# Low Carbon Energy Capital Project

# Carbon, Capture, Use, and Storage (CCUS) Team - Initiative 1

Makpal Sariyeva, Paty Hernandez, Brad Peurifoy Faculty Mentor: Charles McConnell

October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2020







### Houston as a CCUS hub

#### Why CCUS?

- CCUS essential to meet global climate targets
- Immediate emissions reductions from decarbonization
- Emission targets can't be achieved with clean energy alone
- Affordable, reliable, sustainable energy needed to reduce energy poverty

#### What Impacts?

- Long term sustainability of industries
- Set the stage for Houston as a decarbonization center of USA
- Globally recognized for energy skillset, knowledge, and technology
- Low carbon products advantage in global market

### Why Houston?

- "Energy capital to sustainable energy capital"
- Infrastructure and scale suitable for "cluster" economics
- Vast, proximal geologic storage resources
- Energy companies strategies are shifting to "net-zero"



UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

C. T. BAUER COLLEGE of BUSINESS

Gutierrez Energy Management Institute



2



## **Objectives and Findings**

### Objectives

- Develop a staged 3x10yr CCUS deployment analysis roadmap
- Utilize the NPC national analysis construct and regionalize for local impacts
- Analyze the emissions AND economic investment impact in the Houston Area
- Assess and position CCUS "optionality" to alternative geologic formations for both storage and EOR – as well as -for the extended energy producing network in the greater US Gulf Coast in all directions from Houston
   FINDINGS
- Investment and risk hurdles will require "strategic investment"
- A mix of EOR and pure storage provides an investment portfolio approach for CCUS
- Current base of target geologies and infrastructure options are far greater than the stationary emissions in the 9 county Houston region long term expansion impact
- Federal, state and local government policies must support/accelerate this transition







# Key Challenges to Address in Project

#### Carbon Capture



#### Transportation



#### Storage



- Technology maturity
- Capture Cost of CO<sub>2</sub>
  (3/4 of total CCUS cost)
- Electricity cost for compression
- Separation cost to purify CO<sub>2</sub>

4

- Permits & Regulations
- Public acceptance
- Eminent Domain
- Cost of pipeline design and operating expense
- Infrastructure improvements

- Primacy
- Class 6 wells
- Low cost of oil
- Cost of surveillance (Liability for releases)
- Induced seismicity


UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON





### Taking Houston to Net-Zero





# Phase I: Activation (2030)

#### **Capture**

Facility type	Captured emissions (MM tons/yr)	Total investment (bil US\$)
Hydrogen	5.7	\$1.1
Natural gas power plants	7	\$2.5


#### **Transport**

6

Pipeline	Available capacity (MM tons/yr)	Total investment (bil US\$/yr)
Denbury	12.9	\$0.12

- Hydrogen emissions prioritized due to cheaper capture cost.
- Natural gas power plants second due to increasing pressure from investors.
- Denbury currently utilized at 1/3 capacity.







#### UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

# Phase I: Activation (2030)

#### **Storage**

Location	Available storage (bil tons)	Total investment (bil US\$/yr)
Gulf Coast EOR	1.4	
Gulf Coast saline	1,500	\$0.12

- Significant EOR storage is available along Gulf Coast in the form of disparate oil fields.
- Denbury has identified multiple EOR fields along the pipeline's path.
- Saline storage is sufficient to handle Denbury capacity for 75 years.









### Phase I: Economic Model

#### **Discounted cash flow model**

- Phase I only
- Combined hydrogen/natural gas
- Denbury pipeline
- Toggle ratio of saline storage to EOR
- Outputs NPV and IRR

#### **Assumptions**

- NPC capture facility reference costs
- Gaffney Cline estimates for regional gas and electricity costs
- Discount rate: 12%
- Inflated oil, gas, and electricity annually

