

United States Gasoline Fund, LP  
Form 10-Q  
August 12, 2015

**UNITED STATES**

**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

**Washington, D.C. 20549**

**FORM 10-Q**

**X** Quarterly report pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2015.

**OR**

.. Transition report pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 for the transition period from          to          .

**Commission File Number: 001-33975**

**United States Gasoline Fund, LP**

**(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)**

<b>Delaware</b>	<b>20-8837263</b>
<b>(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)</b>	<b>(I.R.S. Employer Identification No.)</b>

**1999 Harrison Street, Suite 1530**

**Oakland, California 94612**

**(Address of principal executive offices) (Zip code)**

**(510) 522-9600**

**(Registrant's telephone number, including area code)**

N/A

**(Former name, former address and former fiscal year, if changed since last report)**

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant (1) has filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to file such reports), and (2) has been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.  Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant has submitted electronically and posted on its corporate Website, if any, every Interactive Data File required to be submitted and posted pursuant to Rule 405 of Regulation S-T (§232.405 of this chapter) during the preceding 12 months (or for such shorter period that the registrant was required to submit and post such files).  Yes  No

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, a non-accelerated filer, or a smaller reporting company. See the definitions of "large accelerated filer," "accelerated filer" and "smaller reporting company" in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act.

Large accelerated filer  Accelerated filer

Non-accelerated filer  (Do not check if a smaller reporting company) Smaller reporting company

Indicate by check mark whether the registrant is a shell company (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Exchange Act).  
 Yes  No

The registrant had 2,400,000 outstanding shares as of August 10, 2015.

**UNITED STATES GASOLINE FUND, LP**

	<b>Page</b>
<b><u>Part I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u></b>	
<u>Item 1. Condensed Financial Statements.</u>	1
<u>Item 2. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations.</u>	16
<u>Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk.</u>	33
<u>Item 4. Controls and Procedures.</u>	34
<b><u>Part II. OTHER INFORMATION</u></b>	
<u>Item 1. Legal Proceedings.</u>	34
<u>Item 1A. Risk Factors.</u>	34
<u>Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds.</u>	34
<u>Item 3. Defaults Upon Senior Securities.</u>	34
<u>Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures.</u>	34
<u>Item 5. Other Information.</u>	34
<u>Item 6. Exhibits.</u>	35

**Part I. FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

**Item 1. Condensed Financial Statements.**

**Index to Condensed Financial Statements**

<b>Documents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<u>Condensed Statements of Financial Condition at June 30, 2015 (Unaudited) and December 31, 2014</u>	2
<u>Condensed Schedule of Investments (Unaudited) at June 30, 2015</u>	3
<u>Condensed Statements of Operations (Unaudited) for the three and six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014</u>	4
<u>Condensed Statement of Changes in Partners' Capital (Unaudited) for the six months ended June 30, 2015</u>	5
<u>Condensed Statements of Cash Flows (Unaudited) for the six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014</u>	6
<u>Notes to Condensed Financial Statements for the period ended June 30, 2015 (Unaudited)</u>	7

*United States Gasoline Fund, LP**Condensed Statements of Financial Condition**At June 30, 2015 (Unaudited) and December 31, 2014*

	June 30, 2015	December 31, 2014
<b>Assets</b>		
Cash and cash equivalents (Notes 2 and 5)	\$94,245,363	\$ 35,557,290
Equity in trading accounts:		
Cash and cash equivalents	10,421,065	6,161,581
Unrealized gain (loss) on open commodity futures contracts	(1,523,806 )	(2,835,302 )
Receivable for shares sold	–	1,689,272
Receivable from General Partner (Note 3)	100,557	134,106
Dividends receivable	823	968
Directors' fees and insurance receivable	2,200	673
Prepaid registration fees	101,657	124,693
ETF transaction fees receivable	–	350
<b>Total assets</b>	<b>\$ 103,347,859</b>	<b>\$ 40,833,631</b>
<b>Liabilities and Partners' Capital</b>		
General Partner management fees payable (Note 3)	\$51,892	\$ 22,444
Professional fees payable	52,255	125,122
Brokerage commissions payable	1,973	1,973
License fees payable	3,923	1,948
<b>Total liabilities</b>	<b>110,043</b>	<b>151,487</b>
<b>Commitments and Contingencies (Notes 3, 4 and 5)</b>		
<b>Partners' Capital</b>		
General Partner	–	–
Limited Partners	103,237,816	40,682,144
<b>Total Partners' Capital</b>	<b>103,237,816</b>	<b>40,682,144</b>
<b>Total liabilities and partners' capital</b>	<b>\$ 103,347,859</b>	<b>\$ 40,833,631</b>
Limited Partners' shares outstanding	2,500,000	1,200,000
Net asset value per share	\$41.30	\$ 33.90
Market value per share	\$41.21	\$ 34.15

*See accompanying notes to condensed financial statements.*



*United States Gasoline Fund, LP**Condensed Schedule of Investments (Unaudited)**At June 30, 2015*

	Number of Contracts	Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Open Commodity Contracts	% of Partners' Capital
Open Futures Contracts - Long United States Contracts			
NYMEX RBOB Gasoline Futures RB August 2015 contracts, expiring July 2015 *	1,200	\$ (1,523,806 )	(1.48 )
	Principal Amount	Market Value	
Cash Equivalents			
United States Treasury Obligation			
U.S. Treasury Bills:			
0.09%, 10/15/2015	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 9,997,497	9.68
0.07%, 11/12/2015	15,000,000	14,996,092	14.53
0.09%, 12/10/2015	25,000,000	24,990,100	24.21
Total Treasury Obligations		49,983,689	48.42
United States - Money Market Funds			
Morgan Stanley Institutional Liquidity Fund - Government Portfolio	25,024,349	25,024,349	24.24
Total Cash Equivalents		\$ 75,008,038	72.66

\* Collateral amounted to \$10,421,065 on open futures contracts.

*See accompanying notes to condensed financial statements.*

*United States Gasoline Fund, LP**Condensed Statements of Operations (Unaudited)**For the three and six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014*

	Three months ended June 30, 2015	Three months ended June 30, 2014	Six months ended June 30, 2015	Six months ended June 30, 2014
Income				
Gain (loss) on trading of open commodity futures contracts:				
Realized gain (loss) on closed positions	\$ 20,860,371	\$ 3,975,000	\$ 18,195,353	\$ 5,012,389
Change in unrealized gain (loss) on open positions	(3,796,036 )	(729,002 )	1,311,496	(2,557,981 )
Dividend income	2,496	1,680	4,990	3,429
Interest income	9,837	914	12,942	2,915
ETF transaction fees	700	1,050	7,350	1,750
Total income (loss)	17,077,368	3,249,642	19,532,131	2,462,502
Expenses				
General Partner management fees (Note 3)	152,647	69,839	260,680	149,104
Professional fees	48,071	36,491	83,594	72,581
Brokerage commissions	23,539	7,102	46,870	16,769
Directors' fees and insurance	2,992	3,204	5,709	6,462
License fees	3,816	1,746	6,517	3,728
Registration fees	11,582	11,582	23,036	23,036
Total expenses	242,647	129,964	426,406	271,680
Expense waiver (Note 3)	(51,838 )	(21,363 )	(100,557 )	(37,637 )
Net expenses	190,809	108,601	325,849	234,043
Net income (loss)	\$ 16,886,559	\$ 3,141,041	\$ 19,206,282	\$ 2,228,459
Net income (loss) per limited partnership share	\$ 6.43	\$ 4.02	\$ 7.40	\$ 3.13
Net income (loss) per weighted average limited partnership share	\$ 6.49	\$ 4.11	\$ 8.17	\$ 2.65
Weighted average limited partnership shares outstanding	2,602,747	763,736	2,351,934	840,055

*See accompanying notes to condensed financial statements.*





*United States Gasoline Fund, LP*

*Condensed Statement of Changes in Partners' Capital (Unaudited)*

*For the six months ended June 30, 2015*

	General Partner	Limited Partners	Total
Balances, at December 31, 2014	\$ —	\$ 40,682,144	\$40,682,144
Addition of 1,600,000 partnership shares	—	54,728,633	54,728,633
Redemption of 300,000 partnership shares	—	(11,379,243 )	(11,379,243 )
Net income (loss)	—	19,206,282	19,206,282
Balances, at June 30, 2015	\$ —	\$ 103,237,816	\$ 103,237,816
Net Asset Value Per Share:			
At December 31, 2014	\$ 33.90		
At June 30, 2015	\$ 41.30		

*See accompanying notes to condensed financial statements.*

*United States Gasoline Fund, LP**Condensed Statements of Cash Flows (Unaudited)**For the six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014*

	Six months ended June 30, 2015	Six months ended June 30, 2014
Cash Flows from Operating Activities:		
Net income (loss)	\$ 19,206,282	\$ 2,228,459
Adjustments to reconcile net income (loss) to net cash provided by (used in) operating activities:		
(Increase) decrease in open commodity futures trading account - cash and cash equivalents	(4,259,484 )	(1,225,774 )
Unrealized (gain) loss on open futures contracts	(1,311,496 )	2,557,981
(Increase) decrease in receivable from General Partner	33,549	100,139
(Increase) decrease in dividends receivable	145	56
(Increase) decrease in directors' fees and insurance receivable	(1,527 )	(2,988 )
(Increase) decrease in prepaid registration fees	23,036	23,036
(Increase) decrease in ETF transaction fees receivable	350	—
Increase (decrease) in General Partner management fees payable	29,448	(6,780 )
Increase (decrease) in professional fees payable	(72,867 )	(152,848 )
Increase (decrease) in brokerage commissions payable	—	(450 )
Increase (decrease) in license fees payable	1,975	(329 )
Net cash provided by (used in) operating activities	13,649,411	3,520,502
Cash Flows from Financing Activities:		
Addition of partnership shares	56,417,905	—
Redemption of partnership shares	(11,379,243 )	(15,008,266 )
Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities	45,038,662	(15,008,266 )
Net Increase (Decrease) in Cash and Cash Equivalents	58,688,073	(11,487,764 )
<b>Cash and Cash Equivalents</b> , beginning of period	35,557,290	52,193,157
<b>Cash and Cash Equivalents</b> , end of period	\$ 94,245,363	\$ 40,705,393

*See accompanying notes to condensed financial statements.*

## United States Gasoline Fund, LP

### Notes to Condensed Financial Statements

For the period ended June 30, 2015 (Unaudited)

#### NOTE 1 — ORGANIZATION AND BUSINESS

The United States Gasoline Fund, LP (“UGA”) was organized as a limited partnership under the laws of the state of Delaware on April 13, 2007. UGA is a commodity pool that issues limited partnership shares (“shares”) that may be purchased and sold on the NYSE Arca, Inc. (the “NYSE Arca”). Prior to November 25, 2008, UGA’s shares traded on the American Stock Exchange (the “AMEX”). UGA will continue in perpetuity, unless terminated sooner upon the occurrence of one or more events as described in its Second Amended and Restated Agreement of Limited Partnership dated as of March 1, 2013 (the “LP Agreement”). The investment objective of UGA is for the daily changes in percentage terms of its shares’ per share net asset value (“NAV”) to reflect the daily changes in percentage terms of the price of gasoline (also known as reformulated gasoline blendstock for oxygen blending, or “RBOB”, for delivery to the New York harbor), as measured by the daily changes in the price of the futures contract for gasoline traded on the New York Mercantile Exchange (the “NYMEX”) that is the near month contract to expire, except when the near month contract is within two weeks of expiration, in which case the futures contract will be the next month contract to expire (the “Benchmark Futures Contract”), less UGA’s expenses. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that the per share NAV will equal, in dollar terms, the spot price of gasoline or any particular futures contract based on gasoline. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that its per share NAV will reflect the percentage change of the price of any particular futures contract as measured over a time period greater than one day. United States Commodity Funds LLC (“USCF”), the general partner of UGA, believes that it is not practical to manage the portfolio to achieve such an investment goal when investing in Futures Contracts (as defined below) and Other Gasoline-Related Investments (as defined below). UGA accomplishes its objective through investments in futures contracts for gasoline, crude oil, natural gas, diesel-heating oil and other petroleum-based fuels that are traded on the NYMEX, ICE Futures or other U.S. and foreign exchanges (collectively, “Futures Contracts”) and other gasoline-related investments such as cash-settled options on Futures Contracts, forward contracts for gasoline, cleared swap contracts and over-the-counter (“OTC”) transactions that are based on the price of gasoline, crude oil and other petroleum-based fuels, Futures Contracts and indices based on the foregoing (collectively, “Other Gasoline-Related Investments”). As of June 30, 2015, UGA held 1,200 Futures Contracts for gasoline traded on the NYMEX and did not hold any Futures Contracts traded on the ICE Futures.

