

**Action 804**  
**0498/0502 Assessment of**  
**Environmental Impacts**  
**Supplementary Information**

  
**Teesside Gas**  
Processing Plant

**David O'Donnell**  
**7<sup>th</sup> November 2014**



# Background

- **CATS/TGPP existing CO<sub>2</sub> spec is 2.9 mol%**
- **CATS & TGLP have requested a revised CO<sub>2</sub> spec to 4 mol%**
- **Two main benefits**
  - **Avoid restricting throughput of existing gas fields**
  - **Avoid risk of potential new gas fields not being developed e.g. Jackdaw**
- **BP assessment of forward CO<sub>2</sub> content**
  - **2014-2018**
    - **CO<sub>2</sub> levels of >2.9 mol% for max of 5% of time at a peak of 4 mol%**
    - **Occur in summer (2-3 days)**
    - **Estimate total impact 0.03 mol% on annual average**
  - **2019+**
    - **Potential new gas fields developed**
    - **Summer months between 2.66 mol% and 3.6 mol% (max 4 mol%)**
    - **Non-summer months between 2.66 mol% and 3 mol% (max 3.57 mol%)**

# Action 804 – Assessment of Environmental Impact

- **Considered max CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and annual forecast cost for 3 scenarios around a new gas field project in period 2019 to 2040**
- **Scenario 1 – Offshore CO<sub>2</sub> removal**
  - **Amine unit installed offshore to remove CO<sub>2</sub> down to 2.9 mol% prior to entry into CATS pipeline**
- **Scenario 2 – Onshore CO<sub>2</sub> removal**
  - **Amine unit installed onshore to remove CO<sub>2</sub> down to 2.9 mol% prior to entry on to the NTS**
- **Scenario 3 – NTS Delivery at 4mol%**
  - **Natural gas is delivered to NTS with a 4 mol% CO<sub>2</sub> content**
- **In all scenarios the following are calculated:**
  - **Amount of CO<sub>2</sub> removed plus emissions from associated fuel gas**
  - **Forecast cost of the amine installation where required**
  - **Forecast cost of annual emissions from the process**

# Action 804 – Assessment of Environmental Impact

## Total Impact of Gas From Field Development over Field Life

Assessment of CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Cost For Field Development (2019-2040)	Scenario 1 Offshore CO <sub>2</sub> Removal	Scenario 2 Onshore CO <sub>2</sub> Removal	Scenario 3 NTS Delivery at 4 mol % CO <sub>2</sub>
CO <sub>2</sub> Removed by Amine unit (4 mol% to 2.9 mol%) (te)	566,214	612,989	0
CO <sub>2</sub> in fuel gas consumed by Amine unit (te)	261,121	266,040	0
CO <sub>2</sub> above 2.9 mol% emitted by consumers (te)	0	0	545,022
<b>Total additional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (te)</b>	<b>827,335</b>	<b>879,029</b>	<b>545,022</b>
CO <sub>2</sub> Total ETS Traded Cost (£)	£12,831,701	£13,197,852	£2,198,459
CO <sub>2</sub> Total Traded Cost with Carbon Price Support (£)	£0	£0	£7,352,646
CO <sub>2</sub> Total Non-Traded Cost (£) (non-ETS consumption)	£0	£0	£20,869,531
Cost of Amine Unit (£)	£122,000,000	£200,000,000	£0
<b>Total Cost (£)</b>	<b>£134,831,701</b>	<b>£213,197,852</b>	<b>£30,420,636</b>
Cost per Tonne (£)	<b>£163</b>	<b>£243</b>	<b>£56</b>
Cost per Tonne (excluding Non-Traded) (£)	<b>£163</b>	<b>£243</b>	<b>£18</b>

# Action 804 – Assessment of Environmental Impact

## Average Annual Impact of Gas From Field Development

Assessment of CO <sub>2</sub> Removal Cost For Field Development (2019-2040) Annual Average	Scenario 1 Offshore CO <sub>2</sub> Removal	Scenario 2 Onshore CO <sub>2</sub> Removal	Scenario 3 NTS Delivery at 4 mol % CO <sub>2</sub>
CO <sub>2</sub> Removed by Amine unit (4 mol% to 2.9 mol%) (te/yr)	25,737	27,863	0
CO <sub>2</sub> in fuel gas consumed by Amine unit (te/yr)	11,869	12,093	0
CO <sub>2</sub> above 2.9 mol% emitted by consumers (te/yr)	0	0	24,774
<b>Total additional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (te/yr)</b>	<b>37,606</b>	<b>39,956</b>	<b>24,774</b>

CO <sub>2</sub> Total ETS Traded Cost (£/yr)	£583,259	£599,902	£99,930
CO <sub>2</sub> Total Traded Cost with Carbon Price Support (£/yr)			£334,211
CO <sub>2</sub> Total Non-Traded Cost (£/yr) (non-ETS consumption)			£948,615
Cost of Amine Unit (£/yr)	£5,545,455	£9,090,909	
<b>Total Cost (£/yr)</b>	<b>£6,128,714</b>	<b>£9,690,811</b>	<b>£1,382,756</b>

## Impact on Total UK CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions

Additional CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions as a % of total UK CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (%)	0.0125%	0.0133%	0.0082%
---	---------	---------	---------

# Action 804 – Calculation Assumptions

Data	Source
<b>CO<sub>2</sub> Content</b>	Operator estimate - single field at 4 mol%. Expect CATS commingled gas to be lower on average
<b>Amine Unit costs</b>	BP estimates - Amine unit fully installed cost
<b>Field Profile</b>	Field Operator
<b>ETS Carbon Valuation</b>	DECC Updated Energy & Emissions Projections - September 2014, 'Carbon Prices - Industry and Services' upto 2035 (2036+ Traded price equals non-traded price)
<b>Carbon Valuation with Carbon Price Support</b>	DECC Updated Energy & Emissions Projections - September 2014, 'Carbon Prices - Electricity Supply Sector' up to 2035 (2036+ inflated at 6% per year)
<b>Carbon Valuation 'Non Traded'</b>	DECC Appraisal Guide 2014, Table 1-20: supporting the toolkit and guidance - Central Prices
<b>Total UK Forecast CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions</b>	DECC Updated Energy & Emissions Projections - September 2014, Annex B Carbon Dioxide Emissions by Source
<b>Emissions cost by User Group</b>	Gas Usage split by gas demand Users (ETS, Carbon Support, non-ETS) - Nationalgrid, Future-Energy-Scenarios pg.168

# Action 804 – Conclusions

- **Single field case is the max impact case – assume full field CO<sub>2</sub> at 4 mol%, in reality will be diluted by other gas**
- **CO<sub>2</sub> removal at “source” (scenarios 1 & 2) creates 60% more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than emitting by user (scenario 3)**
- **Increased electrical load to drive amine units will further add to emission in Scenarios 1 & 2 but are not included in model**
- **No account taken of additional Benzene and Methane emitted from amine units**
- **Cost of mitigation at “source” is between 3x and 4.5x more costly per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub> than emitting by user (and between 9x and 14x more costly when non-traded uses are excluded)**
- **Dilution of CO<sub>2</sub> by other gas will reduce overall additional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but will make amine solutions (scenarios 1 & 2) more costly relative to scenario 3 – similar capital to remove less CO<sub>2</sub>**