknown	1.3613
2004-2005	5,714	6,123	(1,543)	-20.13%	0.0430	1.7136	1.7566	1.0716	1.1104
2003-2004	5,529	7,666	567	7.99%	0.0072	1.7628	1.7901	1.3865	1.4167
2002-2003	5,411	7,099	1,104	18.42%	0.0970	1.5135	1.6105	1.3120	1.3450
2001-2002	5,099	5,995	(567)	-8.64%	0.0762	1.5885	1.6647	1.1757	1.1741
2000-2001	4,970	6,562	(576)	-8.07%	0.0272	1.6924	1.7096	1.3203	1.3198
1999-2000	4,627	7,138	(368)	-4.90%	0.0473	1.7246	1.7719	1.5427	1.4880
1998-1999	4,627	7,506	1,567	26.38%	-0.3606	1.7246	1.3640	1.6222	1.6845
1997-1998	unknown	5,939	588	10.99%	-0.2826	1.7246	1.4420	unknown	1.4090
1996-1997	unknown	5,351	427	8.67%	-0.1374	1.7247	1.5874	unknown	1.3975
1995-1996	unknown	4,924			0.0152	1.7249	1.7401	unknown	1.4097
Average Change Per Year:				5.38%	-0.0257	1.6832	1.6820	1.3429	1.3609

-- The analysis conducted by the OES does not include the 423 Mcf/day capacity related to MERC's FT0011 agreement. This decision to omit these volumes is discussed in the body of the Comments in Docket No. G011/M-07-1404.

*Per Peoples, information prior to 1995 is not available.

**Corrected from peak day to design day number of customers.

*** The Company has not provided the number of peak-day customers beginning from the 2005-2006 heating season.

^ The number of peak day customers is calculated using the Residential and Commercial customer count data provided in MERC's Attachment 11.

OES's Analysis of MERC's Revised Northern PCA System Peak Day Regression

SUMMARY OUTPUT									
Regression Statistics									
Multiple R	0.85660186								
R Square	0.81572783								
Adjusted R Square	0.914506186								
Standard Error	9335.665675								
Observations	270								
ANOVA									
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F				
Regression	286	23183127857	80785363.6	723.0308232	1.4841E-141				
Residual	270	275245E+11							
Total									
Coefficients									
		Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Over 95%
Intercept	29,705,1463	2,403,4709	12.3609	0.0000	24,976,69506	34,441,393	28976.899	34441.3935	34441.3935
AHDD65	2,197,6892	41,52228	52.9276	0.0000	2,115,93458	2,279,4649	1,158,324	3,439,743	3,439,743
HDD65	1,656,667	1,656,667	1.0000	0.3169	-1,287,63332	6,690,107	-1,287,633	6,690,107	6,690,107
Sat	19,819,87023	16,15633	1,227.03	0.0000	-1,287,63332	6,690,107	-1,287,633	6,690,107	6,690,107
Sun	16,187,82033	1,656,1106	9,774.03	0.0000	-9,468,262441	-2,967,378	-9,468,262	-2,967,378	-2,967,378

PNG-NNG Peak Day Regression for Winter 2010																		
Date	Day	Cloquet		Minneapolis		Rochester		Total										
		Daily Meter	Peak A HDD	Daily Meter	Peak A HDD	Daily Meter	Peak A HDD	Daily Meter	Peak A HDD									
12/12/2006	5	5,803	48,053	91,707	45.3	52.3	48.0	90.0	1	0	0	222,226	76,449	145,777	281,675	0	(115,899)	0
12/19/2006	6	5,306	53,862	98,875	56.6	56.6	48.8	90.0	1	0	0	222,477	76,449	146,028	281,675	0	(115,847)	0
12/26/2006	7	5,530	54,824	102,848	57.1	57.1	50.3	90.0	0	0	0	219,156	76,449	151,707	281,675	0	(101,016)	0
12/30/2006	1	5,046	47,118	91,298	44.800	51.2	45.2	90.0	0	0	0	230,271	76,449	153,824	281,675	0	(101,852)	0
12/16/2006	3	7,265	59,763	112,261	179,260	53.8	48.0	90.0	0	0	0	259,686	76,449	192,237	281,675	0	(79,438)	0
12/17/2006	4	7,292	58,785	116,581	192,658	65.3	58.6	90.0	0	0	0	237,009	76,449	160,560	281,675	0	(101,115)	0
12/8/2006	5	5,283	41,652	87,687	133,422	51.3	45.4	90.0	1	0	0	212,231	76,449	135,782	281,675	0	(125,893)	0
12/9/2006	6	4,268	29,577	56,457	90,232	33.8	29.8	90.0	0	1	0	203,868	76,449	127,419	281,675	0	(134,256)	0
12/10/2006	7	4,157	32,505	59,982	96,424	26.7	26.5	90.0	0	0	0	222,694	76,449	146,355	281,675	0	(115,320)	0
12/17/2006	1	3,946	34,013	69,721	106,680	33.1	30.0	90.0	0	0	0	231,673	76,449	155,224	281,675	0	(109,451)	0
12/22/2006	2	3,981	36,719	67,896	112,500	31.2	28.4	90.0	0	0	0	221,443	76,449	144,994	281,675	0	(106,671)	0
12/23/2006	3	3,898	35,766	67,111	108,618	27.2	23.7	90.0	0	0	0	233,824	76,449	157,372	281,675	0	(104,303)	0
12/15/2006	5	4,454	35,514	73,275	113,243	36.1	32.3	90.0	1	0	0	225,477	76,449	149,028	281,675	0	(112,647)	0
12/17/2006	6	4,110	29,814	57,510	91,434	28.8	26.0	90.0	0	1	0	216,123	76,449	139,674	281,675	0	(122,001)	0
12/17/2006	7	4,829	40,445	72,955	117,269	37.7	34.2	90.0	0	1	0	226,121	76,449	149,672	281,675	0	(112,003)	0
12/18/2006	1	5,549	42,586	81,629	128,854	43.7	40.5	90.0	0	0	0	231,808	76,449	155,359	281,675	0	(106,316)	0
12/19/2006	2	4,367	35,654	70,547	110,696	37.1	33.5	90.0	0	0	0	226,881	76,449	150,432	281,675	0	(111,243)	0
12/20/2006	3	4,349	36,275	67,274	107,899	32.7	30.4	90.0	0	0	0	233,784	76,449	157,335	281,675	0	(104,340)	0
12/21/2006	4	4,472	36,633	67,690	108,705	35.4	31.9	90.0	0	0	0	228,610	76,449	152,161	281,675	0	(109,514)	0
12/22/2006	5	4,189	33,377	65,985	106,861	37.1	33.7	90.0	1	0	0	212,644	76,449	138,196	281,675	0	(126,072)	0
12/24/2006	6	4,538	33,300	60,156	98,182	36.2	32.7	90.0	0	1	0	206,700	76,449	130,251	281,675	0	(131,424)	0
12/25/2006	7	5,029	37,942	71,236	113,907	41.8	37.4	90.0	0	0	1	213,581	76,449	137,132	281,675	0	(124,543)	0
12/26/2006	1	4,645	36,181	69,070	109,696	40.8	38.0	90.0	0	0	0	218,957	76,449	141,616	281,675	0	(120,057)	0
12/27/2006	2	4,244	33,441	67,669	105,653	32.7	30.2	90.0	0	0	0	231,481	76,449	155,032	281,675	0	(106,645)	0
12/28/2006	3	4,585	33,692	62,302	100,679	30.7	27.8	90.0	0	0	0	217,694	76,449	141,072	281,675	0	(107,090)	0
12/29/2006	4	4,143	32,717	60,546	97,406	35.3	30.3	90.0	1	0	0	217,694	76,449	141,072	281,675	0	(107,090)	0
12/30/2006	5	3,862	28,697	52,189	84,968	29.8	28.4	90.0	0	1	0	207,421	76,449	130,972	281,675	0	(130,703)	0
12/31/2006	6	4,668	35,478	64,511	104,568	32.4	29.3	90.0	0	1	0	221,319	76,449	144,970	281,675	0	(119,668)	0

CEC Attachment R-2
 MERC-PNG's Revised Design Day Regression Output and the CEC's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Northern Peak Day Calculations

