



MICHAEL J. AHERN
Partner
(612) 340-2881
FAX (612) 340-2643
ahern.michael@dorsey.com

May 1, 2015

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

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

Re: In the Matter of the Application of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation for Authority to Increase Rates for Natural Gas Service in Minnesota, Docket No. G-007,011/GR-10-977

Compliance Filing, Revenue Decoupling Evaluation Report for 2014

Dear Mr. Wolf:

On July 13, 2012, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (the Commission) issued its Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order in the above-referenced matter authorizing Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) to implement a full revenue decoupling pilot program. On December 21, 2012, the Commission issued an Order approving final implementation effective January 1, 2013. Order Point 11.A. to the Commission's July 13, 2012 Order required that MERC file annual reports with the Commission that specify the Revenue Decoupling Mechanism (RDM) adjustment to be applied to each rate class for the billing period and demonstrate annual progress toward achieving the 1.5 percent energy efficiency goal set forth in Minn. Stat. § 216B.241, along with an evaluation plan similar to the one used in CenterPoint Energy's decoupling pilot.

On March 27, 2014, in the above-referenced docket, MERC submitted its first annual Decoupling Evaluation Plan for 2013 in accordance with the Commission's July 13, 2012 and December 21, 2012 Orders. The Commission issued an Order accepting MERC's 2013 Decoupling Evaluation Report for 2013 on September 26, 2014 and required that MERC's next annual Decoupling Report include an estimate of each class's revenues under the following decoupling scenarios:

- No Decoupling
- Partial Decoupling
- Full Decoupling

MERC submits this Compliance Filing in accordance with the Commission's July 13, 2012, December 21, 2012, and September 26, 2014 Orders in the above-referenced docket.

As explained in MERC's Reply Comments filed in this Docket on June 30, 2014, based on conversations with the Department of Commerce (the Department), MERC understands that the Department intended the term "full decoupling" to mean MERC's currently approved pilot decoupling program. MERC notes that its approved RDM applies only to Residential and Small Commercial & Industrial customer classes. Moreover, MERC's decoupling mechanism includes a symmetrical ten-percent cap. For purposes of the information required to be provided, MERC will assume decoupling applies to all rate classes. Additionally, MERC understands partial decoupling to be a revenue-per-

customer decoupling mechanism that removes the effect of weather from decoupling deferrals (i.e., Weather Normalized Decoupling). Filed separately as Attachment C is a spreadsheet estimating each class's revenues with no decoupling, under full decoupling (both with and without a ten-percent cap), and under a Weather Normalized Decoupling (both with and without a ten-percent cap).

MERC also requests that the Commission approve MERC's RDM on a permanent basis following completion of the pilot at the end of 2015. As reflected in this Decoupling Evaluation Report, MERC's decoupling program has been successful in removing the disincentive to promote energy efficiency and conservation that is a consequence of the way rates are set under traditional rate regulation, thereby achieving continued energy savings. In its June 19, 2009 Order Establishing Criteria and Standards to be Utilized in Pilot Proposals for Revenue Decoupling, the Commission concluded it was not ready to establish final criteria and standards for decoupling, concluding instead that "...the most promising approach is to examine the pilot proposals that will be submitted based on the criteria and standards established by this Order. After implementation and review of these pilot projects, utilities will be in the position to tackle the details of implementing an effective decoupling program." MERC has now implemented its RDM and has completed two full years of review of the program. Based on that experience and review, MERC believes the RDM has proven successful in effectively removing the disincentive to promote energy efficiency and should be approved by the Commission on a permanent basis.

Alternatively, if the Commission wishes to continue monitoring the decoupling program to see how it continues to perform and retain the flexibility to make adjustments to the program, MERC requests that the Commission extend the pilot, as currently approved, for an additional three years. Allowing an extension to the pilot would allow the Commission to collect and evaluate additional data regarding whether the RDM achieves continued and/or additional energy savings for the utility.

Attachment A to the Report is a copy of the Moody's Report submitted in response to Part I.1 of the Report. Attachment B is MERC's 2012 Annual Gas Service Quality Report to serve as the "baseline" service quality level prior to implementation of the pilot program in accordance with Section I.2.e of the Report. Attachment C, which is filed separately as a Microsoft Excel file, is a summary of the RDM adjustment to be applied to each rate class for the billing period along with supporting data for the calculations and a summary of each class's revenues with no decoupling, under full decoupling (both with and without a ten-percent cap), and under a Weather Normalized Decoupling (both with and without a ten-percent cap).

Please feel free to contact me at (612) 340-2881 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Michael J. Ahern

Michael J. Ahern

cc: Service List

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation
2014 Annual Revenue Decoupling Evaluation
Report

May 1, 2015

**2014 Annual Evaluation Report
Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation's (MERC)
Revenue Decoupling Mechanism (RDM)**

Table of Contents

- A. Timeline for Evaluation and Request to Extend Current Decoupling Program
- B. Evaluation of MERC CIP Programs and Savings from 2010-2014
- C. Revenue Deferred and Collected Under the RDM Adjustment
- D. Proportion of Margin Lost to Company-Sponsored CIP Relative to the RDM Adjustment
- E. Impact of General Rate Cases During Implementation of the Pilot Program
- F. New Customer Usage and Adjustment Under the RDM
- G. Related Rate and Customer Usage Information (Actual and Forecasted)
- H. Impact on MERC Low Income and LIHEAP Customers
- I. Other Information

A. Timeline for Evaluation and Request to Extend Current Decoupling Program

A. Timeline for Evaluation and Request to Extend Decoupling Program

This Annual Revenue Decoupling Evaluation Report covers the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014. By Order dated September 26, 2014, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") approved Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation's ("MERC" or the "Company") request to move the annual Decoupling Evaluation Report deadline to May 1 to coincide with MERC's Annual Conservation Improvement Program ("CIP") Status Report filing.

On July 13, 2012, the Commission issued its Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Order ("Rate Case Order") in MERC's 2010 General Rate Case authorizing MERC to conduct a full decoupling program on a pilot basis for three years under Minnesota Statute §216B.2412.1. The Commission's Order stated that "The decoupling program may remain in effect for no more than three years (i.e., thirty-six months), unless it is extended by Commission action." The period of the approved decoupling pilot is due to expire at the end of 2015 unless approved for extension by the Commission. MERC requests that the Commission approve MERC's decoupling program on a permanent basis following completion of the pilot at the end of 2015. As reflected in this Decoupling Evaluation Report, MERC's decoupling program has been successful in removing the disincentive to promote energy efficiency and conservation that is a consequence of the way rates are set under traditional rate regulation, thereby achieving continued energy savings.

In its June 19, 2009 Order Establishing Criteria and Standards to be Utilized in Pilot Proposals for Revenue Decoupling, the Commission concluded it was not ready to establish final criteria and standards for decoupling, concluding instead that "...the most promising approach is to examine the pilot proposals that will be submitted based on the criteria and standards established by this Order. After implementation and review of these pilot projects, utilities will be in the position to tackle the details of implementing an effective decoupling program." MERC has now implemented its decoupling program and has completed two full years of review of the program. During that time, as reflected in MERC's annual evaluation filings, MERC's decoupling program has proven successful at effectively removing the disincentive to promote energy efficiency and should be approved by the Commission on a permanent basis.

MERC's Revenue Decoupling Mechanism went into effect on January 1, 2013. In its 2013 Decoupling Evaluation, MERC provided both qualitative and quantitative information showing changes in the results of MERC's CIP. As shown in that evaluation, MERC improved its energy savings for the residential sector under decoupling in 2013. MERC's total energy savings dropped significantly in 2014 in all sectors; however, the programs that were added as a result of decoupling continue to make inroads into their markets and produce savings.

If the Commission approves MERC's request to extend its decoupling program on a permanent basis, MERC would propose to complete the annual evaluation report filings covering the period through the end of the pilot and to continue to make an annual filing of the RDM adjustment along with an annual report no later than May 1 each year.

B. Evaluation of MERC CIP Programs and Savings from 2010-2014

B. Evaluation of MERC CIP Programs and Savings from 2010-2014. Information related to MERC's CIP programs and activities will be examined: the evaluation will use the 2010-2012 CIP program activities for the baseline period prior to decoupling and will use the 2013-2015 CIP program activities for the post-decoupling implementation timeframe. The baseline for comparison is the average energy savings achieved for Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers for the period 2010-2012.

Introduction

The following provides an evaluation of the MERC CIP Program and Savings from 2010 through 2014. Several things should be noted in this report:

- Savings were captured in MCFs for the 2010-2012 Triennial Plan period ("Base Years"). Starting with the 2013-2015 Plan period ("Post Years"), savings are reported in Dekatherms ("Dth"). For simplicity, we use the terms interchangeably and savings were not recalculated based on BTU content or any other calculation.
- In the Base Years, CIP Program portfolios, budget, and savings goals for Peoples Natural Gas ("PNG") and Northern Minnesota Utilities ("NMU") were separate. Starting with the Post Years, they were combined. We have reported accomplishments for both PNG and NMU separately and we have also combined them for ease of comparison as the Post Years no longer track them separately.
- In the Base Years, Low Income programs were considered part of residential programs. However, because the Low Income Sector has been separated out for the Post Years, it has been separated out for the Base Years as well.
- Low Income programs in the Base Years consisted only of Low Income Weatherization. Starting with the Post Years, Low Income Sector programs included both Low Income Weatherization and the 4U2 program. For ease of comparison, 4U2 has been incorporated into the Low Income Sector for the Base Years. It should also be noted that in the 2010 program year, the 4U2 Project was a pilot and only offered through four Community Action Agencies in the PNG service territory.
- To minimize the impact of portfolio level costs from changes in programs, they have been reported separately. These costs include actual spending for CIP Support (marketing, fulfillment and data entry into the tracking system, planning, legal, preparing filings and reports, DER assessments, etc.).
- At the time of writing this report, numbers for 2014 CIP activities have not been filed and consequently are all preliminary numbers.

- While the decoupling mechanism was approved in 2012 and implemented effective January 1, 2013, the initial activity surrounding increasing CIP commitment as a result of the decoupling started in 2012 with one-on-one meetings with a variety of stakeholders to obtain input on project ideas. These stakeholders included the Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources, the Isaak Walton League of America, the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, and the Clean Energy Resource Team. Efforts to meet with other organizations did not materialize due to a variety of reasons. Based on these meetings, MERC made a modification filing in March 2013 to add two new measures and two new projects to the Post Years. These additions, proposed as a result of the decoupling pilot agreement, were approved in April 2013.
- CIP activity changes from year to year, especially for small utilities with large customers. For instance, in NMU for 2011, the C/I Sector achieved 132.7% of sector energy savings goal and in 2012, the C/I Sector achieved 232.8% of goal. In PNG however, the Residential Sector achieved 106.2% of energy savings goal in 2011 and 89.1% in 2012 whereas the C/I Sector achieved approximately 70% in both 2011 and 2012. Due to the customer class makeup of NMU, the C/I Sector normally carried the energy savings while for PNG, the opposite is true – the Residential Sector normally carried the bulk of the savings. To smooth out the impacts that can be made by large projects, the analysis has included an average over the 3-year Base Years. As Post Years progress, the analysis can compare year-to-year trends as well as averages.
- One change in the Post Years is the addition of an online energy audit tool. While this tool does not produce energy savings, we believe the educational value and the potential for lead generation fulfills a need for our portfolio as well as for our customers.
- One of the major changes to the Post Years from the Base Years is the discontinuance of behavior-based projects. While the C/I project was very small and therefore did not have a large impact, the residential project was large and had significant impact on results. Therefore, when relevant, we have provided two charts – one including the residential behavior project and one excluding the residential behavior project. The second chart better compares Base and Post Year activity, costs, and savings.

In addition to the discontinuance of the behavior-based projects, goals decreased significantly for 2013-2015 due to several factors:

- The discontinuance of the behavior projects
- A significant increase in large customers who opted out
- A decrease in the O&M savings allowed for the Building Operator Certification project
- A saturation of the potential market for the large customer Turn-Key Efficiency project.

A more detailed analysis of this is provided on pages 3-5 in our 2013-2015 Triennial CIP Plan.

The high increase in customers who were approved to opt out of CIP reduced the throughput on which our goal is calculated. In 2013, MERC continued to increase the energy savings goal as a percent of retail sales as shown in the chart below, demonstrating MERC's strong commitment to energy efficiency. The decrease in 2014 was due to an anticipated increase in the baseline for high efficiency furnaces which reduced savings even though participation and measures remained the same.

	Energy Saving Goals		Percent of Retail Sales	
	PNG	NMU	PNG	NMU
2010	330,253	89,202	0.79%	0.68%
2011	387,583	103,796	0.93%	0.79%
2012	444,903	120,038	1.07%	0.90%
2013	394,948		1.12%	
2014	357,561		1.01%	
2015				

It should be noted that 2013-2015 Triennial CIP Plans will be extended for one year to put all utilities on the same timeline for filings going forward. At this time, some utilities have triennial plans that are 1 year off. This filing is due June 1, 2015. For MERC, with changes in customers who were approved for opt out and the acquisition of the Alliant Energy Minnesota gas customers, MERC will be proposing a new plan from mid-2015 through the end of 2016. This plan will cover all Alliant Energy Minnesota gas customers as well as propose improvements to our existing CIP Plan.

Executive Summary

As a result of the Revenue Decoupling Mechanism and the input from various stakeholders, MERC implemented two new measures and two new programs in 2013:

- A residential heating system tune-up was implemented
- A retro-commissioning measure was included as part of the C/I Custom Rebate
- A Multifamily Direct Install Plus project was launched in July 2013
- A Small Business Direct Install Plus project was launched in August 2013

No major changes were made to the CIP portfolio in 2014.

The residential heating system tune-up measure is projected to achieve 1.8 Dth of savings per unit. We estimated 2,000 participants for 2013, 4,000 for 2014, and 6,000 for 2015. This would provide 3,200 Dths of savings in 2013, 6,400 Dths in 2014 and 9,600 Dths in 2015.

Unfortunately, goals for this measure have fallen short in both 2013 and 2014. In addition, MERC implemented an Authorized Insulation Contractor program starting in September 2013. This program was implemented to eliminate, to the extent possible, fraudulent activities in air sealing and insulation activities by a variety of organizations that use strong arm tactics in door-to-door marketing. Only work performed by Authorized Insulation Contractors would be eligible for a rebate. While we expected a lower number of rebate applications for this measure due to the change, the actual participation was lower than projected. As a result, savings did not even meet the lowered goal. However, the 2013-2015 Plan assumed an increase in the furnace baseline starting in 2014 which did not materialize. Consequently, unexpected savings were recognized due to the lower efficiency baseline, helping to offset lower savings from tune-ups and insulation.

The retro-commissioning measure is not a high-demand measure. Therefore, MERC estimated 2 participants in 2013, increasing to 6 in 2014, and 8 in 2015. Savings were estimated at 4,000 Dth per participant. In both 2013 and 2014, there were no requests for retro-commissioning even though the Turnkey implementation contractor provided information on the availability of this measure to all C/I customers with whom they were in contact.

MERC issued a Request for Proposals for an implementation contractor for the Multifamily and Small Business projects. The vendor was selected in the summer of 2013 and the projects were implemented late-summer. We are extremely pleased that the Multifamily project exceeded its energy saving goal, even though the project was in start-up mode. The Small Business project only achieved approximately 30% of goal in 2013 but achieved approximately 88% of goal in 2014, a significant increase. The market is also providing valuable information and learnings. It should be noted, however, that the Multifamily and Small Business projects combined have a budget of \$297,558 for 2014 due to uncertainty over market potential. Not including portfolio level costs, the total budget (including Multifamily and Small Business) is \$8,396,291. Therefore, the budgets for these two new projects are only 3.5% of the total project budget. Regardless of their small budgets, it is important for MERC to strive to support

these underserved customer segments. An analysis was performed in 2014 to determine whether eligibility criteria for the small business program were sustainable. A modification request will be submitted to the Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources to increase usage levels for participation in this program. MERC continues to increase its commitment to and support of CIP.

B.1. Based on the results reported in the annual CIP Status Reports, by what amounts did the Company change its CIP program expenditures and its resulting natural gas MCF savings through Company-sponsored programs over the term of the RDM, relative to the 2010-2012 pre-decoupling period? What were the annual CIP savings (completed project basis) for 2014, for Residential and Commercial & Industrial compared to achieved MCF savings in the 2010-2012 (completed project basis) pre-decoupling period?

Changes to CIP Expenditures are detailed in Tables B1(A) and B1(B) below. Table B1(A) provides the information based on all programs, including the residential behavior program. Table B1(B) eliminates the residential behavior program, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of programs offered in 2014. Both charts also compare 2013 to 2014 and the average of the Base Years to 2014.

Activity for Low Income Weatherization has been declining for the past several years. Had 4U2 not been included in the Low Income Sector, this trend would be more obvious. This issue is discussed more thoroughly in Section H, dealing with Low Income. 4U2 has overcome marketing obstacles and now has a pipeline of customers waiting to be served. However, because 4U2 is unable to leverage Federal Weatherization Assistance Program funding, the total cost of improvements is borne by MERC, thereby increasing the cost per Dth saved. In addition, Federal Weatherization Assistance Program protocols have increased the health and safety issues that must be addressed in each home, increasing costs without resulting in additional savings.

The Residential sector spending declined in 2014 compared to both 2013 and to the average of Base Years. The decrease in expenditures from 2013 to 2014 comes from the reduction in the actual rebates for measures such as the attic insulation and air sealing measure, one of the most expensive measures.

The C/I Sector expenditures also was lower than expected. The shift in spending resulted primarily from the reduction in market potential and project opportunities from the impact of opt-outs and the market saturation in our Turnkey customers.

Overall, reduced opportunities resulted in reduced savings and expenditures across the customer sectors. The result over the entire portfolio was a decrease of 14.7% from 2013 to 2014. 2014 expenditures decreased 7% from the Base Years average.

Changes to CIP Expenditures are detailed in Tables B1(A) and B1(B) below. Table B1(A) provides the information based on all projects, including the residential behavior project. Table B1(B) eliminates the residential behavior project, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of projects offered in 2014. Both charts also compare 2013 to 2014 and the average of the Base Years to 2014.

Table B1 (A) - CIP Expenditures

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Projects-PNG	\$595,445	\$467,377	\$564,803	\$542,542				
Low Income Projects-NMU	\$173,617	\$105,824	\$193,307	\$157,583				
Low Income Projects-Total	\$769,062	\$573,201	\$758,110	\$700,124	\$1,044,422	\$950,752		\$997,587
Residential Projects-PNG	\$2,874,197	\$3,558,117	\$4,021,906	\$3,484,740				
Residential Projects-NMU	\$449,292	\$459,060	\$471,925	\$460,092				
Residential Projects-Total	\$3,323,489	\$4,017,176	\$4,493,831	\$3,944,832	\$4,259,150	\$3,215,396		\$3,737,273
C/I Projects-PNG	\$2,082,270	\$1,694,020	\$1,871,669	\$1,882,653				
C/I Projects-NMU	\$514,180	\$925,118	\$1,543,768	\$994,355				
C/I Projects-Total	\$2,596,450	\$2,619,138	\$3,415,437	\$2,877,008	\$2,230,960	\$2,089,208		\$2,160,084
Portfolio Level Expenses-PNG	\$652,607	\$651,263	\$975,455	\$759,775				
Portfolio Level Expenses-NMU	\$207,651	\$206,396	\$308,184	\$240,744				
Portfolio Level Expenses-Total	\$860,258	\$857,659	\$1,283,639	\$1,000,519	\$1,095,706	\$1,105,476		\$1,100,591
Total Expenditures-PNG	\$6,204,519	\$6,370,776	\$7,433,833	\$6,669,709				
Total Expenditures-NMU	\$1,344,740	\$1,696,397	\$2,517,185	\$1,852,774				
Total Expenditures-Total	\$7,549,259	\$8,067,174	\$9,951,017	\$8,522,483	\$8,630,240	\$7,360,832		\$7,995,536
Change 2013 to 2014:				(\$1,269,408)	-14.7%			
Change Base Years Average to 2014:				(\$1,161,651)	-13.6%			

Table B1 (B) - CIP Expenditures

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Projects-PNG	\$595,445	\$467,377	\$564,803	\$542,542				
Low Income Projects-NMU	\$173,617	\$105,824	\$193,307	\$157,583				
Low Income Projects-Total	\$769,062	\$573,201	\$758,110	\$700,124	\$1,044,422	\$950,752		\$997,587
Residential Projects-PNG	\$2,445,335	\$3,120,519	\$3,466,413	\$3,010,756				
Residential Projects-NMU	\$326,918	\$348,137	\$314,502	\$329,852				
Residential Projects-Total	\$2,772,253	\$3,468,656	\$3,780,916	\$3,340,608	\$4,259,150	\$3,215,396		\$3,737,273
C/I Projects-PNG	\$2,082,270	\$1,694,020	\$1,871,669	\$1,882,653				
C/I Projects-NMU	\$514,180	\$925,118	\$1,543,768	\$994,355				
C/I Projects-Total	\$2,596,450	\$2,619,138	\$3,415,437	\$2,877,008	\$2,230,960	\$2,089,208		\$2,160,084
Portfolio Level Expenses-PNG	\$652,607	\$651,263	\$975,455	\$759,775				
Portfolio Level Expenses-NMU	\$207,651	\$206,396	\$308,184	\$240,744				
Portfolio Level Expenses-Total	\$860,258	\$857,659	\$1,283,639	\$1,000,519	\$1,095,706	\$1,105,476		\$1,100,591
Total Expenditures-PNG	\$5,775,657	\$5,933,179	\$6,878,340	\$6,195,725				
Total Expenditures-NMU	\$1,222,366	\$1,585,475	\$2,359,762	\$1,722,534				
Total Expenditures-Total	\$6,998,023	\$7,518,654	\$9,238,102	\$7,918,260	\$8,630,240	\$7,360,832		\$7,995,536
Change 2013 to 2014:				(\$1,269,408)	-14.7%			
Change Base Years Average to 2014:				(\$557,428)	-7.0%			

Changes to CIP Savings are detailed in Tables B1(C) and B1(D) below. Table B1(C) provides the information based on all projects, including the residential behavior project. Table B1(D) eliminates the residential behavior project, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of projects offered in 2014. Both charts also compare 2013 to 2014 and the average of the Base Years to 2014.

Activity in the Low Income Sector was due primarily to the success of 4U2. However, both 4U2 and Low Income Weatherization activity in 2014 was less than 2013. The Residential Sector decreased in energy savings in 2014 compared to 2013. This decrease is based primarily on the attic insulation and air sealing measure and the requirement to use an Authorized Insulation Contractor to be eligible for a rebate. On the flip side, the improvement in the economy is increasing housing starts and the Home Energy Excellence new construction project has

significantly exceeded goals. Activity in the C/I Sector also decreased in 2014 as compared to 2013. Overall, the result over the entire portfolio is a decrease of 13.1% from 2013 to 2014 and a decrease of 10.3% from 2014 to the average of Base Years.

Table B1 (C) - CIP Savings

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Projects-PNG	8,337	6,009	5,710	6,685				
Low Income Projects-NMU	2,231	1,235	1,954	1,806				
Low Income Projects-Total	10,567	7,244	7,664	8,492	11,207	8,139		9,673
Residential Projects-PNG	194,455	205,978	200,156	200,196				
Residential Projects-NMU	37,754	34,504	31,933	34,731				
Residential Projects-Total	232,209	240,482	232,090	234,927	208,071	180,137		194,104
C/I Projects-PNG	146,083	144,398	153,171	147,884				
C/I Projects-NMU	56,977	65,624	141,671	88,091				
C/I Projects-Total	203,060	210,022	294,842	235,975	205,542	180,792		193,167
Total Savings-PNG	348,874	356,384	359,038	354,765				
Total Savings-NMU	96,962	101,363	175,558	124,628				
Total Savings	445,836	457,748	534,596	479,393	424,821	369,068		396,944
Change 2013 to 2014:				(55,753)	-13.1%			
Change Base Years Average to 2014:				(110,325)	-23.0%			

Table B1 (D) - CIP Savings

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Projects-PNG	8,337	6,009	5,710	6,685				
Low Income Projects-NMU	2,231	1,235	1,954	1,806				
Low Income Projects-Total	10,567	7,244	7,664	8,492	11,207	8,139		9,673
Residential Projects-PNG	132,951	162,492	144,721	146,721				
Residential Projects-NMU	20,329	22,624	18,156	20,369				
Residential Projects-Total	153,280	185,116	162,877	167,091	208,071	180,137		194,104
C/I Projects-PNG	146,083	144,398	153,171	147,884				
C/I Projects-NMU	56,977	65,624	141,671	88,091				
C/I Projects-Total	203,060	210,022	294,842	235,975	205,542	180,792		193,167
Total Savings-PNG	287,370	312,898	303,602	301,290				
Total Savings-NMU	79,536	89,483	161,781	110,267				
Total Savings	366,907	402,382	465,383	411,557	424,821	369,068		396,944
Change 2013 to 2014:				(55,753)	-13.1%			
Change Base Years Average to 2014:				(42,489)	-10.3%			

B.2. What is the proportion of MCF savings from Company-sponsored CIP programs compared to overall weather normalized sales volumes, in total, and for Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers for each year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014?

The savings numbers for the Base Years are from the combination of PNG and NMU CIP Status Reports. The sales numbers have been taken from the combination of PNG and NMU Jurisdictional Reports with numbers adjusted to remove the sales of customers who were approved to opt-out of the CIP program and charges.

Changes to CIP Savings as a Percent of Sales are detailed in Table B2 below. A second table removing the impact of the residential behavior program was not included as the difference did not significantly change the final result.

The sales included in Table B2 are the weather normalized sales.

Table B2 - CIP Savings as Percent of Sales (Dth)

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Residential Savings-PNG	202,792	211,987	205,867	206,882				
Residential Savings-NMU	39,985	35,739	33,887	36,537				
Residential Savings-Total	242,777	247,726	239,754	243,419	219,278	188,276		203,777
Residential Sales-PNG	12,957,760	13,355,185	13,392,025	13,234,990				
Residential Sales-NMU	3,055,724	3,168,605	3,122,275	3,115,535				
Residential Sales-Total	16,013,484	16,523,790	16,514,300	16,350,525	16,719,590	20,139,029		18,429,309
Percent of Residential Sales-PNG	1.57%	1.59%	1.54%	1.56%				
Percent of Residential Sales-NMU	1.31%	1.13%	1.09%	1.17%				
Percent of Residential Sales-Total	1.52%	1.50%	1.45%	1.49%	1.3%	0.9%		1.1%
C/I Savings-PNG	146,083	144,398	153,171	147,884				
C/I Savings-NMU	56,977	65,624	141,671	88,091				
C/I Savings-Total	203,060	210,022	294,842	235,975	205,542	180,792		193,167
C/I Sales-PNG	15,209,724	15,129,845	17,794,685	16,044,751				
C/I Sales-NMU	5,212,682	5,212,682	4,752,405	5,059,257				
C/I Sales-Total	20,422,406	20,342,527	22,547,090	21,104,008	23,969,753	36,749,221		30,359,487
Percent of C/I Sales-PNG	0.96%	0.95%	0.86%	0.92%				
Percent of C/I Sales-NMU	1.09%	1.26%	2.98%	1.74%				
Percent of C/I Sales-Total	0.99%	1.03%	1.31%	1.12%	0.9%	0.5%		0.6%
Total Savings-PNG	348,874	356,384	359,038	354,765				
Total Savings-NMU	96,962	101,363	175,558	124,628				
Total Savings-Total	445,836	457,748	534,596	479,393	424,821	369,068		396,944
Total Sales-PNG	28,167,484	28,485,030	31,186,710	29,279,741				
Total Sales-NMU	8,268,406	8,381,287	7,874,680	8,174,791				
Total Sales-Total	36,435,890	36,866,317	39,061,390	37,454,533	40,689,342	56,888,250		48,788,796
Percent of Sales-PNG	1.24%	1.25%	1.15%	1.21%				
Percent of Sales-NMU	1.17%	1.21%	2.23%	1.54%				
Percent of Sales-Total	1.22%	1.24%	1.37%	1.28%	1.0%	0.6%		0.8%

Low Income and Residential Savings are combined. C/I Sales are adjusted for large customer opt-outs. 2013 Sales numbers for both Residential and C/I have been updated. The numbers in the 2013 report were preliminary as the Jurisdictional Reports had not been completed at the time of the Decoupling Evaluation Report. 2014 Sales Numbers are also preliminary as the 2014 Jurisdictional Report is not finalized as yet.

B.3. What were the associated lost margins from Company sponsored CIP, Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers for each year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014?

Lost margins for all projects are provided in Table B3 (A) and include all projects. These lost margins correspond to the savings detailed in Table B1(C).

