Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2685 145th Street West
Rosemount, MN 55068
www.minnesotaenergyresources.com

May 1, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Daniel P. Wolf
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101

PUBLIC DOCUMENT – PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

Re: In the Matter of the Annual Service Quality Report for Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation for 2018

Docket Nos. G011/M-19-___

Dear Mr. Wolf:

Enclosed for filing is Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation's ("MERC's") 2018 Gas Service Quality Report. The nonpublic version of this filing contains private data on individuals. In particular, Attachments 9-A and 10 include customer addresses. This information is maintained by MERC as private customer data and has been excised from the public version of the filing in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13.679.

Please contact me at (414) 221-2374 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Mary L. Wolter
Mary L. Wolter
Director – Gas Regulatory Planning & Policy

Enclosures
cc: Service List

STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Katie J. Sieben	Chair
Dan Lipschultz	Commissioner
Valerie Means	Commissioner
Matthew Schuerger	Commissioner
John A. Tuma	Commissioner

In the Matter of the Annual Service Quality Report for Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation for 2018	Docket No. G011/M-19-___

2018 ANNUAL SERVICE QUALITY REPORT

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation ("MERC" or the "Company") submits this Gas Service Quality Report for 2018 in compliance with Minn. R. Part 7826 and the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's (the "Commission") April 12, 2019, Order Accepting Report, Requiring Compliance Filing, and Setting Additional Reporting Requirements in Docket No. G011/M-18-317.[1]

In the Commission's October 31, 2016, Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, the Commission required that MERC develop, in consultation with the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources (the "Department") and the Minnesota Office of the Attorney General—Residential Utilities and Antitrust Division (the "OAG"), a tool or survey to measure the effectiveness over time of the Improved Customer Experience ("ICE") Project as it relates to the customer services that were intended to be improved by the project.[2] The Commission further ordered that the Company report on its performance toward the identified benchmarks with MERC's annual gas service quality reporting.

This annual Gas Service Quality Report represents the second year in which MERC is reporting on its achievements with respect to the ICE Performance Indicators.[3] When

---

[1] This report also incorporates requirements set forth in the following orders: August 26, 2010, Order Setting Reporting Requirements in Docket No. G999/CI-09-409; March 6, 2012, Order Accepting Reports and Setting Further Requirements in Docket No. G007,011/M-10-374; October 23, 2015, Order in Docket No. G011/M-15-410; October 31, 2016, Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736; and February 9, 2018, Order in Docket Nos. G011/M-16-371 and G011/M17-343.

[2] *In the Matter of the Application of Minn. Energy Res. Corp. for Auth. to Increase Rates for Nat. Gas Serv. in Minn.*, Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND ORDER at 55, Order Point 11 (Oct. 31, 2016).

[3] In January 2017, MERC, the Department, and the OAG reached agreement regarding ten specific "Performance Indicators" to be used beginning in 2017 to measure the effectiveness of ICE, in addition to the service quality measures already reported on in MERC's annual gas service quality report. *In the Matter of the Application of Minn. Energy Res. Corp. for Auth. to Increase Rates for Nat. Gas Serv. in*

considering the overall Performance Indicators associated with the ICE Project, MERC has met or exceeded many of the identified metrics for calendar year 2018, continuing to demonstrate the overall effectiveness of the ICE Project in achieving improved customer service and delivering on the specific areas of customer service intended to be improved by ICE. While factors unrelated to the ICE Project negatively impacted some of MERC's 2018 Performance Indicators, as reflected in this filing, those factors do not undermine a conclusion that MERC has demonstrated the effectiveness over time of the ICE Project as it relates to the customer services that were intended to be improved by the project. MERC has demonstrated that the benchmarks have been met for the Company to retain the $500,000 set aside, in accordance with the Commission's October 31, 2016, Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order issued in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736.

Additionally, because MERC's 2017 and 2018 ICE performance metrics indicate that the ICE Project has achieved its stated objectives in improving customer service, MERC requests that the Commission determine that ongoing monitoring and reporting is no longer necessary, and that the $500,000 no longer needs to be set aside as a performance incentive. Now that ICE has been implemented, further significant improvements stemming directly from the ICE Project in the identified performance measures is not anticipated, although incremental improvements in a number of areas are likely to continue. MERC believes it has demonstrated improvements with respect to the identified ICE Performance Indicators and has fully explained areas where factors outside of the ICE Project have and will continue to impact overall performance.

This filing also addresses compliance with the Commission's April 12, 2019, Order Accepting Reporting, Requiring Compliance Filing, and Setting Additional Reporting Requirements issued in Docket No. G011/M-18-317. In particular, the Commission's Order required MERC to file, in its 2018 Gas Service Quality Report:

a. The utility's filing under 49 C.F.R. 192.1007(e): integrity management plan performance measures; monitoring results; and evaluation of effectiveness in a manner to establish a baseline for ongoing reporting.
b. A summary of any 2018 emergency response violations cited by the Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety ("MNOPS") along with a description of the violation and remediation in each circumstance.
c. The number of violation letters received by the utility from MNOPS during the year in question.
d. A discussion of how to provide ongoing monitoring and metrics towards the deployment of Excess Flow Valves ("EFVs") and manual service line shutoff valves pursuant to the Commission's order in Docket No. G999/CI-18-41.

MERC respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order accepting the Company's 2018 Gas Service Quality Report. Each of the service quality and ICE metrics is described and analyzed below.

Minn., Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, COMPLIANCE FILING—IMPROVED CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE (ICE) PROJECT FILING (Jan. 31, 2017).

A. Call Center Response Time

Each utility is required to report call center response times in terms of the percentage of calls answered within 20 seconds.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 1. As demonstrated in that Attachment and in Table 1, below, MERC's average call response time was 20 seconds for customer service calls. This increase over 2017 results is due to total call volumes increasing 8% from 2017 to 2018.

Table 1: Average Call Center Response Times 2010 – 2018

Year	Average Response Time
2010	17 seconds
2011	18 seconds
2012	20 seconds
2013	19 seconds
2014	36 seconds
2015	28 seconds
2016	38 seconds
2017	15 seconds
2018	20 seconds

B. Meter Reading Performance Data

Each utility is required to report the meter reading performance data contained in Minn. R. 7826.1400. Pursuant to that rule, the annual service quality report must include a detailed report on the utility's meter-reading performance, including for each customer class and for each calendar month:

A. the number and percentage of customer meters read by utility personnel;

B. the number and percentage of customer meters self-read by customers;

C. the number and percentage of customer meters that have not been read by utility personnel for periods of six to 12 months and for periods of longer than 12 months, and an explanation as to why they have not been read; and

D. data on monthly meter-reading staffing levels, by work center or geographical area.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachments 2 and 2-A. The data for self reads includes both estimates and customer self reads.

In its March 6, 2012, Order Accepting Reports and Setting Further Reporting Requirements issued in Docket No. G007,011/M-10-374, the Commission also requested utilities to explain in their annual reports whether the difference between the total percentage of meters (100%) and the percentage of meters read (by both the utility and the customers) is equal to the percentage of estimated meter reads.

MERC's system does not differentiate between an estimate and a customer read so the customer read numbers include both estimates and self-reads.

Consistent with MERC's response in past Gas Service Quality Reports, Attachment 2-A to this 2018 Gas Service Quality Report accounts for meter reading staffing based on payroll time charged to meter reading for MERC employees and full-time-equivalent ("FTE") staffing for MERC contract meter readers.

MERC's 2018 meter reading performance has continued to be strong and is consistent with prior reporting years with no meters not being read over six or twelve months. For 2018, MERC's meter reading staffing levels were somewhat higher than 2017, as reflected in Table 2, below:

Table 2: Meter Reader FTE 2015 – 2018

Year	FTE Meter Readers (internal and contract)
2015	32.50
2016	31.47
2017	30.72
2018	32.92

C. Involuntary Service Disconnections

In lieu of reporting data on involuntary service disconnections as stated in Minn. R. 7826.1500, each utility shall reference the data that it submits under Minn. Stat. §§ 216B.091 and 216B.096.

MERC Response: MERC refers to its monthly reports filed with the Commission under Minn. Stat. §§ 216B.091 and 216B.096, and attached to this report as Attachment 3. In particular:

1. The number of customers who received disconnection notices is reported in item 20 of MERC's monthly report.

2. The number of customers who sought Cold Weather Rule protection under Chapter 7820 is reported in item 3, and the number of customers who sought Cold Weather Rule protection and whose service was disconnected is provided in item 22 of MERC's monthly report.

3. The total number of customers whose service was disconnected involuntarily is provided in item 23 of MERC's monthly report, and the

number of customers whose service was disconnected for 24 hours or more is reported in item 34.

4. The number of customer accounts granted a reconnection request are reported in item 6 of MERC's monthly report.

As discussed in MERC's 2016 and 2017 Gas Service Quality Reports, MERC temporarily suspended disconnection activity during the transition to its new ICE system and during the period of system stabilization. As a result, MERC's 2016 disconnection rates were lower than prior years. The suspension of credit and collection activities during a customer information system conversion is common practice. In particular, the primary focus following conversion and during system stabilization is to ensure the ability to bill customers accurately and in a timely manner, and to respond to customer calls and inquiries. As those systems stabilize, credit and collection activities are reinitiated. MERC reinitiated its disconnection process in the latter part of 2016 and, as shown in Table 3, below, 2017 disconnection rates increased from 2016 levels. In 2018, disconnections returned to being more in line with historic levels.

Table 3: Residential Disconnections (2011-2018)

Year	Disconnection Notices Sent	# of CWR requests	% of CWR Granted	Involuntary Disconnects	% Restored in 24 Hours
2011	62,880	4,678	100%	7,944	51.86%
2012	55,611	5,407	100%	6,358	90.42%
2013	71,491	6,058	100%	8,487	81.34%
2014	87,069	7,014	100%	6,801	88.08%
2015	71,061	8,748	100%	5,393	48.23%
2016	2,690	4,649	100%	782	37.58%
2017	37,208	8,751	100%	1,744	81.36%
2018	58,151	10,014	100%	3,438	69.60%

D. Service Extension Requests

Each utility shall report the service extension request response time data contained in Minn. R. 7826.1600 (A)-(B), except that data reported under Minn. Stat. §§ 216B.091 and 216B.096, subd. 11, is not required.

7826.1600 REPORTING SERVICE EXTENSION REQUEST RESPONSE TIMES.

The annual service quality report must include a report on service extension request response times, including, for each customer class and each calendar month:

A. the number of customers requesting service to a location not previously served by the utility and the intervals between the date service was installed and the later of the in-service date requested by the customer or the date the premises were ready for service; and

B. the number of customers requesting service to a location previously served by the utility, but not served at the time of the request, and the intervals between the date service was installed and the later of the in-service date requested by the customer or the date the premises were ready for service.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 4. "New installs" represent new service requests at locations where no gas service exists, either because the location is new construction or because an alternate fuel source has been used there previously. "Existing" installs represent any building that has previously had natural gas service, but the service has been disconnected.

For locations not previously served, new service requests are either related to customers with new construction or customers requesting service to convert to natural gas. For locations previously served, new service requests consist of requests to turn on service after the service was disconnected at the previous customer's request. Reconnections occurring after disconnections for non-payment are not included in MERC's response.

E. Customer Deposits

Pursuant to Minn. R. 7826.1900, each utility shall report the number of customers who were required to make a deposit as a condition of receiving service.

In its March 6, 2012, Order Accepting Reports and Setting Further Reporting Requirements issued in Docket No. G007,011/M-10-374, the Commission also requested utilities to explain the types of deposits included in the reported number of "required customer deposits."

MERC Response: MERC collected 0 new deposits in 2018 as a condition to receive service. In total, MERC was holding 66 deposits at the end of 2018.

As discussed in MERC's July 30, 2018, Reply Comments filed in the Company's 2017 Gas Service Quality Report docket, Docket No. G011/M-18-317, in late 2017, MERC discovered that it collected deposits from low-income customers in violation of the Company's policy, and the deposits collected were higher than allowed under MERC's tariff. Upon realizing the mistake, the Company refunded all residential deposits collected in 2017. MERC also suspended collection of deposits in 2017, and that trend continued into 2018.

MERC filed a request for approval to increase the allowable amount of cash deposit or surety bond that can be required for residential customers on January 25, 2019, in Docket No. G011/M-19-108. In particular, MERC has proposed to increase the maximum allowable deposit amount from one to two months' worth of estimated or existing billings in order to be able to assess deposits for Residential customers in accordance with the same practices applicable to other WEC Energy Group utilities, consistent with Minnesota rules.

F. Customer Complaints

Each utility shall report the customer complaint data by customer class and calendar month, as required under Minn. R. 7826.2000, including:

A. the number of complaints received;

B. the number and percentage of complaints alleging billing errors, inaccurate metering, wrongful disconnection, high bills, inadequate service, and the number involving service-extension intervals, service-restoration intervals, and any other identifiable subject matter involved in five percent or more of customer complaints;

C. the number and percentage of complaints resolved upon initial inquiry, within ten days, and longer than ten days;

D. the number and percentage of all complaints resolved by taking any of the following actions:

(1) taking the action the customer requested;

(2) taking an action the customer and the utility agree is an acceptable compromise;

(3) providing the customer with information that demonstrates that the situation complained of is not reasonably within the control of the utility; or

(4) refusing to take the action the customer requested; and

E. the number of complaints forwarded to the utility by the commission's Consumer Affairs Office for further investigation and action.

MERC Response: See Attachment 5 to this filing. Attachment 5 also includes MERC's customer complaint report filed annually pursuant to Minnesota Rule 7820.0500. MERC notes that overall, the number of complaints received in 2018 is higher than the number of complaints received in 2017. The higher number of complaints is due to a change in our methodology used to track complaints, and the continued implementation and training on the updated methodology. Specifically, MERC has provided significant training to call center representatives to help identify when customers are not satisfied and to recognize when customers call multiple times. In these instances, a call center supervisor will perform a call back and all call backs are tracked as a complaint. As can be seen in Table 4, below, the change in MERC's complaint tracking complicates year-to-year historical comparisons, however, in the long-run, it will be beneficial to use a consistent methodology that comprehensively identifies all inquiries and appropriately categorizes customer complaints.

Table 4: Customer Complaints (2015-2018)

Year	2015	2016	2017	2018
# of Complaints	454	577	1,547	1,883

G. Telephone Answer Times

Each utility shall report data on telephone answer times to its gas emergency phone line calls.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 6.

H. Mislocates

Each utility shall report data on line mislocates, including the number of times a line is damaged due to a mismarked line or failure to mark a line.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 7.

I. Damaged Gas Lines

Each utility shall report data on the number of gas lines damaged. The damage shall be categorized according to whether it was caused by the utility's employees or contractors, or whether it was due to any other unplanned cause.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 8.

