

WUTC UG-950326,
DOCKET NO. -951415
EXHIBIT # T-1
ADMIT **W/D** **REJECT**
 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES
 AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Dock UG-95 _____
 Exhibit __ (JTS-Testimony)

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

PETITION FOR DETERMINING THE) CASCADE NATURAL
 RATEMAKING TREATMENT OF) GAS CORPORATION
 CERTAIN SPECIAL CONTRACTS) DOCKET NO. UG-95

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ

Q. Please state your name and address for the record.
 A. Jon T. Stoltz, 222 Fairview Avenue North, Seattle
 Washington
 Q. By whom are you employed and what is your title?
 A. I am employed by Cascade Natural Gas Corporation
 ("Cascade" or the "Company") as Senior Vice President
 of Planning and Rates.
 Q. Would you identify your responsibilities with the
 Company?
 A. As Senior Vice President - Planning and Rates, I am
 responsible for the Special Studies and Rates
 Departments of Cascade. The Special Studies
 Department is responsible for the development of the
 Company's Integrated Least Cost Planning function.
 Least Cost Planning involves long range market

RECEIVED
 RECORDS MANAGEMENT
 95 MAR 15 PM 3:36
 STATE OF WASH.
 UTIL. AND TRANS.
 COMMISSION

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
 222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
 (206) 624-3900

1 forecasts, evaluation of the costs and availabilities
2 of demand side and supply side resources to meet such
3 forecasted markets, as well as the development of
4 written Integrated Resource Plans for submittal before
5 the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
6 and the Oregon Public Utility Commission.

7 The Rate Department is responsible for the
8 preparation of all rate related exhibits in "tracking"
9 and general rate relief filings.

10 I am also the liaison for the Company with the
11 state utility commissions of Washington and Oregon for
12 all rate related matters. I have the responsibility
13 of maintaining Cascade's tariffs. I also monitor
14 Northwest Pipeline Corporation's ("Northwest" or the
15 "Pipeline") rate applications and the intervening in
16 such applications before the Federal Energy Regulatory
17 Commission ("FERC") where necessary.

18 Q. Please describe your educational background and
19 previous experience.

20 A. I am a graduate of the University of Texas at El Paso
21 with a degree in electrical engineering. My post
22 graduate studies include courses in utility economic,

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 management and accounting.

2 Prior to joining Cascade, I was employed by El
3 Paso Electric Company as a Rate Engineer with the
4 title of Special Projects Engineer. My
5 responsibilities while with El Paso Electric were
6 quite similar to those rate analysts have with
7 Cascade. My tenure with El Paso Electric was
8 approximately three years.

9 Q. Have you previously sponsored testimony?

10 A. Yes, I have sponsored testimony before the Public
11 Utility Commission of Oregon, before the Washington
12 Utilities and Transportation Commission, before the
13 New Mexico Public Utility Commission, and before FERC.

14 Q. What is the purpose of the Company's filing and your
15 Testimony?

16 A. In the process of the Commission's review of Cascade's
17 Petition for approval of its Special Contract with
18 Longview Fibre Company ("Fibre"), in Docket UG-931386,
19 the Company agreed to file a Petition for an Order to
20 determine the ratemaking treatment of the Fibre
21 Special Contract as well as the Special Contracts
22 related to March Point Cogeneration Company ("March

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 Point"), Encogen Northwest L.P. ("Encogen"), Tenaska
2 Gas Co. ("Tenaska") and B. P. Exploration & Oil, Inc
3 ("Tosco"). The purpose of this filing is to show the
4 results of the revenues, expenses and the rate base of
5 these five contracts (together the "Special
6 Contracts") and the contribution toward overall cost
7 of service the Special Contracts provide to the rest
8 of the system. Cascade will also attempt to show
9 other benefits Cascade and its other customers are
10 receiving as a result of the Special Contracts.

11 Q. Do you sponsor any exhibits along with this testimony?

12 A. Yes. I have prepared or supervised the preparation of
13 the following exhibits: Exhibit ____ (JTS-1), Special
14 Contract's Revenue Requirements, which is a summary of
15 the Statement of Operations and Rate of Return for
16 these Special Contracts; Exhibit ____ (JTS-2), Embedded
17 & Current Deliveries to the Industrial Hosts
18 Customers; Exhibit ____ (JTS-3), Test Period Revenues
19 and Therm Deliveries to the Special Contract
20 Customers; Exhibit ____ (JTS-4), Revenue Restatement of
21 Tosco as Required By WUTC Order in Docket No.
22 UG-930511; and Exhibit ____ (JTS-5), Special Contracts'

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109

(206) 624-3900

1 Chronology of Events.
2 Q. Please describe Exhibits ___ (JTS-1).
3 A. Exhibit ___ (JTS-1) summarizes the Special Contracts'
4 impact on the Statement of Operations for Cascade's
5 State of Washington service area for the calendar year
6 of 1994, on a per books, restated and pro forma basis.
7 The analysis was performed in a similar manner to the
8 approach Cascade would use in a typical general rate
9 case application. This Exhibit consists of four
10 pages. Page One lists the per books portion of the
11 Statement of Operations in Column (b) for the Special
12 Contracts. The summation of the restating adjustments
13 that are developed on Page 2 is shown in Column (c) on
14 Page 1, with the restated results shown in column (d).
15 Column (e) shows the summation of the pro forma
16 adjustments to these Special Contracts which were
17 developed on Page 3. Column (f) shows the total pro
18 forma results and indicates that the Special Contracts
19 earn an overall 12.07% return on a proforma 1994
20 basis. Column (g) shows the amount of change in
21 revenue that would be needed to make these Special
22 Contracts earn a certain overall rate of return. I

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 will discuss the significance of these numbers later
2 in the testimony.