Table B3 (A) - Lost Margins from CIP Participants

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Low Income-PNG	\$14,795	\$11,668	\$11,087			
Low Income-NMU	\$4,854	\$2,987	\$4,727			
Low Income Projects-Total	\$19,649	\$14,655	\$15,814	\$22,138	\$18,142	
Residential-PNG	\$345,080	\$399,947	\$388,643			
Residential-NMU	\$82,149	\$83,462	\$77,243			
Residential Projects-Total	\$427,229	\$483,409	\$465,886	\$411,023	\$401,525	
SCI Projects-PNG	\$21,725	\$21,907	\$21,073			
LCI Projects-PNG	\$197,221	\$214,889	\$230,105			
SCI Projects-NMU	\$10,471	\$12,500	\$24,471			
LCI Projects-NMU	\$100,927	\$130,189	\$283,720			
SCI Projects-Total	\$32,196	\$34,407	\$45,544	\$42,798	\$46,230	
LCI Projects-Total	\$298,148	\$345,078	\$513,825	\$307,738	\$302,025	
Total Lost Margins-PNG	\$578,821	\$648,411	\$650,908			
Total Lost Margins-NMU	\$198,401	\$229,138	\$390,161			
Total Lost Margins	\$777,222	\$877,549	\$1,041,069	\$783,698	\$767,922	\$0

C/I and Total Lost Margins amounts were erroneous due to formula errors in the 2013 report and have been corrected

B.4. During the 2010-2012 pre-decoupling time period as compared to the post-decoupling implementation time period of 2013 and 2014, did the Company change the scope or magnitude of any of its natural gas CIP programs?

MERC did not change the scope or magnitude of any one CIP project. The implementation of the Authorized Insulation Contractor requirement in September 2013 has and will continue to decrease the number of insulation rebate applications MERC receives. Other changes are detailed in the Executive Summary.

B.5. What incremental program changes or expansions were implemented, and when, for the pre-decoupling time period of 2010-2012 as compared to the post-decoupling implementation time period of 2013 and 2014? Identify and describe each new, revised or expanded programmatic changes for Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers.

Behavior projects were discontinued after the Base Years. This included the Residential Home Energy Reports project by Opower and the Schools for Energy Efficiency project by Hallberg Engineering.

The Company made the following changes in the CIP Programs for the Post Years. The changes were made for improvement in the overall efficiency of the programs.

- The Residential Online Energy Audit was added as part of the Residential Sector Support project. This is an easy-to-use online audit that generates leads for other programs. It is free to all participants and based on their score, leads are targeted to different projects within the residential portfolio.
- Direct installation of low cost measures was added to In-Home Energy Audits. MERC's residential auditors now install up to 2 low flow showerheads, up to 2 bathroom faucet aerators, a low flow kitchen faucet aerator, and up to six-feet of pipe insulation as appropriate for the home.
- Residential Dishwasher rebates were added. Dishwashers must be Energy Star to qualify for a rebate.
- Residential Authorized Insulation Contractor ("AIC") program was introduced in September 2013. This program provides for quality insulation and air sealing work by a cadre of insulation contractors who have 1) agreed to program rules for customer service and marketing tactics, 2) passed Residential Building Envelope Whole House Air Leakage Control Installer BPI Certification, 3) taken combustion air training through the Center for Energy and Environment, and 4) passed a stringent quality control process on their initial insulation jobs. Random quality control inspections will continue. Only insulation jobs performed by an AIC contractor will be eligible for a rebate. This

requirement has drastically reduced the number of insulation rebates issued in the last quarter of 2013 and 2014 and this reduction is expected to continue throughout 2015.

The following were added as a direct result of input from stakeholder discussions as required by the decoupling mechanism approval.

- Residential Heating System Tune-Up Rebates were added. This rebate provides \$35 for a 7-point heating system tune-up.
- Retro-Commissioning was added as a measure under C/I Custom Rebates.
- A Small Business project was added. This project targets the hard-to-reach small commercial customer who uses approximately 500 Dth per year or less. This project provides for direct installation of low cost measures such as faucet aerators and pre-rinse spray valves as appropriate. It installs and programs, or reprograms, setback thermostats to fit the businesses' needs. The project also provides a basic analysis of their energy use and investigates up to 3 additional high value energy saving opportunities. Finally, the project offers assistance for completing these high value savings opportunities.
- A Multifamily project was added. This project targets multifamily buildings with 5 or more units with a central gas meter, central heating, and central or individual water heating systems. It includes low income housing, 55 and over senior housing, assisted living, on-campus college housing, and apartments. The project provides for direct installation of low-flow showerheads and faucet aerators, heating system and other high value energy saving opportunity analysis, programming or re-programming of existing boiler controls, and customer ventilation analysis and improvement as appropriate. In addition, low income multifamily buildings are eligible for an additional 25% on the standard C/I rebate.

B.6. What new or revised customer educational, informational and marketing programs related to CIP were implemented by the Company during 2014? What were the primary messages and estimated costs of each of these programs? Were any MCF savings attributed to such programs in the annual CIP Status Report, and if so, how much, and using what assumptions or studies?

As mentioned above, Residential Online Energy Audits were added during 2013 and continued in 2014. This tool is an easy-to-use online audit that generates leads for other programs. It is free to all participants and based on their score, leads are targeted to different projects within the residential portfolio. As an informational tool, there is no energy savings projected. The primary message is "get started using this easy tool to identify ways you can save energy and what services or rebates may be available through MERC to help you." The cost for MERC to

utilize this software tool can be provided separately if desired, as it is a contractual agreement with the software vendor.

MERC invested in updating C/I customer NAICS codes in 2013 to enable C/I customer market segmentation and meaningful direct mail campaigns. The project cost-effectively identified NAICS codes for 85% of the C/I customers. This project was handled internally and was absorbed into the marketing budget. In 2014, this NAICS code was used to direct market specific measures and messages to targeted customer segments.

Trade ally email blasts were also implemented during 2013. Using information from past rebate application forms, MERC targeted specific types of trade allies with information pertinent to their customer base. The costs were mainly labor costs to gather email addresses, develop the email, and send it out. Trade ally email blasts were continued in 2014.

Residential customer email blasts were also implemented in 2013 and continued in 2014. MERC consolidated information from online energy audit and in home energy audit results and sent emails to customers informing them about the availability of rebates. In order to unsubscribe customers who do not wish to receive these emails and to track effectiveness of these email blasts, MERC subscribes to Constant Contact, a software tool that tracks numbers of opened emails, click-throughs, and unsubscribe requests. The cost of this service is again minimal (less than \$150 per year). Other costs associated with this effort were labor to develop the template, write the emails, and send them out.

B.7. What were the annual revenues collected in base rates from ratepayers to fund CIP programs by Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers for the pre-decoupling period of 2010-2012 as compared to the post-decoupling implementation period of 2013 and 2014?

Table B7 - Annual Revenues Collected in Base Rates

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Residential - PNG	\$831,723	\$876,866	\$709,447			
Residential - NMU	\$278,770	\$304,250	\$262,806	\$2,692,461	\$4,865,135	
C/I - PNG	\$41,544	\$43,879	\$32,540			
C/I - NMU	\$20,941	\$19,376	\$16,891	\$181,945	\$362,793	
Total	\$1,172,978	\$1,244,371	\$1,021,684	\$2,874,406	\$5,227,928	

B.8. What were actual annual CIP expenditures for 2010-2012? How were such amounts spent each year for Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers? Identify the total expenditures directly distributed to customers (by customer group), and the total expenditures for the administration and program delivery of the programs.

The actual annual CIP expenditures by sector are listed below. They are broken down into incentive and non-incentive expenditures. Incentive expenditures are rebates only and do not

consider costs for materials that are direct installed. Non-incentive expenditures are for administration, fulfillment and other delivery costs, marketing, and evaluation. With the exception of 2011, incentive dollars as a percent of total project costs continue to increase.

Actual CIP Expenditures by Type are detailed in Tables B8(A) and B8(B) below. Table B8(A) provides the information based on all projects, including the residential behavior project. Table B8(B) eliminates the residential behavior project, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of projects offered in 2014.

Table B8 (A) - Actual Expenditures by Type

All Projects	2010			2011			2012		
	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total
Low Income Sector-PNG	\$0	\$595,445	\$595,445	\$0	\$467,378	\$467,378	\$0	\$564,803	\$564,803
Low Income Sector-NMU	\$0	\$173,617	\$173,617	\$0	\$105,824	\$105,824	\$0	\$193,307	\$193,307
Low Income Sector-Total	\$0	\$769,062	\$769,062	\$0	\$573,202	\$573,202	\$0	\$758,110	\$758,110
Residential Sector-PNG	\$1,649,675	\$1,224,522	\$2,874,197	\$2,141,314	\$1,416,802	\$3,558,116	\$2,488,687	\$1,533,219	\$4,021,906
Residential Sector-NMU	\$207,119	\$242,173	\$449,292	\$233,131	\$225,929	\$459,060	\$213,440	\$258,485	\$471,925
Residential Sector-Total	\$1,856,794	\$1,466,695	\$3,323,489	\$2,374,444	\$1,642,731	\$4,017,176	\$2,702,127	\$1,791,704	\$4,493,831
C/I Sector-PNG	\$1,240,023	\$842,247	\$2,082,270	\$561,367	\$1,132,653	\$1,694,020	\$988,327	\$883,342	\$1,871,669
C/I Sector-NMU	\$269,442	\$244,738	\$514,180	\$516,849	\$408,269	\$925,118	\$1,016,674	\$527,094	\$1,543,768
C/I Sector-Total	\$1,509,465	\$1,086,985	\$2,596,450	\$1,078,216	\$1,540,921	\$2,619,138	\$2,005,001	\$1,410,436	\$3,415,437
Total-PNG	\$2,889,698	\$2,662,214	\$5,551,912	\$2,702,681	\$3,016,833	\$5,719,514	\$3,477,014	\$2,981,364	\$6,458,378
Total-NMU	\$476,561	\$660,528	\$1,137,089	\$749,980	\$740,021	\$1,490,001	\$1,230,114	\$978,886	\$2,209,000
Total	\$3,366,259	\$3,322,742	\$6,689,001	\$3,452,661	\$3,756,854	\$7,209,515	\$4,707,128	\$3,960,250	\$8,667,378
Incentive vs non-incentive as a percent of total spending	50.3%	49.7%		47.9%	52.1%		54.3%	45.7%	
	2013			2014			2015		
	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total
Low Income Sector	\$0	\$1,044,422	\$1,044,422	\$0	\$950,752	\$950,752			\$0
Residential Sector	\$2,993,564	\$1,265,586	\$4,259,150	\$1,946,935	\$1,268,462	\$3,215,397			\$0
C/I Sector	\$1,196,127	\$1,034,833	\$2,230,960	\$982,346	\$1,106,862	\$2,089,208			\$0
Total	\$4,189,691	\$3,344,842	\$7,534,533	\$2,929,281	\$3,326,076	\$6,255,357	\$0	\$0	\$0
Incentive vs non-incentive as a percent of total spending	55.6%	44.4%		46.8%	53.2%				

Table B8 (B) - Actual Expenditures by Type

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010			2011			2012		
	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total
Low Income Sector-PNG	\$0	\$595,445	\$595,445	\$0	\$467,378	\$467,378	\$0	\$564,803	\$564,803
Low Income Sector-NMU	\$0	\$173,617	\$173,617	\$0	\$105,824	\$105,824	\$0	\$193,307	\$193,307
Low Income Sector-Total	\$0	\$769,062	\$769,062	\$0	\$573,202	\$573,202	\$0	\$758,110	\$758,110
Residential Sector-PNG	\$1,649,675	\$795,660	\$2,445,335	\$2,141,314	\$979,205	\$3,558,116	\$2,488,687	\$977,726	\$4,021,906
Residential Sector-NMU	\$207,119	\$119,799	\$326,918	\$233,131	\$115,006	\$459,060	\$213,440	\$101,062	\$471,925
Residential Sector-Total	\$1,856,794	\$915,459	\$2,772,253	\$2,374,444	\$1,094,212	\$4,017,176	\$2,702,127	\$1,078,788	\$4,493,831
C/I Sector-PNG	\$1,240,023	\$842,247	\$2,082,270	\$561,367	\$1,132,653	\$1,694,020	\$988,327	\$883,342	\$1,871,669
C/I Sector-NMU	\$269,442	\$244,738	\$514,180	\$516,849	\$408,269	\$925,118	\$1,016,674	\$527,094	\$1,543,768
C/I Sector-Total	\$1,509,465	\$1,086,985	\$2,596,450	\$1,078,216	\$1,540,921	\$2,619,138	\$2,005,001	\$1,410,436	\$3,415,437
Total-PNG	\$2,889,698	\$2,233,352	\$5,123,050	\$2,702,681	\$2,579,236	\$5,719,514	\$3,477,014	\$2,425,871	\$6,458,378
Total-NMU	\$476,561	\$538,154	\$1,014,715	\$749,980	\$629,099	\$1,490,001	\$1,230,114	\$821,463	\$2,209,000
Total	\$3,366,259	\$2,771,506	\$6,137,765	\$3,452,661	\$3,208,335	\$7,209,515	\$4,707,128	\$3,247,334	\$8,667,378
Incentive vs non-incentive as a percent of total spending	54.8%	45.2%		47.9%	44.5%		54.3%	37.5%	
	2013			2014			2015		
	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total	Incentive	Non-Incentive	Total
Low Income Sector	\$0	\$1,044,422	\$1,044,422	\$0	\$950,752	\$950,752			\$0
Residential Sector	\$2,993,564	\$1,265,586	\$4,259,150	\$1,946,935	\$1,268,462	\$3,215,397			\$0
C/I Sector	\$1,196,127	\$1,034,833	\$2,230,960	\$982,346	\$1,106,862	\$2,089,208			\$0
Total	\$4,189,691	\$3,344,842	\$7,534,533	\$2,929,281	\$3,326,076	\$6,255,357	\$0	\$0	\$0
Incentive vs non-incentive as a percent of total spending	55.6%	44.4%		46.8%	53.2%				

B.9. How did MERC's natural gas Commissioner-approved conservation energy savings goal(s) compare to the reported CIP energy savings for 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 reported in the annual CIP Status Report? How did decoupling influence these results?

Actual versus Approved Energy Savings are detailed in Tables B9(A) and B9(B) below. Table B9(A) provides the information based on all projects, including the residential behavior project. Table B9(B) eliminates the residential behavior project, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of projects offered in 2014. While the percent achieved has decreased in 2014 compared to 2013, MERC continues to exceed its goals in the post-decoupling years.

Table B9 (A) - Actual versus Approved Energy Savings

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Actual - PNG	348,874	356,384	359,038	424,821	369,068	
Actual - NMU	96,962	101,363	175,558			
Actual - Total	445,836	457,748	534,596			
Approved - PNG	324,510	392,079	450,423	394,949	357,561	377,788
Approved - NMU	89,326	105,188	121,682			
Approved - Total	413,836	497,268	572,106			
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - PNG	24,364	(35,695)	(91,386)	29,872	11,507	
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - NMU	7,636	(3,825)	53,876			
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - Total	32,000	(39,520)	(37,510)			
Percent Achieved	107.7%	92.1%	93.4%	107.6%	103.2%	0.0%

Table B9 (B) - Actual versus Approved Energy Savings

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Actual - PNG	287,370	312,898	303,602	424,821	369,068	
Actual - NMU	79,536	89,483	161,781			
Actual - Total	366,907	402,382	465,383			
Approved - PNG	263,352	318,689	364,802	394,949	357,561	377,788
Approved - NMU	71,284	83,538	96,423			
Approved - Total	334,636	402,228	461,226			
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - PNG	24,018	(5,791)	(61,200)	29,872	11,507	
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - NMU	8,252	5,945	65,357			
Savings Over(Under) Achieved - Total	32,270	154	4,157			
Percent Achieved	109.6%	100.0%	100.9%	107.6%	103.2%	0.0%

B.10. MERC shall include a comparison of lifetime energy savings that can be attributed to the Company's CIP before and after the implementation of revenue decoupling.

Lifetime Energy Savings are detailed in Tables B10(A) and B10(B) below. Table B10(A) provides the information based on all projects, including the residential behavior project. Table B10(B) eliminates the residential behavior project, making the comparison relevant to the portfolio of projects offered in 2014. Lifetime energy savings are detailed by utility, by Residential and C/I sectors, by year. With the increase in opt-outs and related decrease in opportunities, lifetime savings have again decreased in 2014.

Table B10 (A)- Lifetime Energy Savings

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Residential Projects-PNG	2,436,407	3,183,864	2,784,390	2,801,554				
Residential Projects-NMU	390,771	429,749	371,618	397,379				
Residential Projects-Total	2,827,178	3,613,613	3,156,008	3,198,933	3,274,790	3,201,910		3,238,350
C/I Projects-PNG	2,361,120	1,726,282	2,095,077	2,060,826				
C/I Projects-NMU	557,135	1,045,860	2,222,509	1,275,168				
C/I Projects-Total	2,918,255	2,772,141	4,317,585	3,335,994	3,033,861	2,467,883		2,750,872
Total Lifetime Savings-PNG	4,797,527	4,910,146	4,879,467	4,862,380				
Total Lifetime Savings-NMU	947,906	1,475,609	2,594,126	1,672,547				
Total Lifetime Savings	5,745,433	6,385,754	7,473,593	6,534,927	6,308,651	5,669,793		5,989,222

Table B10 (B)- Lifetime Energy Savings

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Residential Projects-PNG	2,374,903	3,140,370	2,728,955	2,748,076				
Residential Projects-NMU	373,345	417,871	357,840	383,019				
Residential Projects-Total	2,748,249	3,558,241	3,086,795	3,131,095	3,274,790	3,201,910		3,238,350
C/I Projects-PNG	2,361,120	1,726,282	2,095,077	2,060,826				
C/I Projects-NMU	557,135	1,045,860	2,222,509	1,275,168				
C/I Projects-Total	2,918,255	2,772,141	4,317,585	3,335,994	3,033,861	2,467,883		2,750,872
Total Lifetime Savings-PNG	4,736,023	4,866,652	4,824,032	4,808,902				
Total Lifetime Savings-NMU	930,480	1,463,730	2,580,349	1,658,187				
Total Lifetime Savings	5,666,503	6,330,382	7,404,380	6,467,089	6,308,651	5,669,793		5,989,222

B.11. MERC shall include documentation in its evaluation and annual reports that shows for each existing CIP project any changes that have occurred in the number of participants, any reductions in gas use per participant, and any changes in the cost-effectiveness or any other measure that gauges the performance of these projects.

Due to the redesign of the CIP portfolio for the 2013-2015 Triennial CIP Plan, it was not possible to provide information for CIP project changes by project. For example, in 2012, the Community Energy Services project was a stand-alone project. In 2013, the workshop and In-Home Audit portions of the project were included in the Residential Sector Support project while the actual rebates for improvements were included in the Residential Rebates project. Therefore, information here has been provided by Sector.

The first two tables below detail by sector, by utility and by year, participation in the three customer sectors, including and excluding the Residential Behavior project (Tables B11(A) and B11(B) respectively). The Residential Behavior project had a significant impact on participation as many customers received the Home Energy Report. Participation is one way of gauging the success of a project.

Table B11 (A) - Participation

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Sector-PNG	288	262	217	256				
Low Income Sector-NMU	86	34	69	63				
Low Income Sector-Total	374	296	286	319	401	343		372
Residential Sector-PNG	52,858	64,506	63,915	60,426				
Residential Sector-NMU	13,205	13,336	12,075	12,872				
Residential Sector-Total	66,063	77,842	75,990	73,298	18,805	17,456		18,131
C/I Sector-PNG	257	268	869	465				
C/I Sector-NMU	82	131	338	184				
C/I Sector-Total	339	399	1,207	648	2,442	5,941		4,192
All Sectors-PNG	53,403	65,036	65,001	61,147				
All Sectors-NMU	13,373	13,501	12,482	13,119				
All Sectors-Total	66,776	78,537	77,483	74,265	21,648	23,740		22,694

Table B11 (B) - Participation

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Sector-PNG	288	262	217	256				
Low Income Sector-NMU	86	34	69	63				
Low Income Sector-Total	374	296	286	319	401	343		372
Residential Sector-PNG	14,418	15,815	12,660	14,298				
Residential Sector-NMU	2,314	2,207	1,408	1,976				
Residential Sector-Total	16,732	18,022	14,068	16,274	18,805	17,456		18,131
C/I Sector-PNG	257	268	869	465				
C/I Sector-NMU	82	131	338	184				
C/I Sector-Total	339	399	1,207	648	2,442	5,941		4,192
All Sectors-PNG	14,963	16,345	13,746	15,018				
All Sectors-NMU	2,482	2,372	1,815	2,223				
All Sectors-Total	17,445	18,717	15,561	17,241	21,648	23,740		22,694

Another way of gauging success is the cost to produce energy savings. The tables below detail cost per Dth saved by sector, by utility and by year. The approved cost per Dth for the Low Income sector in 2010 was \$72.78 but has risen to \$120.33 in 2014. One of the reasons for this is the increase in non-energy saving producing requirements and costs for health and safety measures. The approved cost per Dth for the direct-install based Multifamily project for 2013 was \$49.46, going down to \$30.77 for 2014 and \$27.47 in 2015 and the Small Business project was \$31.55 for 2013, \$27.35 in 2014 and \$27.33 in 2015. In comparison, the more mature and less labor intensive rebate projects had an approved cost per Dth saved of \$13.47 for 2013, \$13.41 for 2014, and \$13.35 for 2015, even with the analysis-intensive Turnkey and Custom Rebate activities. Therefore, increased cost per Dth saved is not necessarily indicative of the lack of efficacy of decoupling. Charts highlighting cost per Dth saved are provided below in Table B11(C) and B11(D)

Table B11 (C) - Cost per Dth Saved

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Sector-PNG	\$71.42	\$77.78	\$98.91	\$82.71				
Low Income Sector-NMU	\$77.83	\$85.70	\$98.93	\$87.49				
Low Income Sector-Total	\$72.78	\$79.13	\$98.92	\$83.61	\$93.19	\$120.33		\$106.76
Residential Sector-PNG	\$14.78	\$17.27	\$20.09	\$17.38				
Residential Sector-NMU	\$11.90	\$13.30	\$14.78	\$13.33				
Residential Sector-Total	\$14.31	\$16.70	\$19.36	\$16.79	\$20.47	\$19.38		\$19.92
C/I Sector-PNG	\$14.25	\$11.73	\$12.22	\$12.74				
C/I Sector-NMU	\$9.02	\$14.10	\$10.90	\$11.34				
C/I Sector-Total	\$12.79	\$12.47	\$11.58	\$12.28	\$10.85	\$15.09		\$12.97
Total Portfolio-PNG	\$17.78	\$17.88	\$20.70	\$18.79				
Total Portfolio-NMU	\$13.87	\$16.74	\$14.34	\$14.98				
Total Portfolio-Total	\$16.93	\$17.62	\$18.61	\$17.72	\$20.32	\$19.56		\$19.94

Table B11 (D) - Cost per Dth Saved

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	Base Years Average	2013	2014	2015	Post Years Average
Low Income Sector-PNG	\$71.42	\$77.78	\$98.91	\$82.71				
Low Income Sector-NMU	\$77.83	\$85.70	\$98.93	\$87.49				
Low Income Sector-Total	\$72.78	\$79.13	\$98.92	\$83.61	\$93.19	\$120.33		\$106.76
Residential Sector-PNG	\$18.39	\$19.20	\$23.95	\$20.52				
Residential Sector-NMU	\$16.08	\$15.39	\$17.32	\$16.26				
Residential Sector-Total	\$18.09	\$18.74	\$23.21	\$20.01	\$20.47	\$19.38		\$19.92
C/I Sector-PNG	\$14.25	\$11.73	\$12.22	\$12.74				
C/I Sector-NMU	\$9.02	\$14.10	\$10.90	\$11.34				
C/I Sector-Total	\$12.79	\$12.47	\$11.58	\$12.28	\$10.85	\$15.09		\$12.97
Total Portfolio-PNG	\$20.10	\$18.96	\$22.66	\$20.56				
Total Portfolio-NMU	\$15.37	\$17.72	\$14.59	\$15.62				
Total Portfolio-Total	\$19.07	\$18.69	\$19.85	\$19.24	\$20.32	\$19.56		\$19.94

The third way to gauge success that we provide is the Societal Test. These Societal test results for 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 are based on post year analysis and therefore are actual results based on actual performance as approved in our past Status Reports. The 2014 Societal Test results are preliminary as the Status Report has not been approved yet.

Two things should be noted on these tables. The first is that the Low Income Sector was included in the Residential Sector for the base years. The second is that the methodology and inputs for benefit cost analysis were changed for the Post Years, primarily as a result of the low cost of gas.

Table B11 (E) - Societal Test Trend

All Projects	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Low Income Sector-PNG	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Low Income Sector-NMU	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.07	0.88	
Residential Sector-PNG	6.39	5.44	4.78			
Residential Sector-NMU	6.17	7.44	6.50	1.67	2.22	
C/I Sector-PNG	5.91	6.47	6.14			
C/I Sector-NMU	9.21	3.84	6.36	3.64	2.57	
Total Portfolio-PNG	5.75	5.45	4.85			
Total Portfolio-NMU	6.88	4.37	5.97	2.13	2.18	

Residential Sector in Base Years included Low Income Sector

Table B11 (F) - Societal Test Trend

Projects Without Residential Behavior Project	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Low Income Sector-PNG	n/a	n/a	n/a			
Low Income Sector-NMU	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.07	0.88	
Residential Sector-PNG	4.88	4.66	3.80			
Residential Sector-NMU	3.97	5.83	6.22	1.67	2.22	
C/I Sector-PNG	5.91	6.47	6.14			
C/I Sector-NMU	9.21	3.84	6.36	3.64	2.57	
Total Portfolio-PNG	4.97	5.00	4.30			
Total Portfolio-NMU	5.99	3.98	5.69	2.13	2.18	

Residential Sector in Base Years included Low Income Sector

The 2014 CIP Status Report is not approved yet, therefore, the 2014 data in these tables should be considered preliminary.

B.12. MERC shall document any specific actions the Company has undertaken that demonstrate a shift or realignment in the Company's support for energy conservation initiatives (e.g., efforts that would strengthen energy efficiency requirements in building codes and appliance standards at the national, state or local level).

MERC actively participated in a task force led by Xcel Energy on Codes and Standards. Together with other utilities and the Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources, we have studied possible ways to support improved application of building codes and receive credit for the achievement.

**C. Revenue Deferred and Collected Under the RDM
Adjustment**

C.1. What was the monthly, annual, and cumulative amount of revenue deferred and recovered by customer rate class through the decoupling mechanism during the period being evaluated? A discussion describing actions leading to these adjustments will be provided.

Each month, the average distribution revenue per customer on an actual basis was compared to the baseline forecast approved in Docket No. G011/GR-13-617. The resulting monthly deferrals, as well as the annual result and cumulative balances can be seen in the table below. 2014 had refunds for both Residential and GS Small C&I customers associated with the 2014 decoupling mechanism. The 2014 deferral commenced with refunds beginning March 1, 2015.

Table C1					
	Residential		GS Small C/I		
	Monthly	Cumulative	Monthly	Cumulative	
Jan	\$ 2,584,882	\$ 2,584,882	\$ 166,426	\$ 166,426	
Feb	698,353	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Mar	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Apr	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
May	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Jun	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Jul	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Aug	-	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Sep	(202,083)	3,081,152	-	166,426	
Oct	(227,932)	2,853,220	-	166,426	
Nov	388,126	3,241,346	-	166,426	
Dec	41,889	3,283,235	-	166,426	
Total 2014		<u>\$ 3,283,235</u>		<u>\$ 166,426</u>	
Debits reflect refunds to customers and credits reflect customer surcharges					

C.2. Has MERC made any changes to its methods or calculations of the decoupling deferral over the course of the pilot? Describe any such changes, their purpose and impact on the deferral.

Beginning in July 2013, MERC consolidated its four PGA's into two. The decoupling mechanism was initially formatted to enter each PGA's customer class data separately under the four PGA setup. Starting in July 2013, instead of distinguishing between the various PGA's, the sales and customer count data was entered in at the total MERC level by customer class. This had no effect on the decoupling mechanism calculation as the decoupling calculation is done at the total level.

For MERC's 2014 decoupling mechanism, MERC updated the forecasted sales and customer counts to match what was approved in MERC's 2014 rate case, Docket # G011/GR-13-617. This does have an effect on the margin calculation used in the decoupling mechanism model, but syncs up the margin with what was actually approved for rates in 2014.

C.3. Were there any issues that arose regarding the methodology or input values for calculation of the accounting journal entries which implemented the decoupling deferral? Explain and quantify the impact of any changes in methodology or input values.

The consolidation during 2013 of MERC's four PGA's into two. As discussed previously, this only affected the inputs into the decoupling model, but had no impact on the calculation of the decoupling deferral.

The update of sales and customer counts for the 2014 decoupling mechanism as previously discussed did not have any effect on the inputs, but did make the margin comparison of actuals to what was approved in rates consistent.