Year	Month	Day	5.083	38.061	65.381	109.816	49.71	38.81	90.01	0	0	1	204.840	76.448	138.391	261.675	(133.284)
11/20/2007	11	20	5.083	38.061	65.381	109.816	49.71	38.81	90.01	0	0	1	204.840	76.448	138.391	261.675	(133.284)
12/07/2007	12	07	36.901	36.901	63.563	105.847	49.01	37.11	90.01	0	0	0	211.098	76.448	134.633	261.675	(127.036)
12/14/2007	12	14	4.746	34.765	55.912	95.453	34.61	30.01	90.01	0	0	0	217.146	76.448	140.897	261.675	(120.978)
12/21/2007	12	21	32.559	32.559	52.976	89.570	29.51	28.41	90.01	0	0	0	222.583	76.449	146.134	261.675	(115.541)
12/28/2007	12	28	61.812	61.812	100.136	100.136	34.71	31.71	90.01	0	0	0	215.489	76.449	139.040	261.675	(122.635)
1/04/2008	1	04	33.020	33.020	55.383	93.025	36.31	35.81	90.01	0	0	0	218.175	76.449	134.719	261.675	(136.956)
1/11/2008	1	11	41.799	41.799	67.989	115.191	41.71	39.81	90.01	0	0	0	215.175	76.449	139.726	261.675	(122.946)
1/18/2008	1	18	42.431	42.431	70.992	118.232	41.41	37.91	90.01	0	0	0	218.449	76.449	148.905	261.675	(113.170)
1/25/2008	1	25	39.277	39.277	68.110	115.410	45.71	39.61	90.01	0	0	0	212.379	76.449	135.929	261.675	(114.246)
2/01/2008	2	01	46.998	46.998	84.987	136.907	39.01	34.81	90.01	0	0	0	248.035	76.449	172.666	261.675	(69.088)
2/08/2008	2	08	61.404	61.404	110.952	160.907	60.41	52.41	90.01	0	0	0	239.241	76.449	162.792	261.675	(69.886)
2/15/2008	2	15	54.153	54.153	96.361	157.633	59.81	56.61	90.01	0	0	0	214.276	76.449	137.827	261.675	(123.846)
2/22/2008	2	22	52.818	52.818	94.556	154.997	52.31	47.91	90.01	0	0	0	231.645	76.449	155.196	261.675	(106.479)
2/29/2008	2	29	60.529	60.529	123.223	181.873	64.91	57.91	90.01	0	0	0	246.646	76.449	170.197	261.675	(61.476)
3/06/2008	3	06	7.759	121.095	190.468	292.468	72.21	67.21	90.01	0	0	0	239.490	76.449	153.041	261.675	(108.634)
3/13/2008	3	13	51.174	84.177	124.479	192.479	62.21	58.21	90.01	0	0	0	238.449	76.449	159.932	261.675	(124.843)
3/20/2008	3	20	67.479	67.479	103.811	151.811	67.41	67.41	90.01	0	0	0	214.461	76.449	136.163	261.675	(112.455)
3/27/2008	3	27	52.837	52.837	92.137	152.107	59.81	54.81	90.01	0	0	0	214.461	76.449	138.012	261.675	(123.663)
4/03/2008	4	03	46.881	46.881	80.684	134.059	59.81	54.81	90.01	0	0	0	190.312	76.449	113.965	261.675	(147.812)
4/10/2008	4	10	44.098	44.098	77.014	126.947	47.11	44.61	90.01	0	0	0	214.931	76.449	126.482	261.675	(121.931)
4/17/2008	4	17	49.295	49.295	86.111	142.002	51.01	46.11	90.01	0	0	0	227.793	76.449	151.344	261.675	(110.331)
4/24/2008	4	24	48.093	48.093	81.686	136.291	51.81	47.41	90.01	0	0	0	229.180	76.449	143.731	261.675	(117.944)
5/01/2008	5	01	45.068	45.068	80.576	133.135	49.91	46.31	90.01	0	0	0	221.369	76.449	144.919	261.675	(116.756)
5/08/2008	5	08	46.988	46.988	79.172	132.107	52.81	48.51	90.01	0	0	0	214.387	76.449	137.949	261.675	(123.777)
5/15/2008	5	15	43.994	43.994	76.303	128.303	51.41	46.81	90.01	0	0	0	216.976	76.449	140.653	261.675	(119.449)
5/22/2008	5	22	56.741	56.741	99.223	153.923	61.41	57.91	90.01	0	0	0	216.976	76.449	140.653	261.675	(119.449)
5/29/2008	5	29	88.482	88.482	163.198	219.198	70.81	63.41	90.01	0	0	0	199.078	76.449	122.629	261.675	(139.046)
6/05/2008	6	05	57.960	57.960	104.244	169.266	59.31	52.91	90.01	0	0	0	236.808	76.449	150.379	261.675	(101.296)
6/12/2008	6	12	60.519	60.519	109.354	177.657	66.51	60.01	90.01	0	0	0	224.909	76.449	146.460	261.675	(113.216)
6/19/2008	6	19	59.680	59.680	109.354	175.421	63.31	56.01	90.01	0	0	0	234.008	76.449	157.559	261.675	(104.116)
6/26/2008	6	26	64.530	64.530	109.105	181.424	67.81	61.71	90.01	0	0	0	230.183	76.449	153.754	261.675	(107.841)
7/03/2008	7	03	66.593	66.593	113.264	188.519	76.81	67.41	90.01	0	0	0	211.458	76.449	134.979	261.675	(126.686)
7/10/2008	7	10	74.814	74.814	123.882	209.478	87.81	78.31	90.01	0	0	0	214.209	76.449	141.450	261.675	(126.115)
7/17/2008	7	17	81.614	81.614	132.164	216.164	81.61	73.11	90.01	0	0	0	234.926	76.449	158.477	261.675	(103.188)
7/24/2008	7	24	72.042	72.042	132.063	213.454	80.21	75.71	90.01	0	0	0	238.070	76.449	161.621	261.675	(100.054)
7/31/2008	7	31	69.930	69.930	123.937	201.407	79.31	66.01	90.01	0	0	0	229.416	76.449	152.867	261.675	(109.709)
8/07/2008	8	07	123.251	123.251	202.721	202.721	77.91	70.11	90.01	0	0	0	219.919	76.449	143.470	261.675	(118.205)
8/14/2008	8	14	117.729	117.729	185.390	178.81	70.81	68.81	90.01	0	0	0	221.292	76.449	144.833	261.675	(118.842)
8/21/2008	8	21	67.520	67.520	115.628	182.132	73.91	69.81	90.01	0	0	0	195.132	76.449	112.883	261.675	(149.892)
8/28/2008	8	28	58.655	58.655	106.599	166.577	75.51	69.51	90.01	0	0	0	223.080	76.449	146.611	261.675	(115.064)
9/04/2008	9	04	53.773	53.773	96.590	146.694	52.41	49.51	90.01	0	0	0	232.667	76.449	145.611	261.675	(116.841)
9/11/2008	9	11	63.464	63.464	116.594	174.594	63.41	53.41	90.01	0	0	0	232.126	76.449	145.673	261.675	(116.841)
9/18/2008	9	18	59.545	59.545	108.900	174.594	60.31	55.41	90.01	0	0	0	232.667	76.449	145.673	261.675	(116.841)
9/25/2008	9	25	63.604	63.604	116.200	187.815	68.61	63.31	90.01	0	0	0	232.225	76.449	146.776	261.675	(114.909)
10/02/2008	10	02	64.010	64.010	112.795	184.679	72.51	66.51	90.01	0	0	0	232.225	76.449	146.776	261.675	(114.909)
10/09/2008	10	09	52.488	52.488	95.274	154.159	65.31	58.11	90.01	0	0	0	202.395	76.449	125.666	261.675	(135.789)
10/16/2008	10	16	47.738	47.738	83.148	137.260	55.41	48.01	90.01	0	0	0	209.432	76.449	126.993	261.675	(134.692)
10/23/2008	10	23	49.816	49.816	83.177	139.469	55.21	48.51	90.01	0	0	0	209.653	76.449	126.993	261.675	(134.692)
10/30/2008	10	30	58.246	58.246	99.454	159.454	40.11	36.81	90.01	0	0	0	219.072	76.449	142.573	261.675	(119.102)
11/06/2008	11	06	59.461	59.461	97.454	154.454	40.11	36.81	90.01	0	0	0	219.072	76.449	142.573	261.675	(119.102)
11/13/2008	11	13	34.937	34.937	63.162	104.662	38.11	35.91	90.01	0	0	0	232.019	76.449	155.571	261.675	(106.103)
11/20/2008	11	20	40.266	40.266	70.765	116.550	44.21	38.71	90.01	0	0	0	217.232	76.449	140.783	261.675	(120.892)
11/27/2008	11	27	44.684	44.684	76.984	126.544	43.31	38.71	90.01	0	0	0	223.040	76.449	146.597	261.675	(115.078)
12/04/2008	12	04	42.074	42.074	72.680	122.925	45.11	37.91	90.01	0	0	0	211.271	76.449	134.822	261.675	(128.853)
12/11/2008	12	11	39.827	39.827	69.398	113.440	39.31	37.21	90.01	0	0	0	218.584	76.449	142.135	261.675	(119.540)
12/18/2008	12	18	70.164	70.164	113.456	139.456	39.61	37.21	90.01	0	0	0	226.363	76.449	149.614	261.675	(111.761)
12/25/2008	12	25	39.196	39.196	71.080	113.992	39.01	37.51	90.01	0	0	0	224.126	76.449	149.677	261.675	(111.998)
1/01/2009	1	01	37.976	37.976	66.844	109.438	40.81	36.31	90.01	0	0	0	217.655	76.449	141.206	261.675	(120.469)

OES Attachment R.2
 MERC-PNG's Revised Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Northern Peak Day Calculations

