## Increased Global NGL and LNG Demand – How Appalachia Is Benefitting

Gas Processors Association Midstream 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Appalachian Basin Regional Conference

September 11, 2019

Washington, PA

Howard G. Murphy, Jr. P.E.

Philadelphia Region Appalachian Region



**FORWARD LOOKING** This Presentation was produced by EARTHRES Group, Inc. ("EARTHRES") and is meant to be viewed as a whole and in conjunction with this disclaimer. Any use of this Presentation other than as a whole and in conjunction with this disclaimer is forbidden. Any use of this Presentation outside of its stated purpose without the prior written consent of EARTHRES is forbidden. Except for its stated purpose, this Presentation may not be copied or distributed in whole or in part without EARTHRES' prior written consent.

This Presentation and the information and statements herein are based in whole or in part on information obtained from various sources as of September 11, 2019. While EARTHRES believes such information to be accurate, it makes no assurances, endorsements or warranties express or implied, as to the validity, accuracy or completeness of any such information, any conclusions based thereon, or any methods disclosed in this Presentation. EARTHRES assumes no responsibility for the results of any actions and inactions taken on the basis of this Presentation. By a party using, acting or relying on this Presentation, such party consents and agrees that EARTHRES, its employees, directors, contractors, advisors, members, affiliates, successors and agents shall have no liability with respect to such use, actions, inactions, or reliance.

This Presentation contains forward-looking opinions. Certain unanticipated factors could cause actual results to differ from the opinions contained herein. Forward-looking opinions are based on historical and/or current information that relate to future operations, strategies, financial results and other developments. Some of the unanticipated factors, among others, that could cause the actual results to differ include regulatory developments, technological changes, competitive conditions, new products, general economic conditions, changes in tax laws, adequacy of reserves, credit and other risks associated with operating companies and other third parties, significant changes in interest rates and fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates.

Further, certain statements, findings, and conclusions in this Presentation are based on EARTHRES' interpretations of various contracts. Interpretations of these contracts by legal counsel or a jurisdictional body could differ.

ARTHRES

# Welcome to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual ABGPA Annual Conference ...

- Todays topic is Increased Global NGL and LNG Demand How Appalachia Is Benefitting
- Howard Murphy, Director of Energy Services, Earthres Group, Inc., Morgantown, WV
- EARTHRES provides engineering and consulting services in Mining, Solid Waste, Commercial/Institutional/Industrial, and Energy
- Energy services are in the Upstream, Midstream, and Downstream with a focus on natural gas gathering, transmission, processing, NGLs and LNG

## **Demand for NGLs and LNG**

•Has global demand for NGLs and LNG actually increased?

- The numbers tell the story
  - LNG trade volume increased 9.8% from 2017 to 2018, with 2018 totaling 316.5MT (Million Tonnes)
  - In 2018 new liquefaction plants came on line in Australia, Russia, and the U.S.
  - 2018 import growth was dominated by China and South Korea
  - Panama and Bangladesh began importing in 2018

## **Demand for LNG**

### LNG Trade Volume – 1990 to 2018



EARTHRES

SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report

## **Demand for LNG – Who is Importing?**

## 2018 LNG Imports and Market Share



Note: Number legend represents total imports in MT, followed by market share %. "Other" includes markets with imports less than 2.0 MT (by order of size): Poland, the Netherlands, Brazil, Malaysia, the Dominican Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Greece, Bangladesh, Lithuania, Israel, Canada, Malta, Jamaica, and Colombia.

SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report

ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS<sup>\*\*</sup>

EARTHRES

## **Demand for LNG – Who is Importing?**

## 2018 LNG Imports and Market Share

### ... note the U.S. import of 2.8 MT



Note: Number legend represents total imports in MT, followed by market share %. "Other" includes markets with imports less than 2.0 MT (by order of size): Poland, the Netherlands, Brazil, Malaysia, the Dominican Republic, the United Arab Emirates, Greece, Bangladesh, Lithuania, Israel, Canada, Malta, Jamaica, and Colombia.

SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report

EARTHRES

## **Demand for LNG – Whose Imports are Growing?**

## 2018 Incremental Annual Increase in LNG Imports

15.8					(	🕒 Afri	ca (	Asia	a 🔴	Asia-P	acific	● Eu	urope	🔵 La	atin An	nerica	<b>M</b>	iddle E	ast	No	orth Am	nerica	le Ot	her 🌘	FSU
	6.4	4.0	2.4	1.4	1.3	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3									
																	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	-0.6	-0.6	-0.8	-1.4	-1.4	
																									-3.7
China, 54.8	S. Korea, 44.5	India, 23.3	Pakistan, 7.1	Belgium, 2.4	Netherlands, 2	Other, 22.4	France, 8.4	Thailand, 4.5	Poland, 2	Bangladesh, 0.7	Turkey, 8.5	Singapore, 2.7	Brazil, 1.9	US, 1.3	Chinese Taipei, 17.1	UK, 5	Chile, 3.1	Lithuania, 0.6	Greece, 0.7	Argentina, 2.6	Japan, 83.2	Jordan, 2.6	UAE, 0.8	Spain, 10.8	Egypt, 2.3

Note: "Other" includes markets with incremental imports of less than ±0.2 MT: Malaysia, Italy, Mexico, Kuwait, Portugal, the Dominican Republic, Malta, Panama, Israel, Canada, Jamaica, and Colombia.

EARTHRES

ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS<sup>™</sup>

## **Demand for LNG – Whose Imports are Growing?**

## 2018 Incremental Annual Increase in LNG Imports

15.	8				(	Afrio	ca (	🔵 Asia	a 🔴	Asia-P	acific	ο Ει	irope	🔵 La	atin Am	nerica	<b>M</b>	iddle E	ast	No	orth Am	nerica	le Ot	her 🌘	<b>F</b> SU
	6.4	4.0																							
			2.4	1.4	1.3	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	-0.2	-0.3	-0.4	-0.6	-0.6	-0.8	-1.4	-1.4	
																									-3.7
China, 54.8	S. Korea, 44.5	India, 23.3	Pakistan, 7.1	Belgium, 2.4	Netherlands, 2	Other, 22.4	France, 8.4	Thailand, 4.5	Poland, 2	Bangladesh, 0.7	Turkey, 8.5	Singapore, 2.7	Brazil, 1.9	US, 1.3	Chinese Taipei, 17.1	UK, 5	Chile, 3.1	Lithuania, 0.6	Greece, 0.7	Argentina, 2.6	Japan, 83.2	Jordan, 2.6	UAE, 0.8	Spain, 10.8	Egypt, 2.3

### Note that Japan decreased from 2017 to 2018

EARTHRES

Note: "Other" includes markets with incremental imports of less than ±0.2 MT: Malaysia, Italy, Mexico, Kuwait, Portugal, the Dominican Republic, Malta, Panama, Israel, Canada, Jamaica, and Colombia.

ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS<sup>\*\*</sup>

## **Demand for LNG – Who is Exporting?**

# LNG 2018 Exports and Market Share



Note: Numbers in the legend represent total 2018 exports in MT, followed by market share.

SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report

**ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS<sup>™</sup>** 

EARTHRES

## **Demand for LNG – Who is Exporting?**

# LNG 2018 Exports and Market Share

- In 2009 the U.S. was near the bottom of this list
- 21.1 MTPA is approximately 2.77
  BCF/D



Note: Numbers in the legend represent total 2018 exports in MT, followed by market share.



## **Demand for LNG – Whose Exports are Growing?**

## 2018 Incremental Annual Increase in LNG Exports



SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report

## **Demand for LNG – Whose Exports are Growing?**

## 2018 Incremental Annual Increase in LNG Exports



EARTHRES

ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS

# Demand for LNG – Is LNG Pricing Driving Demand?

- Monthly Average LNG Regional Prices
- Note the volatility in the curves
- Note the absolute value of the LNG pricing relative to Henry Hub
- In todays pricing environment, in areas where gas can be delivered by pipeline LNG is typically not competitive



ARTHRES

- Kenai, AK began operations as an export terminal in the late 1960s
- In the current wave of projects, Sabine was the first export terminal to enter service – in February, 2016
- Cove Point began import-only operations in the late 1970s, added export capability in 2018
- Cove Point supply is principally from the Appalachian Basin



EARTHRES

- Kenai, AK began operations as an export terminal in the late 1960s
- In the current wave of projects, Sabine was the first export terminal to enter service – in February, 2016
- Cove Point began import-only operations in the late 1970s, added export capability in 2018
- Cove Point supply is principally from the Appalachian Basin



