STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service Commission held in the City of New York on May 23, 2001

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Maureen O. Helmer, Chairman
Thomas J. Dunleavy
James D. Bennett
Neal N. Galvin

CASE 00-G-1858 – Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates, Charges, Rules and Regulations of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation.

ORDER CONCERNING JOINT PROPOSAL

(Issued and Effective May 30, 2001)

BY THE COMMISSION:

INTRODUCTION

We established National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation's (NFG or the company) current rates in 2000.[1] That case had been initiated by a Show Cause Order after we determined that without action the company would have earned in excess of a reasonable return.[2] The Show Cause Order also noted that NFG had not filed a restructuring plan pursuant to the Commission's Natural Gas Policy Statement and that "[a] long term rate plan that does not address restructuring issues and other concerns set out in the Policy Statement is an

[1] Case 00-G-1495, National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation Gas Rates, Order Establishing Rates for Gas Service (issued October 23, 2000).

[2] Case 00-G-1495, Order to Show Cause (issued August 31, 2000).

unacceptable response to this order."[3] We stated that we expected "a restructuring proposal to be submitted to us within six months following the effective date of this order" (or, by April 22, 2001).[4]

By letter dated April 10, 2001, NFG reports that, while the parties to the case were unable to reach a proposed resolution of all restructuring issues, several of the parties executed a Joint Proposal[5] designed as an interim measure that takes some steps toward fostering competition while a full restructuring of the company's services is negotiated. As explained in the company's transmittal letter,

> The Joint Proposal is not, and is not intended to be, a comprehensive plan for restructuring [NFG's] rates and services. Rather, it is a proposal that addresses several items relating to Distribution's restructuring to further promote competition in the company's service territory. As provided in the Joint Proposal, the parties have agreed to continue negotiations to address additional restructuring items.[6]

Comments supporting the Joint Proposal have been received from NFG, Multiple Intervenors (MI), the State Consumer Protection Board, four ESCOs and the Department of Public Service Staff (Staff). Concerned Independent Producers and Shippers (Producers and Shippers) suggest that, at best, the Joint

---

[3] Id. at 3.

[4] Case 00-G-1495, Order Establishing Rates for Gas Service, at 6.

[5] The Joint Proposal is attached as Appendix A.

[6] NFG's letter transmitting the Joint Proposal to Secretary Deixler (dated April 10, 2001).

Proposal represents an initial first step and that we should do more.

The parties have also developed an extensive list of restructuring issues to be considered in the next phase of the negotiations. This order resolves the issues posed by the Joint Proposal.

ELEMENTS OF THE JOINT PROPOSAL

Liquid Points[7]

Marketers are generally required to show that they can provide reliable service through the use of firm capacity between the point where gas is produced and where it is accepted for redelivery by the local distribution company. Alternatively, where gas is available at "liquid points," marketers are not required to show firm capacity upstream (i.e., closer to the areas of gas production) of such points. The Joint Proposal provides a listing of certain trading locations that will be considered liquid points[8] and provides a mechanism for certifying new liquid points; marketers will not need to show firm capacity upstream of those points.[9]

The Joint Proposal also provides that NFG will modify its Gas Transportation Operating Procedures Manual accordingly and provides a procedure whereby parties can agree to add or remove liquid points from the list.

---

[7] Liquid Points are places on the interstate pipeline grid where natural gas is actively traded and can be purchased at any time. The number of liquid points available to northeast markets is currently limited due to pipeline constraints.

[8] Joint Proposal, p. 3.

[9] Staff's Comments, p. 3.

Local Production

Western New York has indigenous natural gas that might be able to be used to meet some of NFG's customers' firm requirements.

The Joint Proposal requires that a joint study be performed of local production deliveries into NFG's system. Because local production is generally obtained from wells that are smaller than those in Texas or the Gulf of Mexico and may not receive the same degree of maintenance, NFG has long questioned whether such production is reliable enough to meet its firm load. The study is designed to help resolve that issue.