UGA commenced investment operations on February 26, 2008 and has a fiscal year ending on December 31. USCF is responsible for the management of UGA. USCF is a member of the National Futures Association (the “NFA”) and became a commodity pool operator registered with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (the “CFTC”) effective December 1, 2005 and a swaps firm on August 8, 2013. USCF is also the general partner of the United States Oil Fund, LP (“USO”), the United States Natural Gas Fund, LP (“UNG”), the United States 12 Month Oil Fund, LP (“USL”) and the United States Diesel-Heating Oil Fund, LP (“UHN”), which listed their limited partnership shares on the AMEX under the ticker symbols “USO” on April 10, 2006, “UNG” on April 18, 2007, “USL” on December 6, 2007 and “UHN” on April 9, 2008, respectively. As a result of the acquisition of the AMEX by NYSE Euronext, each of USO’s, UNG’s,

USL's and UHN's shares commenced trading on the NYSE Arca on November 25, 2008. USCF is also the general partner of the United States Short Oil Fund, LP ("DNO"), the United States 12 Month Natural Gas Fund, LP ("UNL") and the United States Brent Oil Fund, LP ("BNO"), which listed their limited partnership shares on the NYSE Arca under the ticker symbols "DNO" on September 24, 2009, "UNL" on November 18, 2009 and "BNO" on June 2, 2010, respectively. USCF is also the sponsor of the United States Commodity Index Fund ("USCI"), the United States Copper Index Fund ("CPER") and the United States Agriculture Index Fund ("USAG"), each a series of the United States Commodity Index Funds Trust. USCI, CPER and USAG listed their shares on the NYSE Arca under the ticker symbol "USCI" on August 10, 2010, "CPER" on November 15, 2011 and "USAG" on April 13, 2012, respectively. All funds listed previously are referred to collectively herein as the "Related Public Funds."

UGA issues shares to certain authorized purchasers ("Authorized Participants") by offering baskets consisting of 50,000 shares ("Creation Baskets") through ALPS Distributors, Inc., as the marketing agent (the "Marketing Agent"). The purchase price for a Creation Basket is based upon the NAV of a share calculated shortly after the close of the core trading session on the NYSE Arca on the day the order to create the basket is properly received.

In addition, Authorized Participants pay UGA a \$350 fee for each order placed to create or redeem one or more Creation Baskets or to redeem one or more baskets ("Redemption Baskets"), consisting of 50,000 shares. Shares may be purchased or sold on a nationally recognized securities exchange in smaller increments than a Creation Basket or Redemption Basket. Shares purchased or sold on a nationally recognized securities exchange are not purchased or sold at the per share NAV of UGA but rather at market prices quoted on such exchange.

In November 2007, UGA initially registered 30,000,000 shares on Form S-1 with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”). On February 26, 2008, UGA listed its shares on the AMEX under the ticker symbol “UGA”. On that day, UGA established its initial per share NAV by setting the price at \$50.00 and issued 300,000 shares in exchange for \$15,000,000. UGA also commenced investment operations on February 26, 2008 by purchasing Futures Contracts traded on the NYMEX based on gasoline. As a result of the acquisition of the AMEX by NYSE Euronext, UGA’s shares no longer trade on the AMEX and commenced trading on the NYSE Arca on November 25, 2008. As of June 30, 2015, UGA had registered a total of 80,000,000 shares.

The accompanying unaudited condensed financial statements have been prepared in accordance with Rule 10-01 of Regulation S-X promulgated by the SEC and, therefore, do not include all information and footnote disclosure required under generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”) in the United States of America. The financial information included herein is unaudited; however, such financial information reflects all adjustments, consisting only of normal recurring adjustments, which are, in the opinion of USCF, necessary for the fair presentation of the condensed financial statements for the interim period.

## **NOTE 2 — SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES**

### **Basis of Presentation**

The financial statements have been prepared in conformity with GAAP as detailed in the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (“FASB”) Accounting Standards Codification. UGA is an investment company and follows the accounting and reporting guidance in FASB Topic 946.

### **Revenue Recognition**

Commodity futures contracts, forward contracts, physical commodities and related options are recorded on the trade date. All such transactions are recorded on the identified cost basis and marked to market daily. Unrealized gains or losses on open contracts are reflected in the condensed statements of financial condition and represent the difference between the original contract amount and the market value (as determined by exchange settlement prices for futures contracts and related options and cash dealer prices at a predetermined time for forward contracts, physical commodities, and their related options) as of the last business day of the year or as of the last date of the condensed financial statements. Changes in the unrealized gains or losses between periods are reflected in the condensed statements of operations. UGA earns income on funds held at the custodian or FCM at prevailing market rates earned on such investments.

## **Brokerage Commissions**

Brokerage commissions on all open commodity futures contracts are accrued on a full-turn basis.

## **Income Taxes**

UGA is not subject to federal income taxes; each partner reports his/her allocable share of income, gain, loss deductions or credits on his/her own income tax return.

In accordance with GAAP, UGA is required to determine whether a tax position is more likely than not to be sustained upon examination by the applicable taxing authority, including resolution of any tax related appeals or litigation processes, based on the technical merits of the position. UGA files an income tax return in the U.S. federal jurisdiction, and may file income tax returns in various U.S. states. UGA is not subject to income tax return examinations by major taxing authorities for years before 2011. The tax benefit recognized is measured as the largest amount of benefit that has a greater than fifty percent likelihood of being realized upon ultimate settlement. De-recognition of a tax benefit previously recognized results in UGA recording a tax liability that reduces net assets. However, UGA's conclusions regarding this policy may be subject to review and adjustment at a later date based on factors including, but not limited to, on-going analysis of and changes to tax laws, regulations and interpretations thereof. UGA recognizes interest accrued related to unrecognized tax benefits and penalties related to unrecognized tax benefits in income tax fees payable, if assessed. No interest expense or penalties have been recognized as of and for the period ended June 30, 2015.

## **Creations and Redemptions**

Authorized Participants may purchase Creation Baskets or redeem Redemption Baskets only in blocks of 50,000 shares at a price equal to the NAV of the shares calculated shortly after the close of the core trading session on the NYSE Arca on the day the order is placed.

UGA receives or pays the proceeds from shares sold or redeemed within three business days after the trade date of the purchase or redemption. The amounts due from Authorized Participants are reflected in UGA's condensed statements of financial condition as receivable for shares sold, and amounts payable to Authorized Participants upon redemption are reflected as payable for shares redeemed.

Authorized Participants pay UGA a fee of \$350 for each order placed to create one or more Creation Baskets or to redeem one or more Redemption Baskets.

## **Partnership Capital and Allocation of Partnership Income and Losses**

Profit or loss shall be allocated among the partners of UGA in proportion to the number of shares each partner holds as of the close of each month. USCF may revise, alter or otherwise modify this method of allocation as described in the LP Agreement.

## **Calculation of Per Share Net Asset Value ("NAV")**

UGA's per share NAV is calculated on each NYSE Arca trading day by taking the current market value of its total assets, subtracting any liabilities and dividing that amount by the total number of shares outstanding. UGA uses the closing price for the contracts on the relevant exchange on that day to determine the value of contracts held on such exchange.

## **Net Income (Loss) Per Share**



Net income (loss) per share is the difference between the per share NAV at the beginning of each period and at the end of each period. The weighted average number of shares outstanding was computed for purposes of disclosing net income (loss) per weighted average share. The weighted average shares are equal to the number of shares outstanding at the end of the period, adjusted proportionately for shares added and redeemed based on the amount of time the shares were outstanding during such period. There were no shares held by USCF at June 30, 2015.

### **Offering Costs**

Offering costs incurred in connection with the registration of additional shares after the initial registration of shares are borne by UGA. These costs include registration fees paid to regulatory agencies and all legal, accounting, printing and other expenses associated with such offerings. These costs are accounted for as a deferred charge and thereafter amortized to expense over twelve months on a straight-line basis or a shorter period if warranted.

### **Cash Equivalents**

Cash equivalents include money market funds and overnight deposits or time deposits with original maturity dates of six months or less.

### **Reclassification**

Certain amounts in the accompanying condensed financial statements were reclassified to conform to the current presentation.

### **Use of Estimates**

The preparation of condensed financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires USCF to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the condensed financial statements, and the reported amounts of the revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results may differ from those estimates and assumptions.

### **NOTE 3 — FEES PAID BY THE FUND AND RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS**

#### **USCF Management Fee**

Under the LP Agreement, USCF is responsible for investing the assets of UGA in accordance with the objectives and policies of UGA. In addition, USCF has arranged for one or more third parties to provide administrative, custody, accounting, transfer agency and other necessary services to UGA. For these services, UGA is contractually obligated to pay USCF a fee, which is paid monthly, equal to 0.60% per annum of average daily total net assets.

#### **Ongoing Registration Fees and Other Offering Expenses**

UGA pays all costs and expenses associated with the ongoing registration of its shares subsequent to the initial offering. These costs include registration or other fees paid to regulatory agencies in connection with the offer and sale of shares, and all legal, accounting, printing and other expenses associated with such offer and sale. For the six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014, UGA incurred \$23,036 and \$23,036, respectively, in registration fees and other offering expenses.

#### **Directors' Fees and Expenses**

UGA is responsible for paying its portion of the directors' and officers' liability insurance for UGA and the Related Public Funds and the fees and expenses of the independent directors who also serve as audit committee members of UGA and the Related Public Funds. UGA shares the fees and expenses on a pro rata basis with each Related Public Fund, as described above, based on the relative assets of each Related Public Fund computed on a daily basis. These fees and expenses for the year ending December 31, 2015 are estimated to be a total of \$11,100 for UGA and \$569,300 for UGA and the Related Public Funds.

#### **Licensing Fees**

As discussed in Note 4 below, UGA entered into a licensing agreement with the NYMEX on April 10, 2006, as amended on October 20, 2011. Pursuant to the agreement, UGA and the Related Public Funds, other than BNO, USCI, CPER and USAG, pay a licensing fee that is equal to 0.015% on all net assets. During the six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014, UGA incurred \$6,517 and \$3,728, respectively, under this arrangement.

### **Investor Tax Reporting Cost**

The fees and expenses associated with UGA's audit expenses and tax accounting and reporting requirements are paid by UGA. These costs are estimated to be \$164,000 for the year ending December 31, 2015.

### **Other Expenses and Fees and Expense Waivers**

In addition to the fees described above, UGA pays all brokerage fees and other expenses in connection with the operation of UGA, excluding costs and expenses paid by USCF as outlined in Note 4 below. USCF has voluntarily agreed to pay certain expenses normally borne by UGA, to the extent that such expenses exceed 0.15% (15 basis points) of UGA's NAV, on an annualized basis. USCF has no obligation to continue such payments into subsequent periods. For the six months ended June 30, 2015, USCF waived \$100,557 of UGA's expenses. This voluntary expense waiver is in addition to those amounts USCF is contractually obligated to pay as described in *Note 4 – Contracts and Agreements*.

### **NOTE 4 — CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS**

UGA is party to a marketing agent agreement, dated as of February 15, 2008, as amended from time to time, with the Marketing Agent and USCF, whereby the Marketing Agent provides certain marketing services for UGA as outlined in the agreement. The fee of the Marketing Agent, which is borne by USCF, is equal to 0.06% on UGA's assets up to \$3 billion; and 0.04% on UGA's assets in excess of \$3 billion. In no event may the aggregate compensation paid to the Marketing Agent and any affiliate of USCF for distribution-related services exceed 10% of the gross proceeds of UGA's offering.

The above fee does not include website construction and development, which are also borne by USCF.

UGA is also party to a custodian agreement, dated January 16, 2008, as amended from time to time, with Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. (“BBH&Co.”) and USCF, whereby BBH&Co. holds investments on behalf of UGA. USCF pays the fees of the custodian, which are determined by the parties from time to time. In addition, UGA is party to an administrative agency agreement, dated February 7, 2008, as amended from time to time, with USCF and BBH&Co., whereby BBH&Co. acts as the administrative agent, transfer agent and registrar for UGA. USCF also pays the fees of BBH&Co. for its services under such agreement and such fees are determined by the parties from time to time.

Currently, USCF pays BBH&Co. for its services, in the foregoing capacities, a minimum amount of \$75,000 annually for its custody, fund accounting and fund administration services rendered to UGA and each of the Related Public Funds, as well as a \$20,000 annual fee for its transfer agency services. In addition, USCF pays BBH&Co. an asset-based charge of (a) 0.06% for the first \$500 million of the Related Public Funds’ combined net assets, (b) 0.0465% for the Related Public Funds’ combined net assets greater than \$500 million but less than \$1 billion, and (c) 0.035% once the Related Public Funds’ combined net assets exceed \$1 billion. The annual minimum amount will not apply if the asset-based charge for all accounts in the aggregate exceeds \$75,000. USCF also pays BBH&Co. transaction fees ranging from \$7 to \$15 per transaction.