C.4. What was the pretax margin and net income impact resulting from the recoverable revenue deferrals for the period being evaluated as a result of the pilot? What percentage of total pretax margins and net income for the Company's operations is represented by these deferrals in each year?

Table C4			
Line	Description	Reference	Amount
1	Decoupling Pre-Tax Margin		\$ (3,449,661)
2	Effective Tax Rate		41.46%
3	Net Income Effect of Decoupling	Line 1 x (1-Line 2)	\$ (2,019,432)
4	2014 Total Margin		\$ 116,388,762
5	Decouple Margin as a % of Total Margin	Line 1 / Line 4	-2.96%
6	2014 Net Income		\$ 11,483,281
7	Decoupling Net Income as a % of Total Net Income	Line 3 / Line 6	-17.59%

C.5. What was MERC's Residential and Commercial & Industrial recorded gas margin revenue and recorded gas margin revenue per customer for 2010-the period being evaluated, before and after decoupling deferrals?

Table C5							
Distribution Margin (excluding CCRC in base rates)							
				2013 Pre- Decoupling Deferral	2013 Post Decoupling Deferral	2014 Pre- Decoupling Deferral	2014 Post Decoupling Deferral
	2010	2011	2012				
Residential Gas Margin	\$ 26,552,150	\$ 32,647,483	\$ 27,945,891	\$ 33,070,295	\$ 30,972,176	\$ 38,984,778	\$ 35,701,543
Residential Customers	187,603	187,125	189,630	192,428	192,428	193,436	193,436
Residential Gas Margin per Customer	\$ 142	\$ 174	\$ 147	\$ 172	\$ 161	\$ 202	\$ 185
Small C/I Gas Margin	\$ 1,255,943	\$ 1,437,591	\$ 1,243,583	\$ 2,108,400	\$ 1,845,305	\$ 2,342,522	\$ 2,176,096
Small C/I Customers	9,597	9,555	10,466	10,983	10,959	10,985	10,985
Small C/I Gas Margin per Customer	\$ 131	\$ 150	\$ 119	\$ 192	\$ 168	\$ 213	\$ 198

C.6. What was the total amount of decoupling surcharge revenue collected from ratepayers each month of the period being evaluated?

No surcharge revenue has been collected from ratepayers as a result of MERC's decoupling mechanism.

C.7. What is the monthly customer bill impact of the decoupling rate adjustment for customers during the recovery period? This should be expressed as an average monthly dollar amount collected and percentage based on the total decoupling amount to be collected divided by total estimated revenue for Residential customers.

In Docket No. G011/GR-13-617, the average residential customer was forecasted to use 73 therms per month. In the 2014 decoupling calculation, the refund rate was calculated to be 0.01936. Therefore, the average monthly refund per residential customer is expected to be \$1.41.

In Docket No. G011/GR-13-617, the estimated average residential customer revenue was \$69.35. Therefore as a percentage the average residential customer will see a refund of 2.04%.

D. Proportion of Margin Lost to Company-Sponsored CIP Relative to the RDM Adjustment

- D.1. What was the annual amount of estimated lost margin due directly to Company CIP programs for Residential and Commercial & Industrial customers during 2014 relative to the RDM for the same customer groups? This analysis should display the estimated annual reduction in therms and margin (\$).**

Table D - 2014 Estimated Energy Savings and Lost Margin Due to CIP

Measures/Programs Added Due to Decoupling	Energy Savings (Therms)	Distribution Margin Rates	Lost Margin
Low Income Sector	81,390	\$0.22290	\$18,142
Residential Sector	1,801,370	\$0.22290	\$401,525
Small C/I Sector	221,109	\$0.20904	\$46,230
Large C/I Sector	1,586,811	\$0.19034	\$302,025
Total	3,690,680		\$767,922

CIP Savings are from Table B1(C)

CIP Savings for C/I are not broken out by Small and Large C/I for purposes of this calculation. The CIP Savings were allocated based on sales usage.

CIP savings for C/I are not broken out by Small and Large C/I for purposes of this calculation. The CIP savings were allocated based on sales usage.

In 2014, MERC recorded a Regulatory Liability (Refund to Customers) of \$3,283,235 for the Residential sector. This includes the Low Income sector as there is no distinction of Low Income Customers in the RDM. Also in 2014, MERC recorded a Regulatory Liability (Refund to Customers) of \$166,426 for the General Service Small C/I sector.

The Large C/I sector is not included in MERC's RDM calculation; therefore no Regulatory Liability or Asset has been calculated.

E. Impact of General Rate Cases During Implementation of the Pilot Program

E.1. Did MERC file any rate cases during the pilot period? If so, when?

MERC filed a rate case in Docket No. G011/GR-13-617 on September 30, 2013 which was based on a 2014 test year.

E.2. To the extent new base rates took effect during the pilot period, when did those new rates take effect and what impact did that have on the methods and mechanics of the deferral calculations? Please include changes to base therm sales, weather adjustments, and rate of return.

The 2014 decoupling mechanism was updated with the sales, customer counts, and distribution rates (less the CCRC) that were ultimately approved in Docket No. G011/GR-13-617.

F. New Customer Usage and Adjustment Under the RDM

F.1. What was the impact of new customers on the decoupling calculations for the period being evaluated? Specifically what was:

- a. The number of customers used (by class) in the decoupling calculations,
- b. The number of customers approved (by class) in the most recent general rate case,
- c. The difference between a and b,
- d. The margin associated with c, and
- e. The per customer impact of d.

Table F1 - Customer Usage and Adjustment		
	Residential	GS Small C&I
Actual Customers in Decoupling Calculation	193,436	10,985
Approved Customers in Decoupling Calculation	192,587	10,959
Actual less Approved Customers	849	26
Difference in Customers x Average Actual Annual Use x Per Therm Rate	\$ 144,792	\$ 3,947
Per Customer Impact of d	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.36

F.2. Did MERC implement any changes to the methodology to account for new customers during the course of the pilot?

No changes to the methodology to account for new customers during the course of the evaluation period were necessary. As described in the Direct Testimony of Ms. Valerie Grace in Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977, MERC's decoupling mechanism is calculated on a per customer basis. The reason behind the per customer basis is to

filter out any changes (increase or decrease) in the number of customers that would differ from those levels supporting the revenue approved by the Commission in a general rate case proceeding. Doing so will not only isolate the changes in usage and related distribution revenues for the number of customers that were used to determine the revenues approved in a general rate case proceeding; it will recognize the additional costs incurred by MERC to provide service to new customers. These costs include the addition of new services and meters as well as other expenses to serve new customers joining the system. This approach will allow MERC to continue to recover the cost of

connecting new customers. Moreover, it will also prevent MERC from recovering revenues for load losses associated with customers leaving the system.

F.3. What were the monthly numbers of customers served, by rate schedule, in the evaluation period being reported on?

Table F3 - Number of Customers		
	Residential	Small C&I
Jan-13	197,769	11,282
Feb-13	193,361	11,054
Mar-13	193,636	11,044
Apr-13	188,175	10,790
May-13	192,368	10,906
Jun-13	193,639	11,001
Jul-13	193,974	10,990
Aug-13	193,120	10,976
Sep-13	193,133	10,897
Oct-13	194,569	10,985
Nov-13	193,571	10,946
Dec-13	193,913	10,949
Monthly Average	193,436	10,985

F.4. What was the actual average usage for customers subject to the decoupling rider for the evaluation period being reported on?

The average annual usage per Residential customer in 2014 was 881 therms.

The average annual usage per General Service Small C/I customer in 2014 was 969 therms.

F.5. In this section, please also refer to and discuss the data regarding total sales volumes and total gas margin revenues provided in response to questions G1 and G2 below.

In the responses to questions G1 and G2 below MERC has identified by Rate Schedule sales and margin revenues for 2010 – 2014 Actual as well as the 2015 Forecast. These sales and margins are not weather normalized, and represent the actual data from year to year.

G. Related Rate and Customer Usage Information (Actual and Forecasted)

G.1. What were total therm sales volumes by rate schedule in the period being evaluated?

Table G1 - Therm Sales						TOTAL
RATE SCHEDULE	TOTAL 2010	TOTAL 2011	TOTAL 2012	TOTAL 2013	TOTAL 2014	FORECAST 2015
SC_INTERR	28,990,686	31,917,575	28,020,652	39,571,664	37,199,675	36,089,165
SC_JOINT	527,860	521,944	388,885	425,811	449,827	409,877
SC_LCI	79,999,173	85,965,329	74,202,360	96,596,507	106,101,306	88,970,695
SC_RES	159,126,553	163,964,334	137,124,435	181,296,462	201,388,459	166,579,253
SC_SCI	8,820,834	8,596,847	7,034,960	12,392,175	14,950,997	11,241,284
SC_TRNSP	442,458,897	455,923,761	522,937,889	497,478,521	554,826,052	466,144,397
Grand Total	719,924,003	746,889,790	769,709,181	827,761,140	914,916,316	769,434,671

G.2. What were total gas margin revenues by rate schedule in 2011 and each evaluation period?

Table G2 – Gas Margin Revenues

					TOTAL FORECAST 2015
RATE SCHEDULE	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
SC_LCI	\$14,954,066	\$13,192,305	\$17,421,453	\$20,195,323	\$15,007,577
SC_RES	\$32,647,483	\$27,945,891	\$37,479,743	\$44,889,488	\$32,906,066
SC_SCI	\$1,437,591	\$1,234,583	\$2,463,734	\$3,125,356	\$2,082,448
Grand Total	\$49,039,140	\$42,372,779	\$57,364,930	\$68,210,167	\$49,996,091

G.3. What was the rate of average annual gas customer growth by rate schedule starting in 2011? How does this compare to MERC's historical levels of gas customer growth in the 2009-2010 period? What is the Company's forecast for future customer growth? What were the average annual customer count totals by rate schedule for the period being reported?

Part 1: Rate of Average Annual Gas Customer Growth by Rate Schedule.

Part 2: MERC's Forecasted Growth Rate.

Part 3: Average Annual Customer Count Totals by Rate Schedule.

Table G3 - Part 1 and 2					
	Part 1:	Part 1:	Part 1:	Part 1:	Part 2:
	Growth Rate	Growth Rate	Growth Rate	Growth Rate	Growth Rate
SERVICECLASS	2011 vs 2010	2012 vs 2011	2013 vs 2012	2014 vs 2012	4cst 2015 vs 2014 Actual
SC_INTERR	-14%	-8%	0%	-1%	2%
SC_JOINT	-22%	-24%	-19%	18%	4%
SC_LCI	-1%	-6%	-3%	0%	0%
SC_RES	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
SC_SCI	0%	10%	5%	0%	0%
SC_TRNSP	0%	0%	1%	3%	-3%
Grand Total	-39%	-27%	-14%	20%	4%

Table G3 - Part 3; Fix Charge Counts/Month						Part 3:
	Part 3:	Part 3:	Part 3:	Part 3:	Part 3:	AVERAGE
	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	FORECAST
SERVICECLASS	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
SC_INTERR	571	488	450	452	446	455
SC_JOINT	14	11	8	7	8	8
SC_LCI	11,516	11,436	10,731	10,412	10,429	10,411
SC_RES	187,603	187,125	189,630	192,428	193,436	194,404
SC_SCI	9,597	9,555	10,466	10,983	10,985	11,014
SC_TRNSP	165	165	165	166	171	166
Grand Total	209,465	208,780	211,451	214,449	215,475	216,458

G.4. What proportion of customers subject to decoupling was residential versus commercial during the pilot. What proportion of usage from customers subject to decoupling was residential versus commercial during the pilot?

Table G4 - Proportions of Customers and Usage		
	2014 Average	% of Customers
	Annual Customers	Applicable to Decoupling
Residential	193,436	95%
General Service Small C&I	10,985	5%
		% of Sales
	2014 Sales	Applicable to Decoupling
Residential	201,388,459	93%
General Service Small C&I	14,950,997	7%

G.5. On a rate schedule basis, how has actual annual gas use per customer changed during 2011 through the period being evaluated?

Table G5 - Change in Use per Customer					
	CHANGE IN USE PER CUST	CHANGE IN USE PER CUST	CHANGE IN USE PER CUST	CHANGE IN USE PER CUST	CHANGE IN USE PER CUST
SERVICECLASS	2011 VS 2010	2012 VS 2011	2013 VS 2012	2014 VS 2013	2015 4CST VS 2014
SC_INTERR	14,544	-3,087	25,249	-4,106	-4,027
SC_JOINT	10,542	-1,133	16,881	-6,638	-7,336
SC_LCI	570	-602	2,362	896	-1,628
SC_RES	28	-153	219	99	-184
SC_SCI	-19	-228	456	233	-340
SC_TRNSP	91,358	395,716	-178,368	255,992	-435,404
Grand Total	117,023	390,512	-133,200	246,476	-448,919

G.6. What has been the change in the Company's natural gas delivered average monthly price per therm by rate schedule during 2011 through the period being evaluated? Provide a detailed incremental chronological listing (including Docket #) and price per therm impact of all rate adjustments (commodity, general rate case, decoupling, etc.) during 2011 through the period being evaluated. What was the cumulative impact factoring in all rate adjustments from the beginning of 2011 through the period being evaluated?

NNG Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost Factor	Dist Margin Factor	Decoupling Factor	Delivered Factor	\$/therm Change in Delivered Rate	Notes
2011	1	0.60675	0.17746	0.00000	0.78421		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.61366	0.19417	0.00000	0.80783	0.02362	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.60068	0.19417	0.00000	0.79485	-0.01298	

2011	4	0.60902	0.19417	0.00000	0.80319	0.00834	
2011	5	0.60584	0.19417	0.00000	0.80001	-0.00318	
2011	6	0.60306	0.19417	0.00000	0.79723	-0.00278	
2011	7	0.59986	0.19417	0.00000	0.79403	-0.00320	
2011	8	0.60905	0.19417	0.00000	0.80322	0.00919	
2011	9	0.55242	0.19417	0.00000	0.74659	-0.05663	
2011	10	0.52999	0.19417	0.00000	0.72416	-0.02243	
2011	11	0.58051	0.19417	0.00000	0.77468	0.05052	
2011	12	0.56398	0.19417	0.00000	0.75815	-0.01653	
2012	1	0.54858	0.19417	0.00000	0.74275	-0.01540	
2012	2	0.51386	0.19417	0.00000	0.70803	-0.03472	
2012	3	0.51831	0.19417	0.00000	0.71248	0.00445	
2012	4	0.50284	0.19417	0.00000	0.69701	-0.01547	
2012	5	0.45246	0.19417	0.00000	0.64663	-0.05038	
2012	6	0.44295	0.19417	0.00000	0.63712	-0.00951	
2012	7	0.45564	0.19417	0.00000	0.64981	0.01269	
2012	8	0.49261	0.19417	0.00000	0.68678	0.03697	
2012	9	0.49561	0.19417	0.00000	0.68978	0.00300	
2012	10	0.52252	0.19417	0.00000	0.71669	0.02691	
2012	11	0.56071	0.19417	0.00000	0.75488	0.03819	
2012	12	0.57632	0.19417	0.00000	0.77049	0.01561	
2013	1	0.53889	0.19754	0.00000	0.73643	-0.03406	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.53387	0.19754	0.00000	0.73141	-0.00502	
2013	3	0.54726	0.19754	0.00000	0.74480	0.01339	
2013	4	0.59179	0.19754	0.00000	0.78933	0.04453	
2013	5	0.63074	0.19754	0.00000	0.82828	0.03895	
2013	6	0.63549	0.19754	0.00000	0.83303	0.00475	

Viking Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.72751	0.17746	0.00000	0.90497		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.72581	0.19417	0.00000	0.91998	0.01501	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.71621	0.19417	0.00000	0.91038	-0.00960	
2011	4	0.71034	0.19417	0.00000	0.90451	-0.00587	
2011	5	0.72539	0.19417	0.00000	0.91956	0.01505	
2011	6	0.72059	0.19417	0.00000	0.91476	-0.00480	
2011	7	0.71968	0.19417	0.00000	0.91385	-0.00091	
2011	8	0.71965	0.19417	0.00000	0.91382	-0.00003	
2011	9	0.48206	0.19417	0.00000	0.67623	-0.23759	

2011	10	0.47587	0.19417	0.00000	0.67004	-0.00619	
2011	11	0.49874	0.19417	0.00000	0.69291	0.02287	
2011	12	0.47693	0.19417	0.00000	0.67110	-0.02181	
2012	1	0.47608	0.19417	0.00000	0.67025	-0.00085	
2012	2	0.44358	0.19417	0.00000	0.63775	-0.03250	
2012	3	0.44479	0.19417	0.00000	0.63896	0.00121	
2012	4	0.39274	0.19417	0.00000	0.58691	-0.05205	
2012	5	0.31198	0.19417	0.00000	0.50615	-0.08076	
2012	6	0.34770	0.19417	0.00000	0.54187	0.03572	
2012	7	0.37755	0.19417	0.00000	0.57172	0.02985	
2012	8	0.40648	0.19417	0.00000	0.60065	0.02893	
2012	9	0.36158	0.19417	0.00000	0.55575	-0.04490	
2012	10	0.40473	0.19417	0.00000	0.59890	0.04315	
2012	11	0.40530	0.19417	0.00000	0.59947	0.00057	
2012	12	0.40513	0.19417	0.00000	0.59930	-0.00017	
2013	1	0.41168	0.19754	0.00000	0.60922	0.00992	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.40574	0.19754	0.00000	0.60328	-0.00594	
2013	3	0.42631	0.19754	0.00000	0.62385	0.02057	
2013	4	0.44587	0.19754	0.00000	0.64341	0.01956	
2013	5	0.50692	0.19754	0.00000	0.70446	0.06105	
2013	6	0.50602	0.19754	0.00000	0.70356	-0.00090	

Great Lakes Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.66055	0.17746	0.00000	0.83801		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.65844	0.19417	0.00000	0.85261	0.01460	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.64956	0.19417	0.00000	0.84373	-0.00888	
2011	4	0.64851	0.19417	0.00000	0.84268	-0.00105	
2011	5	0.66334	0.19417	0.00000	0.85751	0.01483	
2011	6	0.65836	0.19417	0.00000	0.85253	-0.00498	
2011	7	0.65731	0.19417	0.00000	0.85148	-0.00105	
2011	8	0.65714	0.19417	0.00000	0.85131	-0.00017	
2011	9	0.48320	0.19417	0.00000	0.67737	-0.17394	
2011	10	0.46896	0.19417	0.00000	0.66313	-0.01424	
2011	11	0.49067	0.19417	0.00000	0.68484	0.02171	
2011	12	0.46933	0.19417	0.00000	0.66350	-0.02134	
2012	1	0.46835	0.19417	0.00000	0.66252	-0.00098	
2012	2	0.43631	0.19417	0.00000	0.63048	-0.03204	
2012	3	0.43755	0.19417	0.00000	0.63172	0.00124	

2012	4	0.38947	0.19417	0.00000	0.58364	-0.04808	
2012	5	0.30925	0.19417	0.00000	0.50342	-0.08022	
2012	6	0.34485	0.19417	0.00000	0.53902	0.03560	
2012	7	0.37451	0.19417	0.00000	0.56868	0.02966	
2012	8	0.40326	0.19417	0.00000	0.59743	0.02875	
2012	9	0.34347	0.19417	0.00000	0.53764	-0.05979	
2012	10	0.38626	0.19417	0.00000	0.58043	0.04279	
2012	11	0.39815	0.19417	0.00000	0.59232	0.01189	
2012	12	0.39661	0.19417	0.00000	0.59078	-0.00154	
2013	1	0.39717	0.19754	0.00000	0.59471	0.00393	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.39135	0.19754	0.00000	0.58889	-0.00582	
2013	3	0.41188	0.19754	0.00000	0.60942	0.02053	
2013	4	0.43443	0.19754	0.00000	0.63197	0.02255	
2013	5	0.49587	0.19754	0.00000	0.69341	0.06144	
2013	6	0.49791	0.19754	0.00000	0.69545	0.00204	

NMU Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.56922	0.21759	0.00000	0.78681		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.57058	0.24189	0.00000	0.81247	0.02566	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.55991	0.24189	0.00000	0.80180	-0.01067	
2011	4	0.56039	0.24189	0.00000	0.80228	0.00048	
2011	5	0.56855	0.24189	0.00000	0.81044	0.00816	
2011	6	0.56420	0.24189	0.00000	0.80609	-0.00435	
2011	7	0.56242	0.24189	0.00000	0.80431	-0.00178	
2011	8	0.56584	0.24189	0.00000	0.80773	0.00342	
2011	9	0.50203	0.24189	0.00000	0.74392	-0.06381	
2011	10	0.48083	0.24189	0.00000	0.72272	-0.02120	
2011	11	0.52233	0.24189	0.00000	0.76422	0.04150	
2011	12	0.50278	0.24189	0.00000	0.74467	-0.01955	
2012	1	0.49651	0.24189	0.00000	0.73840	-0.00627	
2012	2	0.46326	0.24189	0.00000	0.70515	-0.03325	
2012	3	0.46564	0.24189	0.00000	0.70753	0.00238	
2012	4	0.42590	0.24189	0.00000	0.66779	-0.03974	
2012	5	0.35681	0.24189	0.00000	0.59870	-0.06909	
2012	6	0.37545	0.24189	0.00000	0.61734	0.01864	
2012	7	0.39877	0.24189	0.00000	0.64066	0.02332	
2012	8	0.43064	0.24189	0.00000	0.67253	0.03187	
2012	9	0.41902	0.24189	0.00000	0.66091	-0.01162	

2012	10	0.45593	0.24189	0.00000	0.69782	0.03691	
2012	11	0.48126	0.24189	0.00000	0.72315	0.02533	
2012	12	0.48654	0.24189	0.00000	0.72843	0.00528	
2013	1	0.48940	0.19754	0.00000	0.68694	-0.04149	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.48386	0.19754	0.00000	0.68140	-0.00554	
2013	3	0.50154	0.19754	0.00000	0.69908	0.01768	
2013	4	0.53216	0.19754	0.00000	0.72970	0.03062	
2013	5	0.58453	0.19754	0.00000	0.78207	0.05237	
2013	6	0.58660	0.19754	0.00000	0.78414	0.00207	

NNG Residential

Year	Month	GAS COSTS	DIST MARGIN	ACA Factor	Decoupling Factor	EFFECTIVE RATE	\$/therm Change in Delivered Rate	Notes
2013	7	0.55793	0.19754	0		0.75547		PGA Consolidation
2013	8	0.55893	0.19754	0		0.75647	0.00100	
2013	9	0.54269	0.19754	-0.0004		0.73983	-0.01664	
2013	10	0.5432	0.19754	-0.0004		0.74034	0.00051	
2013	11	0.57612	0.19754	-0.0004		0.77326	0.03292	
2013	12	0.57301	0.19754	-0.0004		0.77015	-0.00311	
2014	1	0.64047	0.2229	-0.0004		0.86297	0.09282	Docket No. G011/GR-13-617 Interim
2014	2	0.69673	0.2229	-0.0004		0.91923	0.05626	
2014	3	0.76921	0.2229	-0.0004		0.99171	0.07248	
2014	4	0.67216	0.2229	-0.0004	-0.01247	0.88219	-0.10952	Implementation of 2013 Decoupling
2014	5	0.67007	0.2229	-0.0004	-0.01247	0.88010	-0.00209	
2014	6	0.65221	0.2229	-0.0004	-0.01247	0.86224	-0.01786	
2014	7	0.6605	0.2229	-0.0004	-0.01247	0.87053	0.00829	
2014	8	0.58232	0.2229	-0.0004	-0.01247	0.79235	-0.07818	
2014	9	0.64579	0.2229	0.04714	-0.01247	0.90336	0.11101	
2014	10	0.64134	0.2229	0.04714	-0.01247	0.89891	-0.00445	
2014	11	0.64747	0.2229	0.04714	-0.01247	0.90504	0.00613	
2014	12	0.72288	0.2229	0.04714	-0.01247	0.98045	0.07541	

Consolidated Residential

Year	Month	GAS COSTS	DIST MARGIN	ACA Factor	Decoupling Factor	EFFECTIVE RATE	\$/therm Change in Delivered Rate	Notes
2013	7	0.47661	0.19754	0.00000		0.67415		PGA Consolidation
2013	8	0.47303	0.19754	0.00000		0.67057	-0.00358	
2013	9	0.44388	0.19754	-0.03086		0.61056	-0.06001	

2013	10	0.4476	0.19754	-0.03086		0.61428	0.00372	
2013	11	0.43626	0.19754	-0.03086		0.60294	-0.01134	
2013	12	0.45976	0.19754	-0.03086		0.62644	0.02350	
2014	1	0.483	0.22290	-0.03086		0.67504	0.04860	Docket No. G011/GR-13-617 Interim
2014	2	0.62107	0.22290	-0.03086		0.81311	0.13807	
2014	3	0.71717	0.22290	-0.03086		0.90921	0.09610	
2014	4	0.55121	0.22290	-0.03086	-0.01247	0.73078	-0.17843	Implementation of 2013 Decoupling
2014	5	0.55653	0.22290	-0.03086	-0.01247	0.73610	0.00532	
2014	6	0.5256	0.22290	-0.03086	-0.01247	0.70517	-0.03093	
2014	7	0.52248	0.22290	-0.03086	-0.01247	0.70205	-0.00312	
2014	8	0.45761	0.22290	-0.03086	-0.01247	0.63718	-0.06487	
2014	9	0.59028	0.22290	0.08726	-0.01247	0.88797	0.25079	
2014	10	0.60022	0.22290	0.08726	-0.01247	0.89791	0.00994	
2014	11	0.66064	0.22290	0.08726	-0.01247	0.95833	0.06042	
2014	12	0.68246	0.22290	0.08726	-0.01247	0.98015	0.02182	

NNG Small C/I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.60675	0.15022	0.00000	0.75697		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.61366	0.16437	0.00000	0.77803	0.02106	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.60068	0.16437	0.00000	0.76505	-0.01298	
2011	4	0.60902	0.16437	0.00000	0.77339	0.00834	
2011	5	0.60584	0.16437	0.00000	0.77021	-0.00318	
2011	6	0.60306	0.16437	0.00000	0.76743	-0.00278	
2011	7	0.59986	0.16437	0.00000	0.76423	-0.00320	
2011	8	0.60905	0.16437	0.00000	0.77342	0.00919	
2011	9	0.55242	0.16437	0.00000	0.71679	-0.05663	
2011	10	0.52999	0.16437	0.00000	0.69436	-0.02243	
2011	11	0.58051	0.16437	0.00000	0.74488	0.05052	
2011	12	0.56398	0.16437	0.00000	0.72835	-0.01653	
2012	1	0.54858	0.16437	0.00000	0.71295	-0.01540	
2012	2	0.51386	0.16437	0.00000	0.67823	-0.03472	
2012	3	0.51831	0.16437	0.00000	0.68268	0.00445	
2012	4	0.50284	0.16437	0.00000	0.66721	-0.01547	
2012	5	0.45246	0.16437	0.00000	0.61683	-0.05038	
2012	6	0.44295	0.16437	0.00000	0.60732	-0.00951	
2012	7	0.45564	0.16437	0.00000	0.62001	0.01269	
2012	8	0.49261	0.16437	0.00000	0.65698	0.03697	
2012	9	0.49561	0.16437	0.00000	0.65998	0.00300	
2012	10	0.52252	0.16437	0.00000	0.68689	0.02691	
2012	11	0.56071	0.16437	0.00000	0.72508	0.03819	

2012	12	0.57632	0.16437	0.00000	0.74069	0.01561	
2013	1	0.53889	0.18525	0.00000	0.72414	-0.01655	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.53387	0.18525	0.00000	0.71912	-0.00502	
2013	3	0.54726	0.18525	0.00000	0.73251	0.01339	
2013	4	0.59179	0.18525	0.00000	0.77704	0.04453	
2013	5	0.63074	0.18525	0.00000	0.81599	0.03895	
2013	6	0.63549	0.18525	0.00000	0.82074	0.00475	

Viking Small C/I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.72751	0.15022	0.00000	0.87773		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.72581	0.16437	0.00000	0.89018	0.01245	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.71621	0.16437	0.00000	0.88058	-0.00960	
2011	4	0.71034	0.16437	0.00000	0.87471	-0.00587	
2011	5	0.72539	0.16437	0.00000	0.88976	0.01505	
2011	6	0.72059	0.16437	0.00000	0.88496	-0.00480	
2011	7	0.71968	0.16437	0.00000	0.88405	-0.00091	
2011	8	0.71965	0.16437	0.00000	0.88402	-0.00003	
2011	9	0.48206	0.16437	0.00000	0.64643	-0.23759	
2011	10	0.47587	0.16437	0.00000	0.64024	-0.00619	
2011	11	0.49874	0.16437	0.00000	0.66311	0.02287	
2011	12	0.47693	0.16437	0.00000	0.64130	-0.02181	
2012	1	0.47608	0.16437	0.00000	0.64045	-0.00085	
2012	2	0.44358	0.16437	0.00000	0.60795	-0.03250	
2012	3	0.44479	0.16437	0.00000	0.60916	0.00121	
2012	4	0.39274	0.16437	0.00000	0.55711	-0.05205	
2012	5	0.31198	0.16437	0.00000	0.47635	-0.08076	
2012	6	0.34770	0.16437	0.00000	0.51207	0.03572	
2012	7	0.37755	0.16437	0.00000	0.54192	0.02985	
2012	8	0.40648	0.16437	0.00000	0.57085	0.02893	
2012	9	0.36158	0.16437	0.00000	0.52595	-0.04490	
2012	10	0.40473	0.16437	0.00000	0.56910	0.04315	
2012	11	0.40530	0.16437	0.00000	0.56967	0.00057	
2012	12	0.40513	0.16437	0.00000	0.56950	-0.00017	
2013	1	0.41168	0.18525	0.00000	0.59693	0.02743	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.40574	0.18525	0.00000	0.59099	-0.00594	
2013	3	0.42631	0.18525	0.00000	0.61156	0.02057	
2013	4	0.44587	0.18525	0.00000	0.63112	0.01956	
2013	5	0.50692	0.18525	0.00000	0.69217	0.06105	