Transportation Balancing

There is currently no requirement that a marketer's daily deliveries track consumption. As the percentage of load supplied through competitive sources increases, this circumstance could create problems for the reliability of the company's system if marketers do not track their customers' load in a reasonable manner.

The Joint Proposal provides that monthly metered transportation customers will be required to deliver at least 80% and no more than 120% of the customers' daily average normalized consumption for the month.

Temperature Swing Storage Allocation

The Joint Proposal provides that a portion of a marketer's load may be met from the company's storage, and that on any day when weather conditions are forecast to, or actually exceed, 62 heating degree days, the company will provide the additional deliverability through its storage capacity. The

Joint Proposal establishes a reserve capacity charge for the service.[10]

Demonstration of Firm Capacity

NFG has proposed that marketers demonstrate firm capacity for the winter season by April 1, but the Joint Proposal provides that marketers need not do so before July 1 of each year so long as a monthly report describing the marketers' plan for compliance is submitted beginning April 1.

COMMENTS OF THE PARTIES

NFG's comments suggest that the proposal's provisions will advance competition in the state. It states that given recent natural gas prices it is wise to proceed cautiously and limit the implementation of restructuring changes to items that will produce few operational disruptions and preserve service reliability. It maintains that the State's economic interests are addressed by the parties' agreement to perform a joint study of local production. Finally, it states that the proposal would produce results that are within the range of reasonable results that would likely have arisen from a litigated proceeding.

MI recognizes the scope of the Joint Proposal as relatively narrow but suggests that the Commission should adopt it without modification.

Staff states that the Joint Proposal strikes a reasonable balance among the interests identified by the Commission because it provides a reasonable resolution of operational issues and accelerates restructuring.

[10] Since marketers are relieved of the requirement to provide upstream capacity for demand when heating degree days exceed 62 on any day, the additional charge roughly approximates the reduced upstream capacity charges now paid by marketers.

Producers and Shippers do not support the proposal. They note there are many non-signatory parties and claim that NFG has been less than forthright in its efforts to resolve outstanding issues. They argue that consideration of numerous critical issues has been postponed and that the Commission should set specific dates for the resolution of remaining issues.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We will revise NFG's procedures in the manner recommended by the Joint Proposal. Some provisions will foster competition. For example, the listing of liquid points will relieve marketers of the need to show firm capacity upstream of those points and the July 1 date for the firm capacity showing is more lenient than NFG had originally proposed. Other provisions, such as the transportation balancing requirement, will help daily deliveries more accurately track consumption, fostering reliability, and the local production study may result in an additional reliable source of production to meet load on NFG's system.

The Producers and Shippers make a reasonable point; several important issues remain unresolved. Still, the parties have made some progress and have agreed to continue working. We will not establish specific dates as requested by the Producers and Shippers, but we expect the process to proceed expeditiously.

Thus, on balance the Joint Proposal represents a reasonable step forward. It enhances both competition and reliability and is the next reasonable step in the restructuring of NFG's rates and practices.

Accordingly, we direct NFG to revise its procedures and tariffs in accord with the recommendations in the Joint Proposal.

The Commission orders:

1. The terms of the Joint Proposal are adopted and incorporated as part of this order.

2. National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation is directed to revise its Gas Transportation Operating Procedures Manual according to the Joint Proposal.

3. National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation is directed to file to become effective June 1, 2001 on a temporary basis, revised tariff amendments in conformance with this order. The company shall serve copies of the revised tariff amendments upon all parties to this proceeding.

4. The requirement of Section 66(12)(b) of the Public Service Law as to newspaper publication of the amendments directed in Clause 3 above is waived.

5. Any comments on the revised tariff amendments must be received at the Commission's offices within ten business days of service of the revised amendments.