EARTHRES

- Elba Island and Lake Charles began operations in the late 1970s as an import only terminal, adding or plan to add export capability
- Total Approved Liquefaction Nameplate Capacity = 24.10 BCFD; 13.53 BCFD under construction, 10.57 BCFD not under construction
- Supply principally from Appalachian and mid-continent Basins

### North American LNG Export Terminals Approved, Not Yet Built





### APPROVED - UNDER CONSTRUCTION - FERC

- 1. Hackberry, LA: 1.43 Bcfd (Sempra-Cameron LNG, Trains 2 & 3) (CP13-25) 2. Freeport, TX: 2.14 Bcfd (Freeport LNG Dev/Freeport LNG Expansion/FLNG
- . Corpus Christi, TX: 1.4 Bcfd (Cheniere Corpus Christi LNG Trains 2 & 3)
- 4. Sabine Pass, LA: 0.7 Bcfd Train 6 (Sabine Pass Liquefaction) (CP13-552) 5. Elba Island, GA: 0.35 Bcfd (Southern LNG Company) (CP14-103) 6. Cameron Parish, LA: 1.41 Bcfd (Venture Global Calcasieu Pass) (CP15-550) 7. Sabine Pass, TX: 2.1 Bcfd (ExxonMobil - Golden Pass) (CP14-517) 8. Calcasieu Parish, LA: 4.0 Bcfd (Driftwood LNG) (CP17-117)

### APPROVED – NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION - FERC

A. Lake Charles. LA: 2.2 Bcfd (Southern Union - Lake Charles LNG) (CP14-120) B. Lake Charles, LA: 1.08 Bcfd (Magnolia LNG) (CP14-347) C. Hackberry, LA: 1.41 Bcfd (Sempra - Cameron LNG) (CP15-560) D. Port Arthur, TX: 1.86 Bcfd (Port Arthur LNG Trains 1 & 2) (CP17-20) F. Freeport, TX: 0.72 Bcfd (Freeport LNG Dev) (CP17-470) G. Pascagoula, MS: 1.5 Bcfd (Gulf LNG Liquefaction) (CP15-521)

APPROVED - NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION - MARAD/Coast Guard

For Canadian LNG Import and Proposed Export Facilities go to:

As of August 8, 2019

EARTHRES

- Total Proposed Liquefaction Nameplate Capacity = 22.70 BCFD
- Supply principally from Appalachian and mid-continent Basins





## CANADA U.S. Jurisdiction FERC Filing FERC Pre-file MARAD / U.S. Coast Guard

www.earthres.com

EARTHRES

### UNITED STATES

PROPOSED TO FERC Pending Applications:

1. Brownsville, TX: 0.55 Bcfd (Texas LNG Brownsville) (CP16-116) 2. Brownsville, TX: 3.6 Bcfd (Rio Grande LNG - NextDecade) (CP16-454) 3. Brownsville, TX: 0.9 Bcfd (Annova LNG Brownsville) (CP16-480) 4. Jacksonville, FL: 0.132 Bcf/d (Eagle LNG Partners) (CP17-41) Plaquemines Parish, LA: 3.40 Bcfd (Venture Global LNG) (CP17-66) 6. Nikiski, AK: 2.63 Bcfd (Alaska Gasline) (CP17-178) 7. Coos Bay, OR: 1.08 Bcfd (Jordan Cove) (CP17-494) 8. Corpus Christi, TX: 1.86 Bcfd (Cheniere Corpus Christi LNG) (CP18-512) 9. Sabine Pass, LA: NA Bcfd (Sabine Pass Liquefaction) (CP19-11) 10. Cameron Parish, LA: 1.18 Bcfd (Commonwealth, LNG) (CP19-502)

#### Projects in Pre-filing:

A. B. LaFourche Parish, LA: 0.65 Bcfd (Port Fourchon LNG) (PF17-9) B. Galveston Bay, TX: 1.2 Bcfd (Galveston Bay LNG) (PF18-7) C. Plaguemines Parish, LA: 0.9 Bcfd (Pointe LNG) (PF18-8) D. Plaguemines Parish, LA: 2.76 Bcfd (Delta LNG - Venture Global) (FP19-4) E. Port Arthur, TX: 1.86 Bcfd Port Arthur LNG Trains 3 & 4 - Sempra) (PF15-5)