J. Service Interruptions

Each utility must report data on service interruptions. Each interruption shall be categorized according to whether it was caused by the utility's employees or contractors, or whether it was due to any other unplanned cause. Utilities must provide the number of customers affected by the service interruption and the average duration of the interruptions.[4]

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 9. MERC calculates total outage time beginning when the outage is reported and ending when gas is available to relight the appliances. The nonpublic version of this attachment contains customer addresses. This information is maintained by MERC as private customer data and has been excised from the public version of the filing in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13.679.

[4] *See In the Matter of the Annual Serv. Quality Report for Minn. Energy Res. Corp. for 2010*, Docket No. G007,011/M-10-374, ORDER ACCEPTING REPORTS AND SETTING FURTHER REQUIREMENTS at 3 (Mar. 6, 2012).

As shown in Attachment 9, and summarized in Attachment 10, May and August had outages that impacted a large number of customers. In May 2018, during planned work before a pressure upgrade, pressure was lost on our system impacting 308 customers. In August 2018, 320 customers were impacted by a single event that resulted from a mislocate that required the Rochester Fire Department to squeeze off the main.

K. MNOPS Reportable Events, Integrity Management Plan, and Excess Flow Valve Reporting

Each utility shall report summaries of major events that are immediately reportable to the MNOPS according to the criteria used by MNOPS to identify reportable events. Each utility shall also provide summaries of all service interruptions caused by system integrity pressure issues. Each summary shall include the following ten items:

- the location;
- when the incident occurred;
- how many customers were affected;
- how the company was made aware of the incident;
- the root cause of the incident;
- the actions taken to fix the problem;
- what actions were taken to contact customers;
- any public relations or media issues;
- whether the customer or the company relighted; and
- the longest any customer was without gas service during the incident.

In addition, in the Commission's April 12, 2019, Order Accepting Reporting, Requiring Compliance Filing, and Setting Additional Reporting Requirements in Docket No. G011/M-18-317, the Commission Ordered MERC to file the following:

- The utility's filing under 49 CFR 192.1007(e): integrity management plan performance measures; monitoring results; and evaluation of effectiveness in a manner to establish a baseline for ongoing reporting.
- A summary of any 2018 emergency response violations cited by MNOPS along with a description of the violation and remediation in each circumstance.
- The number of violation letters received from MNOPS during the year in question.

- A discussion of how to provide ongoing monitoring and metrics towards the deployment of excess flow valves and manual service line shut off valves pursuant to the Commission's Order in Docket No. G999/CI-18-41.

MERC Response: Included in Attachment 12 are MERC's performance measures required under Title 49 C.F.R. § 192.1007(e). In particular, Section 192.1007(e) requires operators to develop and monitor performance measures from an established baseline to evaluate the effectiveness of its integrity management program, including the following: (1) number of leaks either eliminated or repaired, identified by cause and material; (2) number of excavation damages; (3) number of excavation tickets; and (4) additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's integrity management plan. The results of these performance measures are considered in MERC's ongoing evaluation of threats and risks to its distribution system.

As reflected in Attachment 12, in addition to tracking data regarding hazardous leaks and other leaks eliminated or repaired by cause and material and number of excavation damages and excavation tickets, MERC has identified additional measures to evaluate the effectiveness of its integrity management plan as a result of risk evaluation and analysis. Those measures include external corrosion on all steel, atmospheric corrosion on meter sets, emergency response times, and percentage of leaks eliminated or repaired within one year.

For each performance measure, the established baseline is identified and described in Attachment 12. The baseline for each measure is based on available data. For example, MERC has developed a ten-year baseline for leaks (2006-2015) and a five-year baseline with respect to excavation damages, excavation tickets, and the ratio of damages to excavation tickets. Attachment 12 also describes the effectiveness criteria for each performance measure, relative to the baseline, and provides data regarding 2018 results relative to the established baseline. The purpose of the performance metrics under 49 C.F.R. § 192.1007(e) is to allow gas system operators to evaluate the effectiveness of their integrity management programs relative to an established baseline in order to determine progress and identify the need for any accelerated action.

While these performance metrics guide MERC's ongoing evaluation of system integrity and risk, a deeper evaluation of the underlying data is necessary and important to understanding trends in increasing or diminishing effectiveness. MERC's integrity management risk analysis is an ongoing process of understanding what factors affect the risk posed by threats to the gas distribution system and where they are relatively more important than others. The primary objectives in the evaluation and ranking of gas distribution system risks are to:

- Consider each applicable current and potential threat;
- Consider the likelihood of failure (frequency) associated with each threat;
- Consider the potential consequences of such a failure;

- Estimate and rank the risks posed to the distribution system; and
- Consider the relevance of threats in one location to other areas.

MERC's integrity management risk analysis incorporates factors beyond the data provided in Attachment 12 (i.e., leaks and excavation damages) including consequence, risk and consequence probability, and frequency (e.g., the relative percentage of leaks by cause to the total number of leaks for the system). And while the identified effectiveness criteria provide a trigger for further investigation, a deeper analysis of the data is necessary to properly and fully evaluate risk and identify any appropriate actions to mitigate or address risks. Consequently, the Company is constantly reviewing risk and effectiveness and reprioritizing based on current data. Notably, as construction related to right-of-way relocation work, reliability, and integrity management has increased in recent years, so too has the available data and visibility into risks on MERC's system. For example, external corrosion that would not have been detected during a leak survey frequently is identified during construction projects necessitating the excavation of a portion of the distribution system.

The required information regarding MNOPS reportable events and MNOPS emergency response violations is provided in Attachments 10 and 10A. The Nonpublic version of Attachment 10 includes "private data on individuals," such as customer addresses. This information is maintained by MERC as private customer data, and has been excised from the Public version of this filing pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13.679.

With respect to the number of violation letters received from MNOPS during the year in question, Table 5, below, provides the number of violation letters MERC received from MNOPS during 2018, categorized by type. This does not include the emergency response violations as detailed in Attachment 10A.

Table 5: MNOPS Violation Letters (2018)

Category	# of violation letters received
Locating Underground Facility	8 (notices of probable violation)

Finally, with respect to EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves, the Commission required that MERC provide a discussion of how to provide ongoing monitoring and metrics toward the deployment of EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves pursuant to the Commission's Order in Docket No. G999/CI-18-41.

The Commission issued an Order Finding that Excess Flow Valves Comply with Federal Regulations and Taking Other Actions on August 20, 2018, in Docket No. G999/CI-18-41. That order required the natural gas utilities to report on the current status of installations of EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves across the utility's service area and planned installations of EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves through 2025.

As discussed in MERC's December 18, 2018, compliance filing, since 2004, MERC has installed EFVs on all new residential and small commercial service lines with known customer loads not exceeding 1,000 standard cubic feet per hour ("SCFH") as part of our routine installation procedures. For new or replaced service lines with installed meter capacity exceeding 1,000 SCFH, federal regulations require the installation of either a manual service line shut-off valve or, if possible based on sound engineering analysis and availability, an EFV. When applicable and EFVs are not an option, MERC will install manual service shut-off valves as an added safety measure.

As shown in Table 6, below, through the end of 2018, approximately 50,000 EFVs and 124 manual shut-off valves had been installed on MERC's service lines based on required reporting to PHMSA. In particular, PHMSA requires annual reporting on the number of EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves installed during the calendar year and an estimated total number of EFVs and manual service line shut-off valves on the system at the end of the calendar reporting year. MERC proposes to continue to monitor and track these installations, consistent with annual PHMSA reporting, and report annual updates in future Gas Service Quality Reports.

Table 6: EFV and Manual Shut-Off Valve Installations (Through 2018)

	2010	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Total Estimated Services with Equipment at End of 2018**
EFVs	711	1,477	3,536	2,678	3,123	2,995	3,885	4,421	4,007	50,363[5]
Manual Shut-Off Valves*								31	93	124

*Manual Shut-off Valve regulations went into effect in 2017

[5] MERC has been installing EFVs since 2004 but required reporting to PHMSA did not begin until 2011. PHMSA reporting requires MERC to provide the actual number of EFVs and shut-off valves installed during the previous year and the total number of services with those devices at the end of the year.

L. Notification of Reportable Events

Each utility shall provide the Commission and the Department with notification of reportable events as they are defined by MNOPS, contemporaneous with the utility's notification of the event to MNOPS. The notice should be sent to the Commission's Consumer Affairs Office at consumer.puc@state.mn.us and shall describe the location and cause of the event, the number of customers affected, the expected duration of the event, and the utility's best estimate of when service will be restored.

MERC Response: MERC will continue to provide the Commission and the Department with notification of reportable events requiring the evacuation of 10 or more people contemporaneous with the utility's notification of the event to MNOPS through reporting to the Commission's Consumer Affairs Office.

M. Gas Emergency Response Times

Each utility shall report data on gas emergency response times and include the percentage of emergencies responded to: (1) within one hour, and (2) within more than one hour.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 6. The gas emergency call response times include all calls reporting a suspected gas leak, as well as all line hits. MERC also reports the average number of minutes it takes to respond to an emergency. The information provided in Attachment 6 includes response times for all calls reporting a suspected gas leak and line hits. The information in Attachment 6 is the same information provided to MNOPS.

As required by the Commission in its February 9, 2018, Order accepting MERC's 2015 and 2016 Gas Service Quality Reports issued in Docket Nos. G011/M-16-371 and G011/M-17-343, MERC provides the emergency response times in total and without farm tap customers. Page 1 of Attachment 6 provides emergency response times for all customers, page 2 provides emergency response times for all non-farm tap customers, and page 3 provides emergency response times for farm tap customers.

N. Customer Service-Related Operations and Maintenance Expenses

Each utility shall report customer-service related operations and maintenance expenses. The reports shall include only Minnesota-regulated, customer-service expenses and shall be based on the costs each utility records in its FERC accounts 901 and 903, plus payroll taxes and benefits.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment 11. An increase in charges to FERC Account 901000 between 2017 and 2018 is related to postage expenses associated with mailing of bills to customers. In 2017, these expenses were accounted for in FERC Account 905000 and not reported in the Gas Service Quality Report, but in 2018, they were recorded in FERC Account 901000.

O. ICE Performance Indicators

As noted above, the Commission's October 31, 2016, Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, required that MERC develop, in consultation with the Department and the OAG, a tool or survey to measure the effectiveness over time of the ICE Project as it relates to the customer services that were intended to be improved by the project.[6] The Commission further ordered that the Company report on its performance toward the identified benchmarks annually with MERC's gas service quality reporting. In particular, the Commission's Order provided:

> On an annual basis starting in 2017, MERC shall place $500,000 from ratepayers into an account.
>
> a. By February 2017 MERC shall develop a tool or survey to measure the effectiveness over time of the ICE project as it relates to the customer services that were intended to be improved by the project. Any survey, consultant, program, or tool to measure project effectiveness must be adopted in consultation with the Department and the OAG.
>
> b. The Company, after consultation with the Department and the OAG, shall set annual ICE-project customer-service benchmarks to be reached by the end of 2017. The Company may modify these benchmarks and shall report annually unless the Commission determines ongoing monitoring is no longer necessary and that the $500,000 no longer needs to be set aside as a performance incentive.
>
> c. The Company shall report performance towards these benchmarks annually at the same time they do their service-quality reporting. At that time the Commission will determine whether the benchmarks for retention of the $500,000 have been met.

MERC Response: In accordance with the agreed-upon Performance Indicators identified in consultation with the Department and the OAG, and consistent with MERC's reporting on its 2017 ICE Performance Indicators, MERC addresses the following metrics to measure the effectiveness of the ICE Project during 2018:

(1) **customer transaction satisfaction**: measures customer satisfaction with their transaction based on a third-party survey (transactions include customer service calls, moves, etc.);

(2) **residential first call resolution**: measures customers' perception of resolving their issue on their first contact;

---

[6] *In the Matter of the Application of Minn. Energy Res. Corp. for Auth. to Increase Rates for Nat. Ga Serv. in Minn.*, Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND ORDER at 55, Order Point 11 (Oct. 31, 2016).

(3) **billing accuracy**: percentage of bills that are not cancelled, rebilled, or adjusted;

(4) **billing timeliness**: percentage of bills created within the billing window, not including any impacts from printing and mailing processes;

(5) **even payment plan adoption**: percent of customers on even payment plan;

(6) **electronic bill adoption**: percent of customer accounts enrolled in e-billing;

(7) **electronic payment adoption**: percent of electronic payments;

(8) **field service appointments kept**: percentage of customer appointments kept;

(9) **IT/security**: number of masked data fields and number of tokenized customer data fields; and

(10) **net write off as percentage of revenue**: the ratio of the dollar amount of receivables written off less recoveries against gross write-offs, divided by rolling 12-months revenue.

Attachment 13 shows the Company's achievements with respect to each of the agreed-upon ICE Performance Indicators and each Performance Indicator is discussed below. Consistent with MERC's commitment in Docket No. G011/M-18-317, MERC is also providing (1) an explanation of the aspects of the ICE project that are expected to contribute to continuous improvement in each Performance Indicator, (2) identification of any barriers to achieving continuous improvement for each metric; and (3) MERC's expectations of future performance.[7]

1. Customer Transaction Satisfaction

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, the value to customers from this Performance Indicator is measured by customers' overall satisfaction with calls to customer service and other transactions.

[7] *In the Matter of the Annual Serv. Quality Report for Minn. Energy Res. Corp. for 2017*, Docket No. G011/M-18-317, DEPARTMENT RESPONSE COMMENTS at 4 (Aug. 20, 2018) ("In response to the Department's Comments, MERC provided a table showing, for each metric, the aspects of ICE that are contributing to continuous improvement, the barriers to expected achievements, and MERC's expectation for future performance. The Department believes this information provides valuable insight into MERC's 2017 performance, and requests that the Company provide this information in future reports.").

As discussed in MERC's 2017 Gas Service Quality Report filed in Docket No. G011/M-18-317, in 2017, based on customer feedback and after initial testing, MERC shifted from third-party telephone surveys to e-mail surveys. As a result of this change, in order to provide a meaningful comparison to the baseline measurement, MERC completed an analysis to allow for statistical adjustment of results under the newly-implemented e-mail survey method as compared to the previously-used telephone survey method. In particular, testing was performed between July 18, 2016, and September 25, 2016, across all WEC utilities to evaluate the impact of moving from the telephone survey to an e-mail-based survey. During this testing period, the Company collected 542 completed surveys from MERC residential customers, 315 of which were e-mail surveys and 227 of which were telephone surveys. Conducting surveys using both methods (telephone and e-mail) over the same period allowed for an isolation of differences in customer satisfaction reporting attributable to the survey method. The result of the comparison was that Customer Transaction Satisfaction was 8.3 percentage points higher for surveys conducted via telephone compared to e-mail surveys. In response to feedback from the Department, this data was utilized to provide a statistically-adjusted comparison of 2016 Customer Transaction Satisfaction (under telephone surveys) to 2017 results (under e-mail surveys).