6. The revised tariff amendments shall not become effective on a permanent basis until approved by the Commission.

7. This proceeding is continued.

By the Commission,

(SIGNED) JANET HAND DEIXLER
Secretary

STATE OF NEW YORK
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE 00-G-1858 Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates, Charges, Rules and Regulations of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation

JOINT PROPOSAL

On October 23, 2000, the Public Service Commission issued an order in Case 00-G-1495 ("Order") establishing rates for National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation ("Distribution" or the "Company") for a three-year period beginning October 1, 2000, based on, among other things, a joint proposal[1] submitted by several parties ("October Joint Proposal"). The October Joint Proposal provided as follows:

> The Parties wish to emphasize that this [October Joint Proposal] is not intended to be a comprehensive agreement covering Distribution's rates and the further restructuring of its services along competitive lines. Rather, it is an agreement that provides for just and reasonable rates during the time it takes to complete the more comprehensive settlement process, or, if such negotiations do not bear fruit, for the period covered by the [October Joint Proposal].

With respect to the above and related provisions addressing negotiations subsequent to the Order, the Commission stated:

> We agree that the parties should promptly resume negotiations, and we emphasize here that we expect a restructuring proposal to be submitted to us within six months following the effective date of this order. (Order at 6).

[1] Although the October Joint Proposal was originally identified by the parties as an "Agreement" pursuant to the Commission's Settlement Rule, for purposes of the instant Joint Proposal the October "Agreement" shall be referred to as a Joint Proposal.

The Signatory Parties[2] ("Parties") resumed negotiations (so called "Phase II" negotiations) after the Order was issued and held settlement conferences beginning in November, 2000. Pursuant to the Commission's settlement regulations, a Notice of Impending Negotiations was filed by the Company on December 1, 2000. During negotiations it became apparent to the Parties that a comprehensive settlement Joint Proposal, addressing all remaining unresolved restructuring issues, would not likely be completed in time for filing with the Commission before the expiration of the six-month period established in the Order. Recognizing the Commission's interest in proceeding expeditiously, however, the Parties set about to identify discrete issues that would further the Commission's competition initiatives and be resolved in time to achieve implementation for the next heating season. This Joint Proposal is the result of the Parties' efforts toward that end. The Parties intend and request that the changes proposed in this Joint Proposal become effective while negotiations over unresolved restructuring issues proceed.

The Parties believe that this Joint Proposal is appropriate and fair and should be accepted by the Commission as a collaborative effort toward meeting the directive to submit a restructuring proposal within six months of the date of the

---

[2] Signatory Parties were parties that participated in Phase II settlement negotiations, entered appearances on attendance lists distributed at each Phase II settlement session, and signed the instant Joint Proposal.

Order. The changes proposed herein address system operational and capacity management issues affecting marketers and end-use customers. If adopted, these changes will improve system reliability and simplify operational performance rules affecting transportation, aggregation and balancing services. Because negotiations will continue, the Parties further request that the Commission grant an extension of time to submit a plan to address the remaining issues raised by the Commission in its various restructuring orders.

Therefore, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Liquid Points

Energy Service Companies ("ESCOS" or "Marketers") are generally required to show that they can provide reliable service through the use of firm capacity between the point where gas is produced and where it is accepted for redelivery by the local distribution company. Alternatively, where gas is available at "liquid points" marketers are not required to show firm capacity upstream of such points. The Parties accept the following trading locations as liquid points; that is, Marketers will not need to show firm capacity upstream of these points:

Upstream Pipeline	Liquid Trading Point
Columbia Gas	Points in Appalachian Pool
Dominion Transportation	South Point
Tennessee Gas Pipeline	Zone 0, Zone 1
Texas Eastern	South TX, East LA, West LA
Transco	Station 65

TransCanada Dawn, AECOC Hub

The points will be identified in the Company's Gas Transportation Operating Procedures Manual. Points may be added or removed upon the agreement of the parties. To initiate the process to consider whether a point or points should be added or removed, the interested Party shall submit a written statement to Distribution and the Parties identifying the proposed point(s) and providing a supporting explanation. Distribution and any interested Party shall serve a written response on all Parties within thirty (30) days of receipt of the statement. The Parties agree to hold informal discussions addressing such proposals in an effort to reach agreement on whether the identified points should be added to or removed from the above list. Upon agreement, Distribution shall modify its Gas Transportation Operating Procedures Manual to reflect the change adopted by the Parties. In the event an agreement is not reached after ninety (90) days from the date the proposal was initially served on the Parties, the Parties agree that disputed matters may proceed to mediation by the Department of Public Service. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any Parties' right to petition the Commission for relief under the Public Service Law or applicable rules, orders or regulations.