3 Page 2 shows the individual restating
4 adjustments in columns (b) through (f) with the sum of
5 the adjustments shown in column (g). It is this
6 Column (g) which is brought forth to Page 1, Column
7 (c).

8 Page 3 shows the individual pro forma
9 adjustments in columns (b) through (d) with the sum of
10 the adjustments shown in column (e). It is this
11 Column (e) which is brought forward to Page 1, Column
12 (e).

13 Page 4 has been included to show the pro forma
14 results of each individual Special Contract.

15 Q. Please describe Exhibit ____ (JTS-2).

16 A. Exhibit ____ (JTS-2) shows the monthly sales and
17 revenue levels of each of the industrial hosts to the
18 cogeneration customers as such sales and revenues were
19 reflected in Cascade's last general rate case which
20 was based upon the test period of calendar 1988 and
21 the sales and revenues for the same customers in
22 calendar 1994. This schedule also shows the restated

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 and pro forma revenues for these customers.

2 Q. What is shown on Exhibit __ (JTS-3)?

3 A. Exhibit __ (JTS-3) shows the monthly sales and
4 revenue levels of each of the cogeneration customers
5 for calendar 1994, as well as any required restating
6 and pro forma adjustments to volumes delivered and the
7 revenues for that period.

8 Q. Please explain the purpose of Exhibit __ (JTS-4).

9 A. In the Commission's Fourth Supplemental Order in
10 Docket No. 930511, Cascade was directed to file its
11 case showing Tosco's revenues at tariff rates and the
12 Commission would consider an adjustment to contract
13 rates if justified by cost information and evidence
14 that the contract rate was the best obtainable. This
15 Exhibit shows the adjustment to the test period that
16 is required to restate the revenue at Rate Schedule
17 663 rates on line 4. Line 6 shows the pro forma
18 adjustment that would be required to reflect contract
19 rates. These restating and proforma adjustments are
20 reflected in Exhibit __ (JTS-1), on page 2, Column
21 (c) and page 3, Column (b), respectively.

22 Q. What is the purpose of Exhibit __ (JTS-5)?

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109

(206) 624-3900

- 1 A. Exhibit ____ (JTS-5) attempts to show the chronology of
2 events that took place in the development of the
3 Special Contracts as well as the construction of
4 facilities to serve these customers. Many of the
5 Commission's comments concerning these Special
6 Contracts address Cascade's estimated costs of the
7 constructing these projects compared to the actual
8 construction costs. It is hoped that Exhibit ____
9 (JTS-5) will assist the parties in evaluating what
10 facts were reasonably known by Cascade at the time
11 each Special Contract was negotiated.
- 12 Q. What is the significance of the overall results for
13 these Special Contracts.
- 14 A. As I indicated earlier, based on proforma results for
15 calendar 1994, these five Special Contracts have a
16 combined 1994 overall rate of return of 12.07%.
17 Cascade's last authorized overall rate of return, as
18 approved on December 1, 1989, was 11.95%. It is
19 anticipated that if Cascade were to seek general rate
20 relief under today's financial situation, it likely
21 would experience a lower authorized rate of return.
22 If, as an example, the overall return were in the

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 11.00% range, the contribution of these Special
2 Contracts toward the revenue requirements of other
3 ratepayers would be about \$530,000 annually.

4 . Additionally, in the Order approving Cascade's
5 Special Contract with Tosco in WUTC Docket No.
6 UG-930511, the Commission indicated that the Company
7 is required to demonstrate that the Special Contract
8 does not draw improper contributions from ratepayers.
9 The proforma 1994 results indicate that these Special
10 Contracts do not draw contributions from other
11 ratepayers and, in fact, provide contributions toward
12 lowering the rates of the other ratepayers.

13 Q. Please describe each of the Special Contracts and the
14 customers that are served with the Special Contracts.

15 A.

16 March Point

17
18 The first Special Contract is with March Point. The
19 cogeneration facility is located at the Texaco
20 Refinery in Anacortes, Washington. The Texaco
21 Refinery is a long time customer of Cascade and is now
22 receiving excess steam from March Point to augment

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 some of the refinery's energy requirements, as the
2 industrial host for the cogeneration facilities. The
3 Agreement For Natural Gas Service Firm Transportation
4 ("March Point Agreement") was entered into on February
5 28, 1991. On May 21, 1991, Cascade filed its request
6 for approval under WAC 480-80-335. On July 31, 1991
7 the Commission approved the Special Contract under
8 Docket No. UG-910571. The Contract provides for the
9 firm delivery of 400,000 therms per day through
10 Cascade's Anacortes-Sedro Woolley distribution system.
11 In the development of its feasibility study, Cascade
12 estimated that March Point would consume 55,000,000
13 therms per year.