For Canadian LNG Import and Proposed Export Facilities:

https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/energy/natural-gas/5683

As of August 20, 2019

- Total Proposed Liquefaction
  Nameplate Capacity = 22.70 BCFD
- Supply principally from
  Appalachian and mid-continent
  Basins

Total Liquefaction Nameplate Capacity for (Existing + Approved) = 30.04 BCFD

Total Liquefaction Nameplate Capacity for (Existing + Approved + Proposed) = 52.74 BCFD





# U.S. Jurisdiction FERC Filing FERC Pre-file MARAD / U.S. Coast Guard

### UNITED STATES

PROPOSED TO FERC Pending Applications:

Brownsville, TX: 0.55 Bctd (Texas LNG Brownsville) (CP16-116)
 Brownsville, TX: 3.6 Bctd (Rio Grande LNG – NextDecade) (CP16-454)
 Brownsville, TX: 0.9 Bctd (Anova LNG Brownsville) (CP16-450)
 Jacksonville, FL: 0.132 Bctd (Eagle LNG Partners) (CP17-41)
 Plaquemines Parish, LA: 3.40 Bctd (Ventue Global LNG) (CP17-66)
 Nikiski, AK: 2.63 Bctd (Alaska Gasline) (CP17-178)
 Coos Bay, OR: 1.08 Bctd (Andra Cove) (CP17-49)
 Corpus Christi, TX: 1.86 Bctd (Cheniere Corpus Christi LNG) (CP18-512)
 Sabine Passi, LA: NA Bctd (Sabine Pass Liquefaction) (CP19-13)
 Cameron Parish, LA: 1.18 Bctd (Commonweith, LNG) (CP18-502)

#### Projects in Pre-filing:

A. B. LaFourche Parish, LA: 0.65 Bdd (Port Fourchon LNG) (PF17-9) B. Galveston Bay, TX: 1.2 Bdd (Galveston Bay LNG) (PF18-7) C. Plaquemines Parish, LA: 0.9 Bdd (Pointe LNG) (PF18-8) D. Plaquemines Parish, LA: 2.76 Bdd (Delta LNG - Venture Global) (PF19-4) E. Port Arthur, TX: 1.86 Bdd Port Arthur LNG Trains 3.8 4 - Sempra) (PF15-9)

CANADA For Canadian LNG Import and Proposed Export Facilities:

https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/energy/natural-gas/5683

As of August 20, 2019

- In general, expectations for global demand growth for LNG remain strong over the next decade
- LNG project metrics
  - LNG liquefaction and regasification projects typically take five to eight years to go from concept to in service
  - LNG liquefaction projects require significant capital investment \$4 to \$25 Billion for a 5 to 17 MTPA plant, respectively

• New LNG carriers (vessels) typically take three to five years from order placement to completion of sea trials and commissioning



**ENGINEERING FOR SUCCESS<sup>™</sup>** 



 Contract structures are moving toward shorter terms as the industry becomes more commoditized and the spot market grows

 The current backlog of projects that (a) have received Certificate approval, (b) have received a positive Final Investment Decision by the developers and have filed for Certificate approval, and (c) have received a positive Final Investment Decision by the developers and are in the process of filing, suggests strong business fundamentals in favor of LNG

- The ongoing buildout of gas pipeline capacity out of the Appalachian Basin in virtually all directions extends the reach of Appalachian supplies to LNG Liquefaction facilities
- In 2012, a report commissioned by the U.S. Department of Energy found that "... the U.S. was projected to gain net economic benefits from allowing LNG exports ... "and that "... net economic benefits increased as the level of LNG exports increased."

Bottom line – market pull to be used as LNG feedstock is expected to be a significant opportunity for the Appalachian Basin for the next decade



U.S. NGL Production, Consumption, Export, and Import Volume

- 2000 to 2017
- Flat performance up to about 2010
- Wet Marcellus volumes



Note: Net production is net field production at natural gas plant processing plus net refinery and blender production. Consumption is product supplied. Stock/inventory change is excluded.

eia Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Petroleum Supply Annual, September 2018

EARTHRES



EARTHRES

Cia Note: Excludes isobutane, which accounted for less than 1% of exports in 2017. Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Petroleum Supply Annual, September 2018

- 1,300%



EARTHRES

Cia Note: Excludes isobutane, which accounted for less than 1% of exports in 2017. Source: U.S. Energy Information Administrative Control of the second seco Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration, Petroleum Supply Annual, September 2018