12/12/2007	6	8.179	48.431	75.116	129.726	48.9	43.5	90.0	0	1	0	207.891	131.542	261.675	(130.133)
12/22/2007	7	8.346	53.232	90.920	150.498	52.5	44.9	90.0	0	1	0	226.704	150.255	261.675	(111.420)
12/30/2007	1	6.707	52.614	94.114	153.635	57.7	53.3	90.0	0	0	0	224.683	149.244	261.675	(113.431)
12/4/2007	2	6.315	52.657	87.941	146.913	56.8	47.5	90.0	0	0	0	229.011	152.652	261.675	(109.113)
12/8/2007	3	7.262	57.115	100.343	164.720	61.1	55.7	90.0	0	0	0	228.136	151.687	261.675	(109.988)
12/15/2007	4	9.589	62.814	108.078	185.311	67.1	62.4	90.0	0	0	0	213.743	137.443	261.675	(124.402)
12/22/2007	5	8.684	58.584	100.684	163.848	61.1	55.7	90.0	0	0	0	213.743	137.443	261.675	(124.402)
12/29/2007	6	7.449	57.004	96.538	161.898	67.6	63.9	90.0	0	1	0	201.255	124.802	261.675	(138.683)
12/09/2007	7	6.111	58.221	90.903	156.735	59.8	57.9	90.0	0	0	1	210.016	140.667	261.675	(121.108)
12/16/2007	1	6.364	51.524	86.970	143.759	55.0	50.5	90.0	0	0	0	220.713	144.264	261.675	(117.411)
12/23/2007	2	6.616	53.625	93.970	154.211	59.1	55.1	90.0	0	0	0	241.650	155.401	261.675	(96.274)
12/30/2007	3	6.297	52.034	90.184	149.115	58.7	54.8	90.0	0	0	0	217.872	141.423	261.675	(120.252)
12/1/2007	4	6.734	55.303	91.705	153.745	51.9	44.4	90.0	0	0	0	237.478	161.028	261.675	(100.646)
12/15/2007	5	7.854	59.897	101.159	168.993	62.3	59.4	90.0	0	0	0	222.750	146.301	261.675	(115.374)
12/22/2007	6	8.179	62.814	108.078	185.311	67.1	62.4	90.0	0	0	0	213.743	137.443	261.675	(124.402)
12/29/2007	7	6.023	49.110	80.668	140.501	58.1	50.4	90.0	0	1	0	211.685	134.630	261.675	(137.053)
12/12/2007	1	5.535	47.228	80.300	133.953	51.4	46.3	90.0	0	0	0	217.912	141.463	261.675	(120.212)
12/19/2007	2	5.919	46.759	79.204	127.282	48.8	42.5	90.0	0	0	0	222.285	145.939	261.675	(115.839)
12/26/2007	3	5.250	48.654	75.241	126.545	48.9	43.5	90.0	0	0	0	223.215	146.766	261.675	(114.609)
12/02/2007	4	4.571	39.533	64.887	108.951	41.0	37.0	90.0	0	0	0	216.774	140.325	261.675	(121.350)
12/09/2007	5	4.169	34.631	58.961	95.761	33.5	30.5	90.0	0	0	0	213.652	137.203	261.675	(124.472)
12/16/2007	6	5.892	43.948	84.586	140.066	48.9	42.9	90.0	0	1	0	220.983	144.544	261.675	(117.131)
12/23/2007	7	6.373	45.137	78.451	129.431	50.1	45.9	90.0	0	0	0	198.913	123.544	261.675	(139.411)
12/30/2007	1	5.183	39.262	63.371	107.806	42.8	39.5	90.0	0	0	0	201.500	125.051	261.675	(138.624)
12/06/2007	2	5.227	43.010	70.664	119.901	43.1	40.4	90.0	0	0	0	222.426	145.977	261.675	(115.868)
12/13/2007	3	5.890	44.204	76.174	126.238	43.8	40.8	90.0	0	0	0	227.709	151.260	261.675	(110.415)
12/20/2007	4	5.839	46.725	81.957	134.621	47.7	45.8	90.0	0	0	0	216.778	140.328	261.675	(121.346)
12/27/2007	5	5.653	44.602	77.157	127.012	47.7	44.8	90.0	0	1	0	210.182	133.733	261.675	(127.942)
12/03/2007	6	5.550	45.630	78.590	127.960	50.0	46.6	90.0	0	0	0	209.753	133.304	261.675	(128.371)
12/10/2007	7	6.359	51.623	88.464	146.948	51.5	48.8	90.0	0	0	0	225.029	148.990	261.675	(113.095)
12/17/2007	1	6.446	53.446	94.674	160.674	56.8	53.1	90.0	0	0	0	225.029	148.990	261.675	(113.095)
12/24/2007	2	7.859	60.177	110.199	185.575	68.8	65.0	90.0	0	0	0	227.183	150.746	261.675	(110.933)
12/31/2007	3	6.403	50.689	81.578	148.680	59.6	51.9	90.0	0	0	0	215.487	139.048	261.675	(122.827)
12/07/2008	4	5.551	43.378	70.892	119.821	47.0	41.4	90.0	0	0	0	208.010	131.651	261.675	(130.114)
12/14/2008	5	4.751	36.508	58.003	98.462	38.2	33.8	90.0	0	1	0	202.379	125.930	261.675	(135.745)
12/21/2008	6	4.553	34.539	54.011	93.103	30.5	28.2	90.0	0	0	0	217.760	141.311	261.675	(120.364)
12/28/2008	7	4.645	38.949	60.377	103.871	33.9	31.8	90.0	0	0	0	229.289	152.840	261.675	(108.835)
12/04/2008	1	5.277	45.070	72.676	122.823	38.7	35.1	90.0	0	0	0	233.485	157.046	261.675	(104.628)
12/11/2008	2	5.011	41.691	69.084	112.338	38.8	33.0	90.0	0	0	0	224.653	145.744	261.675	(114.741)
12/18/2008	3	5.272	44.178	73.887	123.937	43.7	40.1	90.0	0	0	0	218.107	142.658	261.675	(118.017)
12/25/2008	4	5.465	42.892	73.626	121.863	44.9	41.5	90.0	0	0	0	211.314	134.865	261.675	(126.810)
12/01/2009	5	6.178	50.995	84.333	140.507	48.6	44.8	90.0	0	1	0	223.133	146.684	261.675	(114.891)
12/08/2009	6	7.997	62.157	109.359	178.113	62.1	54.5	90.0	0	0	0	239.405	152.956	261.675	(98.719)
12/15/2009	7	6.295	53.448	69.339	149.092	61.1	55.4	90.0	0	0	0	211.531	135.082	261.675	(126.593)
12/22/2009	1	6.915	59.088	90.384	153.387	52.1	48.4	90.0	0	0	0	236.751	150.302	261.675	(101.373)
12/29/2009	2	7.224	64.693	108.958	173.265	59.0	50.0	90.0	0	0	0	232.089	150.202	261.675	(106.035)
12/05/2010	3	6.560	56.331	81.474	147.478	61.1	55.4	90.0	0	0	0	218.104	133.843	261.675	(127.832)
12/12/2010	4	6.850	62.523	119.450	200.383	67.0	73.7	90.0	0	1	0	210.282	131.655	261.675	(130.020)
12/19/2010	5	8.590	68.651	108.482	183.623	76.0	71.1	90.0	0	0	0	208.104	131.655	261.675	(130.020)
12/26/2010	6	8.237	66.705	110.027	184.969	64.3	60.8	90.0	0	0	0	241.445	154.995	261.675	(96.679)
12/02/2011	7	8.197	66.281	107.529	182.027	72.8	65.1	90.0	0	0	0	219.845	143.396	261.675	(118.279)
12/09/2011	1	8.114	73.341	119.279	201.334	75.6	69.9	90.0	0	0	0	232.805	150.456	261.675	(105.219)
12/16/2011	2	8.096	68.161	113.671	189.828	77.7	71.8	90.0	0	0	0	217.066	140.617	261.675	(121.058)
12/23/2011	3	7.022	63.096	93.986	156.639	61.8	55.7	90.0	0	0	0	232.805	150.456	261.675	(105.219)
12/30/2011	4	6.831	60.363	101.623	163.848	64.2	58.1	90.0	0	0	0	217.372	139.953	261.675	(126.812)
12/06/2012	5	6.920	61.423	103.683	166.331	64.2	58.1	90.0	0	0	0	233.860	151.321	261.675	(104.464)
12/13/2012	6	5.683	40.625	65.847	112.181	39.6	29.7	90.0	0	0	0	228.411	161.862	261.675	(99.713)
12/20/2012	7	8.978	81.306	130.507	220.781	64.5	52.0	90.0	0	0	0	276.840	200.391	261.675	(61.284)
12/27/2012	1	8.882	74.022	117.634	200.516	81.7	73.0	90.0	0	0	0	218.809	142.360	261.675	(119.315)
12/03/2013	2	7.871	61.993	102.112	171.976	64.8	60.4	90.0	0	0	0	227.768	151.319	261.675	(110.956)