14 Cascade first learned of the potential
15 cogeneration project at Texaco on March 2, 1988. At
16 that time Cascade first developed its estimate of the
17 cost to construct new facilities to serve the load.
18 It was almost three years to the day before the March
19 Point Agreement was executed. The required new
20 facilities were constructed in early 1992 and were put
21 into service in May, 1992.
22

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

Encogen

1
2
3 The second Special Contract, with Encogen, is for
4 a cogeneration facility located at the Georgia Pacific
5 facilities in Bellingham, Washington. Georgia Pacific
6 is a long time customer of Cascade and is now
7 receiving excess steam from Encogen to augment some of
8 the mill's energy requirements, as the industrial host
9 for the cogeneration facilities. The Agreement For
10 Natural Gas Service Firm Transportation ("Encogen
11 Agreement") was entered into on November 14, 1991. On
12 November 29, 1991, Cascade filed its request for
13 approval of the Special Contract under WAC 480-80-335.
14 In its filing, Cascade demonstrated that the rates
15 negotiated under the Encogen Agreement were required
16 to avoid the customer bypassing Cascade's distribution
17 system. On April 30, 1992, the Commission approved
18 the Special Contract under Docket No. UG-911345. The
19 Encogen Agreement provides for the firm delivery of
20 370,000 therms per day through Cascade's Bellingham
21 distribution system. In the development of its
22 feasibility study, Cascade estimated that Encogen

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

would consume 115,705,000 therms per year.

Cascade first learned of the potential cogeneration project at Georgia Pacific in mid-1990. It was at that time Cascade first developed its estimate of the cost to construct new facilities to serve the load. Negotiations continued for over a year before the Encogen Agreement was executed. The required new facilities were constructed in late 1992 and early 1993 and were put into service in February, 1993.

Tenaska

The third Special Contract, with Tenaska, is to serve a cogeneration facility located at the site of the former B P Oil refinery, now owned and operated by Tosco, in Ferndale, Washington. This refinery in Ferndale is a long time customer of Cascade. It has been owned by Mobil Oil, then by B P Oil, and now by Tosco. Like the other industrial hosts, Tosco is now receiving excess steam from Tenaska to augment some of the refinery's energy requirements. The Agreement For

1 Natural Gas Service Firm Transportation ("Tenaska
2 Agreement") was entered into on January 15, 1991. On
3 November 1, 1991, Cascade filed its request for
4 approval of the Special Contract under WAC 480-80-335.
5 In its filing, Cascade demonstrated that the rates
6 negotiated under the Tenaska Agreement were required
7 to avoid the customer bypassing Cascade's distribution
8 system. On March 18, 1992, the Commission approved
9 the Special Contract under Docket No. UG-911247. The
10 Tenaska Agreement provides for the firm delivery of
11 520,000 therms per day through Cascade's Northern
12 Bellingham and Ferndale distribution system. In the
13 development of its feasibility study, Cascade
14 estimated that Tenaska would consume 150,000,000
15 therms per year.

16 Cascade first learned of the potential
17 cogeneration project at B P Oil in mid-1990. It was
18 at that time Cascade first developed its estimate of
19 the cost to construct new facilities to serve the
20 load. Negotiations continued for about six months
21 before the Tenaska Agreement was executed. The
22 required new facilities were constructed in 1993 and

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 were put into service in November, 1993.
2

3 Tosco
4

5 The fourth Special Contract was initially with B
6 P Oil, which has since been acquired by Tosco. As
7 indicated above, the B P Oil refinery is the
8 industrial host for the Tenaska cogeneration
9 facilities. The Agreement For Natural Gas Service
10 Firm Transportation ("Tosco Agreement") was entered
11 into on March 25, 1993. On May 4, 1993, Cascade filed
12 its request for approval of the Special Contract under
13 WAC 480-80-335. In its filing, and through subsequent
14 hearings, Cascade demonstrated that the rates
15 negotiated under the Tosco Agreement were required to
16 avoid the customer forcing Tenaska to cancel the
17 Tenaska Agreement with Cascade, which would have
18 resulted in B P and Tenaska jointly bypassing
19 Cascade's distribution system. On April 29, 1994, the
20 Commission approved the Tosco Agreement in its Fourth
21 Supplemental Order in Docket No. UG-930511. The
22 Tosco Agreement provides for the firm delivery of

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 100,000 therms per day through essentially the same
2 distribution facilities that are used to serve
3 Tenaska.