This same statistical adjustment methodology was applied to MERC's 2018 Customer Transaction Satisfaction results. As reflected in MERC's 2017 service quality filing, the target performance for Customer Transaction Satisfaction for 2018 was continuous improvement from pre-ICE baseline levels, driving toward first quartile performance. As shown in Table 7, below, and in Attachment 13, 2018 statistically-adjusted performance of 86.90 percent exceeded both 2016 and 2017 performance and falls within first quartile performance. Performance for this indicator also continued to significantly exceed the baseline (pre-ICE) level.

Table 7: Customer Transaction Satisfaction

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance (statistically adjusted)	2018 Performance (statistically adjusted)
62%	83.6%	72%	83.6%	86.8%	86.9%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in customer transaction satisfaction, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance. As discussed in Docket No. G011/M-18-317, the target performance of continuous improvement should be viewed in the context of each performance metric, taking into consideration the performance achievements that can be specifically attributed to the ICE Project as well as factors outside of the customer information system that impact results. Because each of the metrics is affected by much more than just the ICE technology or platform, MERC could never achieve, much less guarantee, that year after year each metric would improve. Rather, "continuous improvement" can be

achieved, and should be evaluated, over a longer period of time, starting with the 2013-2015 baseline performance.

2. Residential First Call Resolution

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing, the value to customers from this Performance Indicator is measured by the amount of time a customer needs to spend to resolve issues or concerns, and the metric gauges whether customers successfully resolved their reason for contacting the Company with their first contact. The target performance for 2018 for Residential First Call Resolution was to maintain achievements within the second quartile driving towards eventual first quartile performance.

As summarized in Table 8 below and in Attachment 13, performance for 2018 with respect to Residential First Call Resolution increased from 2016, climbing from 81.78 percent in 2016, 83.30 percent in 2017, and 91.50 percent in 2018. MERC achieved first quartile performance in 2018.

Table 8: Residential First Call Resolution

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
80.67%	85%	79%	81.78%	83.30%	91.50%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Residential First Call Resolution, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

3. Billing Accuracy

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, this Performance Indicator is measured by whether customers receive accurate bills. The target performance for 2018 for Billing Accuracy was to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2018 and beyond, dependent on other external factors.

As shown in Table 9, below, and in Attachment 13, performance related to this indicator in 2018 trended downward from 2017, but the reduction in 2018 results was unrelated to ICE. Rather, the decrease was driven by meter reader staffing issues that were encountered in 2018. Turnover in meter reader staffing required that MERC supplement with staffing from temporary workers who required additional training, resulting in more inaccurate meter reads and inaccurate bills in 2018.

In the absence of automatic meter reading ("AMR") or advanced metering infrastructure ("AMI"), MERC does not anticipate achieving first quartile performance with respect to

this metric and meter reading staffing issues will likely continue to impact performance going forward until MERC's AMI project is implemented in 2019 and 2020. While replacement of MERC's outdated billing system created opportunities for improvements in billing accuracy and allowed for automation of more complex billing functions, factors unrelated to the customer information system have and will continue to impact performance with respect to this metric. Demonstration of the effectiveness of the ICE Project with respect to billing is not, and should not be, undermined by staffing issues that are encountered with respect to meter reading.

Table 9: Billing Accuracy

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
99.53%	99.93%	99.79%	99.77%	98.93%	98.85%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Billing Accuracy, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

4. Billing Timeliness

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, this Performance Indicator is measured by the timeliness of customer bills. Timely bills allow customers to efficiently predict and manage their monthly expenditures. The target performance for 2018 for Billing Timeliness was to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2018 and beyond, dependent on other external factors.

As with 2017, 2018 performance came very close to achieving first quartile performance of 99.50 percent based on industry benchmarking data. Performance in 2018 was 99.37 percent or 0.13 percent below the first quartile entry point. While the 2018 results were slightly below 2017 results, MERC attributes this to the same meter reader staffing issue that impacted Billing Accuracy, as discussed above. For example, MERC has had to hold bills to avoid using multiple months of estimated reads, and those bills are delayed until the Company can obtain an actual read. Additionally, weather can impact billing timeliness by impacting meter reading if roads are closed and meters are inaccessible due to significant snowfalls or rainfalls. Finally, issues such as customer billing disputes can and do occasionally affect billing timeliness. Even a small number of bill issues could result in a shift from the first to second quartile, given the narrow margin of performance at those levels.

Table 10: Billing Timeliness

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
99.89%	99.50%	99.00%	98.65%	99.48%	99.37%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Billing Timeliness, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

5. Even Payment Plan Adoption

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, Even Payment Plan Adoption is measured by how many customers choose this option to stabilize their monthly bills. The target performance for 2018 for the Even Payment Plan Adoption Performance Indicator was to maintain achievements within the second quartile, moving toward eventual first quartile performance of 16.8 percent.

With respect to the Even Payment Plan Adoption Performance Indicator, as shown in Table 11 and Attachment 13, for 2018, MERC has seen continued improvement from the performance baseline (pre-ICE) of 14.43 percent; from 2016 of 15.12 percent; and from 2017 of 15.51 percent performance levels. In comparison, 2018 performance achieved 16.00 percent, trending towards the first quartile of 16.80 percent. MERC is achieving its performance target, improving within the second quartile moving toward first quartile performance of 16.80 percent.

Table 11: Even Payment Plan Adoption

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
14.43%	16.80%	11.90%	15.12%	15.51%	16.00%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Even Payment Plan Adoption, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

6. Electronic Bill Adoption

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, this Performance Indicator is measured by the number of customers who choose to receive electronic bills. Implementation of the ICE Project contributed to the optimization of this performance measure by making the electronic billing application more user-friendly for customers, increasing mobile options, and allowing customers to

continue electronic billing if they move and transfer service to a new address. The target performance for 2018 for Electronic Bill Adoption was to maintain first quartile performance.

With respect to the Electronic Bill Adoption Performance Indicator, for 2018, performance exceeded the baseline (pre-ICE), as well as 2016 and 2017 performance levels. In particular, baseline performance was 20.27 percent (2013-2015), 2016 performance was 22.38 percent, and 2017 performance was 26.21, while 2018 performance achieved 30.50 percent. Additionally, MERC achieved its target performance of maintaining first quartile performance.

Table 12: Electronic Bill Adoption

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
20.27%	14.50%	10.30%	22.38%	26.21%	30.50%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Electronic Bill Adoption, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

7. Electronic Payment Adoption

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, this Performance Indicator is measured by whether customers opt to make payments electronically. Implementation of the ICE Project contributed to increases in this performance measure by making the electronic billing application more user-friendly for customers, increasing mobile options, and allowing customers to continue electronic billing if they move and transfer service to a new address. The target performance for 2018 for Electronic Payment Adoption was to maintain first quartile performance.

With respect to the Electronic Payment Adoption Performance Indicator, for 2018, MERC exceeded both the performance baseline as well as 2016 and 2017 performance, maintaining first quartile performance. In particular, as shown in Table 13, below, and Attachment 13, baseline performance was 55.50 percent (2013-2015), 2016 performance was 57.58 percent, and 2017 performance was 60.42 percent, while 2018 performance increased to 60.90 percent. Additionally, MERC achieved its target performance of maintaining first quartile performance.

Table 13: Electronic Payment Adoption

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
55.50%	51.60%	45.30%	57.58%	60.42%	60.90%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Electronic Payment Adoption, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

8. Field Service Appointments Kept

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, the value to customers from this Performance Indicator is that keeping field service appointments results in customer convenience and satisfaction by not having to reschedule appointments or miss additional work to obtain service. The target performance for 2018 for the Field Service Appointments Kept Performance Indicator was to maintain first quartile performance.

With respect to the Field Service Appointments Kept Performance Indicator, for 2018, MERC exceeded 2016 performance and achieved the performance benchmark of maintaining first quartile performance.[8] As reflected in Table 14, below, and Attachment 13, in 2018, MERC kept 99.99 percent of field service appointments.

Table 14: Field Service Appointments Kept

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
N/A	99.0%	98.6%	99.89%	99.99%	99.99%

Attachment 13 to this filing also provides a discussion of the aspects of ICE that contribute toward improvement in Field Service Appointments Kept, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

9. IT/Security

As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, Compliance Filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, this metric measures the increased security of customer data. Though it is difficult to measure avoided data breaches directly, this metric aims to quantify the customer service improvements related to information technology security available as a result of ICE implementation.

[8] As shown in Attachment 13, there is no baseline comparison for the Field Service Appointments Kept performance indicator.

Prior to the ICE Project, MERC's customer information system did not have the capability to mask or tokenize customer information fields, resulting in a baseline of zero fields masked or tokenized. With the ICE Project implementation, the total number of customer data fields that are secured via masking or tokenization increased to approximately 1,386,000. These protected fields include information such as bank account information, birthdates, driver's license numbers, income, social security numbers, and credit card information, among others.

In 2018, MERC continued to achieve the same level of IT security protection and customer data masking and tokenization. As discussed in MERC's January 31, 2017, compliance filing, though the number of tokenized fields per customer is not expected to increase in the near term, this metric captures the significant data security improvements resulting from the ICE Project.

10. Net Write-Offs as a Percentage of Revenue

With respect to the Net Write-Offs as a Percentage of Revenue Performance Indicator, MERC noted in the Company's January 31, 2017, compliance filing submitted in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736, that while ICE is intended to improve write-offs, gas prices and weather dominate the overall write-off impact. In particular, customer payments are more impacted by higher or lower bills (because of gas costs or colder or warmer weather) than MERC's collection activities. Because other outside factors have a significant impact on write-offs, it is difficult to measure improvements over time. Nevertheless, MERC agreed that reporting on write-offs could provide useful data and information and that the Company would attempt to provide a narrative explanation of factors outside of ICE that are or may be impacting this metric as part of the annual reporting.

Acknowledging that factors outside of collection activities significantly impact this metric, MERC's performance target with respect to the Net Write-Offs as a Percentage of Revenue Performance Indicator was continuous improvement within the second quartile.

For 2018, MERC's Net Write-Offs as a Percentage of Revenue were 0.75 percent, which is a decline in performance as compared to the baseline (pre-ICE) as well as 2016 and 2017 levels. While there was a decline in performance with respect to this measures, MERC believes it has seen improvements resulting from the implementation of ICE that contribute to reducing or containing uncollectible expense, such as increased use of e-billing, e-payment, and payment options. Such behaviors tend to help reduce uncollectible expense. Conversely, factors unrelated to the ICE Project such as the colder than normal winter resulting in higher overall customer bills during 2018, negatively impacted total net write offs.

Table 15: Net Write Offs as a Percentage of Revenue

Baseline 2013-2015 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point	2016 Performance	2017 Performance	2018 Performance
0.58%	0.35%	0.52%	0.73%	0.58%	0.75%

Attachment 13 to this filing provides a discussion of the aspects of the ICE Project that contribute toward improvement in Net Write-Offs as a Percent of Revenue, identified barriers to continuous improvement within this measure, and expected future performance.

The Company will continue to target performance within the second quartile, driving towards eventual first quartile performance with respect to this indicator to the extent such performance is achievable in consideration of external factors affecting overall write offs. MERC will also continue to provide a narrative explanation of the factors impacting performance with respect to this measure.

CONCLUSION

When considering the overall Performance Indicators associated with the ICE Project, MERC has met or exceeded many of the identified metrics for calendar year 2018, continuing to demonstrate the overall effectiveness of the ICE Project in achieving improved customer service and delivering on the specific areas of customer service intended to be improved by the ICE Project. While factors unrelated to the ICE Project negatively impacted some of MERC's 2018 Performance Indicators, as reflected in this filing, those factors do not undermine a conclusion that MERC has demonstrated the effectiveness over time of the ICE Project as it relates to the customer services that were intended to be improved by the project. Further, as summarized in this report, MERC has continued its success on many of its standard gas service quality reporting metrics as well. MERC has demonstrated that the benchmarks have been met for the Company to retain the $500,000 and requests that the Commission issue an Order authorizing the Company to retain the $500,000 set aside, in accordance with the Commission's October 31, 2016, Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and Order issued in Docket No. G011/GR-15-736.

Additionally, because MERC's 2017 and 2018 ICE performance metrics indicate that the ICE Project has achieved its stated objectives in improving customer service, MERC requests that the Commission determine that ongoing monitoring and reporting is no longer necessary, and that the $500,000 no longer needs to be set aside as a performance incentive. Now that ICE has been implemented, further significant improvements stemming directly from the ICE Project in the identified performance measures are not anticipated, although incremental improvements in a number of areas are likely to continue. MERC believes it has demonstrated improvements with respect to the identified ICE Performance Indicators and has fully explained areas where factors outside of the ICE Project have and will continue to impact overall performance.

MERC respectfully requests that the Commission accept MERC's 2018 Gas Service Quality Report as in compliance with all applicable reporting requirements and find that the Company has demonstrated that MERC has satisfied the benchmarks set for 2018 associated with the ICE Project.

Dated: May 1, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

BRIGGS AND MORGAN, P.A.

By: *<u>/s/ Kristin M. Stastny</u>*

Kristin M. Stastny
2200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 977-8656
kstastny@briggs.com

Attorney for Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

Call Center Response Time

Calls answered within 20 seconds

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Average	Total
Total calls	20,482	21,067	22,759	23,233	23,072	23,188	20,449	20,974	20,836	27,280	21,247	19,392	21,998	263,979
Average speed of answer (seconds)	16	32	32	18	17	17	14	18	17	28	16	11	20	
% answered in 20 seconds	81%	66%	65%	83%	80%	82%	83%	81%	80%	72%	84%	89%	79%	

Answer time for gas emergency phone lines

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Average	Total
Total calls	2,045	1,763	1,736	1,723	1,966	1,836	1,808	1,836	1,761	2,291	1,711	1,444	1,827	21,920
Average speed of answer (seconds)	9	11	10	3	4	4	3	4	4	6	4	3	6	
% answered in 15 seconds	89%	82%	87%	98%	96%	96%	97%	96%	97%	91%	97%	98%	94%	

Response:
Average speed of answer was met however overall service level fell short by one percent. The lower than average performance in earlier 2018 caused continuous strain to meet the 80%. Actions were taken to increase staffing in response to higher call volumes.