## U.S. NGL Export Statistics – 2017

	Propane	Ethane	Natural gasoline	Normal butane
Number of destination countries	43	7	2	30
Total annual exports (million barrels/day)	0.91	0.18	0.17	0.14
Top five destinations and share of total	Japan, 23% Mexico, 15% China, 14% South Korea, 7% Singapore, 6%	India, 32% Canada, 31% United Kingdom, 18% Norway, 15% Brazil, 2%	Canada, 99% Norway, 1%	China, 15% South Korea, 14% Japan, 11% Canada, 9% Morocco, 7%

SOURCE: U.S. Energy Information Administration, September 10, 2019

U.S. NGL Spot Prices – 2002 to 2018

- Prior to 2017 NGL prices constrained by export terminal capacity
- Current capacity bottlenecks now largely removed



Note: Prices are monthly average of close-of-day spot prices; crude oil is Brent; natural gas is Henry Hub; HGL products are at Mt. Belvieu non-LST (Lone Star Terminal). eia

Source: U.S. Energy Information Administration from Bloomberg

EARTHRES

dollars per million British thermal units

- Like LNG, expectations for global demand growth for NGLs remain strong over the next decade
- NGL project metrics
  - NGL processing projects typically take two to five years to go from concept to in-service
  - NGL projects require significant capital investment
  - Export transportation infrastructure pipeline, terminal storage and loading, and vessels – need additional capacity

- LPG/NGL vessels are typically smaller than LNG vessels (e.g., 100,000 versus 170,000 cubic meters capacity) and take two to three years from order placement to completion of sea trials and commissioning
- The advent of Ethane export via carriers opens markets and extends U.S. producer and processor reach, bolstering Ethane value



EARTHRES

- The ongoing buildout of petrochemical facilities, proposed petrochemical facilities, and proposed NGL pipeline capacity increases both inside and outside the Appalachian Basin opens Appalachian supplies to global NGL markets
- Bottom line market pull for NGL supplies around the globe is expected to be a significant opportunity for the Appalachian Basin for the next decade



## QUESTIONS?

Philadelphia Region Appalachian Region



# Thank You!

Philadelphia Region Appalachian Region



## Key Findings in the DOE Report included –

"This report contains an analysis of the impact of exports of LNG on the U.S. economy under a wide range of different assumptions about levels of exports, global market conditions, and the cost of producing natural gas in the U.S.... The economic impacts of different limits on LNG exports were examined under each of the market scenarios. Export limits were set at levels that ranged from zero to unlimited in each of the scenarios. . . . Across all these scenarios, the U.S. was projected to gain net economic benefits from allowing LNG exports. Moreover, for every one of the market scenarios examined, net economic benefits increased as the level of LNG exports increased. In particular, scenarios with unlimited exports always had higher net economic benefits than corresponding cases with limited exports."

SOURCE: Macroeconomic Impacts of LNG Exports from the United States, NERA Economic Consulting, December 3, 2012

## **Conversion Factors**

Natural gas and LNG	To Convert billion cubic metres NG	billion cubic feet NG	million tonnes oil equivalent	million tonnes LNG	trillion British thermal units	million barrels oil equivalent
From			Multiply by			
1 billion cubic metres NG	1	35.3	0.90	0.74	35.7	6.60
1 billion cubic feet NG	0.028	1	0.025	0.021	1.01	0.19
1 million tonnes oil equivalent	1.11	39.2	1	0.82	39.7	7.33
1 million tonnes LNG	1.36	48.0	1.22	1	48.6	8.97
1 trillion British thermal units	0.028	0.99	0.025	0.021	1	0.18
1 million barrels oil equivalent	0.15	5.35	0.14	0.11	5.41	1

Units

1 metric tonne = 2204.62 lb. = 1.1023 short tons 1 kilolitre = 6.2898 barrels 1 kilolitre = 1 cubic metre 1 kilocalorie (kcal) = 4.187 kJ = 3.968 Btu 1 kilojoule (kJ) = 0.239 kcal = 0.948 Btu 1 British thermal unit (Btu) = 0.252 kcal = 1.055 kJ 1 kilowatt-hour (kWh) = 860 kcal = 3600 kJ = 3412 Btu

SOURCE: IGU World LNG - 2019 Edition Report