4

5

Fibre

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The fifth and last Special Contract reflected in this filing, with Fibre, is to serve a generation facility located at the site of Fibre's cardboard mill, in Longview, Washington. This cardboard mill is a long time customer of Cascade. Unlike the other industrial hosts, Fibre's natural gas consumption at the mill will not decrease as a result of receiving excess steam from generation facilities, as this natural gas turbine generator is replacing an existing hog fuel boiler/generator Fibre has operated for many years. The Agreement For Natural Gas Service Firm Transportation ("Fibre Agreement") was entered into on September 1, 1993. On November 15, 1993, Cascade filed its request for approval of the Special Contract under WAC 480-80-335. In its filing, Cascade demonstrated that the rates negotiated under the Fibre

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION

222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109

(206) 624-3900

1 Agreement were required to avoid the customer
2 bypassing Cascade's distribution system. On September
3 26, 1994, the Commission approved the Fibre Agreement
4 under Docket No. UG-931386. The Fibre Agreement
5 provides for the firm delivery of up to 360,000 therms
6 per day through Cascade's a new 12 inch pipeline in
7 the Company's Longview distribution area. In the
8 development of its feasibility study, Cascade
9 estimated that Fibre would initially consume
10 55,845,000 therms per year with Fibre's first turbine,
11 and will eventually consume 111,690,000 therms per
12 year.

13 Cascade first learned of the potential new
14 generation project at Fibre in mid-1991. It was at
15 that time Cascade first developed its estimate of the
16 cost to construct new facilities to serve the load.
17 Negotiations continued for more than two years before
18 the Fibre Agreement was executed. The required new
19 facilities are currently being constructed and the
20 Company expects to put this pipeline into service in
21 the second quarter of 1995.

22 Q. In addition to the \$1,790,000 contribution toward

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

MILLER, NASH, WIENER,
HAGER & CARLSEN

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
4400 TWO UNION SQUARE
601 UNION STREET
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-2352
TELEPHONE (206) 622-8484
FACSIMILE (206) 622-7485

UG-950326
(P)

PORTLAND OFFICE:
3500 U.S. BANCORP TOWER
111 S.W. FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204-3699
TELEPHONE (503) 224-5858
TELEX 364462 KINGMAR PTL
FACSIMILE (503) 224-0155

JOHN L. WEST, P.C.
DIRECT DIAL: (206) 684-4419

March 15, 1995

Mr. Steve McLellan
Secretary
Washington Utilities and
Transportation Commission
Post Office Box 47250
1300 So. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.
Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

RECEIVED
MAR 15 PM 3:35
STATE OF WASH.
UTILITY AND TRANSP.
COMMISSION

Subject: Cascade Natural Gas Corporation/Petition for
Determining Ratemaking Treatment of Certain
Special Contracts

Dear Mr. McLellan:

Enclosed for filing are the original and 19 copies of a Petition for Determining the Ratemaking Treatment of Certain Special Contracts of Cascade Natural Gas Corporation ("Cascade") in accordance with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission's ("Commission") order in matter UG-931386. Cascade asks the Commission for an Order determining the ratemaking treatment with respect to the special contracts with Longview Fibre Company, March Point Cogeneration Company, Encogen Northwest L.P., Tenaska Gas Co. and B.P. Exploration & Oil, Inc. (the "Special Contracts"). By testimony filed as part of this petition, Cascade expects to demonstrate the benefits of the Special Contracts for ratepayers generally, that the business terms of the Special Contracts had a reasonable basis and do not force inappropriate costs onto captive ratepayers, that the cost bases for Cascade's decisions were appropriate, that the Special Contracts do not result in improper subsidization; and, based on the foregoing, that the Special Contracts were prudently entered into by Cascade.

Certain information contained in this filing has been deleted due to its confidential nature. One copy of this filing containing the confidential information is enclosed as well. It is contained in the sealed envelope marked "Confidential." At the pre-hearing conference, Cascade will request a protective order to be entered in this docket in the standard form used at the Commission.

Exhibit C-2

1 other ratepayers' revenue requirements, do these
2 projects provide other benefits to Cascade's other
3 ratepayers?
4 A. Yes. These Special Contracts not only enabled the
5 Company to attach these new loads, Cascade was also
6 able to avoid the loss of the industrial host
7 customers to bypass. With the exception of Fibre,
8 with whom Cascade has a long term contractual
9 commitment at Fibre's mill, all of the industrial
10 hosts had short term contracts and could have ceased
11 taking service from Cascade if the cogeneration
12 customer had bypassed Cascade's distribution system.
13 During 1994, Tosco, Georgia Pacific and Texaco
14 consumed [REDACTED] therms and generated \$ [REDACTED] of
15 margin, all of which would have been lost with very
16 little corresponding decrease in expense and dedicated
17 rate base, if bypass had occurred. In addition, the
18 Longview Fibre mill consumed [REDACTED] therms in 1994
19 and generated \$ [REDACTED] of margin. Cascade's Peaking
20 Gas Supply (PGS) Contract obligates Fibre not to
21 bypass Cascade at the mill as long as the PGS is in
22 effect. If Cascade had not negotiated the PGS

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 Contract, Fibre's bypass opportunity would have
2 included [REDACTED] million therms at the mill as well as
3 the new generating facilities.