Meter Reading Performance

	Total meters	# company read	% company read	# self-read	% of self-read	# not read in 6-12 months	% not read in 6-12 months	# not read > 12 months	% not read > 12 months	Comments
without farm taps										
January	247,283	239,622	96.90%	119	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
February	220,268	215,346	97.77%	111	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
March	236,237	230,815	97.70%	129	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
April	233,774	230,096	98.43%	116	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
May	235,704	232,465	98.63%	101	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
June	237,106	232,465	98.04%	98	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
July	233,458	230,566	98.76%	88	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
August	239,943	237,122	98.82%	93	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
September	247,365	245,757	99.35%	98	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
October	269,781	266,681	98.85%	102	0.04%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
November	222,566	221,459	99.50%	108	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
December	227,782	221,559	97.27%	110	0.05%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
with farm taps										
January	248,909	239,838	96.36%	855	0.34%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
February	221,846	215,492	97.14%	809	0.36%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
March	237,836	231,002	97.13%	896	0.38%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
April	235,604	230,675	97.91%	827	0.35%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
May	238,307	234,021	98.20%	778	0.33%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
June	239,307	233,491	97.57%	678	0.28%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
July	235,130	230,800	98.16%	736	0.31%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
August	241,606	237,340	98.23%	726	0.30%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
September	249,028	245,976	98.77%	754	0.30%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
October	271,584	267,083	98.34%	834	0.31%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
November	224,236	221,869	98.94%	602	0.27%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	
December	229,488	221,821	96.66%	745	0.32%	-	0.0000%	-	0.0000%	

Meter Reading FTEs

	Hours charged to Meter Reading												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total Yr
2010	5,106	5,807	5,048	6,118	4,245	4,026	3,962	3,954	3,884	6,114	3,736	4,732	56,731
2011	5,293	5,432	5,178	6,446	4,185	3,705	3,824	4,042	3,862	5,989	3,800	4,592	56,346
2012	4,139	4,469	4,271	6,122	3,973	3,844	3,834	4,133	3,882	5,744	3,616	4,552	52,579
2013	4,041	4,382	4,271	6,207	3,920	3,684	3,723	3,682	3,849	5,658	3,980	4,083	51,481
2014	5,312	5,173	5,067	4,840	4,123	4,029	4,119	3,811	3,895	4,136	3,784	4,711	52,999
2015	4,552	4,364	4,563	4,362	4,035	4,406	3,876	4,352	4,013	4,338	7,782	4,243	54,887
2016	4,094	5,134	4,869	4,198	4,222	4,291	3,988	4,537	4,086	4,049	4,158	4,672	52,295
2017	4,989	4,454	4,680	3,795	4,168	4,151	3,622	4,170	3,741	3,938	3,945	4,221	49,874
2018	4,802	4,412	4,546	4,259	4,005	4,002	4,030	4,092	3,392	3,807	3,451	3,613	48,411

	FTE Equivalent												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total Yr
2010	29.3	33.4	29.0	35.2	24.4	23.1	22.8	22.7	22.3	35.1	21.5	27.2	27.3
2011	30.4	31.2	29.8	37.0	24.1	21.3	22.0	23.2	22.2	34.4	21.8	26.4	27.1
2012	23.8	25.7	24.5	35.2	22.8	22.1	22.0	23.8	22.3	33.0	20.8	26.2	25.3
2013	23.2	25.2	24.5	35.7	22.5	21.2	21.4	21.2	22.1	32.5	22.9	23.5	24.8
2014	30.5	29.7	29.1	27.8	23.7	23.2	23.7	21.9	22.4	23.8	21.7	27.1	25.5
2015	26.2	25.1	26.2	25.1	23.2	25.3	22.3	25.0	23.1	24.9	44.7	24.4	26.4
2016	23.5	29.5	28.0	24.1	24.3	24.7	22.9	26.1	23.5	23.3	23.9	26.8	25.1
2017	28.7	25.6	26.9	21.8	24.0	23.9	20.8	24.0	21.5	22.6	22.7	24.3	24.0
2018	27.6	25.4	26.1	24.5	23.0	23.0	23.2	23.5	19.5	21.9	19.8	20.8	23.3

	External Meter Readers - FTE
2010	4.60
2011	4.65
2012	4.25
2013	4.75
2014	4.80
2015	6.10
2016	6.37
2017	6.72
2018	9.62

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Non CWR Months don't need to report the numbers

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire

Red highlighted numbers are the amended numbers from original filing

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #15-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

		Jan-2018	Feb-2018	Mar-2018	Apr-2018	May-2018	ok Jun-2018	ok Jul-2018	Aug-2018	Sep-2018	Oct-2018	Nov-2018	Dec-2018
1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,688	235,763	235,855	235,694	235,414	234,874	234,716	234,561	234,532	235,599	237,400	238,101
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	29,281	28,710	28,561	28,561	4,404	28,955	4,167	28,320	4,243	26,782	26,854	27,330
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,092	1,932	1,566	1,389						1,211	1,177	1,647
RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS													
4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	0	0	0						0	0	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*												
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	14	27	55	92						732	319	76

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

10% PLAN (TPP)

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Non CWR Months don't need to report the numbers

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire

Red highlighted numbers are the amended numbers from original filing

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #15-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

	Jan-2018	Feb-2018	Mar-2018	Apr-2018	May-2018	ok Jun-2018	ok Jul-2018	Aug-2018	Sep-2018	Oct-2018	Nov-2018	Dec-2018
PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)												
16 Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	0	0	0						0	0	0
a) Number of PS requests received	1,092	1,932	1,566	1,389						1,211	1,177	1,647
17 *Intentionally Blank*												
18 Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,092	1,932	1,566	1,389						1,211	1,177	1,647
19 *Intentionally Blank*												
DISCONNECTIONS												
20 Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	6,743	8,913	9,888	5,860	6,738	5,700	4,098	3,185	1,933	1,346	1,299	2,448
21 Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:												
Duplicate columns for use in April and October												
April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column												
All other months, use 1st column only												
a) # Electric - heat affected												
b) # Electric - heat not affected												
c) # Gas - heat affected	26	58	193	90	385	553	333	411	683	296	64	93
d) # Gas - heat not affected												
e) **Total** # disconnected												
April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column												
All other months, use 1st column only												
a) # Electric - heat affected												
b) # Electric - heat not affected												
c) # Gas - heat affected				237						16		
d) # Gas - heat not affected												
e) **Total** # disconnected												
22 Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:												
a) # Electric - heat affected												
b) # Electric - heat not affected												
c) # Gas - heat affected												
d) # Gas - heat not affected												
e) Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NOTE: Please report immediately the names and addresses of customers whose service has been disconnected more than 24 hours.												
23 Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	26	58	193	327	385	553	333	411	683	312	64	93

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Non CWR Months don't need to report the numbers

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire

Red highlighted numbers are the amended numbers from original filing

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #15-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

		Jan-2018	Feb-2018	Mar-2018	Apr-2018	May-2018	ok Jun-2018	ok Jul-2018	Aug-2018	Sep-2018	Oct-2018	Nov-2018	Dec-2018
DOLLAR VALUE													
24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$4,157,315	$4,822,413	$5,292,368	$5,292,368	$748,789	$4,061,670	$602,564	$2,611,329	$383,638	$1,741,275	$2,208,810	$3,217,606
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$142	$168	$185	$185	$170	$140	$145	$92	$90	$65	$82	$118
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	**$794,739**	**$973,457**	**$734,020**	$607,244	$216,039	$131,248	$5,500	$1,287	$1,287	$0	$1,025,361	$777,612
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$27,679,575	$27,681,080	$24,556,280	$18,567,397	$11,540,215	$5,321,547	$4,549,729	$3,900,988	$4,742,421	$7,020,016	$14,522,294	$27,555,997
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$117	$117	$104	$79	$49	$23	$19	$17	$20	$30	$61	$116
30	*Intentionally Blank*												
30	**Average** annual residential bill:												
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$172,868	$141,603	$337,564	$353,659	$227,277	$158,544	$140,577	$161,636	$207,124	$257,043	$138,352	$141,211
DISCONNECTION DURATION													
32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:												
	a) # Electric - heat affected												
	b) # Electric - heat not affected												
	c) # Gas - heat affected	**18**	**56**	**191**	**326**						312	43	99
	d) # Gas - heat not affected												
	e) **Total** # disconnected												
33	*Intentionally Blank*												
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	**18**	**56**	**191**	**326**						312	43	99
35	*Intentionally Blank*												
36	*Intentionally Blank*												
RECONNECTION DATA													
37	# Accounts reconnected	14	27	55	92	94	104	82	104	265	732	319	76
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	178	164	259	440	706	1,059	1,209	1,575	1,587	1,150	383	581
	a) 1-30 days	18	27	131	237	330	456	189	320	468	88	37	306
	b) 31-60 days	23	6	21	102	186	276	393	198	243	222	53	32
	c) 61+ days	137	131	107	101	190	327	627	1,057	876	840	293	243

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	January

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: January, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,688
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	29,281
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,092

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	14

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: January, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,092	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,092	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	**6,743**	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	26	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	26	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	26	26

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: January, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$4,157,315
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$142
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	**$794,739**
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$27,679,575
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$117
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$172,868

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	**18**
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	**18**
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	**18**
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	14
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	178
a)	1-30 days	18
b)	31-60 days	23
c)	61+ days	137

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply: Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year: 2018
Reporting Period: February

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: February, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,763
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,710
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,932

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	27

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: February, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,932
17	*Intentionally Blank*	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,932
19	*Intentionally Blank*	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	**8,913**	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	**58**	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	**58**	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	**58**	**58**

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: February, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$4,822,413
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$168
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	**$973,457**
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$27,681,080
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$117
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$141,603

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	**56**
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	**56**
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	**56**
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	27
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	164
a)	1-30 days	27
b)	31-60 days	6
c)	61+ days	131

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	March

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: March, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,855
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,561
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,566

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	55

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Amended CWR Monthly March 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: March, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,566	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,566	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	**9,888**	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	**193**	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	**193**	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	**193**	**193**

Amended CWR Monthly March 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: March, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$5,292,368
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$185
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	**$734,020**
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$24,556,280
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$104
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$337,564

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	**191**
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	**191**
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	**191**
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	55
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	259
a)	1-30 days	131
b)	31-60 days	21
c)	61+ days	107

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	April

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: April, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,561
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,561
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,389

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	92

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: April, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,389	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,389	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	5,860	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	90	237
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	90	237
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	90	327

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: April, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$5,292,368
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$185
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$607,244
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$18,567,397
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$79
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$353,659

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	326
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	326
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	326
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	92
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	440
a)	1-30 days	237
b)	31-60 days	102
c)	61+ days	101

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	May

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: May, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,414
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	4,404
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

CWR Monthly May 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: May, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		
a)	Number of PS requests received		
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	6,738	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	385	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	385	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	385	385

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: May, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$748,789
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$170
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$216,039
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$11,540,215
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$49
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$227,277

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	0
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	94
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	706
a)	1-30 days	330
b)	31-60 days	186
c)	61+ days	190

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply: Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year: 2018
Reporting Period: June

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: June, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	234,874
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,955
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: June, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		
a)	Number of PS requests received		
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	5,700	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	553	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	553	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	553	553

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: June, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$4,061,670
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$140
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$131,248
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$5,321,547
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$23
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$158,544

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	0
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	104
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,059
a)	1-30 days	456
b)	31-60 days	276
c)	61+ days	327

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Logon to eFiling System...

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	July

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: July, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	234,716
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	4,167
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

CWR Monthly July 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: July, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		
a)	Number of PS requests received		
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	4,098	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	333	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	333	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	333	333

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: July, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$602,564
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$145
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$5,500
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$4,549,729
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$19
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$140,577

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	0
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	82
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,209
a)	1-30 days	189
b)	31-60 days	393
c)	61+ days	627

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	August

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: August, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	234,561
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,320
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: August, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		
a)	Number of PS requests received		
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	3,185	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	411	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	411	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	411	411

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: August, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$2,611,329
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$92
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$1,287
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$3,900,988
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$17
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$161,636

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	0
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	104
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,575
a)	1-30 days	320
b)	31-60 days	198
c)	61+ days	1,057

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	September

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: September, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	234,532
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	4,243
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	406

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	265

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

CWR Monthly September 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: September, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	406	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	406	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,933	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	683	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	683	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	683	683

CWR Monthly September 2018.xls

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: September, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$383,638
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$90
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$1,287
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$4,742,421
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$20
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$207,124

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	683
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	683
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	0
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	265
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,587
a)	1-30 days	468
b)	31-60 days	243
c)	61+ days	876

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.1**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	October

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: October, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	235,599
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	26,782
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,211

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	732

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: October, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,211	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,211	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,346	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	296	16
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	296	16
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	296	312

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: October, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$1,741,275
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$65
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$0
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$7,020,016
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$30
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$257,043

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	312
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	312
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	0
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	732
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,150
a)	1-30 days	88
b)	31-60 days	222
c)	61+ days	840

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.1

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.2**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	November

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: November, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	237,400
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	26,854
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,177

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	319

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: November, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,177	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,177	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,299	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	64	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	64	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	64	64

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: November, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$2,208,810
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$82
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$1,025,361
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	$0
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$14,522,294
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$61
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$138,352

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	43
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	43
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	43
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	319
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	383
a)	1-30 days	37
b)	31-60 days	53
c)	61+ days	293

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.2

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire **Version 4.2**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources
Reporting Year:	2018
Reporting Period:	December

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: December, 2018

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	238,101
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	27,330
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	1,647

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	*Intentionally Blank*	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	76

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP) *This entire section intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: December, 2018

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	
a)	Number of PS requests received	1,647	
17	*Intentionally Blank*		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	1,647	
19	*Intentionally Blank*		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	2,448	
21	Number of customer accounts disconnected who did not seek protection:		
	Duplicate columns for use in April and October		
	All other months, use 1st column only		
	April 1-15 and October 1-15 in 1st column		
	April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected	93	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	**Total** # disconnected	93	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		
c)	# Gas - heat affected		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	93	93

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending: December, 2018

DOLLAR VALUE

24	**Total** dollars past due on all residential accounts:	$3,217,606
25	**Average** past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	$118
26	**Total** dollars received from energy assistance programs:	$777,612
27	**Total** dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	
28	**Total** Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	$27,555,997
29	**Average** monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	$116
30	*Intentionally Blank*	
31	**Total** residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	$141,211

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:	
a)	# Electric - heat affected	
b)	# Electric - heat not affected	
c)	# Gas - heat affected	99
d)	# Gas - heat not affected	
e)	**Total** # disconnected	99
33	*Intentionally Blank*	
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	0
35	*Intentionally Blank*	
36	*Intentionally Blank*	

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	76
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	306
a)	1-30 days	31
b)	31-60 days	32
c)	61+ days	243

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 4.2

Service Extension Requests

	Residential		Commercial	
NEW	**New Installs**	**Avg time between requested date and install**	**New Installs**	**Avg time between requested date and install**
January	52	20	2	40
February	56	16	2	14
March	49	12	4	9
April	124	9	4	7
May	178	11	22	6
June	162	17	11	21
July	235	21	24	32
August	208	23	23	32
September	300	26	34	35
October	390	23	62	37
November	282	25	70	39
December	216	25	45	41

	Residential			Commercial		
EXISTING	**# of Existing Requested**	**# completed as requested**	**Avg Days between request and Completion**	**# of Existing Requested**	**# completed as requested**	**Avg Days between request and Completion**
January	164	163	-	38	37	-
February	112	110	-	20	20	-
March	173	173	-	12	12	-
April	226	224	-	15	15	-
May	314	314	-	25	25	-
June	382	379	-	12	12	-
July	497	495	-	9	9	-
August	557	553	-	15	15	-
September	677	672	-	43	43	-
October	1,026	1,020	-	103	103	-
November	542	539	-	81	80	1
December	191	189	-	26	25	-