#### **Scenarios**

- **100% EOR scenario** and varied key inputs by +/-25%
- 100% saline scenario and varied key inputs by +/-25%
- Oil price/45Q rate required for positive NPV

la numbro		units		mptions	Hydrogen C units	Capex		inits	Opex		units		Inpu	**	units	Cap	
Inputs		units		nptions	units	Capes		inits	Opex		units		Inpu	ts	units	Cap	ex
			bbls produced per metric ton of CO2														
Captured emissions	5,414,933	tons/year	injected	2	barrels	Multiplier	13.54 X		Electricity usage	0.18	MWh/ton		Captured emissions	7,040,654	tons/year	Multiplier	
Capacity per capture unit installed	400,000	tons/year	Project life	20	/ears	Capture capex (total)	1,063,289,854 \$		Electricity price	10	\$/MWhr		Capacity per capture	1,504,290	tons/year	Capture capex (tota	2,468,93
Online percentage	100%		45Q rate (EOR)	35	S/metric ton	1st year capex	20% 9	6	Gas usage	2.55	MMBtu/ton		Online percentage	100%	%	1st year capex	
% saline storage	0%	S.	45Q rate (saline)	50	S/metric ton	2nd year capex	50% 9	6	Gas price	1	\$/MMBtu		% saline storage	0%	96	2nd year capex	
			WTI oil price	40	\$/bbl	3rd year capex	30% 9		Opex, non-energy, annua	2%	% of capex					3rd year capex	
			Inflation	3%		Avg Hydrogen capex	78.545.000		Midstream tariff	10	S/ton					Avg Nat Gas Power	527.5
			Tax rate	21%		Tie-in pipeline cost per n		/mile	Storage cost		S/ton						001,0
			Discount rate	12%		Length of tie-in line	151 n										
			Depreciation		/ears	Total cost of tie-in line											
Oil Price (infated annually)	\$40.00	\$41.00	\$42.03	\$43.08	\$44.15	\$45.26	\$46.39	\$47.55	5 \$48.74	\$49.95	\$51.20	\$52.48	\$53.80	\$55.14	\$56.5	2 \$57.93	
Gas price (inflated annually)	\$2.00	\$2.05		\$2.15	\$2.21		\$2.32	\$2.38	\$2.44		\$2.56	\$2.62	\$2.69	\$2.76	\$2.8		
Electricity price (inflated annually)	\$10.00	\$10.25	\$10.51	\$10.77	\$11.04	\$11.31	\$11.60	\$11.89	\$12.18	\$12.49	\$12.80	\$13.12	\$13.45	\$13.79	\$14.1	3 \$14.48	
Years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	3 9	10		12					
45Q Revenue (saline storage)	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00	\$0.00				
45Q Revenue (EOR storage)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$435,945,548.85	\$435,945,548.85	\$435,945,548.85	\$435,945,548.85				\$435,945,548.85		\$435,945,548.85			
Petroleum revenue	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$1,073,064,399.01	\$1,099,891,008.99	\$1,127,388,284.21	\$1,155,572,991.32	\$1,184,462,316.10	\$1,214,073,874.00	\$1,244,425,720.85	\$1,275,536,363.87	\$1,307,424,772.97	\$1,340,110,392.29	\$1,373,613,152.10	\$1,407,953,480.9	\$1,443,152,317.93	\$1,479,231
Total Revenue	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,509,009,947.86	\$1,535,836,557.84	\$1,563,333,833.06	\$1,591,518,540.17	\$1,620,407,864.95	5 \$1,650,019,422.85	\$1,680,371,269.70	\$1,711,481,912.72	\$1,743,370,321.82	\$1,776,055,941.14	\$1,809,558,700.95	\$1,843,899,029.7	5 \$1,879,097,866.78	\$1,915,176,
Hydrogen capture capex	\$212,657,970.77	\$531,644,926.93	\$318,986,956.16		\$0.00			\$0.00				\$0.00					
Nat gas power plant capex		\$1,234,462,786.80	\$740,677,672.08		\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00				\$0.00					