On October 8, 2013, UGA entered into a brokerage agreement with RBC Capital Markets, LLC (“RBC Capital” or “RBC”) to serve as UGA’s FCM effective October 10, 2013. Prior to October 10, 2013, the FCM was UBS Securities LLC. The agreement with RBC requires it to provide services to UGA in connection with the purchase and sale of Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments that may be purchased and sold by or through RBC Capital for UGA’s account. In accordance with the agreement, RBC Capital charges UGA commissions of approximately \$7 to \$15 per round-turn trade, including applicable exchange and NFA fees for Futures Contracts and options on Futures Contracts. Such fees include those incurred when purchasing Futures Contracts and options on Futures Contracts when UGA issues shares as a result of a Creation Basket, as well as fees incurred when selling Futures Contracts and options on Futures Contracts when UGA redeems shares as a result of a Redemption Basket. Such fees are also incurred when Futures Contracts and options on Futures Contracts are purchased or redeemed for the purpose of rebalancing the portfolio. UGA also incurs commissions to brokers for the purchase and sale of Futures Contracts, Other Gasoline-Related Investments or short-term obligations of the United States of two years or less (“Treasuries”).

	For the six months ended June 30, 2015	For the six months ended June 30, 2014		
Total commissions accrued to brokers	\$ 46,870	\$ 16,769		
Total commissions as an annualized percentage of average net assets	0.11	% 0.07		%
Commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	\$ 44,336	\$ 16,465		
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	94.59	% 98.19		%
Commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	\$ 2,534	\$ 304		
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	5.41	% 1.81		%

The increase in the total commissions accrued to brokers for the six months ended June 30, 2015, compared to the six months ended June 30, 2014, was a result of a greater number of futures contracts that were held and traded as a result

of UGA's increased net assets.

UGA and the NYMEX entered into a licensing agreement on April 10, 2006, as amended on October 20, 2011, whereby UGA was granted a non-exclusive license to use certain of the NYMEX's settlement prices and service marks. Under the licensing agreement, UGA and the Related Public Funds, other than BNO, USCI, CPER and USAG, pay the NYMEX an asset-based fee for the license, the terms of which are described in Note 3. UGA expressly disclaims any association with the NYMEX or endorsement of UGA by the NYMEX and acknowledges that "NYMEX" and "New York Mercantile Exchange" are registered trademarks of the NYMEX.

## NOTE 5 — FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS, OFF-BALANCE SHEET RISKS AND CONTINGENCIES

UGA engages in the trading of futures contracts, options on futures contracts and cleared swaps (collectively, “derivatives”). UGA is exposed to both market risk, which is the risk arising from changes in the market value of the contracts, and credit risk, which is the risk of failure by another party to perform according to the terms of a contract.

UGA may enter into futures contracts, options on futures contracts and cleared swaps to gain exposure to changes in the value of an underlying commodity. A futures contract obligates the seller to deliver (and the purchaser to accept) the future delivery of a specified quantity and type of a commodity at a specified time and place. Some futures contracts may call for physical delivery of the asset, while others are settled in cash. The contractual obligations of a buyer or seller may generally be satisfied by taking or making physical delivery of the underlying commodity or by making an offsetting sale or purchase of an identical futures contract on the same or linked exchange before the designated date of delivery. Cleared swaps are OTC agreements that are eligible to be cleared by a clearinghouse, e.g., ICE Clear Europe, but which are not traded on an exchange. A cleared swap is created when the parties to an off-exchange OTC swap transaction agree to extinguish their OTC contract and replace it with a cleared swap. Cleared swaps are intended to provide the efficiencies and benefits that centralized clearing on an exchange offers to traders of futures contracts, including credit risk intermediation and the ability to offset positions initiated with different counterparties.

The purchase and sale of futures contracts, options on futures contracts and cleared swaps require margin deposits with a FCM. Additional deposits may be necessary for any loss on contract value. The Commodity Exchange Act requires a FCM to segregate all customer transactions and assets from the FCM’s proprietary activities.

Futures contracts, options on futures contracts and cleared swaps involve, to varying degrees, elements of market risk (specifically commodity price risk) and exposure to loss in excess of the amount of variation margin. The face or contract amounts reflect the extent of the total exposure UGA has in the particular classes of instruments. Additional risks associated with the use of futures contracts are an imperfect correlation between movements in the price of the futures contracts and the market value of the underlying securities and the possibility of an illiquid market for a futures contract. Buying and selling options on futures contracts exposes investors to the risks of purchasing or selling futures contracts.

All of the futures contracts held by UGA through June 30, 2015 were exchange-traded. The risks associated with exchange-traded contracts are generally perceived to be less than those associated with OTC transactions since, in OTC transactions, a party must rely solely on the credit of its respective individual counterparties. However, in the future, if UGA were to enter into non-exchange traded contracts, it would be subject to the credit risk associated with counterparty non-performance. The credit risk from counterparty non-performance associated with such instruments is the net unrealized gain, if any, on the transaction. UGA has credit risk under its futures contracts since the sole counterparty to all domestic and foreign futures contracts is the clearinghouse for the exchange on which the relevant

contracts are traded. In addition, UGA bears the risk of financial failure by the clearing broker.

UGA's cash and other property, such as Treasuries, deposited with a FCM are considered commingled with all other customer funds, subject to the FCM's segregation requirements. In the event of a FCM's insolvency, recovery may be limited to a pro rata share of segregated funds available. It is possible that the recovered amount could be less than the total of cash and other property deposited. The insolvency of a FCM could result in the complete loss of UGA's assets posted with that FCM; however, the majority of UGA's assets are held in investments in Treasuries, cash and/or cash equivalents with UGA's custodian and would not be impacted by the insolvency of a FCM. The failure or insolvency of UGA's custodian, however, could result in a substantial loss of UGA's assets.

USCF invests a portion of UGA's cash in money market funds that seek to maintain a stable per share NAV. UGA is exposed to any risk of loss associated with an investment in such money market funds. As of June 30, 2015 and December 31, 2014, UGA held investments in money market funds in the amounts of \$25,024,349 and \$28,024,349, respectively. UGA also holds cash deposits with its custodian. Pursuant to a written agreement with BBH&Co., uninvested overnight cash balances are swept to offshore branches of U.S. regulated and domiciled banks located in Toronto, Canada; London, United Kingdom; Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands; and Nassau, Bahamas; which are subject to U.S. regulation and regulatory oversight. As of June 30, 2015 and December 31, 2014, UGA held cash deposits and investments in Treasuries in the amounts of \$79,642,079 and \$13,694,522, respectively, with the custodian and FCM. Some or all of these amounts may be subject to loss should UGA's custodian and/or FCM cease operations.

For derivatives, risks arise from changes in the market value of the contracts. Theoretically, UGA is exposed to market risk equal to the value of futures contracts purchased and unlimited liability on such contracts sold short. As both a buyer and a seller of options, UGA pays or receives a premium at the outset and then bears the risk of unfavorable changes in the price of the contract underlying the option.

UGA's policy is to continuously monitor its exposure to market and counterparty risk through the use of a variety of financial, position and credit exposure reporting controls and procedures. In addition, UGA has a policy of requiring review of the credit standing of each broker or counterparty with which it conducts business.

The financial instruments held by UGA are reported in its condensed statements of financial condition at market or fair value, or at carrying amounts that approximate fair value, because of their highly liquid nature and short-term maturity.

#### NOTE 6 — FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS

The following table presents per share performance data and other supplemental financial data for the six months ended June 30, 2015 and 2014 for the shareholders. This information has been derived from information presented in the condensed financial statements.

	For the six months ended June 30, 2015 (Unaudited)		For the six months ended June 30, 2014 (Unaudited)	
Per Share Operating Performance:				
Net asset value, beginning of period	\$	33.90	\$	59.89
Total income (loss)		7.54		3.41
Net expenses		(0.14)	)	(0.28)
Net increase (decrease) in net asset value		7.40		3.13
Net asset value, end of period	\$	41.30	\$	63.02
 Total Return		21.83	%	5.23
				%
Ratios to Average Net Assets				
Total income (loss)		22.29	%	4.91
Management fees*		0.60	%	0.60
Total expenses excluding management fees*		0.38	%	0.49
Expenses waived*		(0.23)	)%	(0.15)
Net expenses excluding management fees*		0.15	%	0.34
Net income (loss)		21.92	%	4.45
				%



\* Annualized

Total returns are calculated based on the change in value during the period. An individual shareholder's total return and ratio may vary from the above total returns and ratios based on the timing of contributions to and withdrawals from UGA.

13

**NOTE 7 — FAIR VALUE OF FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS**

UGA values its investments in accordance with Accounting Standards Codification 820 – Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures (“ASC 820”). ASC 820 defines fair value, establishes a framework for measuring fair value in generally accepted accounting principles, and expands disclosures about fair value measurement. The changes to past practice resulting from the application of ASC 820 relate to the definition of fair value, the methods used to measure fair value, and the expanded disclosures about fair value measurement. ASC 820 establishes a fair value hierarchy that distinguishes between: (1) market participant assumptions developed based on market data obtained from sources independent of UGA (observable inputs) and (2) UGA’s own assumptions about market participant assumptions developed based on the best information available under the circumstances (unobservable inputs). The three levels defined by the ASC 820 hierarchy are as follows:

Level I – Quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that the reporting entity has the ability to access at the measurement date.

Level II – Inputs other than quoted prices included within Level I that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly. Level II assets include the following: quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities in active markets, quoted prices for identical or similar assets or liabilities in markets that are not active, inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability, and inputs that are derived principally from or corroborated by observable market data by correlation or other means (market-corroborated inputs).

Level III – Unobservable pricing input at the measurement date for the asset or liability. Unobservable inputs shall be used to measure fair value to the extent that observable inputs are not available.

In some instances, the inputs used to measure fair value might fall within different levels of the fair value hierarchy. The level in the fair value hierarchy within which the fair value measurement in its entirety falls shall be determined based on the lowest input level that is significant to the fair value measurement in its entirety.

The following table summarizes the valuation of UGA’s securities at June 30, 2015 using the fair value hierarchy:

At June 30, 2015	Total	Level I	Level II	Level III
Short-Term Investments	\$75,008,038	\$75,008,038	\$ —	\$ —
Exchange-Traded Futures Contracts				
United States Contracts	(1,523,806 )	(1,523,806 )	—	—

During the six months ended June 30, 2015, there were no transfers between Level I and Level II.

The following table summarizes the valuation of UGA's securities at December 31, 2014 using the fair value hierarchy:

At December 31, 2014	Total	Level I	Level II	Level III
Short-Term Investments	\$34,023,594	\$34,023,594	\$ —	\$ —
Exchange-Traded Futures Contracts				
United States Contracts	(2,835,302 )	(2,835,302 )	—	—

During the year ended December 31, 2014, there were no transfers between Level I and Level II.

Effective January 1, 2009, UGA adopted the provisions of Accounting Standards Codification 815—Derivatives and Hedging, which require presentation of qualitative disclosures about objectives and strategies for using derivatives, quantitative disclosures about fair value amounts and gains and losses on derivatives.

#### Fair Value of Derivative Instruments

Derivatives not Accounted for as Hedging Instruments	Condensed Statements of Financial Condition Location	Fair Value At June 30, 2015	Fair Value At December 31, 2014
Futures - Commodity Contracts	Assets	\$ (1,523,806 )	\$ (2,835,302 )

**The Effect of Derivative Instruments on the Condensed Statements of Operations**

Derivatives not Accounted for as Hedging Instruments	Location of Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Recognized in Income	For the six months ended June 30, 2015		For the six months ended June 30, 2014	
		Realized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Recognized in Income	Change in Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Recognized in Income	Realized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Recognized in Income	Change in Unrealized Gain (Loss) on Derivatives Recognized in Income
Futures – Commodity Contracts	Realized gain (loss) on closed contracts	\$18,195,353		\$5,012,389	
	Change in unrealized gain (loss) on open contracts		\$ 1,311,496		\$ (2,557,981 )

**NOTE 8 — SUBSEQUENT EVENTS**

UGA has performed an evaluation of subsequent events through the date the condensed financial statements were issued. This evaluation did not result in any subsequent events that necessitated disclosures and/or adjustments.