4 . Additionally, the 1994 proforma results of these
5 Special Contracts are conservative since the attached
6 Exhibit __ (JTS-1) has assigned all of the rate base
7 to these cogeneration projects, although other
8 ratepayers actually are provided service through the
9 use of this rate base. The distribution facilities
10 that serve March Point also provides augmented service
11 to the Texaco and Shell refineries, and to the
12 residential and commercial customers in Anacortes.
13 The new distribution pipeline serving Encogen could
14 provide backup service to the Georgia Pacific
15 facilities and to many of the residential and
16 commercial customers in Bellingham. The distribution
17 facilities Exhibit __ (JTS-1) assigned to Tenaska
18 also provides service to Puget Power's Whitehorn gas
19 turbines, the Tosco refinery and the residential and
20 commercial customers in the towns of Lynden, Sumas and
21 Blaine, Washington.

22 Furthermore, through the Company's Peak Gas

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 Supply Service (PGSS) Agreement with Tenaska, the
2 facilities that serve Tenaska can currently be used to
3 service up to 200,000 therms per day of the
4 requirements of the firm core customers Cascade serves
5 in Bellingham on the coldest days of the heating
6 season. Cascade's Ferndale distribution facilities
7 also connect directly with the Canadian pipeline of
8 Westcoast Transmission, LTD, which enables Cascade to
9 avoid the reservation of Northwest Pipeline's Firm
10 Transportation capacity for the service the Company
11 provides to its core market, as described above. The
12 new 12 inch pipeline Cascade is building to serve
13 Fibre's new generators will provide a complete backup
14 to Cascade's Longview core market at a very low
15 incremental cost.

16 Q. Other than the margin associated with avoiding bypass
17 at the industrial host plants, has Cascade attempted
18 to quantify those other benefits in this filing?

19 A. No. The Company believes that the "Stand Alone"
20 Proforma Results of Operations shown in Exhibit __
21 (JTS-1) clearly demonstrates that the Special
22 Contracts do not draw improper contributions from the

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

- 1 Company's other ratepayers. If these Special
2 Contracts remain as part of the Company's overall cost
3 of service, as pointed out earlier, they will provide
4 a higher overall return which would lower the revenue
5 requirements of all other customers.
- 6 Q. Were the actual construction costs higher than the
7 first budget estimates submitted to the WUTC on the
8 March Point, Encogen and Tenaska distribution system
9 projects?
- 10 A. Yes, actual construction costs and, as a result, the
11 actual rate base were higher than first anticipated
12 for those projects. The actual costs were higher than
13 the initial estimates included in the information the
14 Company supplied in its requests for Special Contract
15 approval by this Commission. However, these Special
16 Contracts earn more than an adequate rate of return,
17 even with the higher than anticipated rate base.
- 18 Q. Did the Company intentionally understate the estimates
19 for any reason?
- 20 A. No, it did not. The Company receives no benefit from
21 understating its estimates. To the contrary, the
22 Company's incentive is to make estimates as accurate

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 as possible. In developing its initial estimates for
2 these projects, the Company used what it believed was
3 a reasonable approach and the best information it had
4 available at that time. In March of 1988, when the
5 Company first estimated the cost of providing
6 incremental service to March Point, and as late as
7 1991, when the first three Special Contracts had been
8 signed, but facilities not yet constructed, many of
9 the environmental, permitting and right-of-way
10 acquisition problems that the Company ultimately
11 encountered were unforeseeable by Cascade and the
12 industry, generally. Due to the rapid succession of
13 the first three projects (March Point, Encogen and
14 Tenaska) coming to Cascade's attention, the lessons to
15 be learned from the first project as to increasing
16 costs of pipeline construction were not available in
17 time to significantly aid the Company in estimating
18 the second or third projects. The graphic
19 representation of the time line, as shown on Exhibit
20 ____ (JTS-5), shows that the Special Contracts with
21 March Point, Encogen and Tenaska were signed prior to
22 the construction of any of the three. As a result,

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 Cascade significantly underestimated the cost of the
2 March Point, Encogen and Tenaska construction
3 projects. However, since the rates for these projects
4 were all set on a bypass avoidance basis, and due to
5 certain competitive advantages Cascade held due to the
6 structure of its existing facilities, and due to the
7 relative risk of these projects, the Company
8 negotiated rates which it anticipated would provide
9 fairly high rates of return. As a result, the
10 Company's actual earnings from these projects still
11 provide higher than authorized rates of return, even
12 with the actual costs exceeding estimated costs.

13 Q. Please elaborate on the actual costs of construction
14 compared to the pre-construction estimates.

15 A. One general factor that was not anticipated at the
16 time estimates were submitted was the high overall
17 level of pipeline construction activity in the Pacific
18 Northwest in 1992 and 1993. Other major pipeline
19 projects were going on concurrently, creating a great
20 demand for pipeline construction equipment and
21 experienced installation crews, resulting in higher
22 costs to reflect the higher demand.

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 1. March Point.