2013	6	0.50602	0.18525	0.00000	0.69127	-0.00090
------	---	---------	---------	---------	---------	----------

Great Lakes Small C/I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in	Notes
		Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	
2011	1	0.66055	0.15022	0.00000	0.81077		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.65844	0.16437	0.00000	0.82281	0.01204	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.64956	0.16437	0.00000	0.81393	-0.00888	
2011	4	0.64851	0.16437	0.00000	0.81288	-0.00105	
2011	5	0.66334	0.16437	0.00000	0.82771	0.01483	
2011	6	0.65836	0.16437	0.00000	0.82273	-0.00498	
2011	7	0.65731	0.16437	0.00000	0.82168	-0.00105	
2011	8	0.65714	0.16437	0.00000	0.82151	-0.00017	
2011	9	0.48320	0.16437	0.00000	0.64757	-0.17394	
2011	10	0.46896	0.16437	0.00000	0.63333	-0.01424	
2011	11	0.49067	0.16437	0.00000	0.65504	0.02171	
2011	12	0.46933	0.16437	0.00000	0.63370	-0.02134	
2012	1	0.46835	0.16437	0.00000	0.63272	-0.00098	
2012	2	0.43631	0.16437	0.00000	0.60068	-0.03204	
2012	3	0.43755	0.16437	0.00000	0.60192	0.00124	
2012	4	0.38947	0.16437	0.00000	0.55384	-0.04808	
2012	5	0.30925	0.16437	0.00000	0.47362	-0.08022	
2012	6	0.34485	0.16437	0.00000	0.50922	0.03560	
2012	7	0.37451	0.16437	0.00000	0.53888	0.02966	
2012	8	0.40326	0.16437	0.00000	0.56763	0.02875	
2012	9	0.34347	0.16437	0.00000	0.50784	-0.05979	
2012	10	0.38626	0.16437	0.00000	0.55063	0.04279	
2012	11	0.39815	0.16437	0.00000	0.56252	0.01189	
2012	12	0.39661	0.16437	0.00000	0.56098	-0.00154	
2013	1	0.39717	0.18525	0.00000	0.58242	0.02144	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.39135	0.18525	0.00000	0.57660	-0.00582	
2013	3	0.41188	0.18525	0.00000	0.59713	0.02053	
2013	4	0.43443	0.18525	0.00000	0.61968	0.02255	
2013	5	0.49587	0.18525	0.00000	0.68112	0.06144	
2013	6	0.49791	0.18525	0.00000	0.68316	0.00204	

NMU Small C/I

Gas Cost	Dist Margin	Decoupling	Delivered	\$/therm Change in
----------	-------------	------------	-----------	-----------------------

Year	Month	Factor	Factor	Factor	Factor	Delivered Rate	Notes
2011	1	0.56922	0.18564	0.00000	0.75486		Docket No. G007,011/GR-08-836
2011	2	0.57058	0.20637	0.00000	0.77695	0.02209	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2011	3	0.55991	0.20637	0.00000	0.76628	-0.01067	
2011	4	0.56039	0.20637	0.00000	0.76676	0.00048	
2011	5	0.56855	0.20637	0.00000	0.77492	0.00816	
2011	6	0.56420	0.20637	0.00000	0.77057	-0.00435	
2011	7	0.56242	0.20637	0.00000	0.76879	-0.00178	
2011	8	0.56584	0.20637	0.00000	0.77221	0.00342	
2011	9	0.50203	0.20637	0.00000	0.70840	-0.06381	
2011	10	0.48083	0.20637	0.00000	0.68720	-0.02120	
2011	11	0.52233	0.20637	0.00000	0.72870	0.04150	
2011	12	0.50278	0.20637	0.00000	0.70915	-0.01955	
2012	1	0.49651	0.20637	0.00000	0.70288	-0.00627	
2012	2	0.46326	0.20637	0.00000	0.66963	-0.03325	
2012	3	0.46564	0.20637	0.00000	0.67201	0.00238	
2012	4	0.42590	0.20637	0.00000	0.63227	-0.03974	
2012	5	0.35681	0.20637	0.00000	0.56318	-0.06909	
2012	6	0.37545	0.20637	0.00000	0.58182	0.01864	
2012	7	0.39877	0.20637	0.00000	0.60514	0.02332	
2012	8	0.43064	0.20637	0.00000	0.63701	0.03187	
2012	9	0.41902	0.20637	0.00000	0.62539	-0.01162	
2012	10	0.45593	0.20637	0.00000	0.66230	0.03691	
2012	11	0.48126	0.20637	0.00000	0.68763	0.02533	
2012	12	0.48654	0.20637	0.00000	0.69291	0.00528	
2013	1	0.48940	0.18525	0.00000	0.67465	-0.01826	Docket No. G007,011/GR-10-977
2013	2	0.48386	0.18525	0.00000	0.66911	-0.00554	
2013	3	0.50154	0.18525	0.00000	0.68679	0.01768	
2013	4	0.53216	0.18525	0.00000	0.71741	0.03062	
2013	5	0.58453	0.18525	0.00000	0.76978	0.05237	
2013	6	0.58660	0.18525	0.00000	0.77185	0.00207	

NNG Small C&I								
		GAS	DIST	ACA	Decoupling	EFFECTIVE	\$/therm Change in	
Year	Month	COSTS	MARGIN	Factor	Factor	RATE	Delivered Rate	Notes
2013	7	0.55793	0.18525	0		0.74318		PGA Consolidation
2013	8	0.55893	0.18525	0		0.74418	0.00100	
2013	9	0.54269	0.18525	-0.0004		0.72754	-0.01664	
2013	10	0.5432	0.18525	-0.0004		0.72805	0.00051	
2013	11	0.57612	0.18525	-0.0004		0.76097	0.03292	
2013	12	0.57301	0.18525	-0.0004		0.75786	-0.00311	Docket No. G011/GR-13-617 Interim
2014	1	0.64047	0.20904	-0.0004		0.84911	0.09125	
2014	2	0.69673	0.20904	-0.0004		0.90537	0.05626	
2014	3	0.76921	0.20904	-0.0004		0.97785	0.07248	Implementation of 2013 Decoupling
2014	4	0.67216	0.20904	-0.0004	-0.01701	0.86379	-0.11406	
2014	5	0.67007	0.20904	-0.0004	-0.01701	0.86170	-0.00209	
2014	6	0.65221	0.20904	-0.0004	-0.01701	0.84384	-0.01786	
2014	7	0.6605	0.20904	-0.0004	-0.01701	0.85213	0.00829	
2014	8	0.58232	0.20904	-0.0004	-0.01701	0.77395	-0.07818	
2014	9	0.64579	0.20904	0.04714	-0.01701	0.88496	0.11101	
2014	10	0.64134	0.20904	0.04714	-0.01701	0.88051	-0.00445	
2014	11	0.64747	0.20904	0.04714	-0.01701	0.88664	0.00613	
2014	12	0.72288	0.20904	0.04714	-0.01701	0.96205	0.07541	
NNG Consolidated								
		GAS	DIST	ACA	Decoupling	EFFECTIVE	\$/therm Change in	
Year	Month	COSTS	MARGIN	Factor	Factor	RATE	Delivered Rate	Notes
2013	7	0.47661	0.18525	0		0.66186		PGA Consolidation
2013	8	0.47303	0.18525	0		0.65828	-0.00358	
2013	9	0.44388	0.18525	-0.03086		0.59827	-0.06001	
2013	10	0.4476	0.18525	-0.03086		0.60199	0.00372	
2013	11	0.43626	0.18525	-0.03086		0.59065	-0.01134	
2013	12	0.45976	0.18525	-0.03086		0.61415	0.02350	Docket No. G011/GR-13-617 Interim
2014	1	0.483	0.20904	-0.03086		0.66118	0.04703	
2014	2	0.62107	0.20904	-0.03086		0.79925	0.13807	
2014	3	0.71717	0.20904	-0.03086		0.89535	0.09610	Implementation of 2013 Decoupling
2014	4	0.55121	0.20904	-0.03086	-0.01701	0.71238	-0.18297	
2014	5	0.55653	0.20904	-0.03086	-0.01701	0.71770	0.00532	
2014	6	0.5256	0.20904	-0.03086	-0.01701	0.68677	-0.03093	
2014	7	0.52248	0.20904	-0.03086	-0.01701	0.68365	-0.00312	
2014	8	0.45761	0.20904	-0.03086	-0.01701	0.61878	-0.06487	
2014	9	0.59028	0.20904	0.08726	-0.01701	0.86957	0.25079	
2014	10	0.60022	0.20904	0.08726	-0.01701	0.87951	0.00994	
2014	11	0.66064	0.20904	0.08726	-0.01701	0.93993	0.06042	
2014	12	0.68246	0.20904	0.08726	-0.01701	0.96175	0.02182	

G.7. What has been the natural gas commodity cost embedded in the average monthly price per therm values by rate schedule in the previous question and how did margin revenues (excluding recovery of gas commodity cost) change during 2011 through the period being evaluated? Provide a detailed incremental chronological listing (including Docket #) and impact of all commodity adjustments during the 2011 through the period being evaluated. What was the total impact factoring in all adjustments from the beginning of 2011 through the period being evaluated?

The data has been split into two time frames, pre and post consolidation.

NNG Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.60675	\$5,193,548
2011	2	0.61366	\$4,714,185
2011	3	0.60068	\$3,391,061
2011	4	0.60902	\$1,911,850
2011	5	0.60584	\$1,003,226
2011	6	0.60306	-\$19,554
2011	7	0.59986	\$278,402
2011	8	0.60905	\$384,170
2011	9	0.55242	\$463,786
2011	10	0.52999	\$801,292
2011	11	0.58051	\$1,880,409
2011	12	0.56398	\$3,832,648
2012	1	0.54858	\$4,163,182
2012	2	0.51386	\$4,009,436
2012	3	0.51831	\$2,789,361
2012	4	0.50284	\$100,490
2012	5	0.45246	\$939,924
2012	6	0.44295	\$98,837
2012	7	0.45564	\$377,511
2012	8	0.49261	\$401,463
2012	9	0.49561	\$451,711
2012	10	0.52252	\$980,690
2012	11	0.56071	\$2,261,933
2012	12	0.57632	\$3,423,687
2013	1	0.53889	\$4,515,141
2013	2	0.53387	\$5,635,357
2013	3	0.54726	\$3,824,256
2013	4	0.59179	\$2,754,359
2013	5	0.63074	\$1,500,597
2013	6	0.63549	-\$361,209

Viking Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.72751	\$134,582

2011	2	0.72581	\$123,362
2011	3	0.71621	\$96,217
2011	4	0.71034	\$54,171
2011	5	0.72539	\$21,786
2011	6	0.72059	-\$5,334
2011	7	0.71968	\$912
2011	8	0.71965	\$5,451
2011	9	0.48206	\$7,472
2011	10	0.47587	\$23,885
2011	11	0.49874	\$49,222
2011	12	0.47693	\$108,474
2012	1	0.47608	\$103,978
2012	2	0.44358	\$113,431
2012	3	0.44479	\$80,943
2012	4	0.39274	\$9,607
2012	5	0.31198	\$19,438
2012	6	0.34770	-\$1,951
2012	7	0.37755	\$4,524
2012	8	0.40648	\$6,234
2012	9	0.36158	\$7,389
2012	10	0.40473	\$31,549
2012	11	0.40530	\$67,797
2012	12	0.40513	\$105,484
2013	1	0.41168	\$120,158
2013	2	0.40574	\$139,315
2013	3	0.42631	\$113,693
2013	4	0.44587	\$55,821
2013	5	0.50692	\$71,303
2013	6	0.50602	-\$28,353

Great Lakes Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.66055	\$170,883
2011	2	0.65844	\$149,564
2011	3	0.64956	\$132,559
2011	4	0.64851	\$65,641
2011	5	0.66334	\$23,478
2011	6	0.65836	-\$7,889
2011	7	0.65731	-\$977
2011	8	0.65714	\$6,069

2011	9	0.48320	\$9,096
2011	10	0.46896	\$28,020
2011	11	0.49067	\$70,029
2011	12	0.46933	\$141,660
2012	1	0.46835	\$134,147
2012	2	0.43631	\$144,637
2012	3	0.43755	\$98,805
2012	4	0.38947	\$22,140
2012	5	0.30925	\$29,307
2012	6	0.34485	-\$6,479
2012	7	0.37451	\$2,126
2012	8	0.40326	\$5,795
2012	9	0.34347	\$9,581
2012	10	0.38626	\$42,624
2012	11	0.39815	\$84,457
2012	12	0.39661	\$138,870
2013	1	0.39717	\$163,646
2013	2	0.39135	\$180,072
2013	3	0.41188	\$118,950
2013	4	0.43443	\$93,627
2013	5	0.49587	\$81,538
2013	6	0.49791	-\$23,261

NMU Residential

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.56922	\$1,476,451
2011	2	0.57058	\$1,424,182
2011	3	0.55991	\$1,051,814
2011	4	0.56039	\$690,876
2011	5	0.56855	\$315,036
2011	6	0.56420	-\$21,885
2011	7	0.56242	\$72,309
2011	8	0.56584	\$41,711
2011	9	0.50203	\$97,851
2011	10	0.48083	\$266,325
2011	11	0.52233	\$699,060
2011	12	0.50278	\$1,290,398
2012	1	0.49651	\$1,319,370
2012	2	0.46326	\$1,276,601
2012	3	0.46564	\$829,505

2012	4	0.42590	\$356,144
2012	5	0.35681	\$320,643
2012	6	0.37545	-\$39,527
2012	7	0.39877	\$43,150
2012	8	0.43064	\$74,322
2012	9	0.41902	\$95,819
2012	10	0.45593	\$374,212
2012	11	0.48126	\$795,148
2012	12	0.48654	\$1,247,845
2013	1	0.48940	\$1,150,915
2013	2	0.48386	\$1,405,649
2013	3	0.50154	\$829,715
2013	4	0.53216	\$555,765
2013	5	0.58453	\$629,111
2013	6	0.58660	\$111,993

NNG Residential

Year	Month	Commodity Cost \$/therm	Margin Revenue
2013	7	0.55793	\$ 237,519
2013	8	0.55893	\$ 435,771
2013	9	0.54269	\$ 499,354
2013	10	0.54320	\$ 769,591
2013	11	0.57612	\$ 3,000,545
2013	12	0.57301	\$ 5,565,923
2014	1	0.64047	\$ 8,619,437
2014	2	0.69673	\$ 6,904,807
2014	3	0.76921	\$ 5,642,037
2014	4	0.67216	\$ 3,419,462
2014	5	0.67007	\$ 972,197
2014	6	0.65221	\$ (82,648)
2014	7	0.66050	\$ 163,246
2014	8	0.58232	\$ 547,583
2014	9	0.64579	\$ 591,757
2014	10	0.64134	\$ 1,251,490
2014	11	0.64747	\$ 2,998,781
2014	12	0.72288	\$ 7,193,917

Consolidated Residential

Year	Month	Commodity Cost \$/therm	Margin Revenue
2013	7	0.47661	\$ (53,246)
2013	8	0.47303	\$ (44,024)
2013	9	0.44388	\$ 89,906
2013	10	0.44760	\$ 281,289
2013	11	0.43626	\$ 1,101,590

2013	12	0.45976	\$	1,957,365
2014	1	0.48300	\$	1,516,389
2014	2	0.62107	\$	1,238,674
2014	3	0.71717	\$	1,004,186
2014	4	0.55121	\$	551,446
2014	5	0.55653	\$	253,029
2014	6	0.52560	\$	(50,956)
2014	7	0.52248	\$	(57,321)
2014	8	0.45761	\$	39,754
2014	9	0.59028	\$	69,448
2014	10	0.60022	\$	218,769
2014	11	0.66064	\$	590,910
2014	12	0.68246	\$	1,293,095

NNG Small C&I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.60675	\$260,878
2011	2	0.61366	\$228,393
2011	3	0.60068	\$157,892
2011	4	0.60902	\$76,942
2011	5	0.60584	-\$13,217
2011	6	0.60306	-\$11,948
2011	7	0.59986	\$3,650
2011	8	0.60905	\$8,469
2011	9	0.55242	\$15,218
2011	10	0.52999	\$19,387
2011	11	0.58051	\$54,421
2011	12	0.56398	\$128,167
2012	1	0.54858	\$164,016
2012	2	0.51386	\$162,252
2012	3	0.51831	\$105,012
2012	4	0.50284	-\$17,247
2012	5	0.45246	\$23,248
2012	6	0.44295	-\$1,258
2012	7	0.45564	\$5,621
2012	8	0.49261	\$10,295
2012	9	0.49561	\$13,565
2012	10	0.52252	\$43,608
2012	11	0.56071	\$79,274
2012	12	0.57632	\$159,598
2013	1	0.53889	\$252,592
2013	2	0.53387	\$376,418
2013	3	0.54726	\$220,088

2013	4	0.59179	\$159,065
2013	5	0.63074	\$50,324
2013	6	0.63549	-\$52,759

Viking Small C&I

Year	Month	Gas Cost Factor	Margin Revenue
2011	1	0.72751	\$10,022
2011	2	0.72581	\$9,098
2011	3	0.71621	\$7,607
2011	4	0.71034	\$2,539
2011	5	0.72539	\$256
2011	6	0.72059	-\$265
2011	7	0.71968	\$153
2011	8	0.71965	\$545
2011	9	0.48206	\$476
2011	10	0.47587	\$1,508
2011	11	0.49874	\$2,440
2011	12	0.47693	\$7,739
2012	1	0.47608	\$7,022
2012	2	0.44358	\$9,535
2012	3	0.44479	\$5,602
2012	4	0.39274	-\$230
2012	5	0.31198	\$1,181
2012	6	0.34770	\$146
2012	7	0.37755	\$313
2012	8	0.40648	\$420
2012	9	0.36158	\$624
2012	10	0.40473	\$2,035
2012	11	0.40530	\$5,242
2012	12	0.40513	\$10,492
2013	1	0.41168	\$13,811
2013	2	0.40574	\$18,745
2013	3	0.42631	\$11,630
2013	4	0.44587	\$8,191
2013	5	0.50692	\$6,777
2013	6	0.50602	-\$2,387

Great Lakes Small C&I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.66055	\$22,915
2011	2	0.65844	\$15,307
2011	3	0.64956	\$13,632
2011	4	0.64851	\$5,056
2011	5	0.66334	-\$2,535
2011	6	0.65836	-\$935
2011	7	0.65731	-\$179
2011	8	0.65714	\$223
2011	9	0.48320	\$379
2011	10	0.46896	\$1,346
2011	11	0.49067	\$3,670
2011	12	0.46933	\$11,516
2012	1	0.46835	\$10,266
2012	2	0.43631	\$13,459
2012	3	0.43755	\$7,843
2012	4	0.38947	\$1,021
2012	5	0.30925	\$1,278
2012	6	0.34485	-\$812
2012	7	0.37451	\$241
2012	8	0.40326	\$481
2012	9	0.34347	\$660
2012	10	0.38626	\$2,545
2012	11	0.39815	\$8,253
2012	12	0.39661	\$14,512
2013	1	0.39717	\$24,340
2013	2	0.39135	\$27,682
2013	3	0.41188	\$17,653
2013	4	0.43443	\$14,229
2013	5	0.49587	\$9,563
2013	6	0.49791	-\$3,644

NMU Small C&I

Year	Month	Gas Cost	Margin
		Factor	Revenue
2011	1	0.56922	\$106,958
2011	2	0.57058	\$64,508
2011	3	0.55991	\$80,890
2011	4	0.56039	\$35,029
2011	5	0.56855	\$2,070

2011	6	0.56420	-\$6,535
2011	7	0.56242	\$3,347
2011	8	0.56584	\$1,984
2011	9	0.50203	\$3,802
2011	10	0.48083	\$8,119
2011	11	0.52233	\$29,195
2011	12	0.50278	\$67,461
2012	1	0.49651	\$71,219
2012	2	0.46326	\$79,630
2012	3	0.46564	\$45,465
2012	4	0.42590	\$12,789
2012	5	0.35681	\$16,545
2012	6	0.37545	-\$5,075
2012	7	0.39877	\$1,257
2012	8	0.43064	\$4,032
2012	9	0.41902	\$4,468
2012	10	0.45593	\$15,227
2012	11	0.48126	\$41,301
2012	12	0.48654	\$97,612
2013	1	0.48940	\$81,245
2013	2	0.48386	\$114,977
2013	3	0.50154	\$62,373
2013	4	0.53216	\$47,062
2013	5	0.58453	\$46,200
2013	6	0.58660	-\$16,533

NNG Small C/I

Year	Month	Commodity Cost \$/therm	Margin Revenue
2013	7	0.55793	\$ 3,345
2013	8	0.55893	\$ 15,573
2013	9	0.54269	\$ 17,228
2013	10	0.54320	\$ 148,092
2013	11	0.57612	\$ 129,069
2013	12	0.57301	\$ 326,616
2014	1	0.64047	\$ 583,804
2014	2	0.69673	\$ 491,316
2014	3	0.76921	\$ 370,117
2014	4	0.67216	\$ 182,445
2014	5	0.67007	\$ 8,344
2014	6	0.65221	\$ (31,521)
2014	7	0.66050	\$ (5,742)
2014	8	0.58232	\$ 16,477
2014	9	0.64579	\$ 20,991

2014	10	0.64134	\$	73,595
2014	11	0.64747	\$	197,614
2014	12	0.72288	\$	501,087

Consolidated Small C/I

Year	Month	Commodity Cost \$/therm	Margin Revenue
2013	7	0.47661	\$ (6,904)
2013	8	0.47303	\$ 7,139
2013	9	0.44388	\$ 8,449
2013	10	0.44760	\$ 18,588
2013	11	0.43626	\$ 139,959
2013	12	0.45976	\$ 168,936
2014	1	0.48300	\$ 175,597
2014	2	0.62107	\$ 139,998
2014	3	0.71717	\$ 121,066
2014	4	0.55121	\$ 47,037
2014	5	0.55653	\$ 13,251
2014	6	0.52560	\$ (4,389)
2014	7	0.52248	\$ (4,601)
2014	8	0.45761	\$ 5,447
2014	9	0.59028	\$ 5,872
2014	10	0.60022	\$ 19,174
2014	11	0.66064	\$ 52,915
2014	12	0.68246	\$ 145,460

G.8. What is the Company's most recently available three year forecast for (a) natural gas rates/prices, and (b) numbers of customers by rate schedule, and (c) usage per customer by rate schedule, and (d) overall therm volumes and margin revenues by rate schedule in each available projected future period?

NNG Residential

Year	Month	Commodity Cost* \$/therm	DIST* MARGIN	EFFECTIVE RATE
2015	3	0.50008	0.2229	0.72298
2015	4	0.49307	0.2229	0.71597
2015	5	0.49187	0.2229	0.71477
2015	6	0.48862	0.21806	0.70668
2015	7	0.49362	0.21806	0.71168
2015	8	0.49662	0.21806	0.71468
2015	9	0.45557	0.21806	0.67363
2015	10	0.46242	0.21806	0.68048
2015	11	0.49528	0.21806	0.71334
2015	12	0.52051	0.21806	0.73857
2016	1	0.52991	0.21806	0.74797
2016	2	0.52833	0.21806	0.74639
2016	3	0.51278	0.21806	0.73084
2016	4	0.47862	0.21806	0.69668
2016	5	0.47167	0.21806	0.68973

2016	6	0.47372	0.21806	0.69178
2016	7	0.48667	0.21806	0.70473
2016	8	0.48737	0.21806	0.70543
2016	9	0.48692	0.21806	0.70498
2016	10	0.48447	0.21806	0.70253
2016	11	0.50968	0.21806	0.72774
2016	12	0.52891	0.21806	0.74697
2017	1	0.55051	0.21806	0.76857
2017	2	0.54998	0.21806	0.76804
2017	3	0.54318	0.21806	0.76124
2017	4	0.49062	0.21806	0.70868
2017	5	0.48727	0.21806	0.70533
2017	6	0.49102	0.21806	0.70908
2017	7	0.50262	0.21806	0.72068
2017	8	0.50352	0.21806	0.72158
2017	9	0.50232	0.21806	0.72038
2017	10	0.49837	0.21806	0.71643
2017	11	0.53258	0.21806	0.75064
2017	12	0.55081	0.21806	0.76887

Consolidated Residential

Year	Month	Commodity Cost* \$/therm	DIST* MARGIN	EFFECTIVE RATE
2015	3	0.47371	0.2229	0.69661
2015	4	0.44307	0.2229	0.66597
2015	5	0.44587	0.2229	0.66877
2015	6	0.45037	0.21806	0.66843
2015	7	0.45637	0.21806	0.67443
2015	8	0.45737	0.21806	0.67543
2015	9	0.36851	0.21806	0.58657
2015	10	0.37161	0.21806	0.58967
2015	11	0.42048	0.21806	0.63854
2015	12	0.43903	0.21806	0.65709
2016	1	0.45335	0.21806	0.67141
2016	2	0.45300	0.21806	0.67106
2016	3	0.44985	0.21806	0.66791
2016	4	0.40231	0.21806	0.62037
2016	5	0.40311	0.21806	0.62117
2016	6	0.40691	0.21806	0.62497
2016	7	0.41061	0.21806	0.62867
2016	8	0.41131	0.21806	0.62937
2016	9	0.41011	0.21806	0.62817
2016	10	0.41241	0.21806	0.63047
2016	11	0.43688	0.21806	0.65494
2016	12	0.45493	0.21806	0.67299
2017	1	0.47095	0.21806	0.68901
2017	2	0.47040	0.21806	0.68846
2017	3	0.46525	0.21806	0.68331
2017	4	0.41181	0.21806	0.62987
2017	5	0.41171	0.21806	0.62977
2017	6	0.41521	0.21806	0.63327
2017	7	0.41881	0.21806	0.63687
2017	8	0.41971	0.21806	0.63777
2017	9	0.41851	0.21806	0.63657
2017	10	0.42111	0.21806	0.63917
2017	11	0.45128	0.21806	0.66934

2017	12	0.46633	0.21806	0.68439
------	----	---------	---------	---------

NNG Small C/I

Year	Month	Commodity Cost*	DIST*	EFFECTIVE
		\$/therm	MARGIN	RATE
2015	3	0.50008	0.15688	0.65696
2015	4	0.49307	0.15688	0.64995
2015	5	0.49187	0.15688	0.64875
2015	6	0.48862	0.15688	0.64550
2015	7	0.49362	0.15688	0.65050
2015	8	0.49662	0.15688	0.65350
2015	9	0.45557	0.15688	0.61245
2015	10	0.46242	0.15688	0.61930
2015	11	0.49528	0.15688	0.65216
2015	12	0.52051	0.15688	0.67739
2016	1	0.52991	0.15688	0.68679
2016	2	0.52833	0.15688	0.68521
2016	3	0.51278	0.15688	0.66966
2016	4	0.47862	0.15688	0.63550
2016	5	0.47167	0.15688	0.62855
2016	6	0.47372	0.15688	0.63060
2016	7	0.48667	0.15688	0.64355
2016	8	0.48737	0.15688	0.64425
2016	9	0.48692	0.15688	0.64380
2016	10	0.48447	0.15688	0.64135
2016	11	0.50968	0.15688	0.66656
2016	12	0.52891	0.15688	0.68579
2017	1	0.55051	0.15688	0.70739
2017	2	0.54998	0.15688	0.70686
2017	3	0.54318	0.15688	0.70006
2017	4	0.49062	0.15688	0.64750
2017	5	0.48727	0.15688	0.64415
2017	6	0.49102	0.15688	0.64790
2017	7	0.50262	0.15688	0.65950
2017	8	0.50352	0.15688	0.66040
2017	9	0.50232	0.15688	0.65920
2017	10	0.49837	0.15688	0.65525
2017	11	0.53258	0.15688	0.68946
2017	12	0.55081	0.15688	0.70769

Consolidated Small C/I

Year	Month	Commodity Cost*	DIST*	EFFECTIVE
		\$/therm	MARGIN	RATE
2015	3	0.47371	0.15688	0.63059
2015	4	0.44307	0.15688	0.59995
2015	5	0.44587	0.15688	0.60275
2015	6	0.45037	0.15688	0.60725
2015	7	0.45637	0.15688	0.61325
2015	8	0.45737	0.15688	0.61425
2015	9	0.36851	0.15688	0.52539
2015	10	0.37161	0.15688	0.52849
2015	11	0.42048	0.15688	0.57736

2015	12	0.43903	0.15688	0.59591
2016	1	0.45335	0.15688	0.61023
2016	2	0.45300	0.15688	0.60988
2016	3	0.44985	0.15688	0.60673
2016	4	0.40231	0.15688	0.55919
2016	5	0.40311	0.15688	0.55999
2016	6	0.40691	0.15688	0.56379
2016	7	0.41061	0.15688	0.56749
2016	8	0.41131	0.15688	0.56819
2016	9	0.41011	0.15688	0.56699
2016	10	0.41241	0.15688	0.56929
2016	11	0.43688	0.15688	0.59376
2016	12	0.45493	0.15688	0.61181
2017	1	0.47095	0.15688	0.62783
2017	2	0.47040	0.15688	0.62728
2017	3	0.46525	0.15688	0.62213
2017	4	0.41181	0.15688	0.56869
2017	5	0.41171	0.15688	0.56859
2017	6	0.41521	0.15688	0.57209
2017	7	0.41881	0.15688	0.57569
2017	8	0.41971	0.15688	0.57659
2017	9	0.41851	0.15688	0.57539
2017	10	0.42111	0.15688	0.57799
2017	11	0.45128	0.15688	0.60816
2017	12	0.46633	0.15688	0.62321

OVERALL **THERM VOLUMES**: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

SERVICECLASS	2015	2016	2017
SC_INTERR	36,089,165	36,654,943	37,084,018
SC_JOINT	409,877	410,078	409,947
SC_LCI	88,970,695	88,904,940	88,112,006
SC_RES	166,579,253	166,080,766	165,771,261
SC_SCI	11,241,284	11,146,178	11,042,613
SC_TRNSP	466,144,397	465,449,361	465,384,338
Grand Total	769,434,671	768,646,266	767,804,183

ANNUAL AVERAGE FIXED CHARGE/CUSTOMER COUNTS: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

	Annual Ave. Fix Chg Cts. 2015	Annual Ave. Fix Chg Cts. 2016	Annual Ave. Fix Chg Cts. 2017
SERVICECLASS			
SC_INTERR	455	456	455
SC_JOINT	8	8	8
SC_LCI	10,411	10,420	10,429
SC_RES	194,404	195,444	196,637
SC_SCI	11,014	11,058	11,101
SC_TRNSP	166	166	166
Grand Total	216,458	217,552	218,795

USE PER ANNUAL AVERAGE FIXED CHARGE COUNT: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

SERVICECLASS	2015	2016	2017
SC_INTERR	79,390	80,457	81,473
SC_JOINT	50,706	50,731	50,715
SC_LCI	8,546	8,532	8,449
SC_RES	857	850	843
SC_SCI	1,021	1,008	995
SC_TRNSP	2,809,509	2,805,320	2,804,928
Grand Total	2,952,043	2,948,914	2,949,420

OVERALL **THERM VOLUMES**: {GS RATE SCHEDULES}: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

SERVICECLASS	2015	2016	2017
SC_INTERR			
SC_JOINT			
SC_LCI	88,970,695	88,904,940	88,112,006
SC_RES	166,579,253	166,080,766	165,771,261
SC_SCI	11,241,284	11,146,178	11,042,613
SC_TRNSP			
Grand Total	266,791,232	266,131,884	264,925,880

OVERALL **DISTRIBUTION RATES FOR FORECAST**: {GS RATE SCHEDULES}: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

SERVICECLASS	2015	2016	2017
SC_INTERR			
SC_JOINT			
SC_LCI	0.16579	0.16579	0.16579
SC_RES	0.21806	0.21806	0.21806
SC_SCI	0.18116	0.18116	0.18116
SC_TRNSP			
Grand Total			

OVERALL **MARGIN REVENUES BY RATE SCHEDULE**: {GS RATE SCHEDULES}: MERC FORECAST 2015-2017.