	January				February				March				April				May				June			
Number of Complaints	173				139				258				157				241				207			
Type of Complaint	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class
Billing/Meter Reading Issue	40	28%	8	28%	45	37%	1	6%	102	45%	13	42%	65	45%	7	50%	89	42%	9	33%	57	31%	5	24%
Meter Adjustment	0	0%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Employee Action / Behavior Issue	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	4	2%	1	5%
"My bill is too high"	37	26%	5	17%	25	20%	7	41%	40	18%	5	16%	20	14%	1	7%	37	17%	2	7%	38	20%	2	10%
Service Extension Intervals	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Service Quality	14	10%	3	10%	8	7%	0	0%	18	8%	3	10%	16	11%	3	21%	32	15%	6	22%	33	18%	4	19%
Service Restoration Intervals	3	2%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	45	31%	10	34%	42	34%	9	53%	58	26%	10	32%	36	25%	3	21%	50	23%	10	37%	54	29%	9	43%
Time To Resolve Complaint																								
Initially	163				126				239				147				216				184			
Within 10 days	9				11				17				8				18				21			
> than 10 days	1				2				2				2				7				2			
Complaint Resolution	# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action		# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action		# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action		# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action		# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action		# Resolved by taking the listed action		% Resolved by taking the listed action	
Taking action as customer requested	117		68%		87		63%		165		64%		147		94%		229		95%		191		92%	
Agreeable compromise	52		30%		46		33%		93		36%		10		6%		11		5%		15		7%	
Not within the control of the utility	1		1%		0		0%		0		0%		0		0%		0		0%		0		0%	
Refuse to customer requested action	3		2%		6		4%		0		0%		0		0%		1		0%		1		0%	
BBB Complaints	2				3				1				1				0				2			
OAG Complaints	1				1				0				0				0				0			
PUC Complaints	2				2				3				0				3				2			

Customer Complaints

	July				August				September				October				November				December			
Number of Complaints	195				165				125				106				74				43			
Type of Compliant	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class	# of complaints Residential Class	% of complaints Residential Class	# of complaints Commercial Class	% of complaints Commercial Class
Billing/Meter Reading Issue	63	37%	10	43%	54	38%	8	36%	52	45%	4	40%	28	31%	8	47%	31	45%	0	0%	23	62%	3	50%
Meter Adjustment	3	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	17%
Employee Action / Behavior Issue	5	3%	0	0%	4	3%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
"My bill is too high"	30	17%	6	26%	27	19%	5	23%	14	12%	4	40%	30	34%	3	18%	22	32%	2	40%	8	22%	1	17%
Service Extension Intervals	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Service Quality	24	14%	2	9%	19	13%	4	18%	13	11%	1	10%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Service Restoration Intervals	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	46	27%	5	22%	36	25%	5	23%	33	29%	1	10%	18	20%	6	35%	16	23%	1	20%	6	16%	1	17%
Time To Resolve Complaint																								
Initially	7				0				5				3				9				1			
Within 10 days	179				163				115				93				62				41			
> than 10 days	9				2				5				10				3				1			
Complaint Resolution	# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action			# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action			# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action			# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action			# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action			# Resolved by taking the listed action	% Resolved by taking the listed action		
Taking action as customer requested	193	99%			162	98%			118	94%			95	90%			64	86%			40	93%		
Agreeable compromise	2	1%			2	1%			7	6%			9	8%			10	14%			3	7%		
Not within the control of the utility	0	0%			1	1%			0	0%			0	0%			0	0%			0	0%		
Refuse to customer requested action	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%			2	2%			0	0%			0	0%		
BBB Complaints	0				0				0				0				2				0			
OAG Complaints	2				2				0				1				1				0			
PUC Complaints	0				1				6				6				3				0			

2018

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
Consumer Affairs Office
121 7th Place East #350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

ANNUAL SUMMARY OF CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS
For Year End: 2018 Due May 1st Docket 377
In accordance with MINN. Reg. PSC 284

Name of Utility: Minnesota Energy Resources
Address: 2685 145th Street West, Rosemount, MN 55068
Prepared By: Nancy Lilienthal Phone: 651-322-8902

	Residential			Commercial/Industrial			Interruptible		
	Number Received	*Number Resolved*	*Number Unresolved*	*Number Received*	*Number Resolved*	*Number Unresolved*	*Number Received*	*Number Resolved*	*Number Unresolved*
I. Complaint Type									
A. Service	672	672		103	103				
B. Billing	661	661		81	81				
C. Rates				0	0				
D. Rules	328	328		38	38				
TOTAL COMPLAINTS	1661	1661	0	222	222	0	0	0	0

		Residential	Commercial/ Industrial	Interruptible
II.	**A. Number of Disconnections for Nonpayment**	3,438	257	8
	B. Number of Escrow Forms Filed (per PSC Rule 302G)	0	0	0
III.	**A. Total Number of Customers (year end)**	214,071	23,126	453
	B. Number of Customer's Added During Year	2,560	191	-15

NUMBER OF DISCONNECTS
FOR NON-PAYMENT
(By Month)

	1	2	3
JAN	26	25	0
FEB	58	23	2
MAR	193	25	0
APR	327	27	0
MAY	385	34	1
JUNE	553	23	0
JULY	333	16	0
AUG	411	17	0
SEPT	683	17	4
OCT	312	18	1
NOV	64	18	0
DEC	93	14	0
TOTAL	3,438	257	8

1. Residential
2 Commercial/Industrial
3. Interruptible

Telephone Answer Times

Answer time for gas emergency phone lines

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Total Calls	2,045	1,763	1,736	1,723	1,966	1,836	1,808	1,836	1,761	2,291	1,711	1,444
Average Speed of Answer	9	11	10	3	4	4	3	4	4	6	4	3
% Answered in 15 seconds	89%	82%	87%	98%	96%	96%	97%	96%	97%	91%	97%	98%

Tech Response Time From Time of Call to Arrival

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Calls responded to in Under 1 hour	694	424	452	437	525	505	451	475	520	747	582	516
Calls responded to in Over 1 hour	26	25	21	16	24	16	21	22	22	57	25	22
Total Calls	720	449	473	453	549	521	472	497	542	804	607	538

Calls Responded to in Under 1 Hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	71	97	215	230	81	694
February	48	64	142	116	54	424
March	35	117	145	69	86	452
April	38	77	162	109	51	437
May	51	91	156	142	85	525
June	41	82	155	142	85	505
July	54	65	127	131	74	451
August	36	91	160	106	82	475
September	55	71	154	150	90	520
October	63	130	274	178	102	747
November	42	84	189	172	95	582
December	45	76	184	134	77	516
YTD Total	579	1045	2063	1679	962	6328

Month	MERC Emergency Response Time in Minutes
January	27.25
February	29.25
March	26.84
April	26.32
May	25.19
June	25.39
July	25.54
August	24.75
September	25.28
October	30.01
November	27.11
December	27.51
YTD Average	26.70

Calls Responded to in Over 1 Hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	8	2	8	6	2	26
February	8	2	6	1	8	25
March	5	3	4	3	6	21
April	4	1	4	4	3	16
May	7	3	4	2	8	24
June	1	0	7	1	7	16
July	5	1	5	1	9	21
August	5	1	4	4	8	22
September	3	1	12	1	5	22
October	7	3	33	7	7	57
November	6	1	7	4	7	25
December	5	0	11	1	5	22
YTD Total	64	18	105	35	75	297

Emergency Response - No Farm Taps

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report
Attachment 6A

Tech Response Time From Time of Call to Arrival

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Calls responded to in Under 1 hour	692	422	448	428	510	486	437	467	511	735	572	506
Calls responded to in Over 1 hour	22	21	18	14	22	10	14	20	21	55	23	17
Total Calls	714	443	466	442	532	496	451	487	532	790	595	523

Calls Responded to in Under 1 Hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	71	96	215	230	80	692
February	48	64	141	115	54	422
March	35	68	144	116	85	448
April	38	76	155	108	51	428
May	51	86	152	141	80	510
June	41	80	151	138	76	486
July	53	64	120	130	70	437
August	36	89	158	105	79	467
September	55	70	151	150	85	511
October	62	128	272	176	97	735
November	42	80	185	171	94	572
December	45	73	181	133	74	506
YTD Total	577	974	2025	1713	925	6214

Calls Responded to in Over 1 Hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	8	2	4	6	2	22
February	8	2	3	1	7	21
March	5	3	2	2	6	18
April	4	1	2	4	3	14
May	7	3	3	1	8	22
June	1	0	3	1	5	10
July	5	1	2	1	5	14
August	5	1	4	3	7	20
September	3	1	11	1	5	21
October	7	3	32	7	6	55
November	6	1	5	4	7	23
December	5	0	7	1	4	17
YTD Total	64	18	78	32	65	257

Month	MERC Emergency Response Time in Minutes (No Farm Taps)
January	26.86
February	28.43
March	26.34
April	25.83
May	25.06
June	24.73
July	24.40
August	24.39
September	25.07
October	29.91
November	26.80
December	26.84
YTD Average	26.22

Emergency Response - Farm Taps Only

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report
Attachment 6B

Tech Response Time From Time of Call to Arrival

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Calls responded to in Under 1 hour	2	2	4	9	15	19	14	8	9	12	10	10
Calls responded to in Over 1 hour	4	4	3	2	2	6	7	2	1	2	2	5
Total Calls	6	6	7	11	17	25	21	10	10	14	12	15

Farm Tap Calls responded to in Under 1 hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	0	1	0	0	1	2
February	0	0	1	1	0	2
March	0	1	1	1	1	4
April	0	1	7	1	0	9
May	0	5	4	1	5	15
June	0	2	4	4	9	19
July	1	1	7	1	4	14
August	0	2	2	1	3	8
September	0	1	3	0	5	9
October	1	2	2	2	5	12
November	0	4	4	1	1	10
December	0	3	3	1	3	10
YTD Total	2	23	38	14	37	114

Month	MERC Emergency Response Time in Minutes (Farm Taps Only)
January	74.00
February	89.67
March	59.57
April	46.09
May	29.35
June	38.40
July	50.05
August	42.30
September	36.60
October	36.00
November	42.58
December	50.60
YTD Average	49.60

Farm Tap Calls responded to in Over 1 hour

	NW Region	NE Region	CN Region	SE Region	SW Region	Total
January	0	0	4	0	0	4
February	0	0	3	0	1	4
March	0	0	2	1	0	3
April	0	0	2	0	0	2
May	0	0	1	1	0	2
June	0	0	4	0	2	6
July	0	0	3	0	4	7
August	0	0	0	1	1	2
September	0	0	1	0	0	1
October	0	0	1	0	1	2
November	0	0	2	0	0	2
December	0	0	4	0	1	5
YTD Total	0	0	27	3	10	40

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	YTD
Total locates	1,793	1,572	2,087	6,974	16,334	13,219	13,067	12,872	10,667	11,961	5,696	2,272	98,514
Mislocates	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	3	3	4	5	2	36
% Mislocated	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.014%	0.037%	0.045%	0.046%	0.023%	0.028%	0.033%	0.088%	0.088%	0.037%

Gas Lines Damaged

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 8

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Total	2	5	4	6	29	26	29	36	38	46	22	11	254
Fault of Company Employee or Company Contractor	0	0	1	1	7	6	7	6	4	5	9	2	48
Damage by Others	2	5	3	5	22	20	22	30	34	41	13	9	206
System issue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Damage per 100 miles of pipeline 5024.36 miles of pipe

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
By Others	0.04	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.44	0.40	0.44	0.60	0.68	0.82	0.26	0.18	4.10
Under MERC's Control	-	-	0.02	0.02	0.14	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.08	0.10	0.18	0.04	0.96

Outages Due to Employees/Contractors	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**	**Total**
Number of Customers:	-	-	-	-	310	1	4	324	68	4	11	2	724
Number of Outages:	-	-	-	-	3	1	2	5	4	4	5	2	26
Average Duration of Outage(In Minutes):	-	-	-	-	205	229	165	367	128	170	181	170	135

Outages Due to All Other Causes	**Jan**	**Feb**	**Mar**	**Apr**	**May**	**Jun**	**Jul**	**Aug**	**Sep**	**Oct**	**Nov**	**Dec**	**Total**
Number of Customers:	2	5	3	4	36	26	116	37	67	46	7	7	356
Number of Outages:	2	3	3	4	21	15	25	23	22	28	6	7	159
Average Duration of Outage(In Minutes):	80	521	90	102	118	149	157	176	225	127	77	142	164

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

Service Interruptions

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 9A

Date	Address	City	Number of Customers Affected	Outage Duration (Minutes)	Outage Caused by MERC Employee or MERC Contractor	Outage Caused by Other
1/11/2018	[redacted]		1	40	No	Yes
1/17/2018			1	120	No	Yes
2/4/2018			1	1440	No	Yes
2/8/2018			3	2	No	Yes
2/16/2018			1	120	No	Yes
3/5/2018			1	30	No	Yes
3/24/2018			1	77	No	Yes
3/29/2018			1	163	No	Yes
4/12/2018			1	60	No	Yes
4/16/2018			1	1	No	Yes
4/24/2018			1	275	No	Yes
4/28/2018			1	70	No	Yes
5/7/2018			1	136	No	Yes
5/9/2018			1	370	No	Yes
5/10/2018			1	75	No	Yes
5/10/2018			1	90	No	Yes
5/11/2018			1	120	No	Yes
5/12/2018			1	40	No	Yes
5/14/2018			2	75	No	Yes
5/14/2018			1	60	No	Yes
5/15/2018			1	105	No	Yes
5/15/2018			1	60	No	Yes
5/16/2018			308	270	Yes	No
5/17/2018			1	60	No	Yes
5/18/2018			1	164	Yes	No
5/18/2018			1	150	No	Yes
5/20/2018			1	130	No	Yes
5/21/2018			1	70	No	Yes
5/24/2018			1	15	No	Yes
5/24/2018			1	105	No	Yes
5/26/2018			15	364	No	Yes
5/27/2018			1	64	No	Yes
5/29/2018			1	140	No	Yes
5/29/2018			1	82	No	Yes
5/31/2018			1	168	No	Yes
5/31/2018			1	180	Yes	No
6/6/2018			1	75	No	Yes
6/11/2018			2	910	No	Yes
6/12/2018			1	229	Yes	No
6/13/2018			1	20	No	Yes
6/14/2018			1	60	No	Yes
6/14/2018			1	20	No	Yes
6/14/2018			1	72	No	Yes