## **Item 2. Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations.**

The following discussion should be read in conjunction with the condensed financial statements and the notes thereto of the United States Gasoline Fund, LP (“UGA”) included elsewhere in this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

### *Forward-Looking Information*

This quarterly report on Form 10-Q, including this “Management’s Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations,” contains forward-looking statements regarding the plans and objectives of management for future operations. This information may involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause UGA’s actual results, performance or achievements to be materially different from future results, performance or achievements expressed or implied by any forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements, which involve assumptions and describe UGA’s future plans, strategies and expectations, are generally identifiable by use of the words “may,” “will,” “should,” “expect,” “anticipate,” “estimate,” “believe,” “intend” or “project,” the negative of these words or variations on these words or comparable terminology. These forward-looking statements are based on assumptions that may be incorrect, and UGA cannot assure investors that the projections included in these forward-looking statements will come to pass. UGA’s actual results could differ materially from those expressed or implied by the forward-looking statements as a result of various factors.

UGA has based the forward-looking statements included in this quarterly report on Form 10-Q on information available to it on the date of this quarterly report on Form 10-Q, and UGA assumes no obligation to update any such forward-looking statements. Although UGA undertakes no obligation to revise or update any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, investors are advised to consult any additional disclosures that UGA may make directly to them or through reports that UGA in the future files with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”), including annual reports on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q and current reports on Form 8-K.

### **Introduction**

UGA, a Delaware limited partnership, is a commodity pool that issues shares that may be purchased and sold on the NYSE Arca, Inc (the “NYSE Arca”). The investment objective of UGA is for the daily changes in percentage terms of its shares’ per share net asset value (“NAV”) to reflect the daily changes, in percentage terms, of the price of gasoline, as measured by the daily changes in the price of the futures contract for unleaded gasoline (also known as reformulated gasoline blendstock for oxygen blending, or “RBOB”, for delivery to the New York harbor), traded on the New York Mercantile Exchange (the “NYMEX”) that is the near month contract to expire, except when the near month contract is within two weeks of expiration, in which case it will be measured by the futures contract that is the next month

contract to expire (the “Benchmark Futures Contract”), less UGA’s expenses. “Near month contract” means the next contract traded on the NYMEX due to expire. “Next month contract” means the first contract traded on the NYMEX due to expire after the near month contract. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that the per share NAV will equal, in dollar terms, the spot price of gasoline or any particular futures contract based on gasoline. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that its per share NAV will reflect the percentage change of the price of any particular futures contract as measured over a time period greater than one day. The general partner of UGA, United States Commodity Funds LLC (“USCF”), believes that it is not practical to manage the portfolio to achieve such an investment goal when investing in Futures Contracts (as defined below) and Other Gasoline-Related Investments (as defined below).

UGA invests in futures contracts for gasoline, crude oil, natural gas, heating oil and other petroleum-based fuels that are traded on the NYMEX, ICE Futures or other U.S. and foreign exchanges (collectively, “Futures Contracts”) and other gasoline-related investments such as cash-settled options on Futures Contracts, forward contracts for gasoline, cleared swap contracts and over-the-counter (“OTC”) transactions that are based on the price of gasoline, crude oil and other petroleum-based fuels, Futures Contracts and indices based on the foregoing (collectively, “Other Gasoline-Related Investments”). For convenience and unless otherwise specified, Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments collectively are referred to as “Gasoline Interests” in this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

UGA seeks to achieve its investment objective by investing in a combination of Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments such that daily changes in its per share NAV, measured in percentage terms, will closely track the daily changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract, also measured in percentage terms. USCF believes the daily changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract have historically exhibited a close correlation with the daily changes in the spot price of gasoline. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that the per share NAV will equal, in dollar terms, the spot price of gasoline or any particular futures contract based on gasoline. It is not the intent of UGA to be operated in a fashion such that its per share NAV will reflect the percentage change of the price of any particular futures contract as measured over a time period greater than one day. USCF believes that it is not practical to manage the portfolio to achieve such an investment goal when investing in Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments.

## Regulatory Disclosure

*Impact of Accountability Levels, Position Limits and Price Fluctuation Limits.* Futures contracts include typical and significant characteristics. Most significantly, the futures exchanges and, for certain contracts, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (the “CFTC”), have established accountability levels and position limits on the maximum net long or net short futures contracts in commodity interests that any person or group of persons under common trading control (other than as a hedge, which an investment by UGA is not) may hold, own or control. The net position is the difference between an individual’s or firm’s open long contracts and open short contracts in any one commodity. In addition, most U.S.-based futures exchanges, such as the NYMEX, limit the daily price fluctuation for futures contracts. Currently, the ICE Futures imposes position and accountability limits that are similar to those imposed by U.S.-based futures exchanges and also limits the maximum daily price fluctuation, while some other non-U.S. futures exchanges have not adopted such limits.

The accountability levels for the Benchmark Futures Contract and other Futures Contracts traded on U.S.-based futures exchanges, such as the NYMEX are not a fixed ceiling, but rather a threshold above which the NYMEX may exercise greater scrutiny and control over an investor’s positions. The current accountability level for investments for any one month in the Benchmark Futures Contract is 5,000 contracts. In addition, the NYMEX imposes an accountability level for all months of 7,000 net futures contracts for investments in futures contracts for gasoline. In addition, the ICE Futures maintains accountability levels, position limits and monitoring authority for its unleaded gasoline futures contracts. If UGA and the Related Public Funds (as defined below) exceed these accountability levels for investments in the futures contract for gasoline, the NYMEX and ICE Futures will monitor UGA’s and the Related Public Funds’ exposure and may ask for further information on their activities including the total size of all positions, investment and trading strategy, and the extent of liquidity resources of UGA and the Related Public Funds. If deemed necessary by the NYMEX and/or ICE Futures, UGA could be ordered to reduce its aggregate net position back to the accountability level. As of June 30, 2015, UGA held 1,200 futures contracts for gasoline traded on the NYMEX. As of June 30, 2015, UGA did not hold any Futures Contracts traded on ICE Futures. For the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA did not exceed accountability levels on the NYMEX or ICE Futures.

Position limits differ from accountability levels in that they represent fixed limits on the maximum number of futures contracts that any person may hold and cannot allow such limits to be exceeded without express CFTC authority to do so. In addition to accountability levels and position limits that may apply at any time, the NYMEX and ICE Futures impose position limits on contracts held in the last few days of trading in the near month contract to expire. It is unlikely that UGA will run up against such position limits because UGA’s investment strategy is to close out its positions and “roll” from the near month contract to expire to the next month contract beginning two weeks from expiration of the contract. For the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA did not exceed any position limits imposed by the NYMEX and ICE Futures.

The regulation of commodity interest trading in the United States and other countries is an evolving area of the law. The various statements made in this summary are subject to modification by legislative action and changes in the rules and regulations of the SEC, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”), CFTC, the National Futures

Association (the “NFA”), the futures exchanges, clearing organizations and other regulatory bodies.

***Futures Contracts and Position Limits***

The CFTC is prohibited by statute from regulating trading on non-U.S. futures exchanges and markets. The CFTC, however, has adopted regulations relating to the marketing of non-U.S. futures contracts in the United States. These regulations permit certain contracts on non-U.S. exchanges to be offered and sold in the United States.



The CFTC has proposed to adopt limits on speculative positions in 28 physical commodity futures and option contracts and swaps that are economically equivalent to such contracts in the agriculture, energy and metals markets and rules addressing the circumstances under which market participants would be required to aggregate their positions with other persons under common ownership or control (the “Position Limit Rules”). The Position Limit Rules would, among other things: identify which contracts are subject to speculative position limits; set thresholds that restrict the number of speculative positions that a person may hold in a spot month, individual month, and all months combined; create an exemption for positions that constitute bona fide hedging transactions; impose responsibilities on designated contract markets (“DCMs”) and swap execution facilities (“SEFs”) to establish position limits or, in some cases, position accountability rules; and apply to both futures and swaps across four relevant venues: over-the-counter (“OTC”), DCMs, SEFs as well as non-U.S. located platforms. The CFTC’s first attempt at finalizing the Position Limit Rules, in 2011, was successfully challenged by market participants in 2012 and, since then, the CFTC has re-proposed them and solicited comments from market participants multiple times.

Until such time as the Position Limit Rules are adopted, the regulatory architecture in effect prior to the adoption of the Position Limit Rules will govern transactions in commodities and related derivatives (collectively, “Referenced Contracts”). Under that system, the CFTC enforces federal limits on speculation in agricultural products (e.g., corn, wheat and soy), while futures exchanges enforce position limits and accountability levels for agricultural and certain energy products (e.g., oil and natural gas). As a result, UGA may be limited with respect to the size of its investments in any commodities subject to these limits. Finally, subject to certain narrow exceptions, the Position Limit Rules require the aggregation, for purposes of the position limits, of all positions in the 28 Referenced Contracts held by a single entity and its affiliates, regardless of whether such position existed on U.S. futures exchanges, non-U.S. futures exchanges, in cleared swaps or in OTC swaps. Under the CFTC’s existing position limits requirements and the Position Limit Rules, a market participant is generally required to aggregate all positions for which that participant controls the trading decisions with all positions for which that participant has a 10 percent or greater ownership interest in an account or position, as well as the positions of two or more persons acting pursuant to an express or implied agreement or understanding. At this time, it is unclear how the Position Limit Rules affect UGA, but the effect may be substantial and adverse. By way of example, the Position Limit Rules may negatively impact the ability of UGA to meet its investment objectives through limits that may inhibit USCF’s ability to sell additional Creation Baskets of UGA.

Based on its current understanding of the Position Limit Rules, USCF does not anticipate significant negative impact on the ability of UGA to achieve its investment objective.

### ***“Swap” Transactions***

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the “Dodd-Frank Act”) imposes regulatory requirements on certain “swap” transactions that UGA is authorized to engage in that may ultimately impact the ability of UGA to meet its investment objective. The term “swap” is broadly defined to include various types of OTC derivatives, including swaps and options.

CFTC regulations require that certain transactions ultimately falling within the definition of “swap” be executed on organized exchanges or “swap execution facilities” and cleared through regulated clearing organizations (“CCPs”). “Clearing” refers to the process by which a trade that is bilaterally executed by two parties is submitted to a CCP, via a clearing member (*i.e.*, a “futures commission merchant” or “FCM”), and replaced by two mirror swaps, with the CCP becoming the counterparty to both of the initial parties to the swap. CCPs have several layers of protection against default including margin, member capital contributions and FCM guarantees of their customers’ transactions with the CCP. FCMs also pre-qualify the counterparties to all swaps that are sent to the CCP from a credit perspective, setting limits for each counterparty and collecting initial and variation margin daily from each counterparty for changes in the value of cleared swaps. The margin collected from both parties to the swap protects against credit risk in the event a counterparty defaults. The initial and variation margin requirements are set by and held for the benefit of the CCP. Additional initial margin may be required and held by the FCM, due to its guarantees of its customers’ trades with the CCP.

Current rules and regulations require enhanced customer protections, risk management programs, internal monitoring and controls, capital and liquidity standards, customer disclosures and auditing and examination programs for FCMs. The rules are intended to afford greater assurances to market participants that customer segregated funds and secured amounts are protected, customers are provided with appropriate notice of the risks of futures trading and of the FCMs with which they may choose to do business, FCMs are monitoring and managing risks in a robust manner, the capital and liquidity of FCMs are strengthened to safeguard the continued operations and the auditing and examination programs of the CFTC and the self-regulatory organizations are monitoring the activities of FCMs in a thorough manner.

As of June 10, 2013, swap dealers, major swap participants, commodity pools, certain private funds and entities predominantly engaged in financial activities are required to clear certain index-based credit default swaps and interest rate swaps. As a result, if UGA enters into index-based credit default swaps or interest rate swaps that are subject to mandatory clearing, UGA will be required to centrally clear those swaps. The CFTC is expected to subject other types of swaps to mandatory clearing in the future and it is possible that UGA will be required to centrally clear certain OTC instruments that are presently entered into and settled on a bi-lateral basis.

To the extent that a swap is required to be cleared, it must also be executed on a SEF or DCM if it is designated as “made available to trade” by a SEF or DCM. “Made available to trade” refers to the regulatory process by which the SEF or DCM execution requirement is implemented by the CFTC. To date, only certain of the index-based credit default swaps and interest rate swaps that are required to be cleared are made available to trade on a SEF. If UGA enters into index-based credit default swaps or interest rate swaps that are subject to mandatory clearing, UGA will be required to execute those swaps on a SEF if they are designated as made available to trade.

Swaps that are not required to be cleared and executed on a SEF but that are executed bilaterally are also subject to various requirements pursuant to CFTC regulations, including, among others, reporting and recordkeeping requirements and, depending on the status of the counterparties, trading documentation requirements and dispute resolution requirements. In addition, U.S. regulators are in the process of adopting rules to impose initial and variation margin requirements that will apply to swap dealers and major swap participants and their counterparties. If UGA engages in non-cleared swap transactions it may be subject to some or all of these requirements.