Tie-in line capex	\$100,666,666.67	\$100,666,666.67	\$100,666,666.67	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.0	0 \$0.00	
Electricity (Hydrogen)	\$0.00				\$10,758,731.86	\$11,027,700.16	\$11,303,392.66	\$11,585,977.48				\$12,788,751.29	\$13,108,470.07			7 \$14,116,388.53	
Gas (Hydrogen)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$30,483,073.60		\$32,026,279.21	\$32,826,936.19				\$36,234,795.32	\$37,140,665.20				
Opex, non-energy (Hydrogen)	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$21,265,797.08	\$21,265,797.08	\$21,265,797.08	\$21,265,797.08				\$21,265,797.08	\$21,265,797.08				
Electricity (Natural gas)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$11,265,045.98	\$11,265,045.98	\$11,265,045.98	\$11,265,045.98				\$11,265,045.98	\$11,265,045.98				
Gas (Natural gas)	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$39,427,660.94	\$39,427,660.94	\$39,427,660.94	\$39,427,660.94				\$39,427,660.94	\$39,427,660.94				
Opex, non-energy (Natural gas)	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$49,378,511.47	\$49,378,511.47	\$49,378,511.47	\$49,378,511.47				\$49,378,511.47	\$49,378,511.47	\$49,378,511.47			
Transport tariff	\$0.00	\$0.00			\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10				\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10		\$124,555,871.1		\$124,555
Storage cost	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555,871.1	\$124,555,871.10	\$124,555
EBITDA (Rev-capex-opex)	-\$807,109,752.16	-\$1,866,774,380.40	-\$1,160,331,294.91	\$1,098,325,282.41	\$1,124,145,994.69	\$1,150,612,224.78	\$1,177,740,110.62	\$1,205,546,193.61	\$1,234,047,428.67	\$1,263,261,194.61	\$1,293,205,304.69	\$1,323,898,017.53	\$1,355,358,048.19	\$1,387,604,579.62	\$1,420,657,274.3	3 \$1,454,536,286.40	\$1,489,262
Depreciation	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07	\$547,745,061.07										
	\$1,354,854,813.23		-\$1,708,076,355.98	\$550,580,221.35	\$576,400,933.63	\$602,867,163.71	\$629,995,049.55	\$1,205,546,193.61	\$1,234,047,428.67	\$1,263,261,194.61	\$1,293,205,304.69	\$1,323,898,017.53	\$1,355,358,048.19	\$1,387,604,579.62	\$1,420,657,274.3	3 \$1,454,536,286.40	\$1,489,262
NOPLAT (EBIT*(1-Tax Rate))	\$1,070,335,302.45	-\$1,907,470,358.76	-\$1,349,380,321.22	\$434,958,374.86	\$455,356,737.57	\$476,265,059.33	\$497,696,089.15	\$952,381,492.95		\$997,976,343.74	\$1,021,632,190.71	\$1,045,879,433.85	\$1,070,732,858.07	\$1,096,207,617.90	\$1,122,319,246.7	2 \$1,149,083,666.26	\$1,176,517
FCF	\$1,329,699,993.54	-\$3,226,499,678.10	-\$1,961,966,555.06	\$982,703,435.93	\$1,003,101,798.63	\$1,024,010,120.40	\$1,045,441,150.22	\$952,381,492.95	\$974,897,468.65	\$997,976,343.74	\$1,021,632,190.71	\$1,045,879,433.85	\$1,070,732,858.07	\$1,096,207,617.90	\$1,122,319,246.7	2 \$1,149,083,666.26	\$1,176,517,
PV of FCF	\$1,187,232,137.09	-\$2,572,145,789.30	-\$1,396,489,040.76	\$624,525,799.24	\$569,186,899.56	\$518,795,395.40	\$472,904,483.98	\$384,650,911.64	\$351,557,800.52	\$321,321,673.43	\$293,694,842.01	\$268,451,200.89	\$245,384,335.59	\$224,305,797.36	\$205,043,530.3	2 \$187,440,437.24	\$171,353
Project NPV	\$113,543,909.91																
IRR	12%																





#### UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

# Phase I: Economic Model Results


### Combined hydrogen and natural gas power plant model - 100% EOR

Sensitivity 1							
Base Case Assumptions (100% EOR)							
Online %	100						
bbls produced per metric ton of CO2	2	barrels					
45Q rate (EOR)	\$35	\$/metric ton					
45Q rate (saline)	\$50	\$/metric ton					
WTI oil price	\$40	\$/bbl					
Avg Hydrogen capex	\$78,545,000.00	\$/unit					
Avg Nat Gas Power Plant capex	\$527,505,000.00	\$/unit					
Tie-in pipeline cost per mile	\$2,000,000.00	\$/mile					
Length of tie-in line	151	miles					
Electricity usage (Hydrogen)	0.18	MWh/ton					
Electricity usage (Nat gas)	0.16	MWh/ton					
Electricity price	\$10	\$/MWhr					
Gas usage (Hydrogen)	\$2.55	MMBtu/ton					
Gas usage (Nat Gas)	\$2.80	MMBtu/ton					
Gas price	\$2	\$/MMBtu					
Opex, non-energy, annual	0.02	% of capex					
Midstream tariff	\$10.00	\$/ton					
Storage cost	\$10.00	\$/ton					
NPV	\$ 113,543,909.91						
IRR	12%						

- Project can be NPV positive with 12% IRR today.....however
- US40/bbl price required for 20 years for project with high risk potential
- Most influential parameters include: oil price, recovery factor, nat gas capex, and 45Q rate



9







## Key Take-aways

#### • Phase I (present to 2030):

- Focus on low cost strategic CO<sub>2</sub> Houston emissions: 5.7million tons/yr from Hydrogen SMR
  7 million tons/yr from Natural Gas Power
- **Transport on existing/available Denbury pipeline:** 13 million ton/yr available capacity
- Gulf coast accessible geologic storage: 1.4 Billion tons for EOR and 1.5 Trillion tons of saline
- EOR most economically attractive with current tax credits BUT with Highest Risk
- Parameters needed for overall positive system NPV: (with 12% all equity hurdle)
  - 100% EOR storage requires \$40/bbl oil price PLUS 45Q credit of \$35/ton
  - 100% saline storage only requires 45Q Tax credit significantly above current \$50/ton
- Phase II (2040):
  - Expand capture to include: 6.4 million tons/yr from Natural Gas Power Plant
    13.5 million tons/yr from Industrial Processes Refining and Pet Chem
  - Build pipelines to the East/Central Texas: 20-30 million tons/yr available capacity at \$500 million cost (250 miles X US\$2 million/mile). On and offshore geologic target zones
  - East/Central Texas available storage: 3.6 billion tons for EOR and 500 billion tons of saline
- Phase III (2050):
  - Expand capture to include: 11.4 million tons/yr from Industrial Furnaces
    7.8 million tons/yr from Refinery Catalytic Cracker
  - Build pipeline to the Permian: 20 million tons/yr available capacity at US\$1 billion cost (500 miles X US\$2 million/mile)
  - **Permian available geologic storage:** 4.8 billion tons of EOR and 1 trillion tons of saline







Acknowledgements



### UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

C. T. BAUER COLLEGE of BUSINESS Gutierrez Energy Management Institute





<u>Special thanks</u>: Jane Stricker, Mike Godec, Steve Melzer, Scott Nyquist, and Nigel Jenvey!

# Thank you!


# Appendix

- Phase I- Saline Economic Analysis (slide 13)
- Phase II- Analysis (slides 14-16)
- Phase III- Analysis (slides 17-19)
- Key Takeaways (slide 20)



12





# Phase I: Economic Model Results

### Combined hydrogen and natural gas power plant model - 100% storage


Sensitivity 2							
Base Case Assumptions (100% Saline)							
Online %	100						
bbls produced per metric ton of CO2	2	barrels					
45Q rate (EOR)	\$35	\$/metric ton					
45Q rate (saline)	\$50	\$/metric ton					
WTI oil price	\$40	\$/bbl					
Avg Hydrogen capex	\$78,545,000	\$/unit					
Avg Nat Gas Power Plant capex	\$527,505,000	\$/unit					
Tie-in pipeline cost per mile	\$2,000,000	\$/mile					
Length of tie-in line		miles					
Electricity usage (Hydrogen)	0.18	MWh/ton					
Electricity usage (Nat gas)	0.16	MWh/ton					
Electricity price	<b>\$1</b> 0	\$/MWhr					
Gas usage (Hydrogen)	2.55	MMBtu/ton					
Gas usage (Nat Gas)	2.8	MMBtu/ton					
Gas price	\$2	\$/MMBtu					
Opex, non-energy, annual	0.02	% of capex					
Midstream tariff	\$10	\$/ton					
Storage cost	\$10	\$/ton					
NPV	\$ (3,583,733,634.47)						
IRR	-3%						