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

Service Interruptions

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 9A

Date	Address	City	Number of Customers Affected	Outage Duration (Minutes)	Outage Caused by MERC Employee or MERC Contractor	Outage Caused by Other
6/21/2018	[redacted]		6	138	No	Yes
6/22/2018			3	90	No	Yes
6/25/2018			1	60	No	Yes
6/25/2018			1	90	No	Yes
6/27/2018			3	194	No	Yes
6/28/2018			1	180	No	Yes
6/28/2018			1	62	No	Yes
6/29/2018			2	136	No	Yes
6/29/2018			1	130	No	Yes
7/2/2018			1	470	No	Yes
7/2/2018			1	60	No	Yes
7/2/2018			1	120	No	Yes
7/2/2018			2	90	No	Yes
7/3/2018			1	40	No	Yes
7/3/2018			1	90	No	Yes
7/3/2018			1	120	No	Yes
7/3/2018			1	80	No	Yes
7/5/2018			1	120	Yes	No
7/10/2018			1	80	No	Yes
7/16/2018			1	280	No	Yes
7/16/2018			1	90	No	Yes
7/17/2018			36	283	No	Yes
7/17/2018			3	210	Yes	No
7/18/2018			1	160	No	Yes
7/19/2018			1	90	No	Yes
7/23/2018			1	240	No	Yes
7/24/2018			19	335	No	Yes
7/25/2018			1	60	No	Yes
7/25/2018			38	300	No	Yes
7/25/2018			1	187	No	Yes
7/25/2018			1	115	No	Yes
7/26/2018			1	340	No	Yes
7/26/2018			1	41	No	Yes
7/29/2018			1	15	No	Yes
7/31/2018			1	90	No	Yes
7/31/2018			1	153	No	Yes
8/1/2018			8	190	No	Yes
8/1/2018			1	60	Yes	No
8/3/2018			1	5	No	Yes
8/3/2018			1	40	No	Yes
8/4/2018			1	35	No	Yes
8/7/2018			1	1496	No	Yes
8/7/2018			1	92	No	Yes

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

Service Interruptions

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 9A

Date	Address	City	Number of Customers Affected	Outage Duration (Minutes)	Outage Caused by MERC Employee or MERC Contractor	Outage Caused by Other
8/8/2018	[redacted]		3	90	No	Yes
8/8/2018			1	60	No	Yes
8/9/2018			1	5	No	Yes
8/9/2018			1	120	No	Yes
8/9/2018			1	45	No	Yes
8/10/2018			1	60	Yes	No
8/13/2018			320	355	Yes	No
8/15/2018			1	10	No	Yes
8/16/2018			1	85	No	Yes
8/19/2018			1	75	No	Yes
8/21/2018			1	120	Yes	No
8/21/2018			1	780	No	Yes
8/23/2018			1	95	No	Yes
8/23/2018			1	90	No	Yes
8/23/2018			1	90	No	Yes
8/28/2018			1	1240	Yes	No
8/28/2018			3	123	No	Yes
8/29/2018			1	70	No	Yes
8/31/2018			4	240	No	Yes
8/31/2018			1	85	No	Yes
8/31/2018			1	120	No	Yes
9/1/2018			1	65	No	Yes
9/3/2018			1	120	No	Yes
9/4/2018			1	60	No	Yes
9/5/2018			1	100	No	Yes
9/6/2018			1	1810	No	Yes
9/10/2018			44	241	Yes	No
9/10/2018			1	175	No	Yes
9/11/2018			1	144	No	Yes
9/13/2018			38	128	No	Yes
9/14/2018			1	120	No	Yes
9/16/2018			1	60	No	Yes
9/20/2018			1	10	No	Yes
9/20/2018			6	1440	No	Yes
9/21/2018			1	15	No	Yes
9/24/2018			1	5	No	Yes
9/25/2018			1	120	No	Yes
9/25/2018			6	90	Yes	No
9/25/2018			6	50	Yes	No
9/26/2018			1	122	No	Yes
9/26/2018			1	20	No	Yes
9/27/2018			12	130	Yes	No
9/28/2018			4	109	No	Yes

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

Service Interruptions

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 9A

Date	Address	City	Number of Customers Affected	Outage Duration (Minutes)	Outage Caused by MERC Employee or MERC Contractor	Outage Caused by Other
9/28/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	1	No	Yes
9/29/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	60	No	Yes
9/29/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	146	No	Yes
9/29/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/1/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	60	No	Yes
10/2/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	8	412	No	Yes
10/3/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	214	No	Yes
10/4/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	110	Yes	No
10/4/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/4/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	25	No	Yes
10/4/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/5/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	126	No	Yes
10/5/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	45	No	Yes
10/7/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/10/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	30	No	Yes
10/12/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	85	No	Yes
10/13/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	240	No	Yes
10/15/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	240	No	Yes
10/15/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	90	No	Yes
10/15/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	146	Yes	No
10/16/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	210	No	Yes
10/16/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	90	No	Yes
10/16/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	90	No	Yes
10/16/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	80	Yes	No
10/17/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/17/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	55	No	Yes
10/18/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/21/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	90	No	Yes
10/22/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	2	180	No	Yes
10/22/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/23/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	345	Yes	No
10/23/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	120	No	Yes
10/24/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	2	100	No	Yes
10/30/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	9	235	No	Yes
10/31/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	2	63	No	Yes
10/31/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	45	No	Yes
11/1/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	124	Yes	No
11/1/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	15	No	Yes
11/5/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	10	No	Yes
11/6/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	4	545	Yes	No
11/9/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	92	Yes	No
11/13/2018	[redacted]	[redacted]	1	35	No	Yes

Service Interruptions

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation

2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 9A

Date	Address	City	Number of Customers Affected	Outage Duration (Minutes)	Outage Caused by MERC Employee or MERC Contractor	Outage Caused by Other
11/26/2018	[redacted]		1	183	No	Yes
11/28/2018			2	95	Yes	No
11/28/2018			3	47	Yes	No
11/29/2018			2	99	No	Yes
11/29/2018			1	120	No	Yes
12/3/2018			1	319	No	Yes
12/4/2018			1	115	No	Yes
12/5/2018			1	177	Yes	No
12/6/2018			1	330	No	Yes
12/13/2018			1	70	No	Yes
12/14/2018			1	163	Yes	No
12/19/2018			1	80	No	Yes
12/20/2018			1	67	No	Yes
12/28/2018			1	15	No	Yes

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

MNOPS Reportable Events

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 10

Date	Address	Outage Caused by	Number of Customers Affected	Number of People Evacuated	Outage Duration	Longest Time any Customer was without gas	Root cause of Incident	Actions Taken to Fix Problem	Actions Taken to Contact Customers	Did Customer or Company Relight
4/24/2018	[redacted]	Erosion	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	A mine pit overflowed and caused a wash out on a 4”PE feeding Giants Ridge exposing about 100’ of PE.	Crews are on sight monitored situation until runoff subsided.	Media hot line and External Affairs contacted business owners.	N/A
5/1/2018		Backhoe	0	100	0	0	Abandoned main located instead of 2" PE Main.	Squeezed-off main going both directions and contractor repaired 2” PE main.	Fire Department evacuated customers and then returned them to home.	N/A
5/16/2018		Backhoe	0	80	N/A no customer outage	N/A no customers lost	The backhoe operator hit gas main instead of hand digging to expose it.	Made area safe. Techs squeezed off main and made a temporary repair.	N/A	N/A
5/16/2018		Mapping Incorrectly Labeled	308	N/A	270 Minutes	270 Minutes	During planned work before a pressure upgrade, pressure was lost on our 25# system.	MERC had 25 techs working to light up 308 customers.	Tagged, called, and stopped at customer premises.	Company
5/26/2018		Customer	15	40	1221 Minutes	1221 Minutes	Demolition of the entry way and deck on a trailer sheared off a steel riser in the process.	Evacuation prior to MERC arrival. MERC techs dug up the 2” steel main from a safe distance and pinched it off.	Tags hung on the doors of customers that were not home.	Company
5/31/2018		Cross Bore	0	0	N/A no outage due to old service	N/A	Unlocatable/unmapped service with no riser.	Bar holed until MERC found service tap under a driveway,screwed punch down and capped service.	No customers effected.	N/A

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

MNOPS Reportable Events

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 10

Date	Address	Outage Caused by	Number of Customers Affected	Number of People Evacuated	Outage Duration	Longest Time any Customer was without gas	Root cause of Incident	Actions Taken to Fix Problem	Actions Taken to Contact Customers	Did Customer or Company Relight
6/27/2018	[redacted]	Directional drill	3	0	194 Minutes	194 Minutes	Service line was not located by USIC.	Double squeezed main.	Door tags left	Company
7/12/2018		N/A	1	227	N/A	N/A	Odorizer check involved venting to fill and filter error. Prison downwind self evacuated due to odor.	Leak investigation showed no evidence of natural gas leak.	Direct Contact with Prison Management.	N/A
7/17/2018		Auger	36	9	283 Minutes	480 Minutes	No requested locate ticket. Contractor drilled post hole with auger and struck main.	NPL and MERC dug up main in 2 spots for double squeeze.	Relit 33 customers, tagged door for remaining 3 & attempted to find additional contact info.	Company
7/17/2018		Backhoe	3	0	210 Minutes	1333 Minutes	Backhoe operator hit 2" PE main.	Squeezed off pipe further down the line to try and prevent water from entering gas system and then turned off valve to stop leak.	Went to homes and notified customers. There was only 1 customer that had a gas water heater the rest were furnace only.	Company
7/31/2018		Boring rig	1	0	153 Minutes	153 Minutes	Facility not marked	Conduct audit on USIC tickets.	Relit Customers.	Company
8/1/2018		Contractor	8	30	190 Minutes	190 Minutes	Contractor did not maintain marks and pounded a steel concrete form pin into gas main.	NPL repaired main.	Door taged customer doors, as of 17:00 4 were left to relight.	Company

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

MNOPS Reportable Events

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 10

Date	Address	Outage Caused by	Number of Customers Affected	Number of People Evacuated	Outage Duration	Longest Time any Customer was without gas	Root cause of Incident	Actions Taken to Fix Problem	Actions Taken to Contact Customers	Did Customer or Company Relight
8/13/2018	[redacted]	Backhoe	320	0	355 Minutes	12,960 Minutes	Locate wire cut where 3 phone lines crossed main. This caused signal to jump onto phone lines causing miss mark.	Rochester fire squeezed main off. NPL made repairs & MERC techs proceeded with relights.	Doors were tagged. Shift techs continued contact to ensure reconnects were completed.	Company
8/28/2018	[redacted]	N/A	0	30+	N/A	N/A	Did not expose pipe.	Tech responded to call and dug up service line and squeezed off to stop flow.	N/A	N/A
8/28/2018	[redacted]	Track hoe	3	30+	123 Minutes	123 Minutes	Excavated prior to legal start	Line was exposed, stopple fitting welded on, gas stopped, PE line was cut & capped.	Personal contact made	Company
8/31/2018	[redacted]	Contractor	4	0	240 Minutes	240 Minutes	Contractor was digging a hole with a bobcat skid steer and 12” auger without a locate ticket.	NPL repaired main	Door tags and personal visit	Company all 4 homes were relit.
9/6/2018	[redacted]	Boring	1	0	1810 Minutes	1810 Minutes	Contractor blind-bored fiber into MERC facilities and other utilities. Pulled reamer back and ripped a hole in steel service.	Made area safe, checked for migration and assisted with repair.	MERC employees were in contact with maintenance for the apartment complex.	Customer with assistance from MERC

MNOPS Reportable Events

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 10

Date	Address	Outage Caused by	Number of Customers Affected	Number of People Evacuated	Outage Duration	Longest Time any Customer was without gas	Root cause of Incident	Actions Taken to Fix Problem	Actions Taken to Contact Customers	Did Customer or Company Relight
09/13/18	[redacted]	Excavator damage	38	48	128 Minutes	128 Minutes	Excavator severed a 2" plastic main with a skid steer while backfilling.	Severed main squeezed in 2 locations due to proximity	MERC employees went door to door, tagging where no one was home.	Company
9/24/2018		Boring machine	0	0	N/A	N/A	Did not hand dig to expose line.	Double squeezed and repaired main. No loss to customers.	N/A	N/A
9/25/2018		Excavation	6	0	50 Minutes	50 Minutes	Contract Locator did not mark service. Main was located, but long side service was missed.	MERC employees made area safe, monitored for migration and assisted NPL with leak repair.	Face to face contact	Customer, commercial service
10/4/2018		Third Party Damage	0	25	N/A	N/A	Line hit when cable was plowed in on the North Side of HWY 48. Employee at the health clinic across the street smelled the odorant and evacuated the building prior to our arrival.	MERC checked the building, pinched the cut line, and fishtaped the service back to the main on the South side of the road. NPL was called to excavate the deep main and capped the service.	No customer's were affected. Service line was abandoned. Evacuated personnel were permitted to re-enter their building across the street when all was clear.	N/A

[PRIVATE DATA BEGINS... PUBLIC DOCUMENT--PRIVATE DATA ON INDIVIDUALS HAS BEEN EXCISED

MNOPS Reportable Events

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2018 Gas Service Quality Report - Attachment 10

Date	Address	Outage Caused by	Number of Customers Affected	Number of People Evacuated	Outage Duration	Longest Time any Customer was without gas	Root cause of Incident	Actions Taken to Fix Problem	Actions Taken to Contact Customers	Did Customer or Company Relight
10/10/2018	[redacted]	N/A	1	75	N/A	N/A	YMCA management evacuated 75 people and called in a gas leak.	Found other odor from malfunctioning dryer. Gas was not the source.	The staff allowed them in after it was cleared.	N/A
10/19/2018		N/A	1	60	0	N/A	Small leak on meter set. Customer self-evacuated.	Completed leak investigation. No leaks inside. Found small leak on meter set.	Face to face	N/A
11/1/2018		Excavation	1	10	124 Minutes	124 Minutes	Facility mismarked.	MERC technicians repaired the serviceline, replaced the damaged section, tested & restored service to the homeowner.	Homeowner was on site	Company
12/5/2018		Bore rig	1	0	177 Minutes	177 Minutes	Contractor was boring in fiber and hit 2" PE main that was not located by USIC.	NPL dug up & repaired line.	Contacted business owner before gas was squeezed off	Company
12/6/2018		Bore rig	1	15	177 Minutes	177 Minutes	Contractor jumped the ticket and hit 2" PE main that was not marked yet because ticket wasn't due till next day.	Dug upwind to squeeze and cap line.	Employee contacted fire department as they were the only customer affected.	Company

...PRIVATE DATA ENDS]

Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety Emergency Response Violations Cited 2018