2 In generating the original cost estimate, Cascade used
3 what it believed to be a reasonable standard of
4 \$20,000 to \$25,000 per inch mile for installing a
5 pipeline. (Eg. a 10"pipeline would cost \$200,000 to
6 \$250,000 per mile, a 20" pipeline would cost \$400,000
7 to \$500,000 per mile.)

8 The preliminary system design and construction
9 estimates for March Point (a 16" inch pipeline project
10 of about 8 miles) began in 1988. The construction
11 cost estimate of \$2,800,000 that was originally
12 submitted to the WUTC was developed in April 1991.
13 Construction did not begin until early 1992. The
14 original basis for estimating this project was the
15 construction contract for the 16" Fredonia pipeline
16 that ran from the Sedro Woolley gate station to the
17 Puget Power Fredonia generating station in Burlington.
18 The Fredonia line was constructed in 1983. This
19 appeared reasonable at the time since the March Point
20 construction project was essentially a further
21 extension of the Fredonia construction project.

22 In fact, the use of the \$20,000 to \$25,000 per

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 inch mile estimating rule of thumb was confirmed in
2 1991 on a construction job in Whatcom county. This
3 was a 4.8 mile project using 2" and 6" pipe completed
4 at an average cost of \$16,533 per inch mile. The
5 project was considered to be recent evidence of the
6 reliability of the appropriate cost estimating method.
7 This project was considered more difficult than
8 average construction at that time, due to limited
9 working area, traffic control requirements and
10 blacktop restoration costs.

11 One unanticipated increase in costs on the March
12 Point project was in the cost of acquiring
13 right-of-way. Cascade estimated right-of-way on the
14 March Point project would be similar to the cost of
15 right-of-way on the Fredonia project. The actual
16 costs of securing rights-of-way and the related crop
17 damage payments were several times the figure used in
18 the April 1991 estimate.

19 Other unanticipated items not covered in the
20 original estimate included environmental consulting
21 requirements and extended permitting time, due to
22 changes in the requirements by the U. S. Army Corp of

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 Engineers and the State of Washington.

2 The single largest cost item that increased on
3 the March Point Project was contractor installation
4 costs. The April 1991 estimate included \$1,502,000
5 for contractor installation (including \$102,000 for 8"
6 pipe that was later changed to 16" pipe). The actual
7 contractor installation cost turned out to be
8 \$5,423,000. The Fredonia project was installed for
9 \$20,790 per inch mile and the March Point project cost
10 \$56,000 per inch mile to be installed. Due to delays
11 in receiving the required permits and rights-of-way,
12 the construction of the project began in January 1992.
13 The effect of winter construction can not be precisely
14 determined but Cascade believes winter construction
15 contributed to the higher cost. The contractor bids
16 were higher than anticipated and the final
17 construction cost were higher than the bid estimates.

18 2. Encogen.

19 The original construction estimate of \$1,440,000 for
20 the entire Encogen project was prepared from the same
21 inch-mile rule of thumb that was used for the March
22 Point project. By the time the extensive cost

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 increases on the March Point project were identified,
2 the Special Contract with Encogen had been negotiated
3 and signed, the project design was underway and the
4 Contract, along with the underlying cost estimate had
5 already been submitted to the WUTC. During 1992, the
6 Encogen project was re-estimated based upon the
7 contractor's preliminary estimates and the lessons
8 learned on the March Point project. This revised
9 estimate assumed a \$57,500 per inch mile cost. Even
10 this revised estimate, however, failed to accurately
11 predict the total cost of the project. The final
12 costs resulted in a \$67,300 per inch mile rate. Among
13 the still unanticipated costs suffered in the Encogen
14 project were right-of-way costs which were increased
15 due to Cascade's lack of alternate routes once permits
16 were in place. Some local government permits required
17 lengthening the pipeline route in some locations. The
18 City of Bellingham imposed some unexpected
19 restrictions concerning the installation of the
20 pipeline near wetlands and waterways which resulted in
21 increased costs.

22 3. Tenaska.

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 As was the case with Encogen, many of the original
2 cost estimates for the 20" Tenaska pipeline project
3 were done in advance of the construction of the March
4 Point project. The \$20,000-\$25,000 /inch-mile basis
5 was used for the early estimates.

6 The 20" project was the first of these projects
7 to be installed in Summer/Fall weather. This fact was
8 relied on to predict the quantities of select material
9 and material haul-off that would be required. Once
10 again, the estimate was low but for a different
11 reason. The use of several miles of public road
12 right-of-way was necessitated by Intalco Aluminum
13 Company's unwillingness to grant an easement to
14 Cascade and the Whatcom County Public Works required a
15 large amount of select material in the roads.
16 (Intalco had bypassed Cascade and became involved in
17 litigation with Cascade over a claimed refund after
18 the project was estimated).

19 Right-of-way compensation was fairly reasonable
20 on the West end of the project near Ferndale. On the
21 East end of the project, the demands of the land
22 owners presented unique problems. In the years just

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 preceding Cascade's construction of the Tenaska
2 project, two other pipeline projects had purchased
3 right-of-way in that area and had bid up the "going
4 rate" for compensation to property owners. The
5 property owners demanded a higher price than paid by
6 previous pipelines (Arco/Intalco and Sumas Energy).