In addition to the rules and regulations imposed under the Dodd-Frank Act, swap dealers that are European banks may also be subject to European Market Infrastructure Regulation (“EMIR”). EMIR imposes requirements on non-cleared derivatives that are similar to those imposed by the CFTC and other regulators in the United States and which are described above. UGA may be indirectly impacted by EMIR to the extent that it engages in derivatives transactions with entities that are subject to EMIR.

On August 12, 2013, the CFTC issued final rules establishing compliance obligations for commodity pool operators (“CPOs”) of investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (the “Investment Company Act”) that are required to register due to recent changes to CFTC Regulation 4.5. The final rules were issued in a CFTC release entitled “Harmonization of Compliance Obligations for Registered Investment Companies Required to Register as Commodity Pool Operators.” Although UGA is not a registered investment company under the Investment Company Act, the Harmonization Rules amended certain CFTC disclosure rules to make the requirements for all CPOs to periodically update their disclosure documents consistent with those of the SEC. This change will decrease the burden to UGA and USCF of having to comply with inconsistent regulatory requirements. It is not known whether the CFTC will make additional amendments to its disclosure, reporting and recordkeeping rules to further harmonize these obligations with those of the SEC as they apply to UGA and USCF, but any such further rule changes could result in additional operating efficiencies for UGA and USCF.

## **Money Market Reform**

On July 23, 2014, the SEC adopted to reform money market funds such that institutional prime money market funds will float their net asset value as well as impose rules such that all money market funds' boards of directors will be required implement rules to discourage and prevent runs by investors through the use of redemption fees and gates. Money market funds have two years from the date of adoption to implement the reform. UGA currently invests in money market funds, as well as Treasuries with a maturity date of two years or less, as an investment for assets not used for margin or collateral in the Futures Contracts. It is unclear at this time what the impact of money market reform would have on UGA's ability to hedge risk, however, the imposition of a floating net asset value could cause UGA to limit remaining assets solely to Treasuries and cash.

As the regulatory requirements are constantly evolving, it is difficult to predict the effect any regulatory changes may have on UGA.

## Price Movements

Gasoline futures prices were volatile during the six months ended June 30, 2015. The price of the Benchmark Futures Contract started the period at \$1.4721 per gallon. Prices hit a peak on June 10, 2015 of \$2.1464 per gallon. The low for the period was on January 13, 2015 when the prices dropped to \$1.2685 per gallon. The period ended with the Benchmark Futures Contract at \$2.0494 per gallon, up approximately 39.22% over the period (investors are cautioned that these represent prices for gasoline on a wholesale basis and should not be directly compared to retail prices at a gasoline service station). UGA's per share NAV began the period at \$33.90 and ended the period at \$41.30 on June 30, 2015, an increase of approximately 21.83% over the period. UGA's per share NAV reached its high for the period on June 10, 2015 at \$42.35 and reached its low for the period on January 13, 2015 at \$29.21. The Benchmark Futures Contract prices listed above began with the February 2015 contracts and ended with the August 2015 contracts. The increase of approximately 39.22% on the Benchmark Futures Contract listed above is a hypothetical return only and could not actually be achieved by an investor holding Futures Contracts. An investment in Futures Contracts would need to be rolled forward during the time period described in order to simulate such a result. Furthermore, the change in the nominal price of these differing Futures Contracts, measured from the start of the period to the end of the period, does not represent the actual benchmark results that UGA seeks to track, which are more fully described below in the section titled "*Tracking UGA's Benchmark.*"

During the six months ended June 30, 2015, the gasoline futures market exhibited periods of both contango and backwardation. During periods of contango, the price of the near month gasoline Futures Contract was typically lower than the price of the next month gasoline Futures Contract, or contracts further away from expiration. On days when the market was in backwardation, the price of the near month gasoline Futures Contract was typically higher than the price of the next month gasoline Futures Contract, or contracts further away from expiration. For a discussion of the impact of backwardation and contango on total returns, see "*Term Structure of Gasoline Prices and the Impact on Total Returns*" below.

## Valuation of Futures Contracts and the Computation of the Per Share NAV

The per share NAV of UGA's shares is calculated once each NYSE Arca trading day. The per share NAV for a particular trading day is released after 4:00 p.m. New York time. Trading during the core trading session on the NYSE Arca typically closes at 4:00 p.m. New York time. UGA's administrator uses the NYMEX closing price (determined at the earlier of the close of the NYMEX or 2:30 p.m. New York time) for the contracts held on the NYMEX, but calculates or determines the value of all other UGA investments, including ICE Futures contracts or other futures contracts, as of the earlier of the close of the NYSE Arca or 4:00 p.m. New York time.

## Results of Operations and the Gasoline Market

*Results of Operations.* On February 26, 2008, UGA listed its shares on the American Stock Exchange (the “AMEX”) under the ticker symbol “UGA.” On that day, UGA established its initial offering price at \$50.00 per share and issued 300,000 shares to the initial Authorized Participant in exchange for \$15,000,000 in cash. As a result of the acquisition of the AMEX by NYSE Euronext, UGA’s shares no longer trade on the AMEX and commenced trading on the NYSE Arca on November 25, 2008.

Since its initial offering of 30,000,000 shares, UGA has registered one subsequent offering of its shares: 50,000,000 shares which were registered with the SEC on April 30, 2010. Shares offered by UGA in the subsequent offering were sold by it for cash at the shares’ per share NAV as described in the applicable prospectus. As of June 30, 2015, UGA had issued 11,300,000 shares, 2,500,000 of which were outstanding. As of June 30, 2015, there were 68,700,000 shares registered but not yet issued.

More shares may have been issued by UGA than are outstanding due to the redemption of shares. Unlike funds that are registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, shares that have been redeemed by UGA cannot be resold by UGA. As a result, UGA contemplates that additional offerings of its shares will be registered with the SEC in the future in anticipation of additional issuances and redemptions.

Over the past several years, redemptions for shares in UGA have typically exceeded demand for the creation of new shares. The number of shares outstanding has trended down as a result. Over the last three years, USCF has observed that the realized price volatility of UGA’s NAV, which reflects volatility in the prices of the underlying benchmark futures contract, has trended down in the last few years from prior elevated levels reached in 2009. USCF believes that the decline in current and expected volatility reduces market participants’ perception of potential future price movements. Conversely, when gasoline price movements are more volatile, market participants anticipate potential opportunities for greater future returns, which may result in greater demand for the creation of new shares. USCF further believes that, in the absence of sudden and/or significant price movements, some market participants tend to change their views slowly and with a somewhat backward- rather than forward-looking bias. Although gasoline prices have exhibited an upward trend in recent years, past declines in gasoline prices may still be impacting investors’ decisions, which may explain why UGA’s shares outstanding have trended down despite recent positive performance in UGA’s NAV.

Edgar Filing: United States Gasoline Fund, LP - Form 10-Q

As of June 30, 2015, UGA had the following authorized purchasers: Citadel Securities LLC, Citigroup Global Markets Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., JP Morgan Securities Inc., Merrill Lynch Professional Clearing Corp., Morgan Stanley & Company Inc., NewEdge USA LLC, Nomura Securities International Inc., RBC Capital Markets LLC, SG Americas Securities LLC, Virtu Financial BD LLC and Virtu Financial Capital Markets.

For the Six Months Ended June 30, 2015 Compared to the Six Months Ended June 30, 2014

	For the six months ended June 30, 2015		For the six months ended June 30, 2014	
Average daily total net assets	\$ 87,613,438		\$ 50,113,340	
Dividend and interest income earned on Treasuries, cash and/or cash equivalents	\$ 17,932		\$ 6,344	
Annualized yield based on average daily total net assets	0.04	%	0.03	%
Management fee	\$ 260,680		\$ 149,104	
Total fees and other expenses excluding management fees	\$ 165,726		\$ 122,576	
Fees and expenses related to the registration or offering of additional shares	\$ 23,036		\$ 23,036	
Total amount of the expense waiver	\$ 100,557		\$ 37,637	
Expenses before allowance for the expense waiver	\$ 426,406		\$ 271,680	
Expenses after allowance for the expense waiver	\$ 325,849		\$ 234,043	
Total commissions accrued to brokers	\$ 46,870		\$ 16,769	
Total commissions as annualized percentage of average total net assets	0.11	%	0.07	%
Commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	\$ 44,336		\$ 16,465	
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	94.59	%	98.19	%
Commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	\$ 2,534		\$ 304	
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	5.41	%	1.81	%

*Portfolio Expenses.* UGA's expenses consist of investment management fees, brokerage fees and commissions, certain offering costs, licensing fees, the fees and expenses of the independent directors of USCF and expenses relating to tax accounting and reporting requirements. The management fee that UGA pays to USCF is calculated as a percentage of the total net assets of UGA. The fee is accrued daily and paid monthly.

Average interest rates earned on short-term investments held by UGA, including cash, cash equivalents and Treasuries, were similar during the six months ended June 30, 2015, compared to the six months ended June 30, 2014.

As a result, the amount of income earned by UGA as a percentage of average total net assets was similar during the six months ended June 30, 2015 compared to the six months ended June 30, 2014.

UGA's total fees and expenses excluding management fees for the six months ended June 30, 2015 was higher compared to the six months ended June 30, 2014.

The increase in the total commissions accrued to brokers by UGA for the six months ended June 30, 2015, as compared to the six months ended June 30, 2014, was a result of a greater number of futures contracts being held and traded as a result of UGA's increased net assets.



For the Three Months Ended June 30, 2015 Compared to the Three Months Ended June 30, 2014

	For the three months ended June 30, 2015		For the three months ended June 30, 2014	
Average daily total net assets	\$ 102,044,095		\$ 46,687,420	
Dividend and interest income earned on Treasuries, cash and/or cash equivalents	\$ 12,333		\$ 2,594	
Annualized yield based on average daily total net assets	0.05	%	0.02	%
Management fee	\$ 152,647		\$ 69,839	
Total fees and other expenses excluding management fees	\$ 90,000		\$ 60,125	
Fees and expenses related to the registration or offering of additional shares	\$ 11,582		\$ 11,582	
Total amount of the expense waiver	\$ 51,838		\$ 21,363	
Expenses before allowance for the expense waiver	\$ 242,647		\$ 129,964	
Expenses after allowance for the expense waiver	\$ 190,809		\$ 108,601	
Total commissions accrued to brokers	\$ 23,539		\$ 7,102	
Total commissions as annualized percentage of average total net assets	0.09	%	0.06	%
Commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	\$ 23,466		\$ 6,950	
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of rebalancing	99.69	%	97.86	%
Commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	\$ 73		\$ 152	
Percentage of commissions accrued as a result of creation and redemption activity	0.31	%	2.14	%

*Portfolio Expenses.* UGA's expenses consist of investment management fees, brokerage fees and commissions, certain offering costs, licensing fees, the fees and expenses of the independent directors of USCF and expenses relating to tax accounting and reporting requirements. The management fee that UGA pays to USCF is calculated as a percentage of the total net assets of UGA. The fee is accrued daily and paid monthly.

Average interest rates earned on short-term investments held by UGA, including cash, cash equivalents and Treasuries, were similar during the three months ended June 30, 2015, compared to the three months ended June 30, 2014.

As a result, the amount of income earned by UGA as a percentage of average total net assets was similar during the three months ended June 30, 2015 compared to the three months ended June 30, 2014.

UGA's total fees and expenses excluding management fees for the three months ended June 30, 2015 was higher compared to the three months ended June 30, 2014.

The increase in the total commissions accrued to brokers by UGA for the three months ended June 30, 2015, as compared to the three months ended June 30, 2014, was a result of a greater number of futures contracts being held and traded as a result of UGA's increased net assets.

### **Tracking UGA's Benchmark**

USCF seeks to manage UGA's portfolio such that changes in its average daily per share NAV, on a percentage basis, closely track the daily changes in the average price of the Benchmark Futures Contract, also on a percentage basis. Specifically, USCF seeks to manage the portfolio such that over any rolling period of 30-valuation days, the average daily change in UGA's per share NAV is within a range of 90% to 110% (0.9 to 1.1) of the average daily change in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract. As an example, if the average daily movement of the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract for a particular 30-valuation day time period was 0.5% per day, USCF would attempt to manage the portfolio such that the average daily movement of the per share NAV during that same time period fell between 0.45% and 0.55% (*i.e.*, between 0.9 and 1.1 of the benchmark's results). UGA's portfolio management goals do not include trying to make the nominal price of UGA's per share NAV equal to the nominal price of the current Benchmark Futures Contract or the spot price for gasoline. USCF believes that it is not practical to manage the portfolio to achieve such an investment goal when investing in gasoline Futures Contracts.