2. Local Production

A joint study will be performed of production deliveries into Distribution (NY) to analyze the delivery performance of local production for purposes of meeting the upstream capacity

requirement applicable to service under Service Classification No. 19 (or its successor), and any other applicable function. Details of the proposed study are set forth in Attachment A.

3. Transportation Balancing

The Company will modify its service classification for Monthly-Metered Transportation service to establish a tolerance band for daily deliveries of natural gas to the city gate. The customer (or its marketer-agent) shall be required to deliver a minimum of 80 percent, and no more than 120 percent, of the customer's daily average normalized consumption for the month. The tariff will be further revised to state specifically that the tolerance band established herein shall expire on September 30, 2003.

4. Temperature Swing Storage Allocation

Based on a peak day study completed by the Company, the total amount of capacity allocated to marketers for their customer groups would, under the current system, be based on 74 heating degree days ("HDD"). The Company establishes the Aggregated Daily Delivery Quantity ("ADDQ")[3] using weather forecasts. From the time the ADDQ is provided to marketers to the time gas actually flows, weather conditions can change significantly, creating a requirement at variance with the ADDQ. In addition, the Company needs to be prepared to provide back-up deliverability to the system if a marketer fails to deliver its full ADDQ requirement.

The Company has calculated that the deliverability associated with the assets required to provide for this reliability is the equivalent of 12 HDD worth of demand. Therefore, the Company will require marketers to demonstrate sufficient firm capacity to meet the requirements of their customer groups at 62 HDD (62 HDD = 74 HDD less 12 HDD). On any day when weather conditions are forecast to, or actually exceed, 62 HDD, the Company will provide the additional deliverability through the retained capacity. When weather conditions permit (e.g. forecast HDD are less than 62 HDD), marketer ADDQs will be increased to return the quantities of supplies provided from the retained capacity. The Company will include a Reserve Capacity Charge ("RCC") to the rates for transportation services for customers served under Service Classification No. 19. The RCC shall be calculated according to the methodology shown in Attachment B.

5. Demonstration of FT capacity by May 1

Utilities are authorized to require that marketers demonstrate compliance with the Commission's five-month firm upstream transportation requirement prior to October 1 of each year. The Parties agree that marketers on Distribution's system will continue to demonstrate compliance by July 1 of each year, so long as a monthly report describing the marketer's plan for compliance is submitted beginning April 1. For any marketer that fails to submit the first report on April 1, the date for

---

[3] Unless otherwise indicated, specialized terms and acronyms shall

demonstrating compliance with the five-month firm capacity requirement shall be May 1.

6. Implementation

Upon the approval of this Joint Proposal by the Commission, the Company shall file and serve on all Parties to this proceeding, tariff amendments consistent with the terms and conditions hereof, which tariff amendments shall become effective no later than June 1, 2001.

7. Continuing Negotiations

The Parties agree that in the subsequent negotiations referred to above, they, along with other interested Parties, will attempt to address and resolve all of the outstanding issues raised by the Commission in its various orders aimed at the restructuring of the natural gas industry in New York State.

8. Effect on October Joint Proposal

Unless expressly provided herein or by the Commission, nothing in this Joint Proposal shall be construed to affect or modify the terms and conditions of the October Joint Proposal.

9. Binding Effect

It is expressly understood and agreed that this Joint Proposal represents a negotiated resolution of restructuring issues and is intended to be binding only in this proceeding and only as to the matters specifically addressed herein. Neither the Company, the Commission, Staff nor any other signatory shall be deemed to have approved, agreed to, or consented to any

---

have the same meaning as applies in the Company's tariff.

principle or methodology underlying or supposed to underlie any proposal provided for herein. None of the terms and provisions of this Joint Proposal and none of the positions taken herein by any Party may be referred to, cited, or relied upon by any Party in any fashion as precedent or otherwise in any proceeding before this Commission or any regulatory agency or before any court for any purpose except in furtherance of the purposes and results of this Joint Proposal.