SERVICECLASS	2015	2016	2017
SC_INTERR			
SC_JOINT			
SC_LCI	\$14,750,452	\$14,739,550	\$14,608,089
SC_RES	\$36,324,272	\$36,215,572	\$36,148,081
SC_SCI	\$2,036,471	\$2,019,242	\$2,000,480
SC_TRNSP			
Grand Total	\$53,111,194	\$52,974,363	\$52,756,650

H. Impact on MERC Low Income and LIHEAP Customers

H. Impact on MERC Low Income and LIHEAP Customers

MERC currently provides an annual CIP Status Report to the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources that includes a discussion of the Company's low-income CIP programs and participation.

The information that is provided for each CIP project includes:

- a. The approved participation goal and the actual number of participants served;
- b. The estimate of low-income and renter residential customer participation levels anticipated in the CIP plan and an estimate of low-income and renter participation level actually achieved, if applicable;
- c. The approved budget and actual expenditures;
- d. The approved energy and demand savings goals and the actual energy and demand savings achieved; and
- e. The cost effectiveness of the projects based upon actual results from the utility, participant, ratepayer, and societal perspectives.

H.1. Did the Company change its natural gas therm savings through Company sponsored low income programs for the post-decoupling implementation time period, as compared with the pre-decoupling time period? What were the annual audited low income CIP savings (completed project basis) for the post-decoupling implementation time period for Company sponsored low income projects?

The Company's savings through Company sponsored Low Income programs for the post-decoupling implementation time period increased as compared with the pre-decoupling time period primarily due to the increasing success of the 4U2 Project and its inclusion in the Low Income Sector. Savings decreased, however, from 2013 to 2014. This decrease was due in large part to continued impacts from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding and increased requirements for health and safety measures that do not provide savings.

Table H1 - Low Income CIP Savings

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
LI Weatherization - PNG	7,959	5,851	2,862	3,644	2,733	
LI Weatherization - NMU	2,231	1,228	308			
LI Weatherization - Total	10,190	7,079	3,169			
4U2 - PNG	378	158	2,848	7,563	5,406	
4U2 - NMU	0	6	1,646			
4U2 - NMU	378	164	4,495			
LI Total - PNG	8,337	6,009	5,710	11,207	8,139	
LI Total - NMU	2,231	1,235	1,954			
LI Total	10,567	7,244	7,664			

H.2. What were the associated lost margins from Company sponsored low income CIP programs?

Lost margins from Low Income programs are detailed in Table H2. Lost margins have decreased as the savings decreased.

Table H2 - Low Income Lost Margins

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
LI Weatherization - PNG	\$14,124	\$11,361	\$5,557			
LI Weatherization - NMU	\$4,854	\$2,970	\$745			
LI Weatherization - Total	\$18,978	\$14,331	\$6,302	\$7,198	\$6,092	
4U2 - PNG	\$671	\$307	\$5,530			
4U2 - NMU	\$0	\$15	\$3,982			
4U2 - Total	\$671	\$321	\$9,511	\$14,940	\$12,050	
LI Total - PNG	\$14,795	\$11,668	\$11,087			
LI Total - NMU	\$4,854	\$2,985	\$4,727			
LI Total	\$19,649	\$14,653	\$15,814	\$22,138	\$18,142	

H.3. Did MERC make any commitments to program funding, or program changes or expansions as part of any rate cases or other regulatory proceedings during 2010-2012 (pre-decoupling)? Identify the regulatory proceeding, and provide the program funding, or program changes or expansions MERC made in response.

MERC did not make any commitments to program funding, changes, or expansions as part of the rate case or any other regulatory proceeding with the exception of the agreement made to increase its commitment to CIP if the decoupling mechanism was approved and to obtain input from interested parties in how that would be accomplished.

H.4. What program funding or program changes or expansions were implemented during 2013 or 2014 (post-decoupling implementation time period) for natural gas low income CIP programs as compared with the 2010-2012 pre-decoupling time period? Identify each new, revised or expanded programmatic change including scope and funding.

The 4U2 project was initially approved as a pilot in southern Minnesota (PNG service territory). It was then made into a full project but with little participation from Community Action Partnership ("CAP") agencies. Therefore MERC sent out an RFP and selected a different implementation contractor. The contractor has made great strides in marketing the project and now has a pipeline of potential participants.

In 2013, the 4U2 project was over budget. Because the Low Income Weatherization project was under budget, MERC did not stop any activity and continued its commitment to supporting energy efficiency services for low- to targeted-income customers. No program changes or expansions were made in 2014.

H.5. Identify any other factors that may have contributed to an increase in limited income CIP savings and/or new or expanded limited income CIP program offerings.

The major factor that contributed to an increase in participation in the 4U2 project is improved marketing strategies and tactics.

H.6. What low income CIP customer educational, informational and outreach programs were implemented by the Company during the decoupling pilot period being evaluated? What were the primary messages, including dates of publication or broadcast, and estimated costs of each of these programs? Were any therm savings attributed to such programs referenced above in Section A, and if so, how much, and using what assumptions or studies?

MERC worked with Community Action of Minneapolis (“CAM”) to perform direct mail marketing for Low Income Weatherization during the Base Years. CAM tried to obtain information on those who were denied Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (“LIHEAP”) assistance because they fell over the income guidelines and market information to them. CAM held quarterly meetings with CAP agencies and reminded them to refer customers ineligible for Low Income Weatherization to 4U2. In the fall of 2014, the contract with CAM to oversee our Low Income Weatherization program was terminated. On a temporary basis, each CAP agency that had activity with MERC customers dealt directly with MERC’s implementation contract administrator. In 2015, a contract was signed with Sustainable Resources Center to replace CAM as contract administrator for Low Income Weatherization.

For the 4U2 project, MERC marketed the project through bill inserts, the website, and brochures with application forms. These brochures are passed out to customers at events such as the State Fair and other local events in which we participate. We have also developed flyers and had them disseminated through Senior Centers, libraries, Meals on Wheels, etc. The best tactic so far has been to drop off flyers on the project in the neighborhood where we have served customers. We do not door-knock and try to ‘sell them’ on the project but provide information.

H.7. What information is captured and retained by MERC to track service provided to low income customers in the normal course of business, including monitoring of participation in CIP and rate assistance programs?

As indicated in this report and in the annual CIP Status Report, low income and limited income participants are tracked separately (from other residential customers) through specific programming, Low Income Weatherization and the 4U2 program. Furthermore, these households are also tracked in a number of other programs that support lower-wage earners.

All LIHEAP recipient households are tracked in the State of Minnesota's eHeat system, which MERC personnel have access to and can run participation reports for a number of low income strategies and tactics, which benefit the CIP programs and other customer assistance efforts. MERC regularly uses this data to attempt to increase awareness of and promote customer participation in the State's Energy Assistance Program.

MERC also uses the eHeat system to track low income households who apply for Cold Weather Rule ("CWR") protection, enabling these households to enter into a low-income payment agreement, without having to provide any household income verification. MERC also does some direct promotion of the CWR protections to households who have applied in the past. CWR data is tracked and reported to the Commission via the monthly CWR compliance Questionnaire.

MERC has had a very successful Gas Affordability Program ("GAP") as well, which has greatly influenced many low income customers' ability to eliminate large account arrearages over a two year period of participation. MERC's program has been one of the most successful programs in the State of Minnesota, with about an 85% retention rate. MERC's program funding is generated from a surcharge on customers' monthly gas bills and annual funding has been in the one million dollar range. All participation and the financial impacts are reported through an annual GAP report filing.

Besides the CIP Weatherization Program, MERC promotes the State's Weatherization Assistance Program ("WAP") as well. Households that participate in WAP and the jobs completed are tracked in the eHeat system and that data is used to increase awareness and promote CIP programs to various regions of the service territory during the year. In 2013, 93 MERC households were weatherized through this federally-funded program. Completed jobs totaled more than \$73,000 in benefits.

H.8. Identify and summarize any further information or data available that would assist in the determination of whether or not decoupling has a disproportionate impact on low income customers?

MERC is unaware of any further information or data that is available and that would assist in the determination of whether or not decoupling has a disproportionate impact on low income customers.

H.9. What were the total low income CIP expenditures for the period being evaluated? Did MERC make any commitments regarding funding levels as part of any rate cases or other regulatory proceedings? What is MERC’s best estimate of the proportion of low income participation in each of its conservation programs and how such estimates were derived?

The total expenditures for the Low Income sector by project are detailed below.

Table H9(A) - Low Income Project Expenditures

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
LI Weatherization - PNG	\$543,644	\$400,130	\$218,945	\$276,522	\$288,493	
LI Weatherization - NMU	\$173,617	\$89,705	\$24,184			
LI Weatherization - Total	\$717,261	\$489,834	\$243,129			
4U2 - PNG	\$51,801	\$67,248	\$345,858	\$767,901	\$662,259	
4U2 - NMU	\$0	\$16,119	\$169,123			
4U2 - NMU	\$51,801	\$83,367	\$514,980			
LI Total - PNG	\$595,445	\$467,377	\$564,803	\$1,044,422	\$950,752	
LI Total - NMU	\$173,617	\$105,824	\$193,307			
LI Total	\$769,062	\$573,201	\$758,110			

It is a challenge for MERC and all utilities to estimate the proportion of low-income customers who participate in its conservation programs, similar to the State’s challenge estimating what percentage of income-eligible households apply for and receive assistance from its Energy Assistance Program. As indicated in chart “H10” below, 13,204 eligible MERC customers received grants from the State’s Energy Assistance Program in 2014. During the same time, only 343 low and limited income customers participated in MERC’s Weatherization and 4U2 programs. Of those 343, only 124 were eligible for Energy Assistance. Therefore, only .9% of MERC’s LIHEAP recipients participated in the CIP low-income weatherization project in 2014. Based on Minnesota Department of Commerce data, in 2014, approximately 29% of the estimated income eligible Minnesota households received energy assistance benefits. This would indicate that Minnesota utilities are many years away from a saturation point with the low income customer sector programs.

In addition, we are aware that low income customers have participated in other projects because we request information regarding their income on every application form (we do not request their actual income but whether they are over or under specific dollar amounts that are tied to the federal poverty guideline). A chart of the responses we have received is below. When information is not available (such as for the Home Energy Reports), we use census

statistics and extrapolate. This request for information regarding their income on every application form has been discontinued starting 2015.

Table H9(A) - Low Income Project Expenditures

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
LI Weatherization - PNG	\$543,644	\$400,130	\$218,945	\$276,522	\$288,493	
LI Weatherization - NMU	\$173,617	\$89,705	\$24,184			
LI Weatherization - Total	\$717,261	\$489,834	\$243,129			
4U2 - PNG	\$51,801	\$67,248	\$345,858	\$767,901	\$662,259	
4U2 - NMU	\$0	\$16,119	\$169,123			
4U2 - NMU	\$51,801	\$83,367	\$514,980			
LI Total - PNG	\$595,445	\$467,377	\$564,803	\$1,044,422	\$950,752	
LI Total - NMU	\$173,617	\$105,824	\$193,307			
LI Total	\$769,062	\$573,201	\$758,110			

Table H9(B) - Low Income Participation in All Projects Without Residential Behavior

Project	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
LI Weatherization - PNG	278	240	118	131	124	
LI Weatherization - NMU	87	32	10			
LI Weatherization - Total	365	272	128			
4U2 - PNG	10	0	13	270	219	
4U2 - Total	0	0	34			
4U2 - NMU	10	0	47			
Res Sector Support - PNG	31	82	109	198	232	
Res Sector Support - NMU	7	3	2			
Res Sector Support - Total	38	85	111			
Res Rebates - PNG	1,747	2,694	1,483	1,854	1,692	
Res Rebates - NMU	643	749	342			
Res Rebates - Total	2,390	3,443	1,825			
Multifamily Project	0	0	0	197	3,809	
All Projects - Total	2,803	3,800	2,111	2,650	6,076	

Note the 2014 CIP Status Report is not approved yet; therefore, the 2014 data in Table H9(A) and H9(B) should be considered preliminary. It should also be noted that low income status data will no longer be collected through self-reporting from application forms starting 2015 for Residential Sector Support or Residential Rebates.

H.10. What was the total distribution of LIHEAP funds to low income customers for the period being evaluated?

The following chart provides the total number of MERC customers who received Energy Assistance funds from the Minnesota Energy Assistance Program (funded by Federal LIHEAP dollars):

Table H10 - Low Income Energy Assistance (LIHEAP) Recipients

Federal Fiscal Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Primary Heat Received	\$6,679,917	\$4,764,886	\$3,800,469	\$4,229,929	\$4,347,618	
Crisis Received	\$553,701	\$699,473	\$223,455	\$329,027	\$594,148	
PH & Crisis Total	\$7,233,618	\$5,464,359	\$4,023,924	\$4,558,956	\$4,941,766	
# of Households Served	14,414	14,727	13,610	12,717	13,204	

I. Other Information

- I.1. Was the decoupling pilot program in Minnesota recognized in any public reports issued by credit rating agencies or financial analysts? If so, provide a copy of the report.**

Credit Rating Agencies

MERC's parent, Integrys Energy Group, is rated by Standard & Poor's ("S&P") and Moody's. The 2014 analysis report published by S&P made no mention of Minnesota's decoupling pilot program. The Moody's analysis noted that MERC along with its sibling-regulated LDC utilities have been granted decoupling to offset the impact of declining usage. They also noted that an offset to this and the gas cost pass through mechanism is the below average allowed Return on Equity ("ROE"). Please see Attachment A to this Report for copies of the Moody's reports.

Financial Analysts

There has been no mention of MERC's decoupling pilot program within financial analyst reports during 2014.

- I.2. Is there any other information that would be helpful to the Commission in the evaluation of the decoupling pilot program?**

- a. A comparison of how revenues under traditional regulation would have differed from those collected under the decoupling pilot program;**

Under the RDM, MERC created a revenue offset (reduction to revenue) and a regulatory liability to account for the refund to customers that commenced March 1, 2015. Had the RDM not been in place in 2014, MERC would have recognized an additional revenue amount of \$3,241,346 for Residential and \$166,426 for General Service Small C/I.

- b. An evaluation of if the pilot stabilized revenues for the classes under the pilot and how has such stabilization impacted the utility's overall risk profile;**

The decoupling deferral for 2014 was \$3.4 million, or about 0.96% of total revenue. Thus the program had little impact on total revenue. As noted in our rate case ROE testimony in Docket No. G011/GR-13-617, 12 of the 13 companies included in the proxy group utilized in calculating the appropriate ROE for MERC have a form of revenue stabilization mechanism that is intended to accomplish the same result as the Company's decoupling mechanism. The decoupling program has brought MERC's risk profile more in line with the ROE proxy group.

- c. An evaluation of any problems encountered and improvements/ suggestions for the future;**

MERC has no suggestions for improvements in the future related to the current RDM. As discussed above, MERC requests that the Commission approve MERC's decoupling program on a permanent basis following completion of the pilot at the end of 2015. As reflected in this Decoupling Evaluation Report, MERC's decoupling program has been successful in removing the disincentive to promote energy efficiency and conservation that is a consequence of the way rates are set under traditional rate regulation, thereby achieving continued energy savings.

d. MERC will continue to provide annual service quality reports which currently measure and report:

- 1) Call center response times;**
- 2) Meter reading performance data;**
- 3) Reference to service disconnection data submitted under Minn. Stat. §§ 216B.091 and 216B.096;**
- 4) Service extension request response time data;**
- 5) Customer deposit data;**
- 6) Customer complaint data;**
- 7) Telephone answer times for gas emergency phone line;**
- 8) Mislocate data;**
- 9) Damaged gas lines;**
- 10) Service interruptions;**
- 11) Summaries of major events that are immediately reportable to the Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety and summaries of all service interruptions caused by system integrity pressure issues;**
- 12) Gas emergency response times; and**
- 13) Customer-service related operations and maintenance expenses.**

MERC agrees that it will continue to provide the annual service quality reports with the currently reported data. These reports are typically filed on May 1st of each year.

- e. As part of its initial Evaluation Report Filing, MERC will also provide recent historical information on the above metrics in subsection d, which it has available in order to assist the Commission in determining a "baseline" service quality level prior to implementation of the pilot program, and will fully comply with any other service quality reporting obligations established in other dockets.**

Attachment B is MERC's 2012 Annual Gas Service Quality Report to serve as the "baseline" service quality level prior to implementation of the pilot program.

f. Any other information that can provide assistance to the Commission in its evaluation.

2014 experienced colder than normal weather, and because of that customers will be refunded an over-collection of revenues. The rates for the refund will be \$0.01936 for Residential customers and \$0.01567 for the Small C/I customers. These refund rates are calculated by dividing the balance of the over-collection by the sales forecast approved in Docket No. G011/GR-13-617. In addition, it should be noted that the 10% cap on distribution revenue was exceeded by both Residential and GS Small C/I customers.

In its September 26, 2014 Order accepting MERC's 2013 revenue decoupling evaluation report, the Commission required that MERC include in its 2014 annual decoupling report, an estimate of each class' revenues under the following decoupling scenarios:

- No Decoupling
- Partial Decoupling
- Full Decoupling

As explained in MERC's Reply Comments filed in this Docket on June 30, 2014, based on conversations with the Department, MERC understands that the Department intended the term "full decoupling" to mean MERC's currently approved pilot decoupling program. MERC notes that its approved decoupling mechanism applies only to Residential and Small Commercial & Industrial customer classes. Moreover, MERC's decoupling mechanism includes a symmetrical ten percent cap. For purposes of the information required to be provided, MERC will assume decoupling applies to all rate classes. Additionally, MERC understands partial decoupling to be a revenue-per-customer decoupling mechanism that removes the effect of weather from decoupling deferrals (i.e., Weather Normalized Decoupling). Included as Attachment C is a spreadsheet estimating each class' revenues with no decoupling, under full decoupling (both with and without a 10% cap), and under a Weather Normalized Decoupling (both with and without a 10% cap).

Attachment A

MOODY'S

INVESTORS SERVICE

Credit Opinion: **Integrys Energy Group, Inc.**

Global Credit Research - 06 Jun 2014

Chicago United States

Ratings

Category	Moody's Rating
Outlook	Stable
Senior Unsecured	Baa1
Jr Subordinate	Baa2
Commercial Paper	P-2
Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A1
First Mortgage Bonds	Aa2
Senior Secured	Aa2
Pref. Stock	A3
Commercial Paper	P-1
Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A2
First Mortgage Bonds	Aa3
Senior Secured MTN	(P)Aa3
Commercial Paper	P-1
North Shore Gas Company	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A2
Senior Secured MTN	(P)Aa3

Contacts

Analyst	Phone
Lesley Ritter/New York City	212.553.1607
William L. Hess/New York City	212.553.3837

Key Indicators

[1]Integrys Energy Group, Inc.

	LTM3/31/2014	12/31/2013	12/31/2012	12/31/2011	12/31/2010
CFO pre-WC + Interest / Interest	7.7x	6.9x	5.7x	6.6x	6.0x
CFO pre-WC / Debt	27.7%	23.6%	20.4%	28.2%	27.5%
CFO pre-WC - Dividends / Debt	21.2%	17.2%	13.5%	20.7%	21.0%
Debt / Capitalization	40.4%	41.1%	42.2%	40.9%	43.5%

[1] All ratios are based on 'Adjusted' financial data and incorporate Moody's Global Standard Adjustments for Non-Financial Corporations. Source: Moody's Financial Metrics

Note: For definitions of Moody's most common ratio terms please see the accompanying [User's Guide](#).

Opinion

Rating Drivers

Utility subsidiaries operate in diverse and relatively supportive regulatory environments

Smaller but still meaningful non-regulated business

Strong financial performance

Large capital spending program

Significant holding company debt and above average dividend payout

Corporate Profile

Integrys Energy Group, Inc. (Integrys, Baa1 senior unsecured, stable outlook) is a diversified energy holding company headquartered in Chicago, Illinois operating in both the regulated (approx. 96% of 2013 operating income) and unregulated (approx. 4% of 2013 operating income) space.

Integrys currently owns six regulated utilities: Wisconsin Public Service Corporation (WPS, A1 Issuer Rating), The Peoples Gas, Light and Coke Company (PGL, A2 Issuer Rating), North Shore Gas Company (NSG, A2 Issuer Rating), Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC, not rated), Michigan Gas Utilities Corporation (MGU, not rated), and Upper Peninsula Power Corporation (UPPCO, not rated). In the aggregate, these utilities serve approximately 1.7 million gas and 500,000 electric customers across Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, and Minnesota. Integrys' largest utility subsidiaries are WPS, a vertically integrated electric utility headquartered in Green Bay, Wisconsin, (50% of consolidated regulated rate base) and PGL, a local gas distribution company (LDC) that operates in and around Chicago (30% of consolidated regulated rate base).

Integrys also has a 34% ownership stake in the American Transmission Company (ATC, A1 senior unsecured).

Integrys' sizeable non-regulated retail energy business is largely focused on marketing natural gas and electricity to commercial, industrial and residential customers primarily in the northeastern quadrant of the U.S. Retail electric volumes in 2013 totaled 21.3 million megawatt hours (MWh) while retail gas volumes totaled 183.6 billion cubic feet (Bcf). Integrys has operated a retail energy marketing business since 1994 and has largely managed the associated risks over this period in an adequate manner. We estimate Integrys' non-regulated energy marketing business accounts for 10-15% of consolidated operating income.

In January 2014, Integrys announced the sale of UPPCO (rate base \$218 million, about 5% of consolidated regulated utilities rate base) to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Partners LP (not rated) for approximately \$298.8 million. The transaction is subject to state and federal regulatory approval and is expected to close in late 2014.

In September 2013, MERC entered into an agreement to purchase Alliant Energy Corporation's (A3 senior unsecured) Southeastern Minnesota natural gas distribution business for \$11 million. The transaction is expected to close in late 2014.

In May 2013, Integrys Energy Services acquired all of the equity interests of Compass Energy Services, Inc. and its wholly-owned subsidiary, a nonregulated retail natural gas business supplying commercial and industrial customers primarily in the Mid-Atlantic and Ohio regions. Integrys paid \$12.4 million to acquire the business. In addition, under the terms of the purchase agreement, the former owners of Compass are eligible to receive additional cash consideration of up to \$8 million (but not less than \$3 million), based upon the financial performance of Compass over a five-year period beginning May 2013.

Rating Rationale

Integrys is well positioned in the Baa1 rating category. The company's rating is supported by the underlying cash flow stability provided by its regulated utility subsidiaries, a diverse multi-state territory that provides sound regulatory support, and a strong historical financial performance. The rating is tempered by the high degree of debt held at the holding company, the higher risk profile associated with Integrys' retail energy marketing business, and an above average dividend payout.

On January 31, 2014, WPS, PGL, and NSG were upgraded by one notch as part of a sector-wide rating action reflecting Moody's more favorable view of the relative credit supportiveness of US utility regulation. Integrys' rating

was confirmed.

DETAILED RATING CONSIDERATIONS

DIVERSE AND REASONABLY SUPPORTIVE REGULATORY JURISDICTIONS

Since 2007, Integrys has successfully reduced the business risk profile of its operations through the acquisition of four regulated gas utilities, MGU and MERC (8% consolidated regulated rate base), NSG and PGL (37% consolidated regulated rate base), followed by a restructuring of its non-regulated business in 2009-2010. As a result, Integrys' regulated utilities (including its investment in ATC), typically account for approximately 85-90% of its annual consolidated operating income.

On average, Integrys' LDCs operate in relatively supportive regulatory jurisdictions that provide each company with rate mechanisms to pass gas costs directly to their customers and to recover bad debts. Furthermore, PGL, NSG, MGU and MERC have been granted decoupling mechanisms to offset the financial impact of declining usage, a credit positive. These supportive rate constructs are balanced against below industry average allowed returns on equity. PGL, NSG, and MERC's ROEs are 9.28%, 9.28%, and 9.70%, respectively.

We view WPS' regulatory relationship with the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, its primary regulator, as constructive. Rate cases yield consistent and fairly predictable outcomes that allow for timely recovery of costs and investments, and grant above average authorized equity returns, based on an equity strong capital structure.

Please refer to the credit opinions for WPS, PGL and NSG for further information.

SMALLER BUT STILL MEANINGFUL NON-REGULATED BUSINESS

Integrys substantially reduced the scale and scope of its non-regulated energy marketing businesses in 2009-2010, largely by selling several wholesale businesses with substantial collateral requirements. That said, the risk profile of this business is considerably higher than that of a regulated utility.