Date	Region	Location/Address	Enforcement Action	Remediation	Notes	Type
7/17/2018	SW	Jean Rd. - Balaton, MN	Concern regarding effectiveness of the MERC emergency call center	Call center has enhanced or added a number of initiatives with the objective to improve our emergency response communications. MERC's "Care Center" and "Dispatch Center" have certification programs for employees that include extensive training for both existing and new employees, quality expectations and review, assessments and tenure requirements. In additions, resources have been compiled or improved to assist call center personnel in handling emergency calls with a high degree of accuracy and professionalism.	This MNOPS concern was added to an official notice of probable violation, but the actual violation listed is in reference to a line hit, which is not considered an emergency response violation.	Notice of Probable Violation
7/17/2018	SW	Jean Rd. - Balaton, MN	MNOPS determined that MERC did not make a timely notification to the Duty Officer for a MNOPS reportable incident. Call was not made until 7-19-2018 after being pointed out by MNOPS	Internal communications resulted in this error. Region employees have been trained on the need to timely communicate all facts relating to an emergency response so appropriate notifications can be made.	Warning Letters generally do not result in a fine like a Notice of Probable Violation does.	Warning Letter
7/17/2018	SW	Jean Rd. - Balaton, MN	MERC did not follow its emergency procedures by failing to ensure equipment used to shut off a nearby valve was readily accessible.	MERC disagreed with the proposed Warning Letter. MERC's primary focus in an emergency response is to respond to an incident as quickly as possible to make the scene safety and to make an assessment on the specific follow-up needed, based on the incident and additional resources needed to take further action. MERC operations are supported by a third party contractor (NPL) and they were asked to bring the valve wrench for the MERC operations building on the way to the incident scene.	Warning Letters generally do not result in a fine like a Notice of Probable Violation does.	Warning Letter

Customer Service Related Operations and Maintenance Expenses

O&M expenses FERC Account 901 and 903 plus payroll taxes and benefits

January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
$ 334,721	$ 459,205	$ 473,187	$ 303,305	$ 286,843	$ 514,954	$ 742,179	$ 319,377	$ 409,716	$ 364,177	$ 478,981	$ 593,191	$ 5,279,837

FERC Account	901000	903000	
January	$ 52,718	$ 282,003	
February	$ 98,897	$ 360,308	
March	$ 101,749	$ 371,438	
April	$ 93,965	$ 209,340	
May	$ 36,794	$ 250,050	
June	$ 37,253	$ 477,700	
July	$ 510,628	$ 231,551	
August	$ 114,957	$ 204,420	
September	$ 106,559	$ 303,157	
October	$ 118,183	$ 245,994	
November	$ 102,780	$ 376,201	
December	$ 155,681	$ 437,510	
	$ 1,530,164	$ 3,749,672	$ 5,279,837

192.1007(e)(1)i	Number of Hazardous Leaks either eliminated or repaired, categorized by cause

Leak Causes		Baseline Data 2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Baseline Average 2015	Number of Leaks 2016	2017	2018	Rolling Average 2016	2017	2018	% Change from Baseline 2016	2017	2018
Corrosion	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	2	0	0	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Service	0	5	4	1	3	1	6	0	1	0	2.10	2	0	1	2.30	1.80	1.50	9.52	-14.29	-28.57
Natural Forces	Main	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.30	0	1	1	0.30	0.20	0.30	0.00	-33.33	0.00
	Service	1	1	3	2	3	2	0	2	0	3	1.70	4	3	3	2.00	2.20	2.20	17.65	29.41	29.41
Excavation	Main	23	25	9	14	16	7	10	15	9	12	14.00	14	15	11	13.10	12.10	12.30	-6.43	-13.57	-12.14
	Service	33	35	29	14	17	9	22	7	12	16	19.40	14	18	14	17.50	15.80	14.30	-9.79	-18.56	-26.29
Outside Force	Main	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5	1.10	2	0	3	1.30	1.20	1.50	18.18	9.09	36.36
	Service	3	5	6	1	6	5	4	0	0	9	3.90	5	4	8	4.10	4.00	4.20	5.13	2.56	7.69
Material or Welds	Main	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.60	0	1	1	0.30	0.40	0.40	-50.00	-33.33	-33.33
	Service	0	3	4	3	3	1	2	4	0	1	2.10	2	1	0	2.30	2.10	1.70	9.52	0.00	-19.05
Equipment	Main	1	1	2	2	0	5	2	1	2	0	1.60	0	0	0	1.50	1.40	1.20	-6.25	-12.50	-25.00
	Service	6	9	9	2	3	6	7	2	3	1	4.80	1	3	4	4.30	3.70	3.20	-10.42	-22.92	-33.33
Incorrect Operations	Main	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0.30	0	0	0	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Service	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0.50	0	0	0	0.40	0.40	0.40	-20.00	-20.00	-20.00
Other	Main	4	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1.00	1	1	1	0.70	0.70	0.70	-30.00	-30.00	-30.00
	Service	4	2	8	10	5	3	4	1	5	0	4.20	4	3	0	4.20	4.30	3.50	0.00	2.38	-16.67
Totals	Main	31	30	13	19	18	18	13	16	12	19		19	18	17						
	Service	48	60	63	33	41	28	45	17	22	30		32	32	30						

Established Baseline: 10-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
5-year average Leaks/Year (for threat category equipment)

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 10-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

---

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.

192.1007 (e)(ii)	Number of Excavation Damages
192.1007 (e)(iii)	Number of excavation tickets
192.1007(e)(1)vi	**Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program**

	Baseline Data					Baseline Average	Number of Damages				5-Year Average				% Change from Baseline			
	2010	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Excavation Damages - 3rd party	153	178	127	172	142	154	191	220	201	223	162	170	185	195	4.92	10.36	19.95	26.55
Excavation Damages - 1st/2nd party	0	2	3	7	11	5	12	14	11	17	7	9	11	13	52.17	104.35	139.13	182.61
Excavation Tickets	69,259	69,971	76,457	78,822	84,446	75,791	95,587	99,309	101,266	98,514	81,057	86,924	91,886	95,824	6.95	14.69	21.24	26.43
Damages per 1,000 tickets -3rd	2.21	2.54	1.66	2.18	1.68	2.04	2.00	2.22	1.98	2.26	2.00	1.96	2.02	2.04	-1.89	-3.77	-1.06	0.10
Damages per 1,000 tickets -1st/2nd	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.09	0.13	0.06	0.13	0.14	0.11	0.17	0.09	0.11	0.12	0.14	42.29	78.18	97.24	123.53

Number of Excavation Damages

Established Baseline	5-year average damages/year
Effectiveness Criteria:	Moving 5-year average in an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Number of Excavation Tickets

Established Baseline	5-Year average excavation tickets/year
Effectiveness Criteria:	Moving 5-year average in an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Number of Excavation Damages per 1,000 Tickets

Established Baseline	5-Year average excavation damages per 1,000 tickets
Effectiveness Criteria:	Moving 5-year average in an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data

Damages Data:	Raw data from Accident Database
Ticket Data:	Raw data from GSCO ticket summary

*Baseline data used 5-year 2010-2014. Damages outside of those caused by leaks were not tracked prior to 2010.

192.1007(e)(1)iv	Number of Leaks either eliminated or repaired, categorized by cause

Leak Causes		Baseline Data										Baseline Average	Number of Leaks			Rolling Average			% Change from Baseline		
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
Corrosion	Main	7	4	2	5	4	2	4	1	1	2	3.2	11	6	1	3.6	3.8	3.7	12.50	18.75	15.63
	Service	26	34	22	42	25	23	19	12	12	16	23.1	30	16	26	23.5	21.7	22.1	1.73	-6.06	-4.33
Natural Forces	Main	3	4	8	3	14	5	10	0	1	8	5.6	11	10	16	6.4	7	7.8	14.29	25.00	39.29
	Service	138	132	162	156	173	127	136	60	10	171	126.5	134	227	140	126.1	135.6	133.4	-0.32	7.19	5.45
Excavation	Main	49	44	29	35	30	21	19	32	25	32	31.6	30	44	41	29.7	29.7	30.9	-6.01	-6.01	-2.22
	Service	158	144	124	109	107	106	134	97	107	145	123.1	152	135	152	122.5	121.6	124.4	-0.49	-1.22	1.06
Outside Force	Main	2	6	2	6	0	6	4	0	1	9	3.6	3	5	7	3.7	3.6	4.1	2.78	0.00	13.89
	Service	61	46	42	58	62	56	41	20	5	65	45.6	58	59	58	45.3	46.6	48.2	-0.66	2.19	5.70
Material or Welds	Main	9	7	8	8	10	3	14	6	7	10	8.2	12	17	8	8.5	9.5	9.5	3.66	15.85	15.85
	Service	146	113	132	156	119	130	184	141	205	153	147.9	214	135	82	154.7	156.9	151.9	4.60	6.09	2.70
Equipment	Main	16	9	17	12	8	22	20	15	10	15	14.4	11	6	5	13.9	13.6	12.4	-3.47	-5.56	-13.89
	Service	209	240	256	323	331	309	305	247	304	278	280.2	304	285	395	289.7	294.2	308.1	3.39	5.00	9.96
Incorrect Operations	Main	1	3	1	3	3	6	2	4	3	4	3	1	2	2	3	2.9	3	0.00	-3.33	0.00
	Service	17	24	19	36	28	84	54	42	53	42	39.9	45	58	39	42.7	46.1	48.1	7.02	15.54	20.55
Other	Main	14	10	18	14	3	4	10	11	9	5	9.8	8	9	6	9.2	9.1	7.9	-6.12	-7.14	-19.39
	Service	275	318	385	311	142	120	120	156	174	184	218.5	234	239	148	214.4	206.5	182.8	-1.88	-5.49	-16.34
Totals	Main	101	87	85	86	72	69	83	69	57	85		87	99	86						
	Service	1030	1051	1142	1191	987	955	993	775	870	1054		1171	1154	1040						

Established Baseline: 10-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 10-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.

All Leaks

192.1007(e)(1)v	Number of Hazardous Leaks either eliminated or repaired, categorized by material

Material		Baseline Data										Baseline Average	Number of Leaks			Rolling Average			% Change from Baseline		
		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2015	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
Steel-Bare	Main	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0.70	2	1	1	0.80	0.80	0.80	14.29	14.29	14.29
	Service	3	9	9	4	5	3	0	1	4	2	4.00	5	3	2	4.20	3.60	2.90	5.00	-10.00	-27.50
Steel-Coated	Main	3	5	1	7	1	3	0	3	2	2	2.70	5	1	1	2.90	2.50	2.50	7.41	-7.41	-7.41
	Service	2	6	5	7	7	6	1	1	1	6	4.20	4	2	3	4.40	4.00	3.80	4.76	-4.76	-9.52
Polythylene (PE)	Main	26	24	10	12	14	13	12	13	7	13	14.40	12	13	13	13.00	11.90	12.20	-9.72	-17.36	-15.28
	Service	39	39	35	17	18	12	42	11	12	19	24.40	16	18	18	22.10	20.00	18.30	-9.43	-18.03	-25.00
Other Plastic	Main	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0.40	0	2	0	0.40	0.60	0.60	0.00	50.00	50.00
	Service	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0.60	1	3	2	0.70	1.00	1.10	16.67	66.67	83.33
X-trube	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
	Service	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0.60	1	0	0	0.70	0.70	0.60	16.67	16.67	0.00
Other	Main	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0.20	0	0	1	0.20	0.20	0.30	0.00	0.00	50.00
	Service	0	2	6	2	5	3	1	1	2	1	2.30	4	5	5	2.70	3.00	2.90	17.39	30.43	26.09
Copper	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
	Service	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.20	0	0	0	0.10	0.10	0.10	-50.00	-50.00	-50.00
Ductile/Wrought Iron	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
	Service	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0.60	0	0	0	0.60	0.50	0.50	0.00	-16.67	-16.67
Cast Iron	Main	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.10	0	0	0	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
Aluminum	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
	Service	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0.70	0	0	0	0.60	0.60	0.30	-14.29	-14.29	-57.14
Gasket Material	Main	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0.20	0	1	1	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.00	50.00	100.00
	Service	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0.80	1	1	0	0.70	0.70	0.50	-12.50	-12.50	-37.50
Polyvinylechloride (PVC)	Main	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.20	0	0	0	0.10	0.10	0.00	-50.00	-50.00	-100.00
	Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
Brass	Main	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	-	-
	Service	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.30	0	0	0	0.30	0.10	0.00	0.00	-66.67	-100.00
Totals	Main	31	30	13	19	18	18	13	16	12	19		19	18	17						
	Service	48	60	63	33	41	28	45	17	22	30		32	32	30						

Established Baseline: 10-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 10-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.

Note: Material choices removed from 2015 leak log repair form (159-7004)
- Polyvinylchloride (PVC)
- Cast Iron

192.1007(e)(1)vi	Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program

Threat: External corrosion - steel
Performance Measure: Frequency of leaks on Steel Main per mile of main
Frequency of leaks per 1000 service lines

External Corrosion - All Steel		Baseline Data 2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Baseline Average 2014	Number of Leaks 2015	2016	2017	2018	5-year average 2015	2016	2017	2018	% Change from Baseline 2015	2016	2017	2017
Leaks	Main	4	1	4	1	0	2.00	2	11	6	1	1.60	3.60	4.00	4.00	-20.00	80.00	100.00	100.00
	Service	8	4	6	0	5	4.60	7	15	3	10	4.40	6.60	6.00	8.00	-4.35	43.48	30.43	73.91
Miles of Main		1560	1542	1517	1513	1510	1528.40	1499	1481	1461	1441	1516.20	1504.00	1492.80	1478.40	-0.80	-1.60	-2.33	-3.27
# of steel Services		45,246	44,263	43,297	42,844	42,705	43,671.00	42,907	41,564	40,268	39,302	43,203.20	42,663.40	42,057.60	41,349.20	-1.07	-2.31	-3.69	-5.32
Leaks per Mile of Main		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-18.89	85.23	107.81	108.32
Leaks per 1000 service lines		0.18	0.09	0.14	0.00	0.12	0.10	0.16	0.36	0.07	0.25	0.10	0.16	0.14	0.19	-2.61	49.13	36.87	85.54

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 5-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.
GIS main data reported annually
Service line totals by year.

192.1007(e)(1)vi	Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program

Threat: External corrosion - Cathodically Protected Coated Steel Main
Performance Measure: Frequency of Leaks on Cathodically Protected Steel Main
Frequency of leaks per 1000 Cathodically Protected Steel services

External Corrosion - Coated Steel		Baseline Data					Baseline Average	Number of Leaks				5-year average				% Change from Baseline			
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Leaks	Main	0	0	4	1	0	1.00	2	11	6	1	1.40	3.60	4.00	4.00	40.00	260.00	300.00	300.00
	Service	2	0	2	0	1	1.00	3	6	2	5	1.20	2.40	2.40	3.40	20.00	140.00	140.00	240.00
Miles of Coated Main		1534	1519	1506	1504	1504	1513.40	1499	1481	1461	1441	1506.40	1498.80	1489.80	1477.20	-0.46	-0.96	-1.56	-2.39
# of Coated steel Services		44,955	43,353	44,433	43,473	43,090	43,860.80	42,976	43,178	41,835	40,539	43,465.00	43,430.00	42,910.40	42,323.60	-0.90	-0.98	-2.17	-3.50
Leaks per Mile of Main		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.18	263.83	307.51	308.39
Leaks per 1000 service lines		0.04	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.14	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.08	22.46	145.75	148.24	257.67

Established Baseline: 5-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
5-year average Leaks/Year (for threat category equipment)

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 5-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.
GIS main data reported annually
Service line totals by year.