10. Approval of Commission

The Parties understand that this Joint Proposal requires the approval of the Commission. The Parties concur that this Joint Proposal shall be presented to the Commission for its approval and the Parties agree that they will take such action as is reasonable and necessary to obtain the Commission's approval of said Joint Proposal. If the Commission does not approve this Joint Proposal in its entirety, without modification, a Party may choose not to be bound by its terms and shall indicate same by providing notice to the other Parties and the Commission.

The Parties agree that the Commission reserves the right to take action to insure that the Company is providing safe and adequate service at just and reasonable rates.

This Joint Proposal is being executed in counterpart originals and shall become effective when the counterparts have been executed.

AGREED to this 10th day of ~~March~~ April, 2001.

Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated: 4/10/01

John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated:_____

C. Adrienn Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated:_____

Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated:_____

Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated:_____

Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated:_____

John Holko, Secretary
Independent Oil and Gas Association
Of New York
Dated:_____

Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated:_____

John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated:_____

C. Adrienn Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated:_____

Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated:_____

Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated:_____

Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated:_____

John Holko, Secretary
Independent Oil and Gas Association
Of New York
Dated:_____

Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated:_____

John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated:_____

C. Adrienne Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated:_____

Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated:_____

Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated:_____

Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated:_____

John Holko, Secretary
Independent Oil and Gas Association
Of New York
Dated:_____

AGREED to this ____ day of March, 2001.

_____
Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated: _____

_____
John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated: _____

_____
C. Adrienn Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated: _____

Michael B. Mager
_____
Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated: 4/3/01

_____
Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated: _____

_____
Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated: _____

_____
Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated:_____

_____
John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated:_____

_____
C. Adrienn Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated:_____

_____
Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated:_____

Rob Herron
_____
Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated:_____

_____
Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated:_____

_____
John Holko, Secretary
Independent Oil and Gas Association
Of New York
Dated:_____

Joseph P. Pawlowski
Sr. Vice President
National Fuel Gas Distribution
Corporation
Dated:_____

John P. Zekoll
Deputy Director
Department of Public Service
Dated:_____

C. Adrienn Rhodes
Acting Chairman and Executive Director
Consumer Protection Board
Dated:_____

Michael Mager, Esq.
Multiple Intervenors
Dated:_____

Rob Herron
Crown Energy Services, Inc.
Dated:_____

Robert Hobday
Managing Director, Strategic Issues
Energetix, Inc.
Dated: 4/10/01

John Holko, Secretary
Independent Oil and Gas Association
Of New York
Dated:_____

_____

John Holko
President
Lenape Resources, Inc.
Dated:_____

_____

Scott Sampson
Vineyard Oil & Gas Company
Dated:_____

_____

T. W. Merrill, Jr.
For
TXU Energy Services
Dated: 4/4/01

ATTACHMENT A

NATIONAL FUEL GAS DISTRIBUTION
LOCAL PRODUCTION ISSUES

PRODUCTION DELIVERIES TO AGGREGATION CUSTOMERS

JOINT STUDY METHODOLOGY:

The study will be performed jointly by the Company and interested producer Parties (Study Group). The Study Group agrees to hold meetings periodically to develop data for use in the study. Upon completion of the study, the results will be communicated to the Parties and implementing language will be added to the tariff or Gas Transportation Operations Procedures Manual.