Integrys' remaining non-regulated business is focused on marketing electricity and natural gas in the retail market, serving commercial, industrial, direct and aggregated small commercial and residential customers primarily in the northeastern quadrant of the United States. Physical supply obligations are created when Integrys executes forward retail customer sales contracts. The company's electric supply requirements are primarily met through bilateral electric purchase agreements with generation companies and other marketers, as well as purchases from regional power pools. Integrys does not own natural gas reserves, so all natural gas supply is procured from producers and other suppliers in the wholesale market. Natural gas is sourced at the customer demand regions or from the supply region and transported to the customer demand regions under natural gas transportation contracts. Integrys manages the supply risk of its natural gas marketing business through a multi-year natural gas supply agreement with creditworthy counterparties. This agreement provides the company with sufficient capacity to meet the natural gas requirements of its energy marketing business and includes a contractually set limitation on collateral support requirements. The non-regulated energy marketing business has no leverage and its parent provides the needed collateral support.

Despite a 60% increase in retail electric volume year-over-year, largely driven by a municipal aggregation contract signed in 2013 between Integrys and the city of Chicago, competitive pressure in the marketplace has kept Integrys from achieving improved results in its realized retail electric margin. Specifically, in 2013, realized retail electric margins were \$92.5 million or \$4.33 per MWh, compared to \$91.3 million or \$6.86 per MWh in 2012 and \$98.5 million or \$7.93 per MWh in 2011. Similarly, realized retail gas margins totaled \$41.7 million in 2013 or \$0.23 per dekatherm (Dkth) down from \$47.5 million or \$0.41 per Dkth in 2012, and \$49.1 million or \$0.42 per Dkth in 2011, despite a volume increase of 58% year-over-year.

As of December 31, 2013, guarantees and other forms of corporate support provided by Integrys on behalf of its non-regulated operations to support its commodity transactions totaled approximately \$430 million, while cash collateral provided to third parties was \$38 million, and collateral requirement associated with a hypothetical downgrade of Integrys' rating to below investment grade was estimated at \$193 million.

STRONG FINANCIAL METRICS

Integrys' consolidated historical financial metrics have firmly positioned the company in the Baa1 rating category. Specifically, Integrys achieved consolidated CFO pre-WC to debt of approximately 23.6%, cash flow coverage of interest expense of 6.9x, and debt to capitalization of 41.1% as of fiscal year ended December 31, 2013. Over the past three year period, those metrics averaged 23.9%, 6.4x, and 41.4%, respectively, driven in part by the positive

impact of bonus depreciation.

Integrys' consolidated capital expenditure program for the three-year period 2014 through 2016 is significant at an estimated \$3.0 billion (compared to \$1.9 billion for the three year period ended 2013). The primary drivers for the increase in capital spending include PGL's accelerated cast iron pipe replacement program, the installation of environmental controls at WPS' existing coal plant facilities, and the distribution line undergrounding project at WPS. Both utilities will receive timely recovery for these capital investments, either through existing rider mechanisms or frequent rate case filings.

Integrys' subsidiaries are expected to fund their respective capital expenditure programs with internally generated funds, incremental debt issuances, and parent equity contributions. In 2013, Integrys contributed \$200 million in equity capital to WPS to fund part of its acquisition of a 500 MW natural gas fired power plant. The company also issued \$400 million of hybrid securities and raised \$80 million in equity through its Stock Investment Plan and other stock-based benefit plans to fund its capital requirements. Integrys intends to apply proceeds from its sale of UPPCO towards pro forma capex, reducing its need to issue equity in the near term.

Pro forma, we anticipate that the investment in Integrys' regulated utilities combined with supportive regulatory treatment and a conservative financing policy will result in consolidated key financial metrics of CFO pre-WC to debt and interest coverage in excess of 20% and 6x, respectively, and a debt-to-capitalization ratio slightly above 40% through at least 2016.

ABOVE AVERAGE HOLDING COMPANY DEBT AND HIGH DIVIDEND PAYOUT

The three notch rating difference between Integrys and WPS, its largest subsidiary, results from the subordination and amount of the debt held at the holding company level, as well as Integrys' sizeable unregulated business and above average dividend payout ratio. At December 31, 2013, total holding company debt was about \$1 billion (adjusted for a \$670 million of hybrid securities that currently receive 25% equity and 75% debt treatment for financial leverage purposes by Moody's) or approximately 32% of consolidated long-term balance sheet debt. Most of our peer universe of rated utility companies have less than 20% consolidated debt at the holding company level.

Integrys' dividend payout to shareholders in 2013 was approximately \$215 million, or 61% of consolidated net income (\$212 million, 75% of consolidated net income in 2012). That said, the company's earnings are somewhat influenced by mark-to-market accounting at its energy marketing business. For example, in 2013, the company's earnings were skewed by \$51.7 million (after-tax) of net unrealized gains on non-regulated energy contracts and inventory accounting activities. Ignoring this non-cash impact, Integrys' dividend payout in 2013 was approximately 69% (91% in 2012).

That said, distributions from Integrys' subsidiaries have historically been sufficient to fund the company's external dividend. In 2013, Integrys parent received \$267 million in dividends and return of capital from its subsidiaries. Pro forma, increased capex at the utility subsidiaries will likely reduce their dividends to Integrys relative to historical levels, and the company will have to debt finance its dividend payments, a credit negative. This trend should reverse when the higher capex levels abate and the capital investments are added to rate base and begin generating cash flow.

Liquidity Profile

Integrys proactively manages its liquidity profile to ensure access to funds in an amount comfortably in excess of all potential requirements.

Integrys parent's external sources of liquidity include \$1.1 billion of unsecured revolving credit facilities (\$635 million due June 2017 and \$465 million due May 2019), a significant amount relative to the company's requirements. The committed facilities support the issuance of letters of credit, meet short-term funding requirements and provide backup for Integrys' commercial paper program. Terms of the syndicated revolving credit facilities include a representation that no material adverse change has occurred on the facilities' effective date but not at any other time through the facility's term. The sole financial covenant is a 65% limitation on the debt component of Integrys' capital structure. The company has substantial headroom under the capital structure covenant.

At December 31, 2013, Integrys parent had \$0.3 million of cash on hand, \$935 million available under its revolver net of approximately \$123 million of commercial paper outstanding, and \$52 million in letters of credit. Availability under Integrys' credit facility is sufficient to meet the \$193 million of potential collateral requirement associated with

a hypothetical downgrade of Integrys' rating to below investment grade. Integrys' most near-term parent-level debt maturity is \$55 million due in June 2016.

Separately, WPS and PGL have access to their own liquidity facilities to support their respective business requirements.

For the last twelve months ended March 31, 2014, Integrys consolidated generated about \$499 million in cash from operations, invested approximately \$682 million in capital expenditures, and paid \$207 million in dividends, yielding negative cash flow of \$390 million which the company financed through the issuance of incremental long-term debt. On a pro forma basis, we expect the company to remain cash flow negative with any cash shortfall being met by the UPPCO sale proceeds and incremental debt.

Rating Outlook

The stable rating outlook reflects a reduced business risk profile associated with the completed restructuring of the company's non-regulated businesses, an expectation that the non-regulated business will not grow to more than 15% of the consolidated balance sheet, holdco debt will not exceed current levels, and the consolidated ratio of CFO pre-WC to debt will continue to top 20% for the near to medium term.

What Could Change the Rating - Up

Upward rating movement is not expected in the medium-term. Longer term, we would likely need to see Integrys' consolidated ratio of CFO pre-W/C to debt exceed 25% on a sustainable basis, without the benefit of any temporary items such as bonus depreciation, as well as a reduction in holdco debt or a further decrease in its unregulated activities, to consider an upgrade.

What Could Change the Rating - Down

Adverse changes in regulatory supportiveness or an unexpected increase in leverage or decline in cash flow such that its ratio of CFO pre-W/C to debt falls below 17% on a sustainable basis could lead to a downgrade. A further increase in Integrys' holdco debt or in its unregulated business could also place downward rating pressure on the company.

Rating Factors

Integrys Energy Group, Inc.

Regulated Electric and Gas Utilities Industry Grid [1][2]	Current LTM 3/31/2014		[3]Moody's 12-18 Month Forward ViewAs of May 2014	
Factor 1 : Regulatory Framework (25%)	Measure	Score	Measure	Score
a) Legislative and Judicial Underpinnings of the Regulatory Framework	Aa	Aa	Aa	Aa
b) Consistency and Predictability of Regulation	A	A	A	A
Factor 2 : Ability to Recover Costs and Earn Returns (25%)				
a) Timeliness of Recovery of Operating and Capital Costs	Aa	Aa	Aa	Aa
b) Sufficiency of Rates and Returns	Baa	Baa	Baa	Baa
Factor 3 : Diversification (10%)				
a) Market Position	A	A	A	A
b) Generation and Fuel Diversity	Baa	Baa	Baa	Baa
Factor 4 : Financial Strength (40%)				
a) CFO pre-WC + Interest / Interest (3 Year Avg)	6.7x	Aa	6.3x - 6.7x	Aa
b) CFO pre-WC / Debt (3 Year Avg)	24.3%	A	21% - 25%	A
c) CFO pre-WC - Dividends / Debt (3 Year Avg)	17.6%	A	15% - 19%	A
d) Debt / Capitalization (3 Year Avg)	41.4%	A	40% - 44%	A

Rating:			
Grid-Indicated Rating Before Notching Adjustment		A2	A3
HoldCo Structural Subordination Notching			
a) Indicated Rating from Grid		A2	A3
b) Actual Rating Assigned		Baa1	Baa1

[1] All ratios are based on 'Adjusted' financial data and incorporate Moody's Global Standard Adjustments for Non-Financial Corporations. [2] As of LTM 3/31/2014; Source: Moody's Financial Metrics [3] This represents Moody's forward view; not the view of the issuer; and unless noted in the text, does not incorporate significant acquisitions and divestitures.



© 2014 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. ("MIS") AND ITS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATION") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO CONSIDER MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS IN MAKING ANY INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually

at www.moody's.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

For Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail clients. It would be dangerous for "retail clients" to make any investment decision based on MOODY'S credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Credit Opinion: Integrys Energy Group, Inc.

Global Credit Research - 19 Sep 2014

Chicago United States

Ratings

Category	Moody's Rating
Outlook	Stable
Senior Unsecured	A3
Jr Subordinate	Baa1
Commercial Paper	P-2
Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A1
First Mortgage Bonds	Aa2
Senior Secured	Aa2
Pref. Stock	A3
Commercial Paper	P-1
Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A2
First Mortgage Bonds	Aa3
Senior Secured MTN	(P)Aa3
Commercial Paper	P-1
North Shore Gas Company	
Outlook	Stable
Issuer Rating	A2
Senior Secured MTN	(P)Aa3

Contacts

Analyst	Phone
Lesley Ritter/New York City	212.553.1607
William L. Hess/New York City	212.553.3837

Key Indicators

[1]Integrys Energy Group, Inc.

	LTM 6/30/2014	12/31/2013	12/31/2012	12/31/2011	12/31/2010
CFO pre-WC + Interest / Interest	6.5x	6.9x	5.7x	6.6x	6.0x
CFO pre-WC / Debt	23.7%	23.6%	20.4%	28.2%	27.5%
CFO pre-WC - Dividends / Debt	17.1%	17.2%	13.5%	20.7%	21.0%
Debt / Capitalization	40.4%	41.1%	42.2%	40.9%	43.5%

[1] All ratios are based on 'Adjusted' financial data and incorporate Moody's Global Standard Adjustments for Non-Financial Corporations. Source: Moody's Financial Metrics

Note: For definitions of Moody's most common ratio terms please see the accompanying [User's Guide](#).

Opinion

Rating Drivers

Sale of retail energy services business will reduce risk profile

Utility subsidiaries operate in diverse and relatively supportive regulatory environments

Strong financial performance

Large capital spending program

Significant holding company debt and above average dividend payout

Corporate Profile

Integrys Energy Group, Inc. (Integrys, A3 senior unsecured, stable outlook) is a diversified energy holding company headquartered in Chicago, Illinois operating in both the regulated (approx. 96% of 2013 operating income) and unregulated (approx. 4% of 2013 operating income) space. In June 2014, Wisconsin Energy Corporation (WEC, A2 senior unsecured, negative outlook) entered into a definitive agreement to acquire Integrys for \$9.1 billion, including the assumption of approximately \$3.3 billion of existing debt. The transaction is expected to close in mid-2015.

Integrys currently owns five regulated utilities: Wisconsin Public Service Corporation (WPS, A1 Issuer Rating), The Peoples Gas, Light and Coke Company (PGL, A2 Issuer Rating), North Shore Gas Company (NSG, A2 Issuer Rating), Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC, not rated), and Michigan Gas Utilities Corporation (MGU, not rated). In the aggregate, these utilities serve approximately 1.7 million gas and 450,000 electric customers across Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, and Minnesota. Integrys' largest utility subsidiaries are WPS, a vertically integrated electric and natural gas utility headquartered in Green Bay, Wisconsin, (53% of consolidated regulated rate base) and PGL, a local gas distribution company (LDC) that operates in and around Chicago (32% of consolidated regulated rate base).

Integrys also has a 34% ownership stake in the American Transmission Company (ATC, A1 senior unsecured).

In July 2014, Integrys announced the sale of its retail energy marketing business Integrys Energy Services (IES, not rated) to Exelon Corporation (Baa2, stable). The transaction expected to close in 4Q14. IES is by far the largest component of Integrys' unregulated companies, and accounted for less than 5% of consolidated operating income in 2013.

In January 2014, Integrys announced the sale of UPPCO (rate base \$218 million, about 5% of consolidated regulated utilities rate base) to Balfour Beatty Infrastructure Partners LP (not rated) for approximately \$298.8 million. The transaction closed in August 2014.

In September 2013, MERC entered into an agreement to purchase Alliant Energy Corporation's (A3 senior unsecured) Southeastern Minnesota natural gas distribution business for \$11 million. The transaction is expected to close in late 2014 or early 2015.

Rating Rationale

Integrys is well positioned in the A3 rating category. The company's rating is supported by the underlying cash flow stability provided by its regulated utility subsidiaries, a diverse multi-state territory that provides sound regulatory support, and a strong historical financial performance. The rating is tempered by the high degree of debt held at the holding company and an above average dividend payout.

Moody's placed Integrys under review for upgrade in June 2014 following the announcement of the company's intent to exit the retail marketing business. The review was completed in September 2014 when Integrys' senior unsecured rating was upgraded by one notch to A3 with a stable outlook. We do not expect the pending acquisition by WEC to change the company's rating or rating outlook.

DETAILED RATING CONSIDERATIONS

SALE OF RETAIL ENERGY SERVICES BUSINESS WILL REDUCE RISK

The recent upgrade of Integrys' senior unsecured rating into the A rating category can be largely attributed to the reduction of business risk resulting from the sale of its retail electric and natural gas marketing business. The sale will reduce the organization's liquidity requirements and increase the proportion of its business that is regulated, improving the stability and predictability of its cash flow. Integrys will be almost fully regulated upon completion of the transaction.

DIVERSE AND REASONABLY SUPPORTIVE REGULATORY JURISDICTIONS

Since 2006, Integrys has successfully reduced the business risk profile of its operations through the acquisition of four regulated gas utilities, MGU and MERC (9% consolidated regulated rate base), NSG and PGL (38% consolidated regulated rate base), followed by a restructuring of its non-regulated business in 2009-2010. As a result, Integrys' regulated utilities (including its investment in ATC), have typically accounted for approximately 85-90% of its annual consolidated operating income.

On average, Integrys' LDCs operate in relatively supportive regulatory jurisdictions that provide each company with rate mechanisms to pass gas costs directly to their customers and to recover bad debts. Furthermore, PGL, NSG, MGU and MERC have been granted decoupling mechanisms to offset the financial impact of declining usage, a credit positive. These supportive rate constructs are balanced against below industry average allowed returns on equity. PGL, NSG, MGU, and MERC's ROEs are 9.28%, 9.28%, 10.25%, and 9.70%, respectively.

We view WPS' regulatory relationship with the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, its primary regulator, as constructive. Rate cases yield consistent and fairly predictable outcomes that allow for timely recovery of costs and investments, and grant above average authorized equity returns, based on an equity strong capital structure.

Please refer to the credit opinions for WPS, PGL and NSG for further information.

STRONG FINANCIAL METRICS

Integrys' consolidated historical financial metrics have firmly positioned the company in the A3 rating category. Specifically, Integrys achieved consolidated CFO pre-WC to debt of approximately 23.6%, cash flow coverage of interest expense of 6.9x, and debt to capitalization of 41.1% as of fiscal year ended December 31, 2013. Over the past three year period, those metrics averaged 24.1%, 6.4x, and 41.4%, respectively, driven in part by the positive impact of bonus depreciation.

Integrys' consolidated capital expenditure program for the three-year period 2014 through 2016 is significant at an estimated \$2.9 billion (compared to \$1.9 billion for the three year period ended 2013). The primary drivers for the increase in capital spending include PGL's accelerated cast iron pipe replacement program, the installation of environmental controls at WPS' existing coal plant facilities, and the distribution line undergrounding project at WPS. Both utilities will receive timely recovery for these capital investments, either through existing rider mechanisms or frequent rate case filings.

Integrys' subsidiaries are expected to fund their respective capital expenditure programs with internally generated funds, incremental debt issuances, and parent equity contributions. In 2013, Integrys contributed \$200 million in equity capital to WPS to fund part of its acquisition of a 593 MW natural gas fired power plant. The company also issued \$400 million of hybrid securities and raised \$80 million in equity through its Stock Investment Plan and other stock-based benefit plans to fund its capital requirements. Integrys intends to apply proceeds from its sale of UPPCO and IES towards capex, reducing its need to issue debt and equity in the near term.

Pro forma, we anticipate that the investment in Integrys' regulated utilities combined with supportive regulatory treatment and a conservative financing policy will result in consolidated key financial metrics of CFO pre-WC to debt and interest coverage in excess of 20% and 6x, respectively, and a debt-to-capitalization ratio slightly above 40% through at least 2016.

ABOVE AVERAGE HOLDING COMPANY DEBT AND HIGH DIVIDEND PAYOUT

The two notch rating difference between Integrys and WPS, its largest subsidiary, results from both the subordination and the amount of the debt held at the holding company level. At December 31, 2013, total holding company debt was about \$1 billion (adjusted for \$670 million of hybrid securities that receive 25% equity and 75% debt treatment for financial leverage purposes by Moody's) or approximately 31% of consolidated long-term balance sheet debt. Most of our peer universe of rated utility companies have less than 20% consolidated debt at the holding company level.

Integrys' dividend payout to shareholders in 2013 was approximately \$215 million, or 61% of consolidated net

income (\$212 million, 75% of consolidated net income in 2012). However, the company's earnings were somewhat influenced by mark-to-market accounting at its energy marketing business. For example, in 2013, the company's earnings were skewed by \$64.0 million (after-tax) of net unrealized gains on non-regulated energy contracts and inventory accounting activities. Ignoring this non-cash impact, Integrys' dividend payout in 2013 was approximately 75% (83% in 2012).

Nevertheless, distributions from Integrys' subsidiaries have historically been sufficient to fund the company's external dividend. In 2013, the Integrys parent received \$257 million in dividends and return of capital from its subsidiaries. Pro forma, increased capex at the utility subsidiaries will likely reduce their dividends to Integrys relative to historical levels, and the company will have to debt finance some of its dividend payments, a credit negative. This trend should reverse when the higher capex levels abate and the capital investments are added to rate base and begin generating cash flow.

Liquidity Profile

Integrys proactively manages its liquidity profile to ensure access to funds in an amount comfortably in excess of potential requirements, which will decline once its retail business is sold.

Integrys parent's external sources of liquidity include \$1.1 billion of unsecured revolving credit facilities (\$635 million due June 2017 and \$465 million due May 2019), a significant amount relative to the company's requirements. Moody's notes that these facilities were put on place when the company was highly active in competitive retail electric and gas and required substantial liquidity resources. The committed facilities support the issuance of letters of credit, meet short-term funding requirements and provide backup for Integrys' commercial paper program. Terms of the syndicated revolving credit facilities include a representation that no material adverse change has occurred on the facilities' effective date but not at any other time through the facility's term. The sole financial covenant is a 65% limitation on the debt component of Integrys' capital structure. The company has substantial headroom under the capital structure covenant.

At December 31, 2013, Integrys parent had \$0.3 million of cash on hand, \$935 million available under its revolver net of approximately \$123 million of commercial paper outstanding, and \$52 million in letters of credit. Availability under Integrys' credit facility is sufficient to meet the \$193 million of potential collateral requirement associated with a hypothetical downgrade of Integrys' rating to below investment grade. Integrys' most near-term parent-level debt maturity is \$55 million due in June 2016.

Separately, WPS and PGL have access to their own liquidity facilities to support their respective business requirements.

For the last twelve months ended June 30, 2014, Integrys consolidated generated about \$741 million in cash from operations, invested approximately \$718 million in capital expenditures, and paid \$210 million in dividends, yielding negative cash flow of \$187 million which the company financed through the issuance of incremental long-term debt. On a pro forma basis, we expect the company to remain cash flow negative with any cash shortfall being met by the UPPCO and IES sale proceeds and incremental debt.

Rating Outlook

The stable rating outlook reflects a reduced business risk profile, our expectation that holding company debt will not exceed current levels, and the consolidated ratio of CFO pre-W/C to debt will continue to top 20% for the near to medium term.

What Could Change the Rating - Up

An upgrade is not expected in the near to medium-term. Longer term, we would likely need to see Integrys' consolidated ratio of CFO pre-W/C to debt exceed 25% on a sustained basis, without the benefit of any temporary items such as bonus depreciation, as well as a reduction in holdco debt, to consider an upgrade.

What Could Change the Rating - Down

Adverse changes in regulatory supportiveness, or an unexpected increase in leverage or decline in cash flow such that its ratio of CFO pre-W/C to debt falls below 17% on a sustained basis could lead to a downgrade. A further increase in Integrys' holdco debt or the failure to exit the retail energy marketing business would also place downward rating pressure on the company.

Rating Factors

Integrys Energy Group, Inc.

Regulated Electric and Gas Utilities Industry Grid [1][2]	Current LTM 6/30/2015		[3] Moody's 12-18 Month Forward View As of May 2014	
Factor 1 : Regulatory Framework (25%)	Measure	Score	Measure	Score
a) Legislative and Judicial Underpinnings of the Regulatory Framework	A	A	A	A
b) Consistency and Predictability of Regulation	Aa	Aa	Aa	Aa
Factor 2 : Ability to Recover Costs and Earn Returns (25%)				
a) Timeliness of Recovery of Operating and Capital Costs	Aa	Aa	Aa	Aa
b) Sufficiency of Rates and Returns	A	A	A	A
Factor 3 : Diversification (10%)				
a) Market Position	A	A	A	A
b) Generation and Fuel Diversity	Baa	Baa	Baa	Baa
Factor 4 : Financial Strength (40%)				
a) CFO pre-WC + Interest / Interest (3 Year Avg)	6.4x	Aa	5.8x - 6.3x	Aa
b) CFO pre-WC / Debt (3 Year Avg)	22.6%	A	19% - 24%	Baa
c) CFO pre-WC - Dividends / Debt (3 Year Avg)	16.0%	Baa	13% - 18%	Baa
d) Debt / Capitalization (3 Year Avg)	41.2%	A	42% - 47%	A
Rating:				
Grid-Indicated Rating Before Notching Adjustment		A2		A2
HoldCo Structural Subordination Notching		-2		-2
a) Indicated Rating from Grid		Baa1		Baa1
b) Actual Rating Assigned		A3		A3

[1] All ratios are based on 'Adjusted' financial data and incorporate Moody's Global Standard Adjustments for Non-Financial Corporations. [2] As of LTM 6/30/2014; Source: Moody's Financial Metrics [3] This represents Moody's forward view; not the view of the issuer; and unless noted in the text, does not incorporate significant acquisitions and divestitures.

This publication does not announce a credit rating action. For any credit ratings referenced in this publication, please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on <http://www.moody's.com> for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

MOODY'S
INVESTORS SERVICE

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. ("MIS") AND ITS AFFILIATES ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATION") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO CONSIDER MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS IN MAKING ANY INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to

use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

MIS, a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MIS have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MIS for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at www.moodys.com under the heading "Shareholder Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

For Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail clients. It would be dangerous for "retail clients" to make any investment decision based on MOODY'S credit rating. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Attachment B

MICHAEL J. AHERN
(612) 340-2881
FAX (612) 340-2643
ahern.michael@dorsey.com

May 1, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation Gas Service Quality Standards Report
Docket No. G007,011/M-13-__

Dear Dr. Haar:

Enclosed for filing is Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation's (MERC's) Annual Gas Service Quality Standards Report for 2012.

Please feel free to contact me at (612) 340-2881 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Michael J. Ahern

Michael J. Ahern

cc: Service List

STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE
MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Beverly Jones Heydinger
J. Dennis O'Brien
David C. Boyd
Nancy Lange
Betsy Wergin

Chair
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

In the Matter of the Annual Service Quality
Report for Minnesota Energy Resources
Corporation for 2012

Docket No. G007,011/M-13-__

ANNUAL SERVICE QUALITY REPORT

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation ("MERC" or the "Company") submits this Annual Report for 2012 in compliance with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's August 26, 2010 Order Setting Reporting Requirements in Docket No. G-999/CI-09-409 and March 6, 2012, Order Accepting Reports and Setting Further Requirements in Docket No. G-007,011/M-10-374.

A. Call Center Response Time

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

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

B. Meter Reading Performance Data

Each utility is required to report the meter reading performance data contained in Minn. Rules, part 7826.1400.

7826.1400 REPORTING METER-READING PERFORMANCE.

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 Attachment B. The data for self reads includes both estimates and customer self reads.

In its March 6, 2012, Order Setting Further Reporting Requirements, 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 Response: MERC's system does not differentiate between an estimate and a customer read so the customer read numbers include both estimates and customer self reads.

C. Involuntary Service Disconnections

In lieu of reporting data on involuntary service disconnections as contained in Minn. Rules, part 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 C. 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.

D. Service Extension Requests

Each utility shall report the service extension request response time data contained in Minn. Rules, part 7826.1600, items A and 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 E. “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, where the service has previously been disconnected.

In its March 6, 2012, Order Setting Further Reporting Requirements, the Commission also requested utilities to explain the types of extension requests included in the data on service extension request response times for locations previously served and not previously served.

MERC Response: For locations not previously served, new service requests are for service where no gas exists, usually for new construction or an existing customer who requests new 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. Disconnections for non-payment are not included in MERC’s response.

E. Customer Deposits

Each utility shall report the customer deposit data contained in Minn. Rules, part 7826.1900.

7826.1900 REPORTING CUSTOMER DEPOSITS.

The annual service quality report must include the number of customers who were required to make a deposit as a condition of receiving service.

MERC Response: Twenty-three customers were required to make deposits in 2012, all due to diversion (theft).

In its March 6, 2012, Order Setting Further Reporting Requirements, the Commission also requested utilities to explain the types of deposits included in the reported number of “required customer deposits.”

MERC Response: MERC had twenty-three new deposits in 2012 and all were required from customers because of theft of service. In total, MERC holds 695 deposits, 672 of which were required before 2012.

F. Customer Complaints

Each utility shall report the customer complaint data contained in Minn. Rules, part 7826.2000.

7826.2000 REPORTING CUSTOMER COMPLAINTS.

The annual service quality report must include a detailed report on complaints by customer class and calendar month, including at least the following information:

- 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: The required information is provided in Attachment G.

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 H.

H. Mislocates

Each utility shall report data on 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 I. All of the mislocates noted in Attachment I resulted in a damaged line.

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 J.

J. Service Interruptions

Each utility shall 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.

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

K. MOPS Reportable Events

Each utility shall report summaries of major events that are immediately reportable to the Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety (MOPS) according to the criteria used by MOPS 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.

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

L. Notification of Reportable Events

Each utility shall provide the Commission and the OES with notification of reportable events as they are defined by MOPS, contemporaneous with the utility's notification of the event to MOPS. 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 is currently providing the Commission and the OES with notification of reportable events contemporaneous with the utility's notification of the event to MOPS 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 within one hour and within more than one hour. CenterPoint, IPL, and MERC shall also report the average number of minutes it takes to respond to an emergency.

MERC Response: The required information is provided in Attachment H. The gas emergency call response times include all calls reporting a suspected gas leak, as well as all line hits.

In its March 6, 2012, Order Setting Further Reporting Requirements, the Commission also requested utilities to describe the types of gas emergency calls included in their gas emergency response times, as well as the types of emergency calls included in their reports to the Minnesota Office of Pipeline Safety (MOPS). Further, utilities must explain any difference between the reports provided to the Commission and MOPS.

MERC Response: The information provided in Attachment H includes response time for all calls reporting a suspected gas leak and line hits. The information in Attachment H is the same information provided to MOPS.

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 O.