2/12/2008	6	6.331	46.997	76.309	129.637	51.0	47.4	80.0	1	0	0	209.033	76.449	132.684	281.675	129.091	0
2/22/2008	6	9.927	46.202	74.412	126.441	44.0	41.0	80.0	0	1	0	217.686	76.449	141.237	281.675	120.439	0
2/32/2008	7	5.940	46.698	75.398	129.136	47.2	45.6	80.0	0	0	1	215.820	76.449	139.471	281.675	122.204	0
2/42/2008	7	5.656	43.709	70.359	119.724	39.6	38.0	80.0	0	0	0	230.480	76.449	154.031	281.675	107.644	0
2/52/2008	2	6.076	45.310	76.612	127.896	40.0	38.3	80.0	0	0	0	237.784	76.449	151.955	281.675	109.222	0
2/62/2008	3	6.816	45.111	76.612	127.896	40.0	38.3	80.0	0	0	0	237.784	76.449	151.955	281.675	109.222	0
2/72/2008	4	6.388	43.711	69.773	144.373	58.1	52.8	80.0	0	0	0	218.284	76.449	142.343	281.675	119.330	0
2/82/2008	5	7.744	44.629	76.592	127.165	46.3	42.3	80.0	1	0	0	217.051	76.449	140.602	281.675	121.073	0
2/92/2008	6	7.928	66.568	109.869	184.365	68.3	56.1	80.0	0	1	0	228.819	76.449	152.370	281.675	109.305	0
2/10/2008	7	8.580	73.475	125.151	207.216	87.7	74.1	80.0	0	1	0	206.051	76.449	129.602	281.675	132.073	0
2/11/2008	1	7.638	65.651	113.315	186.508	70.7	65.8	80.0	0	0	0	228.904	76.449	152.453	281.675	109.222	0
2/12/2008	2	6.821	58.316	103.652	169.669	69.5	57.2	80.0	0	0	0	233.389	76.449	156.840	281.675	104.735	0
2/13/2008	3	6.816	52.382	90.549	149.757	59.6	54.8	80.0	0	0	0	216.655	76.449	140.286	281.675	124.489	0
2/14/2008	4	7.533	47.476	102.487	130.253	69.1	63.0	80.0	1	0	0	210.987	76.449	134.646	281.675	127.127	0
2/15/2008	5	5.011	43.777	72.447	122.125	59.2	48.4	80.0	0	1	0	193.144	76.449	116.697	281.675	137.127	0
2/16/2008	6	5.663	50.529	84.153	140.448	45.1	39.0	80.0	0	1	0	232.939	76.449	156.989	281.675	105.266	0
2/17/2008	1	6.933	69.091	115.361	192.065	70.1	58.8	80.0	0	0	0	235.888	76.449	159.449	281.675	102.226	0
2/18/2008	2	7.777	68.113	115.447	192.137	71.4	66.6	80.0	0	0	0	233.044	76.449	156.555	281.675	105.060	0
2/19/2008	3	7.709	68.122	116.649	192.480	74.5	68.8	80.0	0	0	0	226.674	76.449	150.172	281.675	111.503	0
2/20/2008	4	6.838	58.939	106.889	172.666	65.4	61.9	80.0	0	0	0	226.657	76.449	150.268	281.675	111.467	0
2/21/2008	5	6.478	49.851	90.395	146.634	56.2	54.4	80.0	1	0	0	214.619	76.449	138.170	281.675	132.365	0
2/22/2008	6	6.741	47.917	87.971	140.111	44.1	40.7	80.0	0	1	0	200.325	76.449	123.926	281.675	137.749	0
2/23/2008	7	5.624	43.777	72.447	122.125	59.2	48.4	80.0	0	1	0	242.481	76.449	166.042	281.675	65.633	0
2/24/2008	1	6.222	41.001	66.722	144.345	59.1	44.6	80.0	0	0	0	227.680	76.449	151.241	281.675	110.434	0
2/25/2008	2	6.274	48.948	87.464	142.686	59.3	48.7	80.0	0	0	0	223.276	76.449	146.029	281.675	114.846	0
2/26/2008	3	5.636	46.764	78.872	131.272	53.6	48.4	80.0	0	0	0	211.359	76.449	134.910	281.675	126.765	0
2/27/2008	4	6.374	47.257	74.219	127.650	45.1	41.7	80.0	1	0	0	211.426	76.449	134.877	281.675	126.698	0
2/28/2008	5	7.965	49.293	91.145	148.393	55.0	49.3	80.0	0	0	0	225.996	76.449	148.947	281.675	112.728	0
2/29/2008	6	6.171	41.088	61.678	121.028	42.6	37.4	80.0	0	0	0	224.374	76.449	144.922	281.675	116.743	0
2/30/2008	7	6.171	41.088	61.678	121.028	42.6	37.4	80.0	0	0	0	224.374	76.449	144.922	281.675	116.743	0
2/31/2008	1	8.133	55.718	101.088	166.346	60.2	54.1	80.0	0	0	0	231.981	76.449	155.512	281.675	108.163	0
2/32/2008	2	8.133	55.718	101.088	166.346	60.2	54.1	80.0	0	0	0	231.981	76.449	155.512	281.675	108.163	0
2/33/2008	3	9.155	59.930	102.793	165.778	63.8	56.7	80.0	1	0	0	217.924	76.449	141.475	281.675	120.200	0
2/34/2008	4	9.030	54.803	103.199	167.032	58.8	54.0	80.0	0	1	0	213.840	76.449	137.481	281.675	124.164	0
2/35/2008	5	8.089	50.753	91.867	150.739	59.9	44.8	80.0	0	0	0	227.288	76.449	150.819	281.675	110.856	0
2/36/2008	6	8.748	55.178	104.634	169.960	69.3	54.8	80.0	0	0	0	236.726	76.449	160.277	281.675	101.388	0
2/37/2008	7	8.697	51.714	92.900	152.811	57.7	50.3	80.0	0	0	0	233.683	76.449	157.434	281.675	104.241	0
2/38/2008	1	9.784	55.916	102.793	165.778	63.8	46.1	80.0	0	0	0	223.773	76.449	147.264	281.675	114.581	0
2/39/2008	2	8.264	52.811	92.900	152.811	57.7	46.1	80.0	1	0	0	217.054	76.449	140.653	281.675	121.070	0
2/40/2008	3	6.249	53.551	54.748	94.648	34.3	30.6	80.0	1	0	0	207.143	76.449	130.884	281.675	130.981	0
2/41/2008	4	9.071	59.464	106.692	174.217	59.8	49.2	80.0	0	1	0	234.499	76.449	139.048	281.675	103.626	0
2/42/2008	5	12.654	75.644	132.866	220.694	78.4	71.1	80.0	0	0	0	246.192	76.449	169.749	281.675	61.932	0
2/43/2008	6	10.813	68.806	122.459	202.276	70.4	65.5	80.0	0	0	0	245.987	76.449	169.639	281.675	62.737	0
2/44/2008	7	10.168	63.572	110.634	184.695	66.5	64.2	80.0	0	0	0	230.776	76.449	155.334	281.675	106.341	0
2/45/2008	1	9.196	55.655	98.668	163.317	59.3	55.1	80.0	0	0	0	236.726	76.449	160.277	281.675	101.388	0
2/46/2008	2	7.747	48.599	82.490	140.257	47.8	45.8	80.0	1	0	0	217.076	76.449	146.243	281.675	115.365	0
2/47/2008	3	10.653	70.465	128.668	209.896	81.3	69.8	80.0	0	1	0	222.692	76.449	146.243	281.675	115.365	0
2/48/2008	4	10.683	66.290	117.664	184.218	71.9	65.1	80.0	0	0	0	233.692	76.449	157.516	281.675	104.159	0
2/49/2008	5	9.684	53.098	92.164	153.945	52.8	48.4	80.0	0	0	0	235.795	76.449	159.347	281.675	102.328	0
2/50/2008	6	7.395	46.460	85.289	139.524	55.6	48.8	80.0	1	0	0	217.753	76.449	141.904	281.675	120.371	0
2/51/2008	7	5.851	35.092	60.160	101.123	35.0	31.0	80.0	0	1	0	212.131	76.449	132.503	281.675	129.172	0
2/52/2008	1	7.190	48.267	60.414	135.611	44.8	48.1	80.0	0	0	0	203.442	76.449	126.953	281.675	134.682	0
2/53/2008	2	7.689	42.134	76.683	133.669	45.9	46.7	80.0	0	0	0	220.286	76.449	134.943	281.675	107.341	0
2/54/2008	3	9.637	60.975	103.576	172.959	67.7	59.2	80.0	0	0	0	231.396	76.449	144.947	281.675	116.738	0
2/55/2008	4	9.461	57.645	98.764	165.860	66.7	59.8	80.0	1	0	0	210.975	76.449	134.526	281.675	127.149	0

OES Attachment R-3

MERC-PNG's Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Viking Peak Day Calculations