- Project is grounded in 12% all equity return criteria....and....
- US\$+100/Ton 45Q price needed today for positive project @12% all equity
- Most influential parameters include: capex, online %, 45Q rate, hydrogen and NGCC capex




13





UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON** 

### Phase II: Expansion - FW Basin and Offshore



# Phase II: Expansion (2040)

### **Capture**


Facility Type	Captured emissions (MM tons/yr)	Total Investment (bil US\$)
Natural Gas Power Plant	6.4	2.2
Industrial Furnaces	13.5	6.4

### <u>Transport</u>

Pipeline	Available capacity (MM tons/yr)	Total Investment (bil US\$)
East/Central Texas	20	\$0.5

- Build 250-Mile Houston -to-East/Central Texas Pipeline
- Industrial Furnaces are included to expand annual capture of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Additional Natural Gas Power Plants are involved in the expansion of capacity transportation








#### UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

# Phase II: Expansion (2040)

### **Storage**

Location	Available storage (bil tons)	Total Investment (bil US\$/yr)
East/Central Texas EOR	3.6	
East/Central Texas saline	501	TBD

- EOR and Saline storage is available in East/Central Texas
- Leveraging the demand for CO<sub>2</sub> EOR, offering a relatively larger economic benefit








UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON** 

### Phase III: At-Scale - Taking Houston to Net Zero



# Phase III: At-Scale (2050)

### <u>Capture</u>


Facility Type	Captured emissions (MM tons/yr)	Total Investment (bil US\$)
Industrial Furnaces	11.4	2.8
Refinery Catalytic Cracker	7.8	1.4

### **Transport**

Pipeline	Available capacity (MM tons/yr)	Total Investment (bil US\$)
Permian	20	\$1

- Build 500-Mile Houston -to- Permian
  Pipeline
- **Refinery Catalytic Cracker** are included to expand annual capture of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Projected pipeline from Houston to the Permian Basin will help with the economic feasibility of both carbon capture and pipeline projects





**UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON** 

C. T. BAUER COLLEGE of BUSINESS

Gutierrez Energy Management Institute




# Phase III: At-Scale (2050)

### <u>Storage</u>

19

Location	Available storage (bil tons)	Total Investment (bil US\$/yr)
Permian EOR	4.8	
Permian saline	1000	TBD

- Large-scale of EOR and saline storage available in the Permian Basin
- Storage capacity in the Permian will permit to achieve net-zero in carbon goal







#### UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

## Key Take-aways

#### • Phase I (present to 2030):

- Focus on low cost strategic CO<sub>2</sub> Houston emissions: 5.7million tons/yr from Hydrogen SMR
  7 million tons/yr from Natural Gas Power
- **Transport on existing/available Denbury pipeline:** 13 million ton/yr available capacity
- Gulf coast accessible geologic storage: 1.4 Billion tons for EOR and 1.5 Trillion tons of saline
- EOR most economically attractive with current tax credits BUT with Highest Risk
- Parameters needed for overall positive system NPV: (with 12% all equity hurdle)
  - 100% EOR storage requires \$40/bbl oil price PLUS 45Q credit of \$35/ton
  - 100% saline storage only requires 45Q Tax credit significantly above current \$50/ton
- Phase II (2040):
  - Expand capture to include: 6.4 million tons/yr from Natural Gas Power Plant
    13.5 million tons/yr from Industrial Processes Refining and Pet Chem
  - Build pipelines to the East/Central Texas: 20-30 million tons/yr available capacity at \$500 million cost (250 miles X US\$2 million/mile). On and offshore geologic target zones
  - East/Central Texas available storage: 3.6 billion tons for EOR and 500 billion tons of saline
- Phase III (2050):
  - Expand capture to include: 11.4 million tons/yr from Industrial Furnaces
    7.8 million tons/yr from Refinery Catalytic Cracker
  - Build pipeline to the Permian: 20 million tons/yr available capacity at US\$1 billion cost (500 miles X US\$2 million/mile)
  - **Permian available geologic storage:** 4.8 billion tons of EOR and 1 trillion tons of saline