Calls answered within 20 seconds

2012	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Total calls	27,186	26,062	27,281	27,336	29,152	25,052	25,125	25,125	25,867	34,098	27,905	27,662
Average speed of answer	19	20	21	22	21	17	16	19	19	23	18	18
% answered in 20 seconds	80.14%	81.19%	80.03%	80.30%	80.72%	83.69%	84.15%	83.19%	81.95%	79.13%	82.32%	81.87%

Answer time for gas emergency phone lines

2012

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	AVERAGE	TOTAL
Total calls	1,628	1,312	1,235	1,244	1,339	1,279	1,337	1,317	1,401	1,720	1,912	1,617	1,445	17,341
Average speed of answer	7	7	7	6	7	7	7	7	5	6	9	7	7	
% answered in 15 seconds	90.57%	91.39%	91.41%	92.96%	92.33%	92.81%	93.78%	92.71%	94.28%	95.20%	89.07%	91.46%	92.33%	

***note:
increase in
Nov due to
propane
plant
release
resulting in
over 300
leak calls**

Meter Reading

2012												
2012	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		
w/o farm taps												
January	212,620	207,986	97.82%	4,634	2.18%	0	0.0000%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
February	212,655	208,643	98.11%	4,012	1.89%	0	0.0000%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
March	212,395	207,809	97.84%	4,586	2.16%	0	0.0000%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
April	212,652	209,949	98.73%	2,703	1.27%	0	0.0000%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
May	212,669	210,502	98.98%	2,167	1.02%	1	0.0005%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
June	212,728	207,384	97.49%	5,344	2.51%	1	0.0005%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
July	212,592	207,680	97.69%	4,912	2.31%	1	0.0005%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
August	212,787	207,871	97.69%	4,916	2.31%	1	0.0005%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
September	212,918	209,932	98.60%	2,986	1.40%	3	0.0014%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
October	213,145	209,339	98.21%	3,806	1.79%	3	0.0014%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
November	213,419	207,756	97.35%	5,663	2.65%	3	0.0014%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
December	213,723	209,799	98.16%	3,924	1.84%	3	0.0014%	0	0.0000%	accessibility and dogs		
Total	2,554,303	2,504,650	98.06%	49653	1.94%	16	0.0006%	0	0.0000%			
with farm taps												
January	214,527	209,893	97.84%	6541	3.05%	8	0.0037%	9	0.0042%			
February	214,562	210,550	98.13%	5919	2.76%	12	0.0056%	9	0.0042%			
March	214,302	209,716	97.86%	6493	3.03%	12	0.0056%	9	0.0042%			
April	214,559	211,856	98.74%	4610	2.15%	17	0.0079%	9	0.0042%			
May	214,576	212,409	98.99%	4074	1.90%	22	0.0103%	15	0.0070%			
June	214,635	209,291	97.51%	7251	3.38%	23	0.0107%	20	0.0093%			
July	214,499	209,587	97.71%	6819	3.18%	24	0.0112%	28	0.0131%			
August	214,694	209,778	97.71%	6823	3.18%	26	0.0121%	28	0.0130%			
September	214,825	211,839	98.61%	4893	2.28%	131	0.0610%	31	0.0144%			
October	215,052	211,246	98.23%	5713	2.66%	409	0.1902%	32	0.0149%			
November	215,326	209,663	97.37%	7570	3.52%	664	0.3084%	37	0.0172%			
December	215,630	211,706	98.18%	5831	2.70%	749	0.3474%	43	0.0199%			
Total	2,577,187	2,527,534	98.07%	72,537	2.81%	2,097	0.0814%	270	0.0105%			
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Meter reading staffing*	32.54	33.34	31.88	39.19	26.15	23.38	24.07	25.32	24.29	36.56	23.92	28.5

* approximate FTEs based on labor reports

Attachment C

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire
Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #12-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

Jan-2012 Feb-2012 Mar-2012 Apr-2012 May-2012 Jun-2012 Jul-2012 Aug-2012 Sep-2012 Oct-2012 Nov-2012 Dec-2012

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,743	190,925	190,816	190,895	190,980	191,221	190,719	190,924	190,340	191,264	191,497	191,963
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	26,780	28,578	31,857	34,455	32,851	31,570	26,948	22,051	21,207	18,428	19,781	20,338
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests :	675	654	334							2,639	629	476

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>												
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection request:	86	127	183							1,218	289	96

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

10% PLAN (TPP)

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire
Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #12-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

Jan-2012 Feb-2012 Mar-2012 Apr-2012 May-2012 Jun-2012 Jul-2012 Aug-2012 Sep-2012 Oct-2012 Nov-2012 Dec-2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0	0	0						0	1	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	675	654	334						2,639	629	476
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>											
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	675	654	334						2,639	629	476
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>											

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	6,834	6,808	10,370	8,386	7,433	4,648	2,356	1,416	961	1,114	1,419	3,866
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	65	159	354	159	1,529	1,371	1,314	514	269	152	15	14
d)	# Gas - heat not affected												
e)	Total # disconnected	65	159	354	159	1,529	1,371	1,314	514	269	152	15	14

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				463						14		
d)	# Gas - heat not affected												
e)	Total # disconnected	0	0	0	463	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	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	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):	65	159	354	588	1,529	1,371	1,314	514	269	166	15	14
----	---	----	-----	-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-----	-----	-----	----	----

Minnesota Energy Resources
Service Quality Report

Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire
Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091) Docket #12-02

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources for report period ending:

Jan-2012 Feb-2012 Mar-2012 Apr-2012 May-2012 Jun-2012 Jul-2012 Aug-2012 Sep-2012 Oct-2012 Nov-2012 Dec-2012

DOLLAR VALUE

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$3,250,133	\$3,812,235	\$4,573,213	\$4,956,371	\$3,987,257	\$3,454,707	\$2,732,589	\$2,178,140	\$1,959	\$1,679,811	\$1,823,628	\$2,130,546
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$121	\$133	\$144	\$144	\$121	\$109	\$101	\$99	\$92	\$91	\$92	\$105
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$783,937	\$850,960	\$463,831	\$387,489	\$268,727	\$119,153	\$14,781	\$169	\$0	\$0	\$399,578	\$562,213
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,931	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$22,927,081	\$21,494,738	\$14,691,251	\$2,948,298	\$5,776,912	\$1,315,315	\$2,939,455	\$3,271,495	\$3,514,489	\$6,481,289	\$13,255,927	\$20,067,497
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$120	\$113	\$77	\$15	\$30	\$7	\$15	\$17	\$18	\$34	\$69	\$105
30	Intentionally Blank												
30	Average annual residential bill:												
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$116,686	\$86,385	\$74,299	\$161,146	\$158,702	\$212,391	\$148,935	\$133,246	\$134,318	\$77,856	\$70,034	\$71,818

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	34	139	289							131	8	8
d)	# Gas - heat not affected												
e)	Total # disconnected	34	139	289									
33	Intentionally Blank												
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	34	139	289							131	8	8
35	Intentionally Blank												
36	Intentionally Blank												

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	86	127	183	270	423	590	673	503	577	1,218	289	96
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	452	385	419	534	1,572	2,322	2,754	2,671	2,191	950	563	422
a)	1-30 days	18	58	185	289	1,098	826	649	142	46	32	3	3
b)	31-60 days	4	17	56	179	281	1,037	792	507	110	41	30	2
c)	61+ days	430	310	178	66	193	459	1,313	2,022	2,035	877	530	417

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	January	▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: January, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,743
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	26,780
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	675

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	86

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: January, 2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	675
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	675
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:		<i>Required</i>
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column All other months, use 1st column only		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	65	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	65	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	65	65

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: January, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$3,250,133
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$121
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$783,937
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$22,927,081
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$120
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$116,686

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	86
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	452
a)	1-30 days	18
b)	31-60 days	4
c)	61+ days	430

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	February	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: February, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,925
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	28,578
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	654

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	127

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: February, 2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	654
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	654
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	6,808	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		Required
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		Required
c)	# Gas - heat affected	159	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		Required
e)	Total # disconnected	159	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected		CWR period only
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	159	159

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: February, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$3,812,235
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$133
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$850,960
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$21,494,738
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$113
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$86,385

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	139	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected	139	
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	139	
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	127
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	385
a)	1-30 days	58
b)	31-60 days	17
c)	61+ days	310

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	March	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: March, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,816
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	31,857
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	334

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	183

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: March, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	334
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	334
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	10,370	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		Required
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		Required
c)	# Gas - heat affected	354	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		Required
e)	Total # disconnected	354	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected		CWR period only
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	354	354

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: March, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$4,573,213
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$144
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$463,831
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$14,691,251
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$77
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$74,299

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	289	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		
e)	Total # disconnected	289	CWR period only
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	289	
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	183
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	419
a)	1-30 days	185
b)	31-60 days	56
c)	61+ days	178

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	April	▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: April, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,895	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	34,455	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		<i>CWR period only</i>

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i><< Invalid Number</i>
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :		<i>CWR period only</i>

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: April, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	8,386	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	588	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	588	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	588	588

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: April, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$4,956,371
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$144
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$387,489
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$2,948,298
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$15
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$161,146

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	270
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	534
a)	1-30 days	289
b)	31-60 days	179
c)	61+ days	66

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	May	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: May, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,980	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	32,851	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		CWR period only

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		CWR period only
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	423	

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: May, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	7,433	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	1,529	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	1,529	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	1,529	1,529

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: May, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$3,987,257
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$121
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$268,727
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$5,776,912
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$30
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$158,702

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	423
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	1,572
a)	1-30 days	1,098
b)	31-60 days	281
c)	61+ days	193

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	June	▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: June, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	191,221	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	31,570	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		<i>CWR period only</i>

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :		<i>CWR period only</i>

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: June, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	4,648	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column All other months, use 1st column only		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	1,371	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	1,371	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	1,371	1,371

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: June, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$3,454,707
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$109
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$119,153
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$1,315,315
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$7
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$212,391

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	590
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	2,322
a)	1-30 days	826
b)	31-60 days	1,037
c)	61+ days	459

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	July	▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: July, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,719	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	26,948	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		<i>CWR period only</i>

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :		<i>CWR period only</i>

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: July, 2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	2,356	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	1,314	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	1,314	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	1,314	1,314

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: July, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$2,732,589
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$101
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$14,781
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$1,931
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$2,939,455
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$15
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$148,935

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	673
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	2,754
a)	1-30 days	649
b)	31-60 days	792
c)	61+ days	1,313

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas ▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012 ▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	August ▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: August, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,924	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	22,051	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		<i>CWR period only</i>

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :		<i>CWR period only</i>

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: August, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,416	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column All other months, use 1st column only		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	514	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	514	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	514	514

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: August, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$2,178,140
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$99
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$169
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$3,271,495
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$17
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$133,246

DISCONNECTION DURATION

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

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	503
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	2,671
a)	1-30 days	142
b)	31-60 days	507
c)	61+ days	2,022

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	<i>Required</i>
Reporting Period:	September	▼	<i>Required</i>

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: September, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	190,340	
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	21,207	
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:		<i>CWR period only</i>

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :		<i>CWR period only</i>

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: September, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:		<i>CWR period only</i>
a)	Number of PS requests received		<i>CWR period only</i>
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:		<i>CWR period only</i>
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	961	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column All other months, use 1st column only		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>Required</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected	269	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>Required</i>
e)	Total # disconnected	269	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
c)	# Gas - heat affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		<i>CWR period only</i>
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	269	269

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: September, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$1,958,867
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$92
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:	\$3,514,489
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$18
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$134,318

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	215	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected	215	
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).		CWR period only
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	577
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	2,191
a)	1-30 days	46
b)	31-60 days	110
c)	61+ days	2,035

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	October	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: October, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	191,264
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	18,428
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	2,639

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	1,218

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: October, 2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	2,639
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	2,639
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,114	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		Required
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		Required
c)	# Gas - heat affected	152	14
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		Required
e)	Total # disconnected	152	14
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected		CWR period only
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	152	166

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: October, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$1,679,811
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$91
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:	\$6,481,289
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$34
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$77,856

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	131	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected	131	
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	131	
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	1,218
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	950
a)	1-30 days	32
b)	31-60 days	41
c)	61+ days	877

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	November	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: November, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	191,497
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	19,781
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	629

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	1
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	289

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: November, 2012**PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)**

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	1
a)	Number of PS requests received	629
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	629
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	1,419	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		Required
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		Required
c)	# Gas - heat affected	15	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		Required
e)	Total # disconnected	15	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected		CWR period only
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	15	15

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: November, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$1,823,628
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$92
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$399,578
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$13,255,927
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$69
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$70,034

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	8	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected	8	
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).	8	
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	289
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	563
a)	1-30 days	3
b)	31-60 days	30
c)	61+ days	530

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission**Minnesota Cold Weather Rule Compliance Questionnaire****Version 3**

Company Submitting Reply:	Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas	▼	Required
Reporting Year:	2012	▼	Required
Reporting Period:	December	▼	Required

Utility Monthly Reports (216B.091)**Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: December, 2012**

1	Number of Residential Customer Accounts:	191,963
2	Number of Past Due Residential Customer Accounts:	20,338
3	Number of Cold Weather Protection Requests:	476

RECONNECTION AT BEGINNING OF COLD WEATHER MONTHS

4	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
5	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
6	Number of customer accounts granted reconnection <u>request</u> :	96

INABILITY TO PAY (ITP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

10% PLAN (TPP)

*This entire section
intentionally left blank*

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: December, 2012

PAYMENT SCHEDULE (PS)

16	Number of "Right to Appeal" notices mailed to customers:	0
a)	Number of PS requests received	476
17	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
18	Number of PS negotiations mutually agreed upon:	476
19	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	

DISCONNECTIONS

20	Number of disconnection notices mailed to customers:	3,866	
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 April 16-30 and October 16-31 in 2nd column <i>All other months, use 1st column only</i>		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		Required
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		Required
c)	# Gas - heat affected	14	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		Required
e)	Total # disconnected	14	0
22	Number of customer accounts disconnected seeking protection:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected		CWR period only
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected (See Note)	0	
23	Number of customer accounts disconnected for nonpayment (auto-calculation of #21e+ #22e):	14	14

Company: Minnesota Energy Resources People's Natural Gas for report period ending: December, 2012**DOLLAR VALUE**

24	Total dollars past due on all residential accounts:	\$2,130,546
25	Average past due dollar amount per past due account (auto-calculation of #24 ÷ #2):	\$105
26	Total dollars received from energy assistance programs:	\$562,213
27	Total dollars received from other sources (private organizations):	\$0
28	Total Revenue from sales to residential accounts:	\$20,067,497
29	Average monthly residential bill: (auto-calculation of #28 ÷ #1)	\$105
30	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>	
31	Total residential account write-offs due to uncollectible:	\$71,818

DISCONNECTION DURATION

32	Number of customer accounts disconnected 24 hours or more:		
a)	# Electric - heat affected		CWR period only
b)	# Electric - heat not affected		CWR period only
c)	# Gas - heat affected	8	
d)	# Gas - heat not affected		CWR period only
e)	Total # disconnected	8	
33	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
34	Number occupied heat-affected accounts disconnected 24 hours or more (to include customers who did and did not seek protection).		CWR period only
35	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		
36	<i>Intentionally Blank</i>		

RECONNECTION DATA

37	# Accounts reconnected	96
38	# Accounts remaining disconnected	422
a)	1-30 days	3
b)	31-60 days	2
c)	61+ days	417

[END]

cwrutilrpt.xls ver 3.0

Service extension requests

2012	Residential		Commercial		Existing					
		Avg time between requested new Installs		Avg time between requested New Installs	# of existing residential requested	# residential completed as requested	residential average days between request and completion	# of existing commercial requested	# commercial completed as requested	commercial average days between request and completion
January	26	7	12	17	422	418	1	39	38	1
February	16	27	1	78	393	392	1	28	28	0
March	61	26	2	35	365	364	1	20	20	0
April	123	20	8	61	465	461	1	22	22	0
May	133	23	16	29	572	571	1	27	27	0
June	164	21	9	21	637	633	1	23	23	0
July	164	18	12	52	625	624	1	26	26	0
August	237	24	14	37	831	829	1	35	35	0
September	275	19	29	27	1087	1084	1	61	61	0
October	272	18	16	36	1469	1460	1	149	149	0
November	170	9	14	11	831	821	1	113	113	0
December	37	2	7	0	538	534	1	64	64	0

# OF COMPLAINTS	JANUARY				FEBRUARY			
	54				369			
	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue			3	5.55%	2	0.54%	12	3.25%
Billing / Meter Read Issue			11	20.37%	4	1.08%	41	11.11%
Collection / Disconnection Issue			4	7.41%	4	1.08%	60	16.26%
Service Quality			11	20.37%	2	0.54%	69	18.70%
Meter Adjustment			2					
Outage								
My bill is too high			9	16.67%	9	2.44%	75	20.33%
Service Restoration Intervals							1	0.27%
Service Extension Intervals								
Others	2	3.70%	12	22.22%	6	1.63%	84	22.76%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT								
Initially	48				313			
Within 10 days	2				48			
> 10 days	4				8			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	16		29.63%		160		43.36%	
Agreeable Compromise	26		48.15%		128		34.69%	
Not within the control of the Utility	7		12.96%		17		4.61%	
Refuse	5		9.26%		64		17.34%	
PUC COMPLAINTS			7				3	

# OF COMPLAINTS	MARCH				APRIL			
	251				219			
	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue	1	0.40%	13	5.18%			7	3.20%
Billing / Meter Read Issue	2	0.80%	41	16.33%	6	2.74%	21	9.59%
Collection / Disconnection Issue	3	1.20%	27	10.76%	2	0.91%	25	11.42%
Service Quality	2	0.80%	43	17.13%			30	13.70%
Meter Adjustment								
Outage			1	0.40%				
My bill is too high	4	1.60%	48	19.12%	2	0.91%	45	20.55%
Service Restoration Intervals							1	0.46%
Service Extension Intervals								
Others	4	1.60%	62	24.70%	3	1.37%	77	35.16%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT								
Initially	220				208			
Within 10 days	30				6			
> 10 days	1				5			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	101		40.23%		100		45.66%	
Agreeable Compromise	104		41.43%		91		41.55%	
Not within the control of the Utility	4		1.59%		2		0.91%	
Refuse	42		16.73%		26		11.87%	
PUC COMPLAINTS			3				2	

# OF COMPLAINTS	MAY				JUNE			
	122				113			
	# of complaints for Comercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue							6	5.31%
Billing / Meter Read Issue	2	1.64%	10	8.19%			10	8.85%
Collection / Disconnection Issue	1	0.82%	22	18.03%	1	0.88%	21	18.58%
Service Quality			26	21.31%			33	29.20%
Meter Adjustment								
Outage								
My bill is too high	3	2.46%	14	11.48%	2	1.77%	7	6.19%
Service Restoration Intervals								
Service Extension Intervals								
Others	1	0.82%	43	35.25%			33	29.20%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT				5				2
Initially	108				107			
Within 10 days	13				4			
> 10 days	1				2			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	47		38.52%		33		29.20%	
Agreeable Compromise	48		39.34%		35		30.97%	
Not within the control of the Utility	2		1.64%		4		3.54%	
Refuse	25		24.49%		41		36.28%	
PUC COMPLAINTS								

# OF COMPLAINTS	JULY				AUGUST			
	126				144			
	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue			1	0.79%			4	2.78%
Billing / Meter Read Issue			8	6.34%	2	1.39%	9	6.25%
Collection / Disconnection Issue			20	15.87%	4	2.78%	26	18.06%
Service Quality	2	1.59%	48	38.09%	2	1.39%	33	22.92%
Meter Adjustment			4					
Outage								
My bill is too high	1	0.0.79%	8	6.34%	2	1.39%	7	4.86%
Service Restoration Intervals							2	1.39%
Service Extension Intervals					1	0.69%		
Others	1	0.79%	33	26.19%	1	0.69%	51	35.42%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT				7				2
Initially	112				135			
Within 10 days	13				7			
> 10 days	1				2			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	30		23.81%		40		27.78%	
Agreeable Compromise	49		38.89%		50		34.72%	
Not within the control of the Utility	4		3.17%		8		5.56%	
Refuse	43		34.13%		46		31.94%	
PUC COMPLAINTS								

# OF COMPLAINTS	SEPTEMBER				OCTOBER			
	149				139			
	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue			3	2.01%			3	2.16%
Billing / Meter Read Issue	3	2.01%	20	13.42%	1	0.72%	14	10.07%
Collection / Disconnection Issue	3	2.01%	29	19.46%	3	2.16%	13	9.35%
Service Quality	1	0.67%	35	23.49%			56	40.29%
Meter Adjustment								
Outage								
My bill is too high	1	0.67%	5	3.36%	1	0.72%	4	2.88%
Service Restoration Intervals			1	0.67%				
Service Extension Intervals							1	0.72%
Others	2	1.34%	46	30.87%	3	2.16%	40	28.78%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT				2				2
Initially	139				130			
Within 10 days	7				6			
> 10 days	3				3			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	54		36.24%		52		37.41%	
Agreeable Compromise	57		38.26%		56		40.29%	
Not within the control of the Utility								
Refuse	38		25.50%		31		22.30%	
PUC COMPLAINTS								

# OF COMPLAINTS	NOVEMBER				DECEMBER			
	99				119			
	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class	# of complaints for Commercial Class	% of complaints for Commercial Class	# of complaints for Residential Class	% of complaints for Residential Class
Employee Action / Behavior Issue			3	3.03%			2	1.68%
Billing / Meter Read Issue			10	10.10%			18	15.13%
Collection / Disconnection Issue			12	12.12%			29	24.40%
Service Quality	1	1.01%	28	28.28%	2	1.68%	20	16.81%
Meter Adjustment								
Outage								
My bill is too high	1	1.01%	3	3.03%	3	2.52%	4	3.36%
Service Restoration Intervals			1	1.01%				
Service Extension Intervals							1	0.84%
Others	5	5.05%	35	35.35%	7	5.88%	33	27.73%
TIME TO RESOLVE COMPLAINT				3				2
Initially	91				83			
Within 10 days	6				1			
> 10 days	2				35			
	# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed		# resolved by taking listed		% resolved by taking listed	
Complaint Resolution	action		action		action		action	
Taking action as customer request	37		37.37%		37		31.09%	
Agreeable Compromise	45		45.45%		60		50.42%	
Not within the control of the Utility								
Refuse	17		17.17%		22		18.49%	
PUC COMPLAINTS								

Answer time for gas emergency phone lines

	2012												AVERAGE	TOTAL
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December		
Total calls	1,628	1,312	1,235	1,244	1,339	1,279	1,337	1,317	1,401	1,720	1,912	1,617	1445	17,341
Average speed of answer	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	5	6	9	7	6.8
% answered in 15 seconds	90.57%	91.39%	91.41%	92.96%	92.33%	92.81%	93.78%	92.71%	94.28%	95.20%	89.07%	91.46%	92.3%	

Tech Response Time From Time of Call to Arrival

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Calls responded to in Under 1 hour	491	387	404	401	433	409	426	448	572	610	676	503	5760
Calls responded to in Over 1 hour	29	17	20	23	26	25	23	31	17	23	204	23	461
Total Calls	520	404	424	424	459	434	449	479	589	633	880	526	6221

Calls responded to in Under 1 hour

	NW region	NE region	CN region	SE region	SW region	Total
January	48	85	110	179	69	491
February	52	70	85	136	44	387
March	55	70	93	141	45	404
April	36	83	88	145	49	401
May	53	84	126	129	41	433
June	33	114	85	127	50	409
July	47	95	80	157	47	426
August	52	85	109	157	45	448
September	76	116	127	167	86	572
October	79	111	134	207	79	610
November	54	105	239	205	73	676
December	45	82	171	153	52	503
Totals	630	1100	1447	1903	680	5760

MERC Average emergency response time in minutes	Month
January	0.28.33
February	0.26.58
March	0.27.48
April	0.27.46
May	0.29.28
June	0.28.44
July	0.28.22
August	0.28.32
September	0.28.12
October	0.26.37
November	0.49.59
December	0.29.07
YTD Average 2012	0:30:00

Calls responded to in Over 1 hour

	NW region	NE region	CN region	SE region	SW region	Total
January	7	4	10	3	5	29
February	6	1	1	4	5	17
March	7	0	2	5	6	20
April	7	0	8	4	4	23
May	7	2	9	2	6	26
June	5	6	2	7	5	25
July	14	1	4	0	4	23
August	9	3	6	7	6	31
September	6	4	1	1	5	17
October	7	5	3	2	6	23
November	7	4	182	8	3	204
December	7	2	6	1	7	23
Totals	89	32	234	44	62	461

MERC's emergency response time target is 30 minutes

*note: Central increase in Nov due to propane plant release resulting in over 300 leak calls

Emergency reponse time													
2012													
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
Total calls	520	404	424	424	459	434	449	479	589	633	880	526	6221
# responded to in < 1 hour	491	387	404	401	433	409	426	448	572	610	676	503	5760
% responded to in < 1 hour	94.4%	95.8%	95.3%	94.6%	94.3%	94.2%	94.9%	93.5%	97.1%	96.4%	76.8%	95.6%	92.6%
# responded to in > 1 hour	29	17	20	23	26	25	23	31	17	23	204	23	461
% responded to in > 1 hour	5.9%	4.4%	5.0%	5.7%	6.0%	6.1%	5.4%	6.9%	3.0%	3.8%	30.2%	4.6%	7.4%
Average minutes to respond	29	27	28	28	29	29	28	29	28	27	50	29	30

***note:
Central
increase in
Nov due to
propane
plant
release
resulting in
over 300
leak calls**

Mislocates

	2012												
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	TOTAL
Total locates	1561	856	2080	5624	9090	9480	8383	9579	4242	7976	9294	2831	70996
Mislocates	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4	2	3	2	24
% mislocated	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%	0.011%	0.032%	0.048%	0.052%	0.094%	0.025%	0.032%	0.071%	0.034%

Gas lines damaged

[illegible]

Gas lines damaged

2012

DATE	Address	Outage caused by system issue	outage caused by MERC employee or MERC contractor	outage caused by other	Number of customer affected	outage duration/minutes	Lost Gas Billed/Mcf
JANUARY							
1/5/2012	133 2nd Ave Worthington	N	N	Y	2	15	0.00
1/7/2012	120 N Dugan Welcome	N	N	Y	1	1200	8.19
1/19/2012	125 Center St Oronoco	N	N	Y	1	549	24.60
FEBRUARY							
MARCH							
3/20/2012	4916 Whispering Way Eagan	N	N	Y	1	15	9.06
3/27/2012	3355 Discovery Rd Eagan	N	N	Y	1	20	0.00
3/8/2012	13 South St Dodge Center	N	N	Y	1	96	4.97
3/19/2012	913 17th Ave NE Rochester	N	N	Y	1	60	0.57
3/29/2012	301 2nd St NW Kasson	N	N	Y	2	80	0.00
APRIL							
4/1/2012	428 Superior Ave Crosby	N	N	Y	1	300	0.16
4/2/2012	105 S Main Dover	N	N	Y	1	20	0.00
4/9/2012	221 7th St NW Rochester	N	N	Y	1	120	0.18
4/20/2012	1201 S Broadway Rochester	N	N	Y	3	60	0.72
4/11/2012	432 N Rebecca Ivanhow	N	N	Y	1	780	0.06
4/26/2012	15 W Front St Cottonwood	N	N	Y	1	35	0.51
4/30/2012	310 Brown St Jackson	N	N	Y	1	1311	32.78
4/16/2012	39545 Government Rd Hinckley	N	N	Y	1	45	4.34
4/24/2012	850 Hwy 65 S Mora	N	N	Y	1	30	2.07
4/5/2012	21547 Harvest Hills Prior Lake	N	N	Y	1	90	4.65
4/24/2012	20195 Holyoke Ave Lakeville	N	N	Y	1	60	74.40
4/26/2012	123 NE 7th St Grand Rapids	N	N	Y	1	20	0.19
4/30/2012	50940 Miller Highway Hermantown	N	N	Y	100	540	1.24
MAY							
5/15/2012	215 Highway 56 Hayfield	N	N	Y	1	93	2.46
5/26/2012	1619 Wishire Ct NE Rochester	N	N	Y	1	150	0.72