For any meter with daily measurement capabilities (e.g. orifice meters or displacement meters with electronic correctors), daily readings over the winter period of November 2000 to March 2001 will be compiled. A reliability index (percentage) will be developed to measure the following factors:

- Minimum Daily Production Volume
- Average Production over the Season's 10 day peak period
- Monthly Deliverability Decline over the winter period

ATTACHMENT B
Page 1 of 2

National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation
New York Division

RESERVE CAPACITY COST STATEMENT

	Total New York Monthly Capacity Dth	Total New York Annual Capacity Dth	Demand Rate $/Dth	Total Demand Cost	
Daily Temperature Swing/Peaking Reserve Capacity Costs					
NFGSC - ESS Delivery	84,980	1,019,760	$ 2.1400	$ 2,182,286	
NFGSC - ESS Capacity	3,994,060	47,928,720	$ 0.0432	$ 2,070,521	
Engage	27,412	328,944	$ 5.0167	$ 1,650,213	
Empire	27,412	328,944	$ 0.7694	$ 253,090	
NFGSC - EFT	111,844	1,342,125	$ 4.0334	$ 5,413,327	
Total Daily Temperature Swing/Peaking Reserve Capacity Costs				$ 11,569,437	
Throughput				77,422,675	Mcf
Daily Temperature Swing/Peaking Reserve Capacity Costs per Mcf				$ 0.1494	/Mcf
Less: Storage and Capacity Costs Recovered through SC 13M Rates				$ 0.0928	/Mcf
Reserve Capacity Cost Charge (RCC/Mcf)				$ 0.0566	/Mcf

Example based on rates in effect 3/1/2001

NATIONAL FUEL GAS DISTRIBUTION CORPORATION
New York Division
Applicable to Billings Under Service Classification No. 13M of P.S.C. No. 8 - GAS
Effective With Usage During Billing Period Commencing March 1, 2001
For Customers that receive Gas Supply Service from a Qualified Supplier Under Service Classification No. 19

Summary of Maximum and Minimum Allowable Prices

	Transportation Service Classification No. 13M						
TBS System Billing Class (Tariff Class)	TC-5 (TC-R)	TC-6 (TC-1.0)	TC-1 (TC-1.1)	TC-2 (TC-2.0)	TC-3 (TC-3.0)	TC-4 (TC-4.0)	TC-8 (TC-4.1)
Minimum Charge (October - May)	$12.92	$16.47	$300.00	$600.00	$1,400.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00
Minimum Charge (June-September)	$12.92	$16.47	$150.00	$300.00	$1,400.00	$3,000.00	$3,000.00
Base Rate per Mcf	$2.6771	$2.1252	$1.3332	$1.0042	$0.6976	$0.3240	$0.4605
Plus: Revenue Credit in Case 00-G-1495	$(0.3530)	$(0.2409)	$(0.1452)	$(0.1025)	$(0.1017)	$(0.0252)	$(0.0506)
Plus: Reserve Capacity Cost Charge	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566	$ 0.0566
Plus: Amount applicable during the period January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2001 for R & D Funding Mechanism pursuant to Commission Order in Case 99-G-1369	$0.0104	$0.0104	$0.0104	$0.0104	$0.0104	$0.0104	$0.0104
Amount applicable during the period July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001 for Take or Pay Reconciliation pursuant to General Information Leaf No. 144 of P.S.C. No. 8 - Gas	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)	$(0.0013)
Amount applicable during the period March 1, 2001 through March 31, 2001 for Transition Cost Surcharge pursuant to General Information Leaf No. 148.2 of P.S.C. No. 8 - Gas	$0.1059	$0.1059	$0.1059	$0.1059	$0.1059	$0.1059	$0.1059
Amount applicable during the period August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001 for transportation transition cost reconciliation pursuant to General Information Leaf Nos. 85 & 86 of P.S.C. No 8 - Gas	$0.0000	$0.0000	$(0.0003)	$(0.0003)	$(0.0003)	$(0.0003)	$(0.0003)
Amount applicable for the recovery of current transition cost from transportation customers in accordance with the Commission's Order in Case 93-G-0932 issued on March 28, 1999	$0.0278	$0.0278	$0.0143	$0.0143	$0.0143	$0.0143	$0.0143
Total Base Rate, per Mcf	$2.5235	$2.0837	$1.3736	$1.0873	$0.7815	$0.4844	$0.5955
Minimum Allowable Rate	$0.1000	$0.1000	$0.1000	$0.1000	$0.1000	$0.1000	$0.1000

Source: GTR Statement No. 37
Page 4 of 6