For the 30-valuation days ended June 30, 2015, the simple average daily change in the Benchmark Futures Contract was 0.122%, while the simple average daily change in the per share NAV of UGA over the same time period was 0.120%. The average daily difference was (0.002)% (or (0.2) basis points, where 1 basis point equals 1/100 of 1%). As a percentage of the daily movement of the Benchmark Futures Contract, the average error in daily tracking by the per share NAV was (0.112)%, meaning that over this time period UGA's tracking error was within the plus or minus 10% range established as its benchmark tracking goal.

Since the commencement of the offering of UGA's shares to the public on February 26, 2008 to June 30, 2015, the simple average daily change in the Benchmark Futures Contract was 0.017% while the simple average daily change in the per share NAV of UGA over the same time period was 0.014%. The average daily difference was (0.003)% (or (0.3) basis points, where 1 basis point equals 1/100 of 1%). As a percentage of the daily movement of the Benchmark Futures Contract, the average error in daily tracking by the per share NAV was (1.007)%, meaning that over this time period UGA's tracking error was within the plus or minus 10% range established as its benchmark tracking goal. The following two graphs demonstrate the correlation between the changes in UGA's NAV and the changes in the Benchmark Futures Contract. The first graph exhibits the daily changes in the last 30 valuation days ended June 30, 2015. The second graph measures monthly changes from June 30, 2010 through June 30, 2015.

***\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS***

***\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS***

An alternative tracking measurement of the return performance of UGA versus the return of its Benchmark Futures Contract can be calculated by comparing the actual return of UGA, measured by changes in its per share NAV, versus the *expected* changes in its per share NAV under the assumption that UGA's returns had been exactly the same as the daily changes in its Benchmark Futures Contract.

For the six months ended June 30, 2015, the actual total return of UGA as measured by changes in its per share NAV was 21.83%. This is based on an initial per share NAV of \$33.90 as of December 31, 2014 and ending per share NAV as of June 30, 2015 of \$41.30. During this time period, UGA made no distributions to its shareholders. However, if UGA's daily changes in its per share NAV had instead exactly tracked the changes in the daily total return of the Benchmark Futures Contract, UGA would have had an estimated per share NAV of \$41.43 as of June 30, 2015, for a total return over the relevant time period of 22.21%. The difference between the actual per share NAV total return of UGA of 21.83% and the expected total return based on the Benchmark Futures Contract of 22.21% was an error over the time period of (0.38)%, which is to say that UGA's actual total return underperformed the benchmark result by that percentage. UGA incurs expenses primarily composed of the management fee, brokerage commissions for the buying and selling of futures contracts and other expenses. The impact of these expenses tends to cause daily changes in the per share NAV of UGA to track slightly lower than daily changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract.

By comparison, for the six months ended June 30, 2014, the actual total return of UGA as measured by changes in its per share NAV was 5.23%. This was based on an initial per share NAV of \$59.89 as of December 31, 2013 and an ending per share NAV as of June 30, 2014 of \$63.02. During this time period, UGA made no distributions to its shareholders. However, if UGA's daily changes in its per share NAV had instead exactly tracked the changes in the daily total return of the Benchmark Futures Contract, UGA would have had an estimated per share NAV of \$63.31 as of June 30, 2014, for a total return over the relevant time period of 5.71%. The difference between the actual per share NAV total return of UGA of 5.23% and the expected total return based on the Benchmark Futures Contract of 5.71% was an error over the time period of (0.48)%, which is to say that UGA's actual total return underperformed the benchmark result by that percentage. UGA incurred expenses primarily composed of the management fee, brokerage commissions for the buying and selling of futures contracts and other expenses. The impact of these expenses may have caused daily changes in the per share NAV of UGA to track slightly lower than daily changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract. USCF believes that a portion of the difference between the actual total return and the expected total return can be contributed to the net impact of the expenses that UGA pays, offset in part by the income that UGA collects on its cash and cash equivalent holdings.

There are currently three factors that have impacted or are most likely to impact UGA's ability to accurately track its Benchmark Futures Contract.

First, UGA may buy or sell its holdings in the then current Benchmark Futures Contract at a price other than the closing settlement price of that contract on the day during which UGA executes the trade. In that case, UGA may pay a price that is higher, or lower, than that of the Benchmark Futures Contract, which could cause the changes in the daily per share NAV of UGA to either be too high or too low relative to the daily changes in the Benchmark Futures Contract. During the six months ended June 30, 2015, USCF attempted to minimize the effect of these transactions by

seeking to execute its purchase or sale of the Benchmark Futures Contract at, or as close as possible to, the end of the day settlement price. However, it may not always be possible for UGA to obtain the closing settlement price and there is no assurance that failure to obtain the closing settlement price in the future will not adversely impact UGA's attempt to track the Benchmark Futures Contract over time.

Second, UGA incurs expenses primarily composed of the management fee, brokerage commissions for the buying and selling of futures contracts, and other expenses. The impact of these expenses tends to cause daily changes in the per share NAV of UGA to track slightly lower than the inverse of daily changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract. At the same time, UGA earns dividend and interest income on its cash, cash equivalents and Treasuries. UGA is not required to distribute any portion of its income to its shareholders and did not make any distributions to shareholders during the six months ended June 30, 2015. Interest payments, and any other income, were retained within the portfolio and added to UGA's NAV. When this income exceeds the level of UGA's expenses for its management fee, brokerage commissions and other expenses (including ongoing registration fees, licensing fees and the fees and expenses of the independent directors of USCF), UGA will realize a net yield that will tend to cause daily changes in the per share NAV of UGA to track slightly higher than daily changes in the Benchmark Futures Contract. If short-term interest rates rise above the current levels, the level of deviation created by the yield would decrease. Conversely, if short-term interest rates were to decline, the amount of error created by the yield would increase. When short-term yields drop to a level lower than the combined expenses of the management fee and the brokerage commissions, then the tracking error becomes a negative number and would tend to cause the daily returns of the per share NAV to underperform the daily returns of the Benchmark Futures Contract. USCF anticipates that interest rates will continue to remain at historical lows and, therefore, it is anticipated that fees and expenses paid by UGA will continue to be higher than interest earned by UGA. As such, USCF anticipates that UGA will continue to underperform its benchmark until such a time when interest earned at least equals or exceeds the fees and expenses paid by UGA.

Third, UGA may hold Other Gasoline-Related Investments in its portfolio that may fail to closely track the Benchmark Futures Contract's total return movements. In that case, the error in tracking the Benchmark Futures Contract could result in daily changes in the per share NAV of UGA that are either too high, or too low, relative to the daily changes in the Benchmark Futures Contract. During the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA did not hold any Other Gasoline-Related Investments. If UGA increases in size, and due to its obligations to comply with regulatory limits, UGA may invest in Other Gasoline-Related Investments which may have the effect of increasing transaction related expenses and may result in increased tracking error.

*Term Structure of Gasoline Futures Prices and the Impact on Total Returns.* Several factors determine the total return from investing in a futures contract position. One factor that impacts the total return that will result from investing in near month futures contracts and "rolling" those contracts forward each month is the price relationship between the current near month contract and the next month contract. For example, if the price of the near month contract is higher than the next month contract (a situation referred to as "backwardation" in the futures market), then absent any other change there is a tendency for the price of a next month contract to rise in value as it becomes the near month contract and approaches expiration. Conversely, if the price of a near month contract is lower than the next month contract (a situation referred to as "contango" in the futures market), then absent any other change there is a tendency for the price of a next month contract to decline in value as it becomes the near month contract and approaches expiration.

As an example, assume that the price of gasoline for immediate delivery (the "spot" price), was \$2 per gallon, and the value of a position in the near month futures contract was also \$2. Over time, the price of a gallon of gasoline will fluctuate based on a number of market factors, including demand for gasoline relative to its supply. The value of the near month contract will likewise fluctuate in reaction to a number of market factors. If investors seek to maintain their position in a near month contract and not take delivery of the gasoline, every month they must sell their current near month contract as it approaches expiration and invest in the next month contract.

If the futures market is in backwardation, *e.g.*, when the expected price of gasoline in the future would be less, the investor would be buying a next month contract for a lower price than the current near month contract. Using the \$2 per gallon price above to represent the front month price, the price of the next month contract could be \$1.96 per barrel, that is, 2% cheaper than the front month contract. Hypothetically, and assuming no other changes to either prevailing gasoline prices or the price relationship between the spot price, the near month contract and the next month contract (and ignoring the impact of commission costs and the income earned on cash and/or cash equivalents), the value of the \$1.96 next month contract would rise as it approaches expiration and becomes the new near month contract with a price of \$2. In this example, the value of an investment in the second month contract would tend to rise faster than the spot price of gasoline, or fall slower. As a result, it would be possible in this hypothetical example for the spot price of gasoline to have risen 10% after some period of time, while the value of the investment in the second month futures contract would have risen 12%, assuming backwardation is large enough or enough time has elapsed. Similarly, the spot price of gasoline could have fallen 10% while the value of an investment in the futures contract could have fallen only 8%. Over time, if backwardation remained constant, the difference would continue to increase.

If the futures market is in contango, the investor would be buying a next month contract for a higher price than the current near month contract. Using again the \$2 per gallon price above to represent the front month price, the price of the next month contract could be \$2.04 per barrel, that is, 2% more expensive than the front month contract.

Hypothetically, and assuming no other changes to either prevailing gasoline prices or the price relationship between the spot price, the near month contract and the next month contract (and ignoring the impact of commission costs and the income earned on cash and/or cash equivalents), the value of the next month contract would fall as it approaches expiration and becomes the new near month contract with a price of \$2. In this example, it would mean that the value of an investment in the second month would tend to rise slower than the spot price of gasoline, or fall faster. As a result, it would be possible in this hypothetical example for the spot price of gasoline to have risen 10% after some period of time, while the value of the investment in the second month futures contract will have risen only 8%, assuming contango is large enough or enough time has elapsed. Similarly, the spot price of gasoline could have fallen 10% while the value of an investment in the second month futures contract could have fallen 12%. Over time, if contango remained constant, the difference would continue to increase.

The chart below compares the price of the near month contract to the price of the next month contract over the last 10 years. When the price of the near month contract is higher than the price of the next month contract, the market would be described as being in backwardation. When the price of the near month contract is lower than the price of the next month contract, the market would be described as being in contango. Although the prices of the near month contract and the price of the next month contract do tend to move up or down together, it can be seen that at times the near month prices are clearly higher than the price of the next month contract (backwardation), and other times they are below the price of the next month contract (contango). In addition, investors can observe that gasoline prices, both near month and next month, often display a seasonal pattern in which the price of gasoline tends to rise in the summer months and decline in the winter months. This mirrors the physical demand for gasoline, which typically peaks in the summer.

***\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS***



An alternative way to view backwardation and contango data over time is to subtract the dollar price of the next month gasoline futures contract from the dollar price of the near month gasoline futures contract. If the resulting number is a positive number, then the price of the near month contract is higher than the price of the next month and the market could be described as being in backwardation. If the resulting number is a negative number, then the near month price is lower than the price of the next month and the market could be described as being in contango. The chart below shows the results from subtracting the next month contract price from the price of the near month contract for the 10-year period between June 30, 2005 and June 30, 2015. Investors will note that the near month gasoline futures contract spent time in both backwardation and contango. Investors will further note that the markets display a very seasonal pattern that corresponds to the seasonal demand patterns for gasoline mentioned above. That is, in many, but not all cases, the price of the near month is higher than the next month during the middle of the summer months as the price of gasoline for delivery in those summer months rises to meet peak demand. At the same time, the price of the near month contract, when that month is just before the onset of spring, does not rise as far or as fast as the price of a next month contract whose delivery falls closer to the start of the summer season.

***\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS***

While the investment objective of UGA is not to have the market price of its shares match, dollar for dollar, changes in the spot price of gasoline, contango and backwardation have impacted the total return on an investment in UGA shares during the past year relative to a hypothetical direct investment in gasoline. For example, an investment in UGA shares made on December 31, 2014 and held to June 30, 2015, increased based upon the changes in the NAV for UGA shares on those days, by approximately 21.83%, while the spot price of gasoline for immediate delivery during the same period increased by 39.22%. By comparison, an investment in UGA shares made on December 31, 2013 and held to June 30, 2014, increased based upon the changes in the NAV for UGA shares on those days, by approximately 5.23%, while the spot price of gasoline for immediate delivery during the same period increased by 9.24% (note: these comparisons ignore the potential costs associated with physically owning and storing gasoline, which could be substantial).

Periods of contango or backwardation do not materially impact UGA's investment objective of having the daily percentage changes in its per share NAV track the daily percentage changes in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract since the impact of backwardation and contango tend to equally impact the daily percentage changes in price of both UGA's shares and the Benchmark Futures Contract. It is impossible to predict with any degree of certainty whether backwardation or contango will occur in the future. It is likely that both conditions will occur during different periods.