7 The actual bids received from the contractors
8 for the installation of the pipeline were higher than
9 the pre-bid informal estimates that were received the
10 previous year (1992), even though those pre-bid
11 informal estimated were made with the knowledge of the
12 cost of the March Point project. The actual
13 installation cost was higher than the contractors'
14 estimates, particularly due to the extensive work
15 required in the public road rights-of-way.

16 Q. If Cascade had known during negotiations that the
17 actual construction costs were going to exceed the
18 estimated construction costs, would Cascade have
19 attempted to negotiate higher rates in the Special
20 Contracts?

21 A. If the Company had known the estimates were too low,
22 Cascade would have attempted to negotiated rates for

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 the Special Contracts based upon higher estimated
2 construction costs. However, that does not mean that
3 the rates that were negotiated were not the best rates
4 the Company could obtain under the circumstances. All
5 three of these projects, March Point, Encogen and
6 Tenaska, involved negotiations with parties that were
7 experienced in the cost of the constructing new
8 pipelines to serve cogeneration facilities and each of
9 the parties had estimated their bypass construction
10 costs. March Point Cogeneration Company is a
11 partnership involving San Juan Energy Company. San
12 Juan is a wholly owned subsidiary of Mission Energy
13 Company. Mission Energy Company had recently built
14 several cogeneration facilities in California and they
15 were knowledgeable in the cost of constructing
16 pipelines to serve those facilities. March Point had
17 estimated the cost of constructing new pipeline
18 facilities to serve the Texaco site and had reviewed
19 possible pipeline routes to the site. Based upon the
20 tough negotiations between Cascade and March Point in
21 setting the Special Contract rate, Cascade believes
22 March Point's estimated cost were similar to Cascade's

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 initial estimate. If Cascade had insisted on higher
2 Special Contract rates, March Point would have likely
3 bypassed Cascade and built their own pipeline
4 facilities.

5 Encogen is associated with Enserch Development
6 Corporation which has developed several cogeneration
7 projects elsewhere in the country and has first hand
8 knowledge of the potential cost of pipeline facilities
9 required to serve a new cogeneration facility.

10 Enserch is wholly owned by Lone Star gas Company,
11 which also has pipeline construction cost knowledge.
12 Like March Point, Encogen had estimated the cost of
13 bypassing Cascade and negotiated the Special Contract
14 rate with Cascade with that knowledge. Cascade
15 believes Encogen's estimated construction costs were
16 also similar to Cascade's estimated costs and, if
17 Cascade had insisted on higher Special Contract rates,
18 Encogen would have likely bypassed Cascade and built
19 their own pipeline facilities.

20 Tenaska Gas Company also was experienced in the
21 construction of pipeline facilities necessary to serve
22 a new cogeneration facility. Tenaska had recently

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 built a bypass pipeline in Texas to serve a
2 cogeneration facility Tenaska built there. Many of
3 the people representing Tenaska during Cascade's
4 negotiations had worked for interstate pipelines
5 before forming Tenaska Gas Company. Tenaska had
6 estimated the cost of constructing a new pipeline to
7 serve the proposed cogeneration facilities at Tosco (B
8 P Oil). Cascade believes that Tenaska's estimated
9 cost of bypassing Cascade was lower than Cascade's
10 estimate and that if Cascade had insisted upon higher
11 Special Contract rates, Tenaska would have bypassed
12 Cascade.

13 Cascade did not have to build any new
14 facilities to serve Tosco. The Commission, in its
15 Fourth Supplemental Order in Docket No. UG-930511,
16 found that Tosco, by joining Tenaska in a joint
17 bypass, had a credible bypass threat, even though
18 Cascade was not informed by Tenaska or Tosco of that
19 joint bypass opportunity until after it had negotiated
20 its rates with Tenaska. The Special Contract rate for
21 Tosco had all but been decided before Cascade was
22 informed of the potential joint bypass. Tenaska had

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 early on promised Tosco the same rate that Tenaska
2 would pay for distribution transportation service.
3 Cascade's negotiation choices were simple; either give
4 Tosco the same rate as Tenaska or lose both customers
5 to bypass. Although Cascade was not pleased with the
6 position it found itself in, the business opportunity
7 of serving the new Tenaska load appeared to be too
8 good to allow the joint bypass.

9 Cascade believes that the rates negotiated for
10 all of the Special Contracts were the highest rates
11 Cascade could obtained, based upon what was known by
12 Cascade and the other parties' negotiation teams at
13 the time the Contracts were entered into.

14 Q. Were the lessons learned on the first three projects
15 helpful in estimating the Fibre Special Contract
16 rates?

17 A. The Company is hopeful that its construction estimate
18 for the Fibre project will more accurately reflect the
19 ultimate actual construction costs. At the time of
20 preparing this testimony, the new distribution
21 facilities required to serve Fibre are still being
22 installed and not all actual cost are known. The

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 reports thus far indicate that the Fibre construction
2 project is within budget.