MERC-PNG's Regression Output and OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Peak Day Calculations												
SUMMARY OUTPUT												
Regression Statistics												
Multiple R	0.918193817											
R Square	0.843079886											
Adjusted R Square	0.840720185											
Standard Error	525.3835614											
Observations	271											
ANOVA												
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F							
Regression	4	394449712.6	98612428	357.283	1.199E-105							
Residual	266	73417827.85	276006.87									
Total	270	467867540.4										
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%				
Intercept	1,141.6855	143.0241	7.9825	0.0000	860.0821863	1423.288798	860.0821863	1423.288798				
AHDD65	77.5807	2.1548	36.0044	0.0000	73.33811495	81.82320372	73.33811495	81.82320372				
Sat	(280.8111)	87.5062	(3.2090)	0.0015	-453.1039541	-108.518297	-453.1039541	-108.5182968				
Sun	(249.8543)	91.6436	(2.7242)	0.0069	-430.0933295	-69.2152061	-430.0933295	-69.2152061				
Dec	(182.8834)	68.7716	(2.6593)	0.0083	-318.2893172	-47.4775501	-318.2893172	-47.4775501				

PNG-VGT Peak Day Regression for Winter 2010												
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	(Mon=1)	Total	Fargo									
Date	Day	Daily Meter	AHDD65	Sat	Sun	Dec	Estimated Peak Day Use	Estimated Interruptible Use	Estimated Firm Use	MERC Total Entitlement Value	Difference Between Firm Use and Estimated Total Entitlement	0= Sufficient Capacity 1=Estimated Firm Use Greater than Total Entitlement
12/1/2006	5	5,335	50	0	0	1	9,720	3,329	6,391	7,625	(1,234)	0
12/2/2006	6	6,063	66	1	0	1	8,898	3,329	5,569	7,625	(2,056)	0
12/3/2006	7	5,940	62	0	1	1	9,111	3,329	5,782	7,625	(1,843)	0
12/4/2006	1	6,439	60	0	0	1	9,994	3,329	6,665	7,625	(960)	0
12/5/2006	2	5,269	46	0	0	1	9,912	3,329	6,583	7,625	(1,042)	0
12/6/2006	3	7,089	64	0	0	1	10,382	3,329	7,053	7,625	(572)	0
12/7/2006	4	6,356	69	0	0	1	9,259	3,329	5,930	7,625	(1,695)	0
12/8/2006	5	4,235	44	0	0	1	9,033	3,329	5,704	7,625	(1,921)	0
12/9/2006	6	3,523	31	1	0	1	9,077	3,329	5,748	7,625	(1,877)	0
12/10/2006	7	3,430	38	0	1	1	8,495	3,329	5,166	7,625	(2,459)	0
12/11/2006	1	3,729	38	0	0	1	9,039	3,329	5,710	7,625	(1,915)	0
12/12/2006	2	4,041	36	0	0	1	9,487	3,329	6,158	7,625	(1,467)	0
12/13/2006	3	3,489	34	0	0	1	9,062	3,329	5,733	7,625	(1,892)	0
12/14/2006	4	4,092	34	0	0	1	9,681	3,329	6,352	7,625	(1,273)	0
12/15/2006	5	4,166	39	0	0	1	9,367	3,329	6,038	7,625	(1,587)	0
12/16/2006	6	3,556	32	1	0	1	8,998	3,329	5,669	7,625	(1,956)	0
12/17/2006	7	4,504	44	0	1	1	9,047	3,329	5,718	7,625	(1,907)	0
12/18/2006	1	4,518	46	0	0	1	9,209	3,329	5,880	7,625	(1,745)	0
12/19/2006	2	3,971	40	0	0	1	9,118	3,329	5,789	7,625	(1,836)	0
12/20/2006	3	4,429	38	0	0	1	9,686	3,329	6,357	7,625	(1,268)	0
12/21/2006	4	4,075	44	0	0	1	8,929	3,329	5,600	7,625	(2,025)	0
12/22/2006	5	3,785	38	0	0	1	9,042	3,329	5,713	7,625	(1,912)	0
12/23/2006	6	3,728	36	1	0	1	8,867	3,329	5,538	7,625	(2,087)	0
12/24/2006	7	3,795	36	1	0	1	8,926	3,329	5,597	7,625	(2,028)	0
12/25/2006	1	4,139	49	0	1	1	8,349	3,329	5,020	7,625	(2,605)	0
12/26/2006	2	3,863	36	0	0	1	9,315	3,329	5,986	7,625	(1,639)	0
12/27/2006	3	3,660	31	0	0	1	9,518	3,329	6,189	7,625	(1,436)	0
12/28/2006	4	3,845	34	0	0	1	9,431	3,329	6,102	7,625	(1,523)	0
12/29/2006	5	3,670	37	0	0	1	9,034	3,329	5,705	7,625	(1,920)	0
12/30/2006	6	3,527	39	1	0	1	8,500	3,329	5,171	7,625	(2,454)	0
12/31/2006	7	4,517	48	1	0	1	8,764	3,329	5,435	7,625	(2,190)	0

OES Attachment R-3

MERC-PNG's Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Viking Peak Day Calculations

12/1/2007	6	5,050	53	1	0	1	8,868	3,329	5,539	7,625	(2,086)	0
12/2/2007	7	6,107	71	0	1	1	8,626	3,329	5,297	7,625	(2,328)	0
12/3/2007	1	5,687	64	0	0	1	8,960	3,329	5,631	7,625	(1,994)	0
12/4/2007	2	5,779	53	0	0	1	9,925	3,329	6,596	7,625	(1,029)	0
12/5/2007	3	6,316	73	0	0	1	8,914	3,329	5,585	7,625	(2,040)	0
12/6/2007	4	6,062	63	0	0	1	9,440	3,329	6,111	7,625	(1,514)	0
12/7/2007	5	6,785	77	0	0	1	9,023	3,329	5,694	7,625	(1,931)	0
12/8/2007	6	6,900	79	1	0	1	8,730	3,329	5,401	7,625	(2,224)	0
12/9/2007	7	6,516	78	0	1	1	8,420	3,329	5,091	7,625	(2,534)	0
12/10/2007	1	5,796	63	0	0	1	9,130	3,329	5,801	7,625	(1,824)	0
12/11/2007	2	5,816	63	0	0	1	9,206	3,329	5,877	7,625	(1,748)	0
12/12/2007	3	5,280	58	0	0	1	9,012	3,329	5,683	7,625	(1,942)	0
12/13/2007	4	6,881	60	0	0	1	10,455	3,329	7,126	7,625	(499)	0
12/14/2007	5	6,363	72	0	0	1	9,044	3,329	5,715	7,625	(1,910)	0
12/15/2007	6	5,119	56	1	0	1	8,775	3,329	5,446	7,625	(2,179)	0
12/16/2007	7	5,198	57	0	1	1	8,750	3,329	5,421	7,625	(2,204)	0
12/17/2007	1	4,816	55	0	0	1	8,825	3,329	5,496	7,625	(2,129)	0
12/18/2007	2	5,034	53	0	0	1	9,203	3,329	5,874	7,625	(1,751)	0
12/19/2007	3	4,896	52	0	0	1	9,079	3,329	5,750	7,625	(1,875)	0
12/20/2007	4	4,646	48	0	0	1	9,185	3,329	5,856	7,625	(1,769)	0
12/21/2007	5	4,285	47	0	0	1	8,911	3,329	5,582	7,625	(2,043)	0
12/22/2007	6	5,648	60	1	0	1	8,922	3,329	5,593	7,625	(2,032)	0
12/23/2007	7	6,288	68	0	1	1	8,974	3,329	5,645	7,625	(1,980)	0
12/24/2007	1	4,801	57	0	1	1	8,402	3,329	5,073	7,625	(2,552)	0
12/25/2007	2	4,339	43	1	0	1	8,949	3,329	5,620	7,625	(2,005)	0
12/26/2007	3	4,732	54	0	0	1	8,780	3,329	5,451	7,625	(2,174)	0
12/27/2007	4	4,946	52	0	0	1	9,154	3,329	5,825	7,625	(1,800)	0
12/28/2007	5	4,666	49	0	0	1	9,116	3,329	5,787	7,625	(1,838)	0
12/29/2007	6	4,698	51	1	0	1	8,675	3,329	5,346	7,625	(2,279)	0
12/30/2007	7	4,774	54	0	1	1	8,585	3,329	5,256	7,625	(2,369)	0
12/31/2007	1	6,043	62	0	1	1	9,257	3,329	5,928	7,625	(1,697)	0
1/1/2008	2	7,047	77	1	0	0	9,230	3,329	5,901	7,625	(1,724)	0
1/2/2008	3	6,254	68	0	0	0	9,388	3,329	6,059	7,625	(1,566)	0
1/3/2008	4	5,142	52	0	0	0	9,499	3,329	6,170	7,625	(1,455)	0
1/4/2008	5	4,909	51	0	0	0	9,409	3,329	6,080	7,625	(1,545)	0
1/5/2008	6	3,947	46	1	0	0	8,554	3,329	5,225	7,625	(2,400)	0
1/6/2008	7	3,553	35	0	1	0	9,023	3,329	5,694	7,625	(1,931)	0
1/7/2008	1	3,867	36	0	0	0	9,470	3,329	6,141	7,625	(1,484)	0
1/8/2008	2	4,951	49	0	0	0	9,593	3,329	6,264	7,625	(1,361)	0
1/9/2008	3	4,750	48	0	0	0	9,428	3,329	6,099	7,625	(1,526)	0
1/10/2008	4	4,972	48	0	0	0	9,676	3,329	6,347	7,625	(1,278)	0
1/11/2008	5	5,041	50	0	0	0	9,556	3,329	6,227	7,625	(1,398)	0
1/12/2008	6	5,056	57	1	0	0	8,760	3,329	5,431	7,625	(2,194)	0
1/13/2008	7	6,503	67	0	1	0	9,465	3,329	6,136	7,625	(1,489)	0
1/14/2008	1	7,670	80	0	0	0	9,928	3,329	6,599	7,625	(1,026)	0
1/15/2008	2	5,961	68	0	0	0	9,077	3,329	5,748	7,625	(1,877)	0
1/16/2008	3	7,017	64	0	0	0	10,490	3,329	7,161	7,625	(464)	0
1/17/2008	4	7,039	72	0	0	0	9,851	3,329	6,522	7,625	(1,103)	0
1/18/2008	5	8,296	81	0	0	0	10,409	3,329	7,080	7,625	(545)	0
1/19/2008	6	8,050	85	1	0	0	9,616	3,329	6,287	7,625	(1,338)	0
1/20/2008	7	7,537	82	0	1	0	9,320	3,329	5,991	7,625	(1,634)	0
1/21/2008	1	7,473	71	0	0	0	10,388	3,329	7,059	7,625	(566)	0
1/22/2008	2	7,554	71	0	0	0	10,468	3,329	7,139	7,625	(486)	0
1/23/2008	3	8,307	81	0	0	0	10,448	3,329	7,119	7,625	(506)	0
1/24/2008	4	7,122	75	0	0	0	9,726	3,329	6,397	7,625	(1,228)	0
1/25/2008	5	5,839	62	0	0	0	9,458	3,329	6,129	7,625	(1,496)	0
1/26/2008	6	5,280	60	1	0	0	8,737	3,329	5,408	7,625	(2,217)	0
1/27/2008	7	4,130	48	0	1	0	8,551	3,329	5,222	7,625	(2,403)	0
1/28/2008	1	5,343	48	0	0	0	10,021	3,329	6,692	7,625	(933)	0
1/29/2008	2	9,192	85	0	0	0	11,046	3,329	7,717	7,625	92	1
1/30/2008	3	8,515	87	0	0	0	10,197	3,329	6,868	7,625	(757)	0
1/31/2008	4	7,244	74	0	0	0	9,959	3,329	6,630	7,625	(995)	0