*Gasoline Market.* During the six months ended June 30, 2015, the price of unleaded gasoline in the United States was impacted by several factors. In particular, USCF believes that excess supply resulted in lower prices that spurred increased demand, resulting in gasoline prices that rose even as crude oil prices, the input product for gasoline fell. The price of the Benchmark Futures Contract started the period at \$1.472 per gallon. Prices hit a peak on June 10, 2015 of \$2.146 per gallon. The low for the period was on January 13, 2015, when the price dropped to \$1.269 per gallon. The period ended with the Benchmark Futures Contracts at \$2.049 per gallon, up approximately 39.22% over the period (investors are cautioned that these represent prices for gasoline on a wholesale basis and should not be directly compared to retail prices as a gasoline service station).

*Crude Oil Market.* During the six months ended June 30, 2015, crude oil prices were impacted by several factors. Crude oil inventories grew to 465.4 million barrels by the end of June, 21% higher than the same week a year earlier. Global storage remained near the peak level of 491 million barrels reported in April, the highest volume since the EIA began reporting storage data in 1982. The amount of crude in storage increased consistently from the start of the year (when inventories were 22% lower) to late April before beginning to decline on moderately reduced output from shale producers and other sources. The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries' ("OPEC") decision in late 2014 to maintain production levels despite falling demand led to the oversupplied market. Continuing concerns about the political negotiations with Iran, as well as security concerns in Yemen, Libya and Iraq, have left the market subject to bouts of heightened volatility. United States crude oil prices finished the first half of 2015 approximately 11.6% higher than at the beginning of the year. Prices rose as investors speculated that global inventories may stabilize later in the year and record production growth should eventually be curtailed by a price range that is significantly lower than it was one year ago. However, should supply continue to grow or should the global economic situation cease to improve, or decline, there is a meaningful possibility that crude oil prices could fall further, while disruptions due to conflicts in the Middle East would likely have the opposite effect.

USCF believes that over both the medium-term and the long-term, changes in the price of crude oil will exert the greatest influence on the price of refined petroleum products such as gasoline. At the same time, there can be other factors that, particularly in the short term, cause the price of gasoline to rise (or fall), more (or less) than the price of crude oil. For example, higher gasoline prices cause American consumers to reduce their gasoline consumption, particularly during the high demand period of the summer driving season and gasoline prices are impacted by the availability of refining capacity. Furthermore, a slowdown or recession in the U.S. economy may have a greater impact on U.S. gasoline prices than on global crude oil prices. As a result, it is possible that changes in gasoline prices may not match the changes in crude oil prices.

*Unleaded Gasoline Price Movements in Comparison to Other Energy Commodities and Investment Categories.* USCF believes that investors frequently measure the degree to which prices or total returns of one investment or asset class move up or down in value in concert with another investment or asset class. Statistically, such a measure is usually done by measuring the correlation of the price movements of the two different investments or asset classes over some period of time. The correlation is scaled between 1 and -1, where 1 indicates that the two investment options move up or down in price or value together, known as "positive correlation," and -1 indicates that they move in completely opposite directions, known as "negative correlation." A correlation of 0 would mean that the movements of the two are neither positively nor negatively correlated, known as "non-correlation." That is, the investment options sometimes move up and down together and other times move in opposite directions.

For the ten-year time period between June 30, 2005 and June 30, 2015, the table below compares the monthly movements of unleaded gasoline prices versus the monthly movements of the prices of several other energy commodities, such as natural gas, crude oil and diesel-heating oil, as well as several major non-commodity investment asset classes, such as large cap U.S. equities, U.S. government bonds and global equities. It can be seen that over this particular time period, the movement of unleaded gasoline on a monthly basis was neither strongly correlated nor inversely correlated with the movements of large cap U.S. equities, U.S. government bonds, global equities or natural gas. However, movements in unleaded gasoline were strongly correlated to movements in crude oil and diesel-heating oil.

Correlation Matrix June 30, 2005 - June 30, 2015*	Large Cap U.S. Equities (S&P 500)	U.S. Gov't. Bonds (EFFAS U.S. Gov't. Bond Index)	Global Equities (FTSE World Index)	Crude Oil	Diesel- Heating Oil	Natural Gas	Unleaded Gasoline
Large Cap U.S. Equities (S&P 500)	1.000	(0.308 )	0.959	0.439	0.417	0.102	0.348
U.S. Gov't. Bonds (EFFAS U.S. Gov't. Bond Index)		1.000	(0.282 )	(0.343)	(0.281 )	(0.009)	(0.295 )
Global Equities (FTSE World Index)			1.000	0.525	0.488	0.149	0.409
Crude Oil				1.000	0.789	0.276	0.740
Diesel-Heating Oil					1.000	0.325	0.762
Natural Gas						1.000	0.229
Unleaded Gasoline							1.000

Source: Bloomberg, NYMEX

**\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS**

The table below covers a more recent, but much shorter, range of dates than the above table. Over the shorter, one-year period ended June 30, 2015, unleaded gasoline was neither strongly correlated nor inversely correlated with large cap U.S. equities and U.S. government bonds. However, movements in crude oil were strongly correlated to global equities, crude oil, diesel-heating oil, and natural gas.

Correlation Matrix 12 Months ended June 30, 2015*	Large Cap U.S. Equities (S&P 500)	U.S. Gov't. Bonds (EFFAS U.S. Gov't. Bond Index)	Global Equities (FTSE World Index)	Crude Oil	Diesel- Heating Oil	Natural Gas	Unleaded Gasoline
Large Cap U.S. Equities (S&P 500)	1.000	(0.297 )	0.900	0.145	0.622	0.299	0.329
U.S. Gov't. Bonds (EFFAS U.S. Gov't. Bond Index)		1.000	(0.261 )	(0.452)	(0.571 )	(0.155)	(0.452 )
Global Equities (FTSE World Index)			1.000	0.393	0.774	0.375	0.599
Crude Oil				1.000	0.609	0.485	0.795
Diesel-Heating Oil					1.000	0.359	0.776
Natural Gas						1.000	0.569
Unleaded Gasoline							1.000

Source: Bloomberg, NYMEX

**\* PAST PERFORMANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY INDICATIVE OF FUTURE RESULTS**

Investors are cautioned that the historical price relationships between gasoline and various other energy commodities, as well as other investment asset classes, as measured by correlation may not be reliable predictors of future price movements and correlation results. The results pictured above would have been different if a different range of dates had been selected. USCF believes that gasoline has historically not demonstrated a strong correlation with equities or bonds over long periods of time. However, USCF also believes that in the future it is possible that gasoline could have long term correlation results that indicate prices of gasoline more closely track the movements of equities or bonds. In addition, USCF believes that, when measured over time periods shorter than ten years, there will always be some periods where the correlation of gasoline to equities and bonds will be either more strongly positively correlated or more strongly negatively correlated than the long term historical results suggest.

The correlations between gasoline, crude oil, natural gas and diesel-heating oil are relevant because USCF endeavors to invest UGA's assets in Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments so that daily changes in percentage terms in UGA's per share NAV correlate as closely as possible with daily changes in percentage terms in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract. If certain other fuel-based commodity futures contracts do not closely correlate with the gasoline Futures Contract, then their use could lead to greater tracking error. As noted above, USCF also believes that the changes in percentage terms in the price of the Benchmark Futures Contract will closely

correlate with changes in percentage terms in the spot price of gasoline.

### **Critical Accounting Policies**

Preparation of the condensed financial statements and related disclosures in compliance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America requires the application of appropriate accounting rules and guidance, as well as the use of estimates. UGA's application of these policies involves judgments and actual results may differ from the estimates used.

USCF has evaluated the nature and types of estimates that it makes in preparing UGA's condensed financial statements and related disclosures and has determined that the valuation of its investments, which are not traded on a United States or internationally recognized futures exchange (such as forward contracts and OTC contracts) involves a critical accounting policy. The values which are used by UGA for its Futures Contracts are provided by its commodity broker who uses market prices when available, while OTC contracts are valued based on the present value of estimated future cash flows that would be received from or paid to a third party in settlement of these derivative contracts prior to their delivery date and valued on a daily basis. In addition, UGA estimates interest and dividend income on a daily basis using prevailing rates earned on its cash and cash equivalents. These estimates are adjusted to the actual amount received on a monthly basis and the difference, if any, is not considered material.

## Liquidity and Capital Resources

UGA has not made, and does not anticipate making, use of borrowings or other lines of credit to meet its obligations. UGA has met, and it is anticipated that UGA will continue to meet, its liquidity needs in the normal course of business from the proceeds of the sale of its investments or from the Treasuries, cash and/or cash equivalents that it intends to hold at all times. UGA's liquidity needs include: redeeming shares, providing margin deposits for its existing Futures Contracts or the purchase of additional Futures Contracts and posting collateral for its OTC contracts and payment of its expenses, summarized below under "Contractual Obligations."

UGA currently generates cash primarily from: (i) the sale of baskets consisting of 50,000 shares ("Creation Baskets") and (ii) income earned on Treasuries, cash and/or cash equivalents. UGA has allocated substantially all of its net assets to trading in Gasoline Interests. UGA invests in Gasoline Interests to the fullest extent possible without being leveraged or unable to satisfy its current or potential margin or collateral obligations with respect to its investments in Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments. A significant portion of UGA's NAV is held in cash and cash equivalents that are used as margin and as collateral for its trading in Gasoline Interests. The balance of the assets is held in UGA's account at its custodian bank and in investments in Treasuries at the FCM. Income received from UGA's investments in money market funds and Treasuries is paid to UGA. During the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA's expenses exceeded the income UGA earned and the cash earned from the sale of Creation Baskets and the redemption of Redemption Baskets. During the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA used other assets to pay expenses, which could cause a decrease in UGA's NAV over time. To the extent expenses exceed income, UGA's NAV will be negatively impacted.

UGA's investments in Gasoline Interests may be subject to periods of illiquidity because of market conditions, regulatory considerations and other reasons. For example, most commodity exchanges limit the fluctuations in futures contracts prices during a single day by regulations referred to as "daily limits." During a single day, no trades may be executed at prices beyond the daily limit. Once the price of a futures contract has increased or decreased by an amount equal to the daily limit, positions in the contracts can neither be taken nor liquidated unless the traders are willing to effect trades at or within the specified daily limit. Such market conditions could prevent UGA from promptly liquidating its positions in Futures Contracts. During the six months ended June 30, 2015, UGA did not purchase or liquidate any of its positions while daily limits were in effect; however, UGA cannot predict whether it may have to purchase or liquidate positions in the future.

Since the initial offering of shares, UGA has been responsible for expenses relating to: (i) management fees, (ii) brokerage fees and commissions, (iii) licensing fees for the use of intellectual property, (iv) ongoing registration expenses in connection with offers and sales of its shares subsequent to the initial offering, (v) other expenses, including tax reporting costs, (vi) fees and expenses of the independent directors of USCF and (vii) other extraordinary expenses not in the ordinary course of business, while USCF has been responsible for expenses relating to the fees of UGA's Marketing Agent, Administrator and Custodian and registration expenses relating to the initial offering of shares. If USCF and UGA are unsuccessful in raising sufficient funds to cover these respective expenses or in locating any other source of funding, UGA will terminate and investors may lose all or part of their investment.





## Market Risk

Trading in Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments, such as forwards, involves UGA entering into contractual commitments to purchase or sell gasoline at a specified date in the future. The aggregate market value of the contracts will significantly exceed UGA's future cash requirements since UGA intends to close out its open positions prior to settlement. As a result, UGA is generally only subject to the risk of loss arising from the change in value of the contracts. UGA considers the "fair value" of its derivative instruments to be the unrealized gain or loss on the contracts. The market risk associated with UGA's commitments to purchase gasoline is limited to the aggregate market value of the contracts held. However, should UGA enter into a contractual commitment to sell gasoline, it would be required to make delivery of the gasoline at the contract price, repurchase the contract at prevailing prices or settle in cash. Since there are no limits on the future price of gasoline, the market risk to UGA could be unlimited.

UGA's exposure to market risk depends on a number of factors, including the markets for gasoline, the volatility of interest rates and foreign exchange rates, the liquidity of the Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments markets and the relationships among the contracts held by UGA. Drastic market occurrences could ultimately lead to the loss of all or substantially all of an investor's capital.

## Credit Risk

When UGA enters into Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments, it is exposed to the credit risk that the counterparty will not be able to meet its obligations. The counterparty for the Futures Contracts traded on the NYMEX and on most other futures exchanges is the clearinghouse associated with the particular exchange. In general, in addition to margin required to be posted by the clearinghouse in connection with cleared trades, clearinghouses are backed by their members who may be required to share in the financial burden resulting from the nonperformance of one of their members and, therefore, this additional member support should significantly reduce credit risk. Some foreign exchanges are not backed by their clearinghouse members but may be backed by a consortium of banks or other financial institutions. There can be no assurance that any counterparty, clearinghouse, or their members or their financial backers will satisfy their obligations to UGA in such circumstances.