5/25/2012	418 E Eyota St Dover	N	N	Y	6	120	0.00
5/7/2012	350 S Edquist Appleton	N	N	Y	1	15	0.26
5/30/2012	507 S Hwy Jackson	N	Y	N	1	30	0.72
5/18/2012	940 W 4th St Rush City	N	N	Y	1	60	0.00
5/5/2012	1301 Trapp Rd Eagan	N	N	Y	1	15	7.57
5/30/2012	15100 Cty Rd 23 Verndale	N	N	Y	1	160	0.46
5/2/2012	1237 Lake Ave Detroit Lakes	N	N	Y	1	60	2.15
5/16/2012	719 19th St NW Bemidji	N	N	Y	1	10	2.87
JUNE							
6/1/2012	312 N 4th Ave Biwabik	N	N	Y	1	30	0.27
6/28/2012	100 Block E Main Ada	N	N	Y	1	20	0.00
6/25/2012	3259 Terminal Dr Eagan	N	N	Y	1	135	144.85
6/28/2012	5204 Oriole Dr Farmington	N	N	Y	1	15	4.65
6/26/2012	27920 Danville Ave Castle Rock	N	N	Y	1	190	148.80
6/24/2012	1654 Hickory Ln Eagan	N	N	Y	4	180	29.52
6/5/2012	2700 Schaeffer Ln NE Rochester	N	N	Y	1	60	5.36
6/4/2012	626 Chalet Dr Rochester	N	Y	N	1	60	1.12
6/12/2012	532 Willow Bend Ln SW Rochester	N	N	Y	2	40	24.16
6/20/2012	1104 6th Ave NW Rochester	N	Y	N	1	60	8.58
6/16/2012	6810 Chester Heights Rochester	N	N	Y	1	30	1.12
6/12/2012	705 3rd Ave Windom	N	N	Y	1	20	8.96
6/26/2012	857 Hwy 12 Ortonville	N	N	Y	1	30	0.00
6/12/2012	205 3rd St E Canby	N	N	Y	1	50	16.40
JULY							
7/9/2012	992 Gary St Calumet	N	N	Y	1	30	0.21
7/1/2012	5668 Miller Hwy Pike Lake	N	N	Y	1	90	0.31
7/13/2012	3113 Cty Rd 112 International Falls	N	N	Y	1	15	3.10
7/14/2012	4846 Morris Thomas Rd Hermantown	N	N	Y	1	5	0.00
7/16/2012	19563 Gama Beach Rd Grand Rapids	N	N	Y	2	150	6.70
7/18/2012	18394 520th St Deer River	N	N	Y	1	30	8.04
7/18/2012	1531 E 3rd Ave International Falls	N	N	Y	1	27	6.20
7/26/2012	1407 E Hwy 2 Grand Rapids	N	N	Y	1	40	10.72
7/9/2012	123 Carlton Dr SW Rochester	N	N	Y	1	90	21.00
7/19/2012	300 3rd Ave NW Pine Island	N	N	Y	1	120	0.00
7/31/2012	25510 625th St Kasson	N	N	Y	1	5	1.34
7/25/2012	120 E Main west Concord	N	N	Y	1	240	5.25
7/9/2012	14155 Abbeyfield Ct Rosemount	N	N	Y	1	60	18.60
7/23/2012	3805 Windcrest Ct Eagan	N	N	Y	2	120	2.46

7/12/2012	3430 200th St W Farmington	N	N	Y	1	60	19.38
7/10/2012	37887 Lincoln Trail North Branch	N	N	Y	1	60	4.34
7/17/2012	5400 Oriole Dr Farmington	N	N	Y	1	15	4.02
7/18/2012	5417 Oriole Dr Farmington	N	N	Y	1	20	1.95
7/2/2012	2038 Knollwodd Dr Fairmont	N	N	Y	1	90	0.93
7/5/2012	1378 Springfield Pkwy Jackson	N	N	Y	1	143	32.75
7/3/2012	Weave & Cleveland Welcome	N	N	Y	7	60	14.58
7/9/2012	418 Weaver St Welcome	N	N	Y	9	1020	3.60
7/23/2012	216 1/2 Cleveland St Welcome	N	N	Y	1	60	0.80
7/24/2012	1208 River Rd Windom	N	N	Y	2	1020	45.80
7/12/2012	1156 River Rd Windom	N	N	Y	1	1200	0.24
7/24/2012	101 Shady Ln Jackson	N	N	Y	1	60	0.69
7/2/2012	111 Benjamin Jackson	N	N	Y	3	1140	111.90
7/20/2012	300 Block Hwy 9 Ada	N	N	Y	1	0	0.00
7/22/2012	1332 E Shore Dr Detroit Lakes	N	N	Y	2	20	4.65
7/23/2012	500 8th Ave Ironton	N	N	Y	1	0	0.00
7/31/2012	506 SE 7th Ave Roseau	N	N	Y	1	120	0.00
AUGUST		N	N	Y			
8/12/2012	609 18th St Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	120	8.67
8/16/2012	2014 Town Rd 416 Ranier	N	N	Y	1	5	1.55
8/17/2012	607 18th St Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	60	8.67
8/24/2012	Golf Course and Horseshoe Rd Cloquet	N	N	Y	74	245	30.20
8/8/2012	627 5th St SW Rochester	N	Y	N	1	60	4.29
8/8/2012	1408 Pahama Ct Rochester	N	Y	N	14	240	29.22
8/14/2012	7130 SE 30th St Rochester	N	N	Y	1	349	0.14
8/14/2012	1213 S Broadway Rochester	N	N	Y	1	90	0.10
8/21/2012	801 S Broadway Rochester	1	N	Y	1	180	0.46
8/15/2012	726 3rd St NW Rochester	N	N	Y	1	90	2.15
8/27/2012	30 Civic Center Dr Rochester	N	Y	N	1	30	17.19
8/30/2012	25055 608th St Mantorville	N	Y	N	1	20	5.36
8/1/2012	723 NW 2nd St Rochester	N	N	Y	1	360	2.86
8/9/2012	110 Center Ave S Hayfield	N	N	Y	2	345	160.08
8/2/2012	1392 Cleome Ln Eagan	N	Y	N	1	10	2.46
8/26/2012	350 Johnson Ave Pine City	N	N	Y	1	10	0.47
8/29/2012	1692 Covington Ln Eagan	N	N	Y	2	120	7.38
8/24/2012	669 Coventry Pkwy Eagan	N	N	Y	1	60	9.84
8/6/2012	14640 Diamond Path Rosemount	N	N	Y	1	120	22.92
8/15/2012	419 6th St Pine City	N	Y	N	2	150	6.76

8/7/2012	10005 205th St W Rosmeount	N	Y	N	1	30	1.17
8/20/2012	1609 6th Ave Mountain Lake	N	N	Y	1	60	2.73
8/6/2012	511 Main St Lamberton	N	N	Y	1	5	22.32
8/27/2012	1429 6th Ave Mountain Lake	N	N	Y	1	60	3.20
8/28/2012	1403 6th Ave Mountain Lake	N	N	Y	1	260	3.20
SEPTEMBER							
9/4/2011	1108 Ugstad Rd Proctor	N	N	Y	3	35	173.60
9/10/2012	715 17th St Int Falls	N	N	Y	1	120	7.75
9/11/2012	1721 1st Ave E Int Falls	N	N	Y	1	30	9.30
9/11/2012	1571 Airport Rd Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	240	0.00
9/11/2012	609 18th St Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	90	0.00
9/14/2012	106 Sharon St Buhl	N	N	Y	1	60	4.02
9/20/2012	444 3rd St Int Falls	N	N	Y	2	115	0.29
9/5/2012	10 9 1/2 St SE Rochester	N	Y	N	3	42	6.01
9/8/2012	218 N Chatfield St Dover	N	N	Y	267	390	39.60
9/14/2012	100 9th St SE Kasson	N	N	Y	1	96	5.78
9/14/2012	1355 East Ln LaCrescent	N	N	Y	3	90	33.21
9/14/2012	2nd St & 9Th Ave Rochester	N	N	Y	19	45	11.46
9/8/2012	955 21st SE Rochester	N	N	Y	1	120	1.08
9/11/2012	723 2nd St NW Rochester	N	N	Y	1	60	0.54
9/28/2012	1117 E Caledonia St Caledonia	N	N	Y	1	510	5.54
9/4/2012	17280 Sunset Trail Pine City	N	N	Y	1	5	0.00
9/8/2012	8896 197th St Lakeville	N	N	Y	1	60	4.65
9/9/2012	11300 235th St E Lakeville	N	N	Y	1	105	7.75
9/12/2012	313 Walnut St Farmington	N	N	Y	1	60	10.20
9/6/2012	1696 Woodgate Ln Eagan	N	Y	N	2	60	2.46
9/19/2012	213 Cleveland Welcome	N	N	Y	1	45	0.40
9/25/2012	1317 2nd Ave Mountain Lake	N	N	Y	1	60	24.40
9/27/2012	908 Milwaukee Lakefield	N	N	Y	1	1080	77.50
9/15/2012	213 Elm St Tracy	N	N	N	1		
OCTOBER							
10/11/2012	315 SE 1st St Grand Rapids	N	N	Y	1	15	0.29
10/22/2012	301 3rd St Nashwauk	N	Y	N	1	60	0.00
10/31/2012	34336 Chestnut Cir Moos Lake	N	N	Y	1	30	0.27
10/3/2012	61057 252nd Ave Mnatorville	N	N	Y	1	90	7.44
10/24/2012	200 2nd St Claremont	N	N	Y	1	75	0.06
10/19/2012	2003 NE Parkwood Hills Dr Rochester	N	N	Y	1	240	1.08
10/17/2012	116 E Main Hayfield	N	N	Y	1	65	17.18

House destroyed

10/2/2012	1317 2nd Ave Mt Lake	N	N	Y	1	15	2.70
10/4/2012	1313 2nd Ave Mt Lake	N	N	Y	1	15	2.70
10/9/2012	401 Milwaukee Lakefield	N	N	Y	1	60	1.10
10/22/2012	262 State St Jackson	N	N	Y	1	420	0.51
10/6/2012	9596 Main St Elko	N	N	Y	1	60	1.17
10/13/2012	14429 565th St West Concord	N	N	Y	1	10	0.47
10/9/2012	3500 Dodd Rd Eagan	N	Y	N	1	90	128.76
10/12/2012	190 Shorewood Detroit Lakes	N	N	Y	1	15	4.65
10/2/2012	23402 Cross Dr Deerwood	N	N	Y	1	68	18.22
NOVEMBER							
11/1/2012	87 Outer Dr Silver Bay	N	Y	N	1	20	0.00
11/13/2012	702 NE 9th Ave Grand Rapids	N	N	Y	1	100	2.68
11/30/2012	1504 Edge Dr Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	150	0.78
11/6/2012	839 5th Ave SE Rochester	N	Y	N	1	60	0.14
11/13/2012	2138 Gemini Dr SW Rochester	N	N	Y	1	90	1.55
11/27/2012	416 State St West Concord	N	N	Y	1	315	22.03
11/1/2012	235 State St Jackson	N	N	Y	1	960	109.89
11/23/2012	37303 600th Ave Mt Lake	N	N	Y	1	60	39.41
11/8/2012	132 2nd St NE Crosby	N	Y	N	1	90	0.00
DECEMBER							
12/5/2012	1308 Hwy 33 Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	480	515.04
12/4/2012	2930 146th St W Rosemount	N	N	Y	1	120	0.00
12/4/2012	4462 Dodd Rd Eagan	N	N	Y	1	15	0.00
12/4/2012	24232 Pillsbury Lakeville	N	N	Y	1	150	304.50

Service interruptions

	2012												Total
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	
Total	3	0	5	13	10	14	31	25	23	16	9	4	153
System Integrity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Company employee or contractor damage caused by other	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	2	2	3	0	17
	3	0	5	13	9	12	31	18	21	14	6	4	136

2012

DATE	Address	Outage caused by system issue	outage caused by MERC employee or MERC contractor	outage caused by other	Number of customers affected	outage duration	comments
1/19/2012	125 E Center Oronoco	N	N	Y	1	9.15 hours	vehicle ran off the road and hit a residential meter
5/18/2012	Cloquet	N	N	Y	2	0	Transmission pipeline experienced low pressure. Only 2 customers affected had alternate fuel source.
6/26/2012	27920 Danville Ave Castle Rock	N	N	Y	1	3.16	Service line severed, excavator had not requested a locate.
7/3/2012	Rochester International Airport	N	N	N	0	0	The service to the airport has it's own odorizer. During low load periods "slugging" can occur. Slugging is where odorant pools and eventually passes through the line. The liquid odorant can be easily detected through any of the gas burners. This is what occurred resulting in the the fire department evacuating the airport.
8/13/2012	1771 Yankee Doodle Rd Eagan	Y	N	N	0	0	Measurement Tech was testing large volume meter. When tech went to trun the inlet valve on the valve failed (broke). 2 buildings were evacuated while the valve was being replaced.
9/10/2012	218 N Chatfield St Dover	N	N	Y	267	390	Contractor severed main feed serving Dover, requiring turning gas off to the town. The contractor was determined to be at fault.
9/11/2012	1571 Airport Rd Cloquet	N	N	Y	1	240	Contractor severed service line to nursing home, resulting in the nursing home being evacuated. The contractor was determined to be at fault.
9/15/2012	213 Elm St Tracy	N	N	N	1		Home destroyed due to explosion. Investigation on-going.
12/6/2012	20802 Kensington Blvd Lakeville	N	N	N	0	0	200 people evacuated from commercial building by business management. No gas in building, only 3 small leaks were found.

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

2012

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total
\$	550,986	\$ 454,909	\$ 642,276	\$ 549,033	\$ 513,547	\$ 522,441	\$ 485,439	\$ 488,944	\$ 474,394	\$ 753,406	\$ 393,197	\$ 580,755	\$ 6,409,328

901000

903000

Jan-13	\$	38,652	\$	512,335	
Feb-13	\$	54,616	\$	400,293	
Mar-13	\$	50,879	\$	591,397	
Apr-13	\$	16,416	\$	532,618	
May-13	\$	35,304	\$	478,243	
Jun-13	\$	33,300	\$	489,141	
Jul-13	\$	33,505	\$	451,934	
Aug-13	\$	38,405	\$	450,538	
Sep-13	\$	53,248	\$	421,147	
Oct-13	\$	59,593	\$	693,813	
Nov-13	\$	43,001	\$	350,196	
12-Dec	\$	48,223	\$	532,532	
	\$	505,142	\$	5,904,186	\$ 6,409,328

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
) ss
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

Kristin M. Stastny hereby certifies that on the 1st day of May, 2013, on behalf of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) she electronically filed a true and correct copy of MERC's 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.

/s/ Kristin M. Stastny
Kristin M. Stastny

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 1st Day of May, 2013.

/s/ Paula Bjorkman
Notary Public, State of Minnesota

[illegible]

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Andrew	Moratzka	apmoratzka@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth Street Suite 4200 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
Gregory	Walters	gjwalters@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Electronic Service	No	GEN_SL_Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation_General Service List

MICHAEL J. AHERN
(612) 340-2881
FAX (612) 340-2643
ahern.michael@dorsey.com

July 8, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Burl W. Haar
Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation's (MERC's) 2012 Annual Service
Quality Report (Report)
Docket No. G007, 011/M-13-355
Reply Comments

Dear Dr. Haar:

On June 27, 2013, the Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources filed Comments recommending that the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Commission) accept MERC's Report pending the provision of additional information in MERC's Reply Comments. The specific information the Department requested is provided in detail in the following pages.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Michael J. Ahern

Michael J. Ahern

STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Beverly Jones Heydinger
J. Dennis O'Brien
David C. Boyd
Nancy Lange
Betsy Wergin

Chair
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner
Commissioner

In the Matter of the Review of
Minnesota Energy Resources
Corporation's (MERC's) 2012
Annual Service Quality Report

Docket No. G007, 011/M-13-355

REPLY COMMENTS OF MINNESOTA ENERGY RESOURCES CORPORATION

Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) submits the attached Reply Comments in response to the June 27, 2013, Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of Energy Resources (Department) Comments in this docket. In its Comments, the Department recommended that MERC provide additional information in its Reply Comments, specifically:

- A. an explanation for the large increase in meters not read for 6-12 months at the end of 2012;
- B. an explanation detailing why the average commercial installation time increased from 2011 to 2012 and why April's average commercial response time was significantly longer than other months in 2012;
- C. a full explanation of why meter adjustment and service quality complaints increased between 2011 and 2012. Specifically, MERC should address whether the increase in complaints, in particular service quality, resulted from additional changes in how the Company classifies complaints or whether those complaints are due to operational or other issues;
- D. a full explanation as to why the percentage of complaints resolved upon initial inquiry decreased from 2011 to 2012. Specifically, MERC should address whether the decrease

in complaints resolved upon initial inquiry was due changes in the way the Company processes disputes or whether the increase was due to some other issue;

- E. a copy of MERC's May 1, 2012 customer complaint report required by Minnesota Rule 7820.0500
- F. a detailed explanation of each unusual service interruption, as defined in the Department's comments on the Company's 2011 Service Quality Report; including, what caused the service interruption and why the event impacted several customers or lasted for an extended period of time;
- G. further information regarding the residential explosion that occurred on September 15, 2012 and updates on the status and findings of the investigation;
- H. an explanation detailing why monthly O&M expenses in October 2012 were noticeably different than the monthly average.

Below, MERC discusses the additional information requested by the Department.

A. The large increase in meters not read for 6-12 months at the end of 2012

With the warmer than normal weather in 2012, MERC was able to perform the annual farm tap inspections earlier in the year, with the annual readings taken at the time of the inspection. Typically, these inspections are performed throughout the summer. With the readings being done earlier in the year, MERC experienced more accounts having 6-12 month reads. Farm tap accounts provide their own monthly readings with MERC being required to perform an annual read.

B. Why the average commercial installation time increased from 2011 to 2012 and why April's average commercial response time was significantly longer than other months in 2012

In reviewing these applications, it appears several of these requests — while ready for service — decided to wait until there was not a winter construction charge. The date was not updated which resulted in the appearance of service extensions being delayed.

C. Why meter adjustment and service quality complaints increased between 2011 and 2012. Specifically, whether the increase in complaints, in particular service quality, resulted from additional changes in how the Company classifies complaints or whether those complaints are due to operational or other issues

MERC initiated a new customer complaint tracking system late in 2011. Prior to that time, complaints to the Call Center were manually tracked and MERC felt not as accurate as a more automated process. Now the customer service representative needs to complete a pop up window before moving in the system. This consists of indicating whether the call is regarding a complaint and if so, what type of complaint. There is also an automated follow up that requires the customer service representative to provide the required reporting information. MERC does not believe there were any more particular types of complaints in 2012, but rather more accurate reporting.

D. Why the percentage of complaints resolved upon initial inquiry decreased from 2011 to 2012. Specifically, whether the decrease in complaints resolved upon initial inquiry was due changes in the way the Company processes disputes or whether the increase was due to some other issue

As explained above, MERC believes the complaint reporting is now more accurate than in the past and it would be difficult to compare with previous years.

E. A copy of MERC's May 1, 2012 customer complaint report required by Minnesota Rule 7820.0500

A copy of MERC's May 1, 2012 customer complaint report is attached (Attachment A).

F. Explanation of each unusual service interruption, as defined in the Department's comments on the Company's 2011 Service Quality Report; including, what caused the service interruption and why the event impacted several customers or lasted for an extended period of time

Attachment B to these reply comments provides additional information regarding the twelve "unusual service interruptions" identified, including what caused the service interruption (where known), and why the event impacted several customers or lasted for an extended period of time.

G. Further information regarding the residential explosion that occurred on September 15, 2012 and updates on the status and findings of the investigation

The investigation of the incident of September 15, 2012 at 213 Elm Street, Tracy, MN is not complete. Post-incident inspections and testing show that there were no natural gas leaks from jurisdictional piping or equipment.

H. Why monthly O&M expenses in October 2012 were noticeably different than the monthly average

In September 2012, MERC booked the performance incentive payout to its third party billing and call center vendor, Vertex. This resulted in an accrual being booked in October which overstated the October O&M. There was a reversal done in November which resulted in that month's O&M being less than other months. When averaging October and November you will note the amounts are similar to the other months.

DATED this 8th day of July, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

/s/ Michael J. Ahern
Michael J. Ahern
50 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 340-2881

Attorney for Minnesota Energy
Resources Corporation

Attachment A

Attachment A



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 2012 Due May 1st Docket 377
In accordance with MINN. Reg. PSC 284

Name of Utility: Minnesota Energy Resources
Address: 2665 145TH STREET WEST, ROSEMOUNT, MN
Prepared By: Nancy Lilienthal Phone: 651-322-8902

I. Complaint Type

- A. Service
- B. Billing
- C. Rates
- D. Rules
- TOTAL COMPLAINTS

Residential			Commercial/Industrial			Interruptible		
Number Received	Number Resolved	Number Unresolved	Number Received	Number Resolved	Number Unresolved	Number Received	Number Resolved	Number Unresolved
1040	1040		51	51				
199	199		20	20				
280	280		21	21				
224	224		29	29				
1743	1743	0	121	121	0	0	0	0

- II. A. Number of Disconnections for Nonpayment
- B. Number of Escrow Forms Filed (per PSC Rule 302G)
- III. A. Total Number of Customers (year end)
- B. Number of Customer's Added During Year

Residential	Commercial/ Industrial	Interruptible
7,029	377	0
0	0	0
191,448	21,331	461
965	-29	-47

NUMBER OF DISCONNECTS
FOR NON-PAYMENT
(By Month)

	1	2	3
JAN	73	17	
FEB	181	15	
MAR	383	44	
APR	632	78	
MAY	1688	70	
JUNE	1536	71	
JULY	1477	30	
AUG	594	18	
SEPT	270	7	
OCT	169	16	
NOV	13	3	
DEC	13	8	
TOTAL	7,029	377	0

- 1. Residential
- 2 Commercial/Industrial
- 3. Interruptible

Attachment B

Attachment B—Unusual Service Interruptions

Date	Address	Cause (System issue, MERC employee/contractor, or other)	Number of customers affected	Outage Duration	Cause of unusual service interruption; explanation of length and number of customers affected
1/7/2012	120 N Dugan Welcome	Other	1	1200	An individual hit a meter set with his car, causing damage and a leak. The service interruption occurred on a Saturday night. The business affected was closed over the weekend and a crew repaired it the next business day.
4/30/2012	310 Brown St Jackson	Other	1	1311	A third party-contractor was using a boring machine, pulling back pipe. Contactor did not verify the depth of the boring machine reamer and struck the underside of a service line, forcing the pipe upward and breaking the pipe at the threaded connection. The service interruption occurred at approximately 9pm. The area was made safe and a repair crew repaired the following day.
4/30/2012	50940 Miller Highway Hermantown	Other	100	540	On April 30, 2012 a contractor working on a sewer project hit a service tee on a 2 inch PE main breaking the service tee off the main and allowing gas to blow. The main was squeezed off upstream of the damage, resulting in an interruption of natural gas service to one hundred customers. After repairs were completed the main was placed back in-service and service restored to the impacted customers.
7/2/2012	111 Benjamin Jackson	Other	3	1140	An unknown service line was hit during third party contractor boring. The service line was not on maps and the meter inside the home had not been in service for years. The service interruption occurred at

					approximately 4pm. The area was evacuated and made safe by 9pm and a repair crew restored service the following morning.
7/9/2012	418 Weaver St Welcome	Other	9	1020	A contractor was installing sewer and water north of a gas main and service tee. As the contractor was completing work for the day, he smelled gas and notified the fire department and MERC. It was discovered there was a leak from the service tee. The service interruption occurred around 7 pm. A construction crew made the area safe and completed repairs to the tee and services the next day.
7/12/2012	1156 River Rd Windom	Other	1	1200	A service line was pulled out because it was not supported during installation of a water line. The service interruption occurred at approximately 4pm. The area was made safe and repairs were made the next day.
7/24/2012	1208 River Rd Windom	Other	2	1020	A service line was pulled while a new water main was being installed. The root cause was determined to be a failure to hand dig while excavating the area. The service interruption occurred at approximately 4pm. The area was made safe and repairs were made the next day.
8/8/2012	1408 Pahama Ct Rochester	Other	14	240	Contractor severed dead end main resulting in service being lost to 14 customers.
8/24/2012	Golf Course and Horseshoe Rd Cloquet	Other	74	245	On August 21, 2012 a contractor working on a road rebuild project hit a 2 inch PE main. In order to safely repair the damage, the main was squeezed off. Seventy-four customers downstream of the squeeze

					point were impacted by a natural gas service interruption. Service to impacted customers was restored after repairs were completed on the damaged main.
9/8/2012	218 N Chatfield St Dover	Other	267	390	Contractor severed main feed serving Dover, requiring turning gas off to the town. The contractor was determined to be at fault.
9/14/2012	2nd St & 9th Ave Rochester	Other	19	45	Contractor severed dead end main resulting in service being lost to 19 customers.
9/27/2012	908 Milwaukee Lakefield	Other	1	1080	Operator for GM Contracting pulled the service line from the main while digging in sewer lines. Service interruption occurred at approximately 3pm. Temporary repairs were made on September 27 and service line and main repair was completed on September 28.

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
) ss
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

Kristin M. Stastny hereby certifies that on the 1st day of May, 2015, on behalf of Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation (MERC) she electronically filed a true and correct copy of the attached Annual Decoupling Evaluation 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.

/s/ Kristin M. Stastny
Kristin M. Stastny

Subscribed and sworn to before me
This 1st Day of May, 2015.

/s/ Alice Jaworski
Notary Public, State of Minnesota

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	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Julia	Anderson	Julia.Anderson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-DOC	1800 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012134	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Christopher	Anderson	canderson@allete.com	Minnesota Power	30 W Superior St Duluth, MN 558022191	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Michael	Auger	mauger@usenergyservices.com	U S Energy Services, Inc.	Suite 1200 605 Highway 169 N Minneaplis, MN 554416531	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
James J.	Bertrand	james.bertrand@leonard.com	Leonard Street & Deinard	150 South Fifth Street, Suite 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Michael	Bradley	mike.bradley@lawmoss.com	Moss & Barnett	150 S. 5th Street, #1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Kathleen M.	Brennan	kmb@mcgrannshea.com	McGrann Shea Carnival, Straughn & Lamb, Chartered	N/A	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Seth	DeMerritt	ssdemerritt@integrysgroup.com	Integrys Business Support	700 North Adams P.O. Box 19001 Green Bay, WI 543079001	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Ian	Dobson	ian.dobson@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	Antitrust and Utilities Division 445 Minnesota Street, BRM Tower St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service 1400	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Richard	Eichstadt	richard.eichstadt@poet.com	Poet Biorefining - Preston	701 Industrial Dr N PO Box 440 Preston, MN 55965	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Sharon	Ferguson	sharon.ferguson@state.mn.us	Department of Commerce	85 7th Place E Ste 500 Saint Paul, MN 551012198	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
David P.	Geschwind	dp.geschwind@smmpa.org	Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency	500 First Avenue SW Rochester, MN 55902	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Annete	Henkel	mui@mutilityinvestors.org	Minnesota Utility Investors	413 Wacouta Street #230 St. Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Eric	Johnson	Eric.Johnson@ever-greenenergy.com	Ever-Green Energy	1350 Landmark Towers 345 St. Peter Street St. Paul, MN 55102	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
David G.	Kult	dgkult@minnesotaenergyresources.com	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	2665 145th St. NW Rosemount, MN 55068	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
David	Kyto	djkyto@integrysgroup.com	Integritys Business Support	700 North Adams PO Box 19001 Green Bay, WI 543079001	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
James D.	Larson	james.larson@avantenergy.com	Avant Energy Services	220 S 6th St Ste 1300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
John	Lindell	agorud.ecf@ag.state.mn.us	Office of the Attorney General-RUD	1400 BRM Tower 445 Minnesota St St. Paul, MN 551012130	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Eric	Lipman	eric.lipman@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	PO Box 64620 St. Paul, MN 551640620	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Michael	Loeffler	mike.loeffler@nngco.com	Northern Natural Gas Co.	CORP HQ, 714 1111 So. 103rd Street Omaha, NE 681241000	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Pam	Marshall	pam@energycents.org	Energy CENTS Coalition	823 7th St E St. Paul, MN 55106	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Thomas R.	Maus		Energy Associates, Inc.	254 Highway 33 North Cloquet, MN 557209403	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Mike	McGlone	N/A	Heat Share - Salvation Army	2445 Prior Avenue Roseville, MN 55113	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Brian	Meloy	brian.meloy@stinsonleonard.com	Stinson, Leonard, Street LLP	150 S 5th St Ste 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Andrew	Moratzka	apmoratzka@stoel.com	Stoel Rives LLP	33 South Sixth Street Suite 4200 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Jeff	Sande		Bemidji State University	Box 1 Deputy Hall 1500 Birchmont Drive Bemidji, MN 566012699	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	Ste 122 9100 W Bloomington Frwy Bloomington, MN 55431	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Steve	Sorenson	N/A	Constellation Energy	12120 Port Grace Blvd, Suite 200 La Vista, NE 68128	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Byron E.	Starns	byron.starns@leonard.com	Leonard Street and Deinard	150 South 5th Street Suite 2300 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Kristin	Stastny	stastny.kristin@dorsey.com	Dorsey & Whitney LLP	50 South 6th Street Suite 1500 Minneapolis, MN 55402	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Eric	Swanson	eswanson@winthrop.com	Winthrop Weinstine	225 S 6th St Ste 3500 Capella Tower Minneapolis, MN 554024629	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Gregory	Walters	N/A	Minnesota Energy Resources Corporation	3460 Technology Dr. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Casey	Whelan		U.S. Energy Services, Inc.	Suite 1200 605 Highway 169 North Minneapolis, MN 554416531	Paper Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
Daniel P	Wolf	dan.wolf@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Place East Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 551012147	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_10-977_Official
James P.	Zakoura	Jim@smizak-law.com	Smithyman & Zakoura Chartered	750 Commerce Plaza II 7400 West 110th Street Overland Park, KS 662102362	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_10-977_Official