3 Q. What is the future outlook for these Special
4 Contracts?

5 A. All of the Special Contracts are in the very early
6 stages of their terms. March Point is in its third
7 year, Encogen is just completing its second year and
8 Tenaska had not been on a full year in the 1994 test
9 period used in Exhibit ____ (JTS-1). The Fibre service
10 is expected to be completed and the Fibre Agreement is
11 expected to become effective in the second quarter of
12 1995.

13 As is the case with normal Utility rate making,
14 as accumulated depreciation reduces rate base over
15 time, the overall rate of return earned from these
16 Special Contracts will increase, given the same level
17 of volumes delivered.

18 Q. Are there any risks associated with these Special
19 contracts?

20 A. Certainly, there are still risks associated with these
21 Contracts. The Companies that currently operate these
22 facilities could go out of business before Cascade has

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 recovered its investment. However, all of these
2 facilities have substantial dollars invested in the
3 generation equipment and facilities. Cascade believes
4 that it is highly likely that the banks, which
5 financed the cogeneration plant, or some new entity
6 could continue to operate the facilities if a current
7 operator would falter.

8 Cascade is currently depreciating its new
9 distribution systems over the useful life of those
10 facilities, generally 37.5 years, while its Agreements
11 with the customers range between 15 and 25 years. It
12 is possible that, at the end of the primary term, the
13 customer may not want to continue receiving service
14 from Cascade, leaving the undepreciated plant stranded
15 unless Cascade can find other customers to use the
16 distribution facilities. Again, with the large
17 capital investment in the generating equipment, it
18 seems likely that the facilities would want to
19 continue to receive natural gas service beyond the
20 primary term, even if the cogenerator had to find
21 another purchaser for the power.

22 Other risks which might be imagined include the

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

- 1 risk of plant obsolescence, the risk of reduced demand
2 for electricity from these plants, mechanical failure
3 or other force majeure occurrences which disrupts the
4 operation or destroys one or more plants.
- 5 Q. Is it appropriate for other ratepayers to take on
6 those risks?
- 7 A. If the Commission believes that the current and future
8 benefits of these contracts should flow through to the
9 ratepayers, then the ratepayers should also incur the
10 risks associated with these Contracts. Part of the
11 reason these Contracts are currently earning a 12.07%
12 overall return is because the Company is using
13 standard depreciation based upon useful life rather
14 than a depreciation rate based upon contract life. If
15 today's ratepayers have lower rates because of the
16 depreciation rate, then the future ratepayers should
17 be at risk for the undepreciated plant that will
18 remain at the end of the Special Contracts' primary
19 term.
- 20 Q. Would the Company and its shareholders be willing to
21 take on the risk of the Special Contracts?
- 22 A. The Company believes these projects represent good

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 business. It foresees these Special Contracts
2 generating higher than allowed rates of return over
3 the primary terms and beyond. Cascade does not
4 believe the risks associated with the longevity of
5 these projects is unreasonable. However, if the
6 Commission feels the risks are too great for Cascade's
7 other ratepayers and the Commission would allow
8 Cascade to take earnings benefits, along with the
9 investment risk, below the line, Cascade would accept
10 that alternative treatment.

11 Q. What is the Company's recommendation to the Commission
12 in this Petition to Determine Future Ratemaking
13 Treatment of the Special Contracts?

14 A. Cascade recommends that the Commission find the
15 following:

16 (1). The volumes of gas delivered to Tosco should
17 be priced at the Special Contract rates for
18 ratemaking purposes.

19 (2). The Special Contracts do not draw improper
20 contributions from other ratepayers.

21 (3). The Company acted responsibly and in the
22 best interest of all of its customers as well as

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 its shareholders in negotiating the Special
2 Contracts.
3 (4). Based upon what was reasonably known at the
4 time, the Company obtained reasonable rates under
5 the Special Contracts.
6 (5). The Special Contracts do not force
7 inappropriate costs onto Cascade's captive
8 ratepayers.
9 (6). The Special Contracts which contain an
10 automatic rate adjustment clause are to be
11 excluded from any overall general rate increase or
12 decrease the Company may seek and obtain for its
13 other rates schedules for customers generally, and
14 (7). The revenues, expenses and rate base, along
15 with the resulting net operating income generated
16 from the Special Contracts shall be combined with
17 the revenues, expenses and rate base of all other
18 Washington ratepayers to determine an overall net
19 operating income and rate of return. Any surplus
20 net operating income from the Special Contracts
21 above the allowed rate of return will be used to
22 lower the rates of all other rates schedules and

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900

1 ratepayers generally and any deficit net operating
2 income below the allowed rate of return will be
3 used to raise the rates of all other rate
4 schedules and ratepayers generally in all future
5 general rate proceedings.

6 Q. Does this complete your direct testimony?

7 A. Yes, it does.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

TESTIMONY OF JON T. STOLTZ - RATE MAKING TREATMENT OF SPECIAL CONTRACT

CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION
222 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109
(206) 624-3900