USCF attempts to manage the credit risk of UGA by following various trading limitations and policies. In particular, UGA generally posts margin and/or holds liquid assets that are approximately equal to the market value of its obligations to counterparties under the Futures Contracts and Other Gasoline-Related Investments it holds. USCF has implemented procedures that include, but are not limited to, executing and clearing trades only with creditworthy parties and/or requiring the posting of collateral or margin by such parties for the benefit of UGA to limit its credit exposure. An FCM, when acting on behalf of UGA in accepting orders to purchase or sell Futures Contracts on United States exchanges, is required by CFTC regulations to separately account for and segregate as belonging to UGA, all assets of UGA relating to domestic Futures Contracts trading. These FCMs are not allowed to commingle UGA's assets with their other assets. In addition, the CFTC requires commodity brokers to hold in a secure account UGA's

assets related to foreign Futures Contracts trading.

If, in the future, UGA purchases OTC contracts, see “*Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk*” in this quarterly report on Form 10-Q for a discussion of OTC contracts.

As of June 30, 2015, UGA held cash deposits and investments in Treasuries and money market funds in the amount of \$104,666,428 with the custodian and FCM. Some or all of these amounts may be subject to loss should UGA’s custodian and/or FCM cease operations.

### **Off Balance Sheet Financing**

As of June 30, 2015, UGA had no loan guarantee, credit support or other off-balance sheet arrangements of any kind other than agreements entered into in the normal course of business, which may include indemnification provisions relating to certain risks that service providers undertake in performing services which are in the best interests of UGA. While UGA’s exposure under these indemnification provisions cannot be estimated, they are not expected to have a material impact on UGA’s financial position.

## European Sovereign Debt

UGA had no direct exposure to European sovereign debt as of June 30, 2015 and has no direct exposure to European sovereign debt as of the filing of this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

## Redemption Basket Obligation

In order to meet its investment objective and pay its contractual obligations described below, UGA requires liquidity to redeem shares, which redemptions must be in blocks of 50,000 shares called "Redemption Baskets". UGA has to date satisfied this obligation by paying from the cash or cash equivalents it holds or through the sale of its Treasuries in an amount proportionate to the number of shares being redeemed.

## Contractual Obligations

UGA's primary contractual obligations are with USCF. In return for its services, USCF is entitled to a management fee calculated daily and paid monthly as a fixed percentage of UGA's NAV, currently 0.60% of NAV on its average daily total net assets.

USCF agreed to pay the start-up costs associated with the formation of UGA, primarily its legal, accounting and other costs in connection with USCF's registration with the CFTC as a CPO and the registration and listing of UGA and its shares with the SEC, FINRA and NYSE Arca (formerly, AMEX), respectively. However, since UGA's initial offering of shares, offering costs incurred in connection with registering and listing additional shares of UGA have been directly borne on an ongoing basis by UGA, and not by USCF.

USCF pays the fees of UGA's marketing agent, ALPS Distributors, Inc., and the fees of the custodian and transfer agent, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co. ("BBH&Co."), as well as BBH&Co.'s fees for performing administrative services, including those in connection with the preparation of UGA's condensed financial statements and its SEC, NFA and CFTC reports. USCF and UGA have also entered into a licensing agreement with the NYMEX pursuant to which UGA and the Related Public Funds, other than BNO, USCI, CPER and USAG, pay a licensing fee to the NYMEX. UGA also pays the fees and expenses associated with its tax accounting and reporting requirements. USCF has voluntarily agreed to pay certain expenses normally borne by UGA to the extent that such expenses exceed 0.15% (15 basis points) of UGA's NAV, on an annualized basis. USCF has no obligation to continue such payments into subsequent periods. This voluntary expense waiver is in addition to those amounts USCF is contractually obligated to pay as described in *Note 4 to the Notes to Condensed Financial Statements (Unaudited)* in *Item 1* of this quarterly

report on Form 10-Q.

In addition to USCF's management fee, UGA pays its brokerage fees (including fees to a FCM), OTC dealer spreads, any licensing fees for the use of intellectual property, and, subsequent to the initial offering, registration and other fees paid to the SEC, FINRA, or other regulatory agencies in connection with the offer and sale of shares, as well as legal, printing, accounting and other expenses associated therewith, and extraordinary expenses. The latter are expenses not incurred in the ordinary course of UGA's business, including expenses relating to the indemnification of any person against liabilities and obligations to the extent permitted by law and under the LP Agreement, the bringing or defending of actions in law or in equity or otherwise conducting litigation and incurring legal expenses and the settlement of claims and litigation. Commission payments to a FCM are on a contract-by-contract, or round turn, basis. UGA also pays a portion of the fees and expenses of the independent directors of USCF. See *Note 3* to the *Notes to Condensed Financial Statements (Unaudited)* in *Item 1* of this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

The parties cannot anticipate the amount of payments that will be required under these arrangements for future periods, as UGA's per share NAVs and trading levels to meet its investment objective will not be known until a future date. These agreements are effective for a specific term agreed upon by the parties with an option to renew, or, in some cases, are in effect for the duration of UGA's existence. Either party may terminate these agreements earlier for certain reasons described in the agreements.

As of June 30, 2015, UGA's portfolio consisted of 1,200 RBOB Gasoline Futures RB Contracts traded on the NYMEX. As of June 30, 2015, UGA did not hold any Futures Contracts traded on ICE Futures. For a list of UGA's current holdings, please see UGA's website at [www.unitedstatescommodityfunds.com](http://www.unitedstatescommodityfunds.com).

### **Item 3. Quantitative and Qualitative Disclosures About Market Risk.**

#### *Over-the-Counter Derivatives*

UGA may purchase OTC contracts. Unlike most exchange-traded futures contracts or exchange-traded options on such futures, each party to an OTC contract bears the credit risk that the other party may not be able to perform its obligations under its contract.

UGA may enter into certain transactions where an OTC component is exchanged for a corresponding futures contract (“Exchange for Risk” or “EFR transaction”). In the most common type of EFR transaction entered into by UGA, the OTC component is the purchase or sale of one or more baskets of UGA shares. These EFR transactions may expose UGA to counterparty risk during the interim period between the execution of the OTC component and the exchange for a corresponding futures contract. Generally, the counterparty risk from the EFR transaction will exist only on the day of execution.

Swap transactions, like other financial transactions, involve a variety of significant risks. The specific risks presented by a particular swap transaction necessarily depend upon the terms and circumstances of the transaction. In general, however, all swap transactions involve some combination of market risk, credit risk, counterparty credit risk, funding risk, liquidity risk and operational risk.

Highly customized swap transactions in particular may increase liquidity risk, which may result in a suspension of redemptions. Highly leveraged transactions may experience substantial gains or losses in value as a result of relatively small changes in the value or level of an underlying or related market factor.

In evaluating the risks and contractual obligations associated with a particular swap transaction, it is important to consider that a swap transaction may be modified or terminated only by mutual consent of the original parties and subject to agreement on individually negotiated terms. Therefore, it may not be possible for USCF to modify, terminate or offset UGA’s obligations or its exposure to the risks associated with a transaction prior to its scheduled termination date.

To reduce the credit risk that arises in connection with such contracts, UGA will generally enter into an agreement with each counterparty based on the Master Agreement published by the International Swaps and Derivatives Association that provides for the netting of its overall exposure to its counterparty, if the counterparty is unable to meet its obligations to UGA due to the occurrence of a specified event, such as the insolvency of the counterparty.

USCF assesses or reviews, as appropriate, the creditworthiness of each potential or existing counterparty to an OTC contract pursuant to guidelines approved by USCF's board of directors (the "Board"). Furthermore, USCF on behalf of UGA only enters into OTC contracts with counterparties who are, or are affiliates of, (a) banks regulated by a United States federal bank regulator, (b) broker-dealers regulated by the SEC, (c) insurance companies domiciled in the United States, or (d) producers, users or traders of energy, whether or not regulated by the CFTC. Any entity acting as a counterparty shall be regulated in either the United States or the United Kingdom unless otherwise approved by the Board after consultation with its legal counsel. Existing counterparties are also reviewed periodically by USCF. UGA will also require that the counterparty be highly rated and/or provide collateral or other credit support. Even if collateral is used to reduce counterparty credit risk, sudden changes in the value of OTC transactions may leave a party open to financial risk due to a counterparty default since the collateral held may not cover a party's exposure on the transaction in such situations.

In general, valuing OTC derivatives is less certain than valuing actively traded financial instruments such as exchange-traded futures contracts and securities or cleared swaps because the price and terms on which such OTC derivatives are entered into or can be terminated are individually negotiated, and those prices and terms may not reflect the best price or terms available from other sources. In addition, while market makers and dealers generally quote indicative prices or terms for entering into or terminating OTC contracts, they typically are not contractually obligated to do so, particularly if they are not a party to the transaction. As a result, it may be difficult to obtain an independent value for an outstanding OTC derivatives transaction.

During the three month reporting period ended June 30, 2015, UGA limited its OTC activities to EFR transactions.

UGA anticipates that the use of Other Gasoline-Related Investments together with its investments in Futures Contracts will produce price and total return results that closely track the investment goals of UGA. However, there can be no assurance of this. OTC contracts may result in higher transaction-related expenses than the brokerage commissions paid in connection with the purchase of Futures Contracts, which may impact UGA's ability to successfully track the Benchmark Futures Contract.

#### **Item 4. Controls and Procedures.**

##### **Disclosure Controls and Procedures**

UGA maintains disclosure controls and procedures that are designed to ensure that material information required to be disclosed in UGA's periodic reports filed or submitted under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, is recorded, processed, summarized and reported within the time period specified in the SEC's rules and forms.

The duly appointed officers of USCF, including its chief executive officer and chief financial officer, who perform functions equivalent to those of a principal executive officer and principal financial officer of UGA if UGA had any officers, have evaluated the effectiveness of UGA's disclosure controls and procedures and have concluded that the disclosure controls and procedures of UGA have been effective as of the end of the period covered by this quarterly report on Form 10-Q.

##### **Change in Internal Control Over Financial Reporting**

There were no changes in UGA's internal control over financial reporting during UGA's last fiscal quarter that have materially affected, or are reasonably likely to materially affect, UGA's internal control over financial reporting.

#### **Part II. OTHER INFORMATION**

##### **Item 1. Legal Proceedings.**

Not applicable.

##### **Item 1A. Risk Factors.**

There have been no material changes to the risk factors previously disclosed in UGA's Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2014, filed on March 26, 2015.

**Item 2. Unregistered Sales of Equity Securities and Use of Proceeds.**

Not applicable.

**Item 3. Defaults Upon Senior Securities.**

Not applicable.

**Item 4. Mine Safety Disclosures.**

Not applicable.

**Item 5. Other Information.**

**Monthly Account Statements**

Pursuant to the requirement under Rule 4.22 under the Commodity Exchange Act, each month UGA publishes an account statement for its shareholders, which includes a Statement of Income (Loss) and a Statement of Changes in Net Asset Value. The account statement is furnished to the SEC on a current report on Form 8-K pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act and posted each month on UGA's website at [www.unitedstatescommodityfunds.com](http://www.unitedstatescommodityfunds.com).



**Item 6. Exhibits.**

Listed below are the exhibits, which are filed as part of this quarterly report on Form 10-Q (according to the number assigned to them in Item 601 of Regulation S-K):

<b>Exhibit Number</b>	<b>Description of Document</b>
<b>31.1(1)</b>	Certification by Principal Executive Officer Pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
<b>31.2(1)</b>	Certification by Principal Financial Officer Pursuant to Section 302 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
<b>32.1(1)</b>	Certification by Principal Executive Officer Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
<b>32.2(1)</b>	Certification by Principal Financial Officer Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 1350, as Adopted Pursuant to Section 906 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.
<b>101.INS</b>	XBRL Instance Document.
<b>101.SCH</b>	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Schema.
<b>101.CAL</b>	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Calculation Linkbase.
<b>101.DEF</b>	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Definition Linkbase.
<b>101.LAB</b>	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Label Linkbase.
<b>101.PRE</b>	XBRL Taxonomy Extension Presentation Linkbase.

(1) Filed herewith.

## **SIGNATURES**

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned thereunto duly authorized.

### **United States Gasoline Fund, LP (Registrant)**

By: United States Commodity Funds LLC, its general partner

By: /s/ John P. Love  
John P. Love  
President and Chief  
Executive Officer  
(Principal executive  
officer)

Date: August 12, 2015

By: /s/ Stuart P. Crumbaugh  
Stuart P. Crumbaugh  
Chief Financial Officer  
(Principal financial and  
accounting officer)

Date: August 12, 2015