OES Attachment R-3

MERC-PNG's Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Viking Peak Day Calculations

1/1/2007	1	4,731	55	0	1	0	8,673	3,329	5,344	7,625	(2,281)	0
1/2/2007	2	4,354	51	0	0	0	8,834	3,329	5,505	7,625	(2,120)	0
1/3/2007	3	3,825	38	0	0	0	9,296	3,329	5,967	7,625	(1,658)	0
1/4/2007	4	3,817	34	0	0	0	9,636	3,329	6,307	7,625	(1,318)	0
1/5/2007	5	3,871	39	0	0	0	9,309	3,329	5,980	7,625	(1,645)	0
1/6/2007	6	3,987	44	1	0	0	8,743	3,329	5,414	7,625	(2,211)	0
1/7/2007	7	4,871	45	0	1	0	9,540	3,329	6,211	7,625	(1,414)	0
1/8/2007	1	5,105	51	0	0	0	9,583	3,329	6,254	7,625	(1,371)	0
1/9/2007	2	5,443	56	0	0	0	9,511	3,329	6,182	7,625	(1,443)	0
1/10/2007	3	4,747	47	0	0	0	9,514	3,329	6,185	7,625	(1,440)	0
1/11/2007	4	7,242	69	0	0	0	10,313	3,329	6,984	7,625	(641)	0
1/12/2007	5	7,647	87	0	0	0	9,322	3,329	5,993	7,625	(1,632)	0
1/13/2007	6	6,395	75	1	0	0	8,705	3,329	5,376	7,625	(2,249)	0
1/14/2007	7	6,592	79	0	1	0	8,665	3,329	5,336	7,625	(2,289)	0
1/15/2007	1	7,159	78	0	0	0	9,524	3,329	6,195	7,625	(1,430)	0
1/16/2007	2	6,272	71	0	0	0	9,223	3,329	5,894	7,625	(1,731)	0
1/17/2007	3	5,909	51	0	0	0	10,389	3,329	7,060	7,625	(565)	0
1/18/2007	4	5,788	48	0	0	0	10,477	3,329	7,148	7,625	(477)	0
1/19/2007	5	5,663	61	0	0	0	9,364	3,329	6,035	7,625	(1,590)	0
1/20/2007	6	4,769	50	1	0	0	9,022	3,329	5,693	7,625	(1,932)	0
1/21/2007	7	5,097	53	0	1	0	9,129	3,329	5,800	7,625	(1,825)	0
1/22/2007	1	5,172	51	0	0	0	9,636	3,329	6,307	7,625	(1,318)	0
1/23/2007	2	5,093	52	0	0	0	9,451	3,329	6,122	7,625	(1,503)	0
1/24/2007	3	5,373	48	0	0	0	10,098	3,329	6,769	7,625	(856)	0
1/25/2007	4	4,987	56	0	0	0	9,107	3,329	5,778	7,625	(1,847)	0
1/26/2007	5	4,813	41	0	0	0	10,026	3,329	6,697	7,625	(928)	0
1/27/2007	6	7,107	68	1	0	0	9,951	3,329	6,622	7,625	(1,003)	0
1/28/2007	7	6,205	69	0	1	0	9,004	3,329	5,675	7,625	(1,950)	0
1/29/2007	1	7,322	67	0	0	0	10,529	3,329	7,200	7,625	(425)	0
1/30/2007	2	6,623	75	0	0	0	9,227	3,329	5,898	7,625	(1,727)	0
1/31/2007	3	6,707	68	0	0	0	9,832	3,329	6,503	7,625	(1,122)	0
2/1/2007	4	7,584	75	0	0	0	10,223	3,329	6,894	7,625	(731)	0
2/2/2007	5	7,809	79	0	0	0	10,132	3,329	6,803	7,625	(822)	0
2/3/2007	6	8,240	89	1	0	0	9,472	3,329	6,143	7,625	(1,482)	0
2/4/2007	7	8,354	85	0	1	0	9,931	3,329	6,602	7,625	(1,023)	0
2/5/2007	1	7,865	81	0	0	0	10,022	3,329	6,693	7,625	(932)	0
2/6/2007	2	7,837	78	0	0	0	10,230	3,329	6,901	7,625	(724)	0
2/7/2007	3	8,205	86	0	0	0	9,951	3,329	6,622	7,625	(1,003)	0
2/8/2007	4	7,951	80	0	0	0	10,185	3,329	6,856	7,625	(769)	0
2/9/2007	5	7,738	80	0	0	0	9,972	3,329	6,643	7,625	(982)	0
2/10/2007	6	6,448	77	1	0	0	8,644	3,329	5,315	7,625	(2,310)	0
2/11/2007	7	5,861	60	0	1	0	9,345	3,329	6,016	7,625	(1,609)	0
2/12/2007	1	6,979	77	0	0	0	9,427	3,329	6,098	7,625	(1,527)	0
2/13/2007	2	7,701	83	0	0	0	9,726	3,329	6,397	7,625	(1,228)	0
2/14/2007	3	7,672	77	0	0	0	10,120	3,329	6,791	7,625	(834)	0
2/15/2007	4	7,040	80	0	0	0	9,241	3,329	5,912	7,625	(1,713)	0
2/16/2007	5	5,858	59	0	0	0	9,678	3,329	6,349	7,625	(1,276)	0
2/17/2007	6	5,458	53	1	0	0	9,459	3,329	6,130	7,625	(1,495)	0
2/18/2007	7	5,424	54	0	1	0	9,424	3,329	6,095	7,625	(1,530)	0
2/19/2007	1	5,055	46	0	0	0	9,950	3,329	6,621	7,625	(1,004)	0
2/20/2007	2	4,155	42	0	0	0	9,337	3,329	6,008	7,625	(1,617)	0
2/21/2007	3	5,266	40	0	0	0	10,569	3,329	7,240	7,625	(385)	0
2/22/2007	4	4,847	49	0	0	0	9,444	3,329	6,115	7,625	(1,510)	0
2/23/2007	5	5,025	40	0	0	0	10,352	3,329	7,023	7,625	(602)	0
2/24/2007	6	4,561	42	1	0	0	9,462	3,329	6,133	7,625	(1,492)	0
2/25/2007	7	4,332	43	0	1	0	9,179	3,329	5,850	7,625	(1,775)	0
2/26/2007	1	4,485	43	0	0	0	9,590	3,329	6,261	7,625	(1,364)	0
2/27/2007	2	4,587	46	0	0	0	9,428	3,329	6,099	7,625	(1,526)	0
2/28/2007	3	4,596	42	0	0	0	9,778	3,329	6,449	7,625	(1,176)	0