192.1007(e)(1)vi	Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program

Threat: External corrosion - Unprotected Bare Steel
Performance Measure: Frequency of Leaks on UnProtected Bare Steel Main
Frequency of leaks per 1000 UnProtected Bare Steel services

External Corrosion - Bare Steel		Baseline Data					Baseline Average	Number of Leaks				5-year average				% Change from Baseline			
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Leaks	Main	4	1	0	0	0	1.00	0	0	0	0	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	-80.00	-100.00	-100.00	-100.00
	Service	2	1	4	0	1	1.60	4	6	1	3	2.00	3.00	2.40	3.00	25.00	87.50	50.00	87.50
Miles of Bare Main		26	23	11	8	6	14.80	0	0	0	0	9.60	5.00	2.80	1.20	-35.14	-66.22	-81.08	-91.89
# of Bare steel Services		291	181	101	95	25	138.60	0	0	0	0	80.40	44.20	24.00	5.00	-41.99	-68.11	-82.68	-96.39
Leaks per Mile of Main		0.15	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	-77.97	-100.00	-100.00	-100.00
Leaks per 1000 service lines		6.87	5.52	39.60	0.00	40.00	18.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.03	15.92	8.00	8.00	-7.47	-13.48	-56.52	-56.52

Established Baseline: 5-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
5-year average Leaks/Year (for threat category equipment)

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 5-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.
GIS main data reported annually
Service line totals by year.

192.1007(e)(1)vi	Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program

Threat: Atmospheric corrosion - meter sets
Performance Measure: Frequency of leaks per 10,000 meter sets per year

	Baseline Data					Baseline Average	Number of Leaks				5-year average				% Change from Baseline			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Leaks due to A/C on meter sets	17	19	13	12	7	13.60	9	15	12	16	12.00	11.20	11.00	11.80	-11.76	-17.65	-19.12	-13.24
Number of meter sets	211,090	211,729	213,336	215,414	215,794	213,472.60	230,531	232,724	235,381	238,144	217,360.80	221,559.80	225,968.80	230,514.80	1.82	3.79	5.85	7.98
Leaks per 10,000 meter sets	0.81	0.90	0.61	0.56	0.32	0.64	0.39	0.64	0.51	0.67	0.56	0.51	0.49	0.51	-12.99	-20.91	-24.03	-20.43

Established Baseline: 5-year average Leaks/Year (for each threat category and main/service location)
5-year average Leaks/Year (for threat category equipment)

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 5-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established baseline

---

Source Data: Raw data from Leak Logs.
GIS main data reported annually
Service line totals by year.
Meter Set information from Open CIS annually.

192.1007(e)(1)vi	Any additional measures the operator determines are needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator's IM program

Key Performance Metrics - Section 9.3.1 in Distribution Integrity Management Plan

	Baseline Data					Baseline Average	Data				5-year average				% Change from Baseline			
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018	2015	2016	2017	2018
Average employee response time (minutes) to customer or public reports of a natural gas odor	26.78	26.93	29.53	28.41	27.74	27.88	27.00	27.99	28.15	26.70	27.92	28.1	27.9	27.5	0.16	0.92	-0.07	-1.30
% of customer and public odor complaints with employee response times less than 60 minutes	95.38	95.46	93.23	94.47	94.68	94.64	95.93	95.82	95.24	95.60	94.75	94.8	95.2	95.5	0.12	0.19	0.62	0.86
% of leaks eliminated or repaired within the time period of one year	98.21	96.19	94.42	99.76	94.61	96.64	95.17	97.69	97.37	95.56	96.03	96.33	96.92	96.08	-0.63	-0.32	0.29	-0.58

Established Baseline: 5-year average of leaks over 365 days to repair

Effectiveness Criteria: Moving 5-year average is an increase of 10% or more from established

Attachment 13 MERC Improved Customer Experience Performance Indicators (2018)

Performance Indicator Metric	2013-2015 Performance Average	2016 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point)	Target Performance (End of 2017)	Target Performance (End of 2018)	2017 Performance	2017 Statistically Adjusted Performance	2018 Performance	2018 Statistically Adjusted Performance	Aspects of ICE Contributing to Continuous Improvement	Barriers to Increased Achievement in 2018	Expectations for Future Performance
Customer Transaction Satisfaction (%)	62%	83.6%	82.00%	72.00%	Continuous improvement driving towards 1st Quartile performance	Continued improvement from pre-ICE baseline levels, driving toward first quartile performance. Going forward, as the industry continues to evolve, we find different ways to measure and gain customer insights. Our means to gauge customer feedback has changed and we are seeing a better sampling of our customer demographics and number of participants to survey. Our focus is to improve performance while balancing other external and internal factors that may impact customer satisfaction. We do not measure our satisfaction with our CIS system only, we use this metric to identify process improvement opportunities and root causes to dissatisfaction. Items like gas prices, branding, internal processes, regulated processes, etc. can impact customer satisfaction.	**78.5%**	**86.80%**	**78.60%**	**86.90%**	Improved customer service processes and systems; improved self-service options for customers; efficiency and effectiveness of our customer service identification and resolution process through improved Care Center tools.	Change from telephone to e-mail surveys (research indicates that while e-mail surveys result in higher response rates and more participation, overall satisfaction reported tends to be lower as customer have more time to consider and provide more candid feedback then they would to a person over the phone). Measurement can be very subjective and impacted by the mode of survey and other factors.	Continued improvement from pre-ICE baseline levels, driving toward first quartile performance. Going forward, as the industry continues to evolve, we find different ways to measure and gain customer insights. Our means to gauge customer feedback has changed and we are seeing a better sampling of our customer demographics and number of participants to survey. Our focus is to improve performance while balancing other external and internal factors that may impact customer satisfaction. We do not measure our satisfaction with our CIS system only, we use this metric to identify process improvement opportunities and root causes to dissatisfaction. Items like gas prices, branding, internal processes, regulated processes, etc. can impact customer satisfaction.
Residential First Call Resolution (%)	80.67%	81.78%	85%	79%	Continuous improvement within 2nd Quartile driving towards eventual 1st Quartile performance. 1st quartile performance not expected in 2017.	Maintain achievements within second quartile, driving toward first quartile.	**83.30%**	**N/A**	**91.50%**	**N/A**	Improved customer service processes and systems; improved call escalation processes	None	Maintain achievements (2018 achieved first quartile performance)
Billing Accuracy	99.53%	99.77%	99.93%	99.79%	Continuous improvement toward 2nd Quartile performance	Staffing, weather, and human error are all factors that will continue to impact this metric; MERC expects to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2018 and beyond, dependent upon other external factors. MERC's planned implementation of AMI in 2019 and 2020 is expected to result in improvements in billing accuracy in the future.	**98.93%**	**N/A**	**98.85%**	**N/A**	Replacement of outdated customer information system; system billing capabilities (compared to pre-ICE system); system automation capabilities (compared to pre-ICE system); efficiency and effectiveness of our customer service identification and resolution process through improved Care Center tools.	Meter reading staffing issues unrelated to ICE (turnover in meter reader staff); weather impacts on meter reading; some unavoidable level of human error (in the absence of AMR/AMI)	Staffing, weather, and human error are all factors that will continue to impact this metric; MERC expects to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2019 and beyond, dependent upon other external factors. MERC's planned implementation of AMI in 2019 and 2020 is expected to result in improvements in billing accuracy in the future.
Billing Timeliness	99.89%	98.65%	99.50%	99.00%	Maintain 1st Quartile performance	Staffing, weather, and human error are all factors that will continue to impact this metric; MERC expects to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2018 and beyond, dependent upon other external factors. MERC's planned implementation of AMI in 2019 and 2020 is expected to result in improvements in billing timeliness in the future.	**99.48%**	**N/A**	**99.37%**	**N/A**	Replacement of outdated customer information system; system billing capabilities (compared to pre-ICE system); system automation capabilities (compared to pre-ICE system)	Narrow windows of the quartiles (at the 99.00 percent level) means that minor changes can greatly impact achievements in this metric. Meter reader staffing, weather, and human error affect billing timeliness in a similar manner as billing accuracy.	Staffing, weather, and human error are all factors that will continue to impact this metric; MERC expects to maintain performance with slight improvements in 2019 and beyond, dependent upon other external factors. MERC's planned implementation of AMI in 2019 and 2020 is expected to result in improvements in billing timeliness in the future.
Even Payment Plan Adoption (%)	14.43%	15.12%	16.8%	11.9%	Continuous improvement within 2nd Quartile driving towards eventual 1st Quartile performance. 1st quartile performance not expected in 2017.	Maintain achievements within second quartile, moving toward first quartile performance. While MERC will continue to target continuous even payment plan adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest.	**15.51%**	**N/A**	**16.00%**	**N/A**	Proactive solicitation and automated enrollment into the even payment plan makes enrollment easier for customers	Customer education and interest	Maintain achievements within second quartile, moving toward first quartile performance of 16.8 percent. While MERC will continue to target continuous even payment plan adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest.
e-Bill Adoption (%)	20.27%	22.38%	14.5%	10.3%	Continuous improvement while maintaining 1st Quartile performance	Target maintaining first quartile performance. While MERC will continue to target continuous e-bill adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest. MERC anticipates a potential barrier to 2018 and future achievement with a planned web platform project, which could create temporary disruptions.	**26.21%**	**N/A**	**30.50%**	**N/A**	Makes electronic billing application more user-friendly for customers, increases mobile options, and allows customers to continue electronic billing if they move and transfer service to a new address.	None	Target maintaining first quartile performance. While MERC will continue to target continuous e-bill adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest. *Potential barrier to 2019 and future achievement with a planned web platform project, which could create temporary disruptions.*
e-Payment Adoption %	55.50%	57.58%	51.6%	45.3%	Continuous improvement while maintaining 1st Quartile performance	Target maintaining first quartile performance. While MERC will continue to target continuous e-bill adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest. MERC anticipates a potential barrier to 2018 and future achievement with a planned web platform project, which could create temporary disruptions.	**60.42%**	**N/A**	**60.90%**	**N/A**	Makes electronic billing application more user-friendly for customers, increases mobile options, and allows customers to continue electronic billing if they move and transfer service to a new address.	None	Target maintaining first quartile performance. While MERC will continue to target continuous e-bill adoption through customer education, participation is optional and will depend on customer interest. *Potential barrier to 2019 and future achievement with a planned web platform project, which could create temporary disruptions.*

Performance Indicator Metric	2013-2015 Performance Average	2016 Performance	1st Quartile (Entry Point)	2nd Quartile (Entry Point)	Target Performance (End of 2017)	Target Performance (End of 2018)	2017 Performance	2017 Statistically Adjusted Performance	2018 Performance	2018 Statistically Adjusted Performance	Aspects of ICE Contributing to Continuous Improvement	Barriers to Increased Achievement in 2018	Expectations for Future Performance
Field Service Appointments Kept	N/A	99.89%	99.0%	98.6%	Maintain 1st Quartile performance	Target maintaining first quartile performance. MERC's 2017 achievements were 99.99 percent of field service appointments kept; year-over-year improvements are not expected.	**99.99%**	**N/A**	**99.99%**	**N/A**	Improvements with the implementation of ICE, including improved mobile routing capabilities to the dispatch system, increases our ability to timely meet service appointments. Integrated scheduling into the customer information system to streamline customer scheduling.	None	Maintain first quartile performance. MERC's 2018 achievements were 99.99 percent of field service appointments kept.
Net Write Off as % of Revenue	0.58%	0.73%	0.35%	0.52%	This metric is correlated to weather and environmental factors. Our goal is continuous improvement within 2nd Quartile driving towards eventual 1st Quartile performance.	MERC will continue to target performance within the second quartile driving toward eventual first quartile performance to the extent such performance is achievable in consideration of external factors affecting overall write offs.	**0.58%**	**N/A**	**0.75%**	**N/A**	Improvements in collections; system enhancements to allow for additional atomization	Factors unrelated to customer information system and collection activities have a more significant impact on net write offs (e.g., weather, gas prices, other impacts on customer bills)	MERC will continue to target performance within the second quartile driving toward eventual first quartile performance to the extent such performance is achievable in consideration of external factors affecting overall write offs.
IT / Security (# of masked customer data fields; # of tokenized customer data fields)	0 fields	1,386,000 fields	N/A	N/A	Maintain number of fields protected and continue to meet industry standards for customer data masking/tokenization	Maintain number of fields protected and continue to meet industry standards for customer data masking/tokenization. No changes anticipated in the near term (increases would only occur with future upgrades or modifications to the system).	1,386,000 fields	**N/A**	1,386,000 fields	**N/A**	Prior to ICE, MERC's customer information system did not have the capability to mask or tokenize customer information fields. With ICE, customer data fields that are secured via masking or tokenization include bank account information, birthdate, drivers' license information, income, social security numbers, credit card information, and other person data.	None	No changes anticipated in the near term (increases would only occur with future upgrades or modifications to the system).

In the Matter of the Annual Service Quality Report for Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation for 2018

Docket No. G011/M-19-___

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kristin M. Stastny, hereby certify that on the 1st day of May, 2019, on behalf of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC), I electronically filed a true and correct copy of the enclosed Gas Service Quality Report on www.edockets.state.mn.us. Said documents were also served via U.S. mail and electronic service as designated on the attached service list.

Dated this 1st day of May, 2019.

/s/ Kristin M. Stastny
Kristin M. Stastny

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	50 S 6th St Ste 1500 Minneapolis, MN 554021498	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Generic Notice	Commerce Attorneys	commerce.attorneys@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	445 Minnesota Street Suite 1800 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Seth	DeMerritt	Seth.DeMerritt@wecenergygroup.com	MERC (Holding)	700 North Adams PO Box 19001 Green Bay, WI 543079001	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Ian	Dobson	residential.utilities@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012131	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 280 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Daryll	Fuentes	dfuentes@usg.com	USG Corporation	550 W Adams St Chicago, IL 60661	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@stinson.com	Stinson,Leonard, Street LLP	50 S 6th St Ste 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Andrew	Moratzka	andrew.moratzka@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth St Ste 4200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Catherine	Phillips	catherine.phillips@we-energies.com	We Energies	231 West Michigan St Milwaukee, WI 53203	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Elizabeth	Schmiesing	eschmiesing@winthrop.com	Winthrop & Weinstine, P.A.	225 South Sixth Street Suite 3500 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Colleen	Sipiorski	Colleen.Sipiorski@wecenergygroup.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	700 North Adams St Green Bay, WI 54307	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Kristin	Stastny	kstastny@briggs.com	Briggs and Morgan, P.A.	2200 IDS Center 80 South 8th Street Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General 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_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List
Mary	Wolter	mary.wolter@wecenergygroup.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (HOLDING)	231 West Michigan St Milwaukee, WI 53203	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List