OES Attachment R-3

MERC-PNG's Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Viking Peak Day Calculations

2/1/2008	5	5,446	55	0	0	0	9,642	3,329	6,313	7,625	(1,312)	0
2/2/2008	6	5,906	56	1	0	0	9,698	3,329	6,369	7,625	(1,256)	0
2/3/2008	7	4,908	47	0	1	0	9,467	3,329	6,138	7,625	(1,487)	0
2/4/2008	1	5,000	51	0	0	0	9,480	3,329	6,151	7,625	(1,474)	0
2/5/2008	2	6,588	72	0	0	0	9,403	3,329	6,074	7,625	(1,551)	0
2/6/2008	3	5,756	69	0	0	0	8,836	3,329	5,507	7,625	(2,118)	0
2/7/2008	4	5,025	56	0	0	0	9,093	3,329	5,764	7,625	(1,861)	0
2/8/2008	5	4,947	47	0	0	0	9,707	3,329	6,378	7,625	(1,247)	0
2/9/2008	6	8,062	71	1	0	0	10,668	3,329	7,339	7,625	(286)	0
2/10/2008	7	8,235	91	0	1	0	9,349	3,329	6,020	7,625	(1,605)	0
2/11/2008	1	7,354	77	0	0	0	9,837	3,329	6,508	7,625	(1,117)	0
2/12/2008	2	6,220	61	0	0	0	9,911	3,329	6,582	7,625	(1,043)	0
2/13/2008	3	6,526	65	0	0	0	9,912	3,329	6,583	7,625	(1,042)	0
2/14/2008	4	7,753	79	0	0	0	10,042	3,329	6,713	7,625	(912)	0
2/15/2008	5	6,763	69	0	0	0	9,812	3,329	6,483	7,625	(1,142)	0
2/16/2008	6	4,408	46	1	0	0	8,958	3,329	5,629	7,625	(1,996)	0
2/17/2008	7	6,585	57	0	1	0	10,366	3,329	7,037	7,625	(588)	0
2/18/2008	1	7,837	83	0	0	0	9,854	3,329	6,525	7,625	(1,100)	0
2/19/2008	2	8,408	90	0	0	0	9,874	3,329	6,545	7,625	(1,080)	0
2/20/2008	3	8,011	89	0	0	0	9,512	3,329	6,183	7,625	(1,442)	0
2/21/2008	4	6,062	71	0	0	0	8,976	3,329	5,647	7,625	(1,978)	0
2/22/2008	5	5,316	56	0	0	0	9,426	3,329	6,097	7,625	(1,528)	0
2/23/2008	6	4,413	56	1	0	0	8,241	3,329	4,912	7,625	(2,713)	0
2/24/2008	7	4,305	47	0	1	0	8,815	3,329	5,486	7,625	(2,139)	0
2/25/2008	1	5,350	59	0	0	0	9,186	3,329	5,857	7,625	(1,768)	0
2/26/2008	2	5,357	51	0	0	0	9,844	3,329	6,515	7,625	(1,110)	0
2/27/2008	3	4,988	54	0	0	0	9,258	3,329	5,929	7,625	(1,696)	0
2/28/2008	4	4,697	46	0	0	0	9,528	3,329	6,199	7,625	(1,426)	0
2/29/2008	5	5,402	53	0	0	0	9,694	3,329	6,365	7,625	(1,260)	0
12/1/2008	1	1,582	53	0	0	1	5,741	3,329	2,412	7,625	(5,213)	0
12/2/2008	2	4,779	48	0	0	1	9,274	3,329	5,945	7,625	(1,680)	0
12/3/2008	3	5,494	56	0	0	1	9,431	3,329	6,102	7,625	(1,523)	0
12/4/2008	4	6,054	62	0	0	1	9,517	3,329	6,188	7,625	(1,437)	0
12/5/2008	5	5,436	60	0	0	1	9,062	3,329	5,733	7,625	(1,892)	0
12/6/2008	6	6,098	66	1	0	1	8,901	3,329	5,572	7,625	(2,053)	0
12/7/2008	7	5,458	56	0	1	1	9,098	3,329	5,769	7,625	(1,856)	0
12/8/2008	1	5,614	63	0	0	1	8,992	3,329	5,663	7,625	(1,962)	0
12/9/2008	2	6,011	62	0	0	1	9,478	3,329	6,149	7,625	(1,476)	0
12/10/2008	3	5,876	50	0	0	1	10,243	3,329	6,914	7,625	(711)	0
12/11/2008	4	6,902	70	0	0	1	9,749	3,329	6,420	7,625	(1,205)	0
12/12/2008	5	5,342	55	0	0	1	9,317	3,329	5,988	7,625	(1,637)	0
12/13/2008	6	4,945	70	1	0	1	7,467	3,329	4,138	7,625	(3,487)	0
12/14/2008	7	7,109	97	0	1	1	7,614	3,329	4,285	7,625	(3,340)	0
12/15/2008	1	8,082	89	0	0	1	9,435	3,329	6,106	7,625	(1,519)	0
12/16/2008	2	7,300	77	0	0	1	9,569	3,329	6,240	7,625	(1,385)	0
12/17/2008	3	7,204	77	0	0	1	9,497	3,329	6,168	7,625	(1,457)	0
12/18/2008	4	6,650	75	0	0	1	9,037	3,329	5,708	7,625	(1,917)	0
12/19/2008	5	5,520	60	0	0	1	9,075	3,329	5,746	7,625	(1,879)	0
12/20/2008	6	6,745	83	1	0	1	8,244	3,329	4,915	7,625	(2,710)	0
12/21/2008	7	7,241	84	0	1	1	8,746	3,329	5,417	7,625	(2,208)	0
12/22/2008	1	6,847	75	0	0	1	9,303	3,329	5,974	7,625	(1,651)	0
12/23/2008	2	5,853	64	0	0	1	9,115	3,329	5,786	7,625	(1,839)	0
12/24/2008	3	6,094	76	0	0	1	8,448	3,329	5,119	7,625	(2,506)	0
12/25/2008	4	4,765	58	0	0	1	8,508	3,329	5,179	7,625	(2,446)	0
12/26/2008	5	3,786	46	1	0	1	8,153	3,329	4,824	7,625	(2,801)	0
12/27/2008	6	5,240	64	1	0	1	8,212	3,329	4,883	7,625	(2,742)	0
12/28/2008	7	4,832	56	0	1	1	8,480	3,329	5,151	7,625	(2,474)	0
12/29/2008	1	5,387	60	0	0	1	8,937	3,329	5,608	7,625	(2,017)	0
12/30/2008	2	6,667	82	0	0	1	8,566	3,329	5,237	7,625	(2,388)	0
12/31/2008	3	5,961	75	0	0	1	8,354	3,329	5,025	7,625	(2,600)	0

OES Attachment R-3

MERC-PNG's Design Day Regression Output and the OES's Analysis of MERC-PNG's Viking Peak Day Calculations

1/1/2009	4	5,705	67	1	0	0	8,677	3,329	5,348	7,625	(2,277)	0
1/2/2009	5	5,554	66	0	0	0	8,833	3,329	5,504	7,625	(2,121)	0
1/3/2009	6	5,384	72	1	0	0	7,967	3,329	4,638	7,625	(2,987)	0
1/4/2009	7	6,754	83	0	1	0	8,455	3,329	5,126	7,625	(2,499)	0
1/5/2009	1	6,107	73	0	0	0	8,884	3,329	5,555	7,625	(2,070)	0
1/6/2009	2	5,927	70	0	0	0	8,927	3,329	5,598	7,625	(2,027)	0
1/7/2009	3	6,915	72	0	0	0	9,727	3,329	6,398	7,625	(1,227)	0
1/8/2009	4	6,300	67	0	0	0	9,512	3,329	6,183	7,625	(1,442)	0
1/9/2009	5	6,166	69	0	0	0	9,264	3,329	5,935	7,625	(1,690)	0
1/10/2009	6	5,692	67	1	0	0	8,623	3,329	5,294	7,625	(2,331)	0
1/11/2009	7	5,644	60	0	1	0	9,169	3,329	5,840	7,625	(1,785)	0
1/12/2009	1	7,582	84	0	0	0	9,490	3,329	6,161	7,625	(1,464)	0
1/13/2009	2	7,924	90	0	0	0	9,398	3,329	6,069	7,625	(1,556)	0
1/14/2009	3	8,661	92	0	0	0	9,947	3,329	6,618	7,625	(1,007)	0
1/15/2009	4	8,564	94	0	0	0	9,717	3,329	6,388	7,625	(1,237)	0
1/16/2009	5	6,670	70	0	0	0	9,649	3,329	6,320	7,625	(1,305)	0
1/17/2009	6	4,909	50	1	0	0	9,152	3,329	5,823	7,625	(1,802)	0
1/18/2009	7	4,904	51	0	1	0	9,154	3,329	5,825	7,625	(1,800)	0
1/19/2009	1	5,450	50	0	0	0	10,018	3,329	6,689	7,625	(936)	0
1/20/2009	2	5,112	54	0	0	0	9,356	3,329	6,027	7,625	(1,598)	0
1/21/2009	3	4,973	54	0	0	0	9,244	3,329	5,915	7,625	(1,710)	0
1/22/2009	4	5,295	64	0	0	0	8,723	3,329	5,394	7,625	(2,231)	0
1/23/2009	5	7,053	84	0	0	0	8,961	3,329	5,632	7,625	(1,993)	0
1/24/2009	6	7,043	84	1	0	0	8,643	3,329	5,314	7,625	(2,311)	0
1/25/2009	7	7,149	83	0	1	0	8,898	3,329	5,569	7,625	(2,056)	0
1/26/2009	1	7,374	83	0	0	0	9,348	3,329	6,019	7,625	(1,606)	0
1/27/2009	2	6,596	77	0	0	0	9,026	3,329	5,697	7,625	(1,928)	0
1/28/2009	3	6,015	63	0	0	0	9,576	3,329	6,247	7,625	(1,378)	0
1/29/2009	4	6,846	71	0	0	0	9,732	3,329	6,403	7,625	(1,222)	0
1/30/2009	5	5,126	51	0	0	0	9,626	3,329	6,297	7,625	(1,328)	0
1/31/2009	6	3,892	40	1	0	0	8,958	3,329	5,629	7,625	(1,996)	0
2/1/2009	7	5,189	65	0	1	0	8,325	3,329	4,996	7,625	(2,629)	0
2/2/2009	1	7,467	82	0	0	0	9,550	3,329	6,221	7,625	(1,404)	0
2/3/2009	2	7,215	77	0	0	0	9,670	3,329	6,341	7,625	(1,284)	0
2/4/2009	3	6,347	69	0	0	0	9,417	3,329	6,088	7,625	(1,537)	0
2/5/2009	4	4,473	50	0	0	0	9,044	3,329	5,715	7,625	(1,910)	0
2/6/2009	5	3,771	43	0	0	0	8,894	3,329	5,565	7,625	(2,060)	0
2/7/2009	6	4,652	54	1	0	0	8,626	3,329	5,297	7,625	(2,328)	0
2/8/2009	7	3,735	44	0	1	0	8,461	3,329	5,132	7,625	(2,493)	0
2/9/2009	1	3,647	32	0	0	0	9,574	3,329	6,245	7,625	(1,380)	0
2/10/2009	2	3,727	35	0	0	0	9,411	3,329	6,082	7,625	(1,543)	0
2/11/2009	3	4,164	45	0	0	0	9,080	3,329	5,751	7,625	(1,874)	0
2/12/2009	4	4,917	57	0	0	0	8,911	3,329	5,582	7,625	(2,043)	0
2/13/2009	5	5,097	60	0	0	0	8,830	3,329	5,501	7,625	(2,124)	0
2/14/2009	6	5,659	62	1	0	0	8,962	3,329	5,633	7,625	(1,992)	0
2/15/2009	7	4,655	56	0	1	0	8,518	3,329	5,189	7,625	(2,436)	0
2/16/2009	1	4,537	54	0	0	0	8,812	3,329	5,483	7,625	(2,142)	0
2/17/2009	2	4,663	59	0	0	0	8,538	3,329	5,209	7,625	(2,416)	0
2/18/2009	3	6,415	71	0	0	0	9,329	3,329	6,000	7,625	(1,625)	0
2/19/2009	4	5,873	64	0	0	0	9,364	3,329	6,035	7,625	(1,590)	0
2/20/2009	5	5,399	64	0	0	0	8,872	3,329	5,543	7,625	(2,082)	0
2/21/2009	6	5,554	66	1	0	0	8,587	3,329	5,258	7,625	(2,367)	0
2/22/2009	7	5,750	63	0	1	0	9,038	3,329	5,709	7,625	(1,916)	0
2/23/2009	1	5,299	61	0	0	0	8,964	3,329	5,635	7,625	(1,990)	0
2/24/2009	2	3,992	49	0	0	0	8,612	3,329	5,283	7,625	(2,342)	0
2/25/2009	3	5,605	69	0	0	0	8,677	3,329	5,348	7,625	(2,277)	0
2/26/2009	4	6,422	86	0	0	0	8,200	3,329	4,871	7,625	(2,754)	0
2/27/2009	5	6,397	79	0	0	0	8,706	3,329	5,377	7,625	(2,248)	0
2/28/2009	6	6,167	73	1	0	0	8,614	3,329	5,285	7,625	(2,340)	0

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sharon Ferguson, hereby certify that I have this day, served copies of the following document on the attached list of persons by electronic filing, e-mail, or by depositing a true and correct copy thereof properly enveloped with postage paid in the United States Mail at St. Paul, Minnesota.

**Minnesota Office of Energy Security
Response Comments**

**Docket No. G007/M-09-1282; G011/M-09-1283; G011/M-09-1284; and
G011/M-09-1285**

Dated this 7th of June, 2010

/s/Sharon Ferguson

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Michael	Ahern	ahern.michael@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney, LLP	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Michael	Bradley	bradley@moss-barnett.com	Moss & Barnett	4800 Wells Fargo Ctr 90 S 7th St Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Marie	Doyle	marie.doyle@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy	800 LaSalle Avenue P O Box 59038 Minneapolis, MN 554590038	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Jack	Kegel		MMUA	Suite 400 3025 Harbor Lane North Plymouth, MN 554475142	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
James D.	Larson		Avant Energy Services	200 S 6th St Ste 300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Robert S	Lee	RSL@MCMLAW.COM	Mackall Crouse & Moore Law Offices	1400 AT&T Tower 901 Marquette Ave Minneapolis, MN 554022859	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	900 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@leonard.com	Leonard, Street & Deinard	150 S 5th St Ste 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Ann	Seha	seha.ann@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
James R.	Talcott		Northern Natural Gas Company	1111 South 103rd Street Omaha, NE 68124	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282
Gregory	Walters	gjwalters@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1282_09-1282

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Michael	Ahern	ahern.michael@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney, LLP	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Michael	Bradley	bradley@moss-barnett.com	Moss & Barnett	4800 Wells Fargo Ctr 90 S 7th St Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Marie	Doyle	marie.doyle@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy	800 LaSalle Avenue P O Box 59038 Minneapolis, MN 554590038	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Jack	Kegel		MMUA	Suite 400 3025 Harbor Lane North Plymouth, MN 554475142	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
James D.	Larson		Avant Energy Services	200 S 6th St Ste 300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Robert S	Lee	RSL@MCMLAW.COM	Mackall Crouse & Moore Law Offices	1400 AT&T Tower 901 Marquette Ave Minneapolis, MN 554022859	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	900 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@leonard.com	Leonard, Street & Deinard	150 S 5th St Ste 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Ann	Seha	seha.ann@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
James R.	Talcott		Northern Natural Gas Company	1111 South 103rd Street Omaha, NE 68124	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283
Gregory	Walters	gjwalters@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1283_09-1283

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Michael	Ahern	ahern.michael@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney, LLP	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Michael	Bradley	bradley@moss-barnett.com	Moss & Barnett	4800 Wells Fargo Ctr 90 S 7th St Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Marie	Doyle	marie.doyle@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy	800 LaSalle Avenue P O Box 59038 Minneapolis, MN 554590038	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Jack	Kegel		MMUA	Suite 400 3025 Harbor Lane North Plymouth, MN 554475142	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
James D.	Larson		Avant Energy Services	200 S 6th St Ste 300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Robert S	Lee	RSL@MCMLAW.COM	Mackall Crouse & Moore Law Offices	1400 AT&T Tower 901 Marquette Ave Minneapolis, MN 554022859	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	900 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@leonard.com	Leonard, Street & Deinard	150 S 5th St Ste 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Ann	Seha	seha.ann@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
James R.	Talcott		Northern Natural Gas Company	1111 South 103rd Street Omaha, NE 68124	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284
Gregory	Walters	gjwalters@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1284_09-1284

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Michael	Ahern	ahern.michael@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney, LLP	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Michael	Bradley	bradley@moss-barnett.com	Moss & Barnett	4800 Wells Fargo Ctr 90 S 7th St Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Marie	Doyle	marie.doyle@centerpointenergy.com	CenterPoint Energy	800 LaSalle Avenue P O Box 59038 Minneapolis, MN 554590038	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Burl W.	Haar	burl.haar@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	Suite 350 121 7th Place East St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Jack	Kegel		MMUA	Suite 400 3025 Harbor Lane North Plymouth, MN 554475142	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
James D.	Larson		Avant Energy Services	200 S 6th St Ste 300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Robert S	Lee	RSL@MCMLAW.COM	Mackall Crouse & Moore Law Offices	1400 AT&T Tower 901 Marquette Ave Minneapolis, MN 554022859	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	900 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@leonard.com	Leonard, Street & Deinard	150 S 5th St Ste 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Ann	Seha	seha.ann@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney	Suite 1500 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
James R.	Talcott		Northern Natural Gas Company	1111 South 103rd Street Omaha, NE 68124	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285
Gregory	Walters	gjwalters@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_9-1285_09-1285