

# Written Findings and Determination by the Commissioners of Natural Resources and Revenue for Issuance of a License under the Alaska Gasline Inducement Act (AGIA)

Preface.....	ES-1
Executive Summary .....	ES-2
Acronyms and Abbreviations	
Glossary	

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION AND AGIA

A. Introduction .....	1-1
B. History of Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Efforts .....	1-3
1. The Stranded Gas Development Act .....	1-3
2. Alaska Gasline Inducement Act .....	1-4
C. Summary of Projects .....	1-7
1. The TC Alaska Application .....	1-7
2. The LNG Project Options .....	1-7
3. The Producer Project .....	1-7
4. The Bullet Line .....	1-8
5. LNG and an Overland Pipeline .....	1-8
D. Maximizing Benefits for Alaskans .....	1-9
1. Getting a Natural Gas Pipeline, Quickly .....	1-10
2. Jobs and Long-term Careers for Alaskans.....	1-12
3. Affordable Energy for Alaskans.....	1-14
4. Sufficiently Maximizing Revenues to the State and Its Citizens.....	1-16
E. Summary .....	1-19
F. References.....	1-20

## CHAPTER TWO TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

A. Natural Gas Primer .....	2-1
1. Natural Gas Markets .....	2-1
2. LNG Basics .....	2-3
3. History of LNG.....	2-3
4. Asian Gas Quality Demands .....	2-4
B. Pipeline Primer.....	2-5
1. Natural Gas Pipeline Project Development.....	2-5
2. Project Analysis.....	2-6

3.	Pipeline Regulation .....	2-7
4.	The Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act and Impacts on the Regulation of an Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline .....	2-9
5.	Alaska’s Natural Gas Resources .....	2-10
C.	Analysis Team.....	2-11
D.	References.....	2-14

### CHAPTER THREE ANALYSIS OF TC ALASKA’S APPLICATION

A.	Introduction and Summary .....	3-1
B.	Who is TC Alaska?.....	3-3
1.	History and Company Description.....	3-3
a.	TransCanada in Alaska .....	3-3
C.	Summary of Proposed Project .....	3-5
1.	Gas Treatment Plant (GTP) .....	3-6
a.	Potential Equity Partners.....	3-7
b.	Management Challenges .....	3-7
c.	Regulatory Challenges .....	3-8
d.	Transportation Challenges .....	3-9
D.	TC Alaska’s Project Would Produce a Significantly Positive Net Present Value for the State of Alaska .....	3-10
1.	Summary of Methodology and Results of NPV Analysis.....	3-11
2.	NPV Methodology .....	3-17
a.	General Approach .....	3-17
b.	Natural Gas Prices .....	3-20
c.	EIA Price Forecast .....	3-23
d.	Wood Mackenzie Price Projection.....	3-25
e.	Projection Based on Forward-Looking North American Supply and Demand Model .....	3-27
f.	Estimated Volumes of Natural Gas Sold .....	3-35
g.	Estimated Pipeline and GTP Costs, Schedule, and Tariffs .....	3-44
h.	Pipeline Cost and Schedule Analysis, Including Cost and Schedule Ranges.....	3-46
i.	Nominal Dollar Cost Ranges and Tariffs: Escalation Risk .....	3-54
j.	Upstream Costs.....	3-61
3.	Estimated NPV Produced by the Project—Results of the NPV Analysis .....	3-61
a.	Estimated NPV under the Proposal Base Case .....	3-62
b.	Estimated NPV Under the Conservative Base Case and Low Volume Sensitivity Case Remain Favorable.....	3-69
c.	The Project Would Produce a Positive NPV Even If No Point Thomson or YTF Gas Is Ever Produced.....	3-75
4.	Impact of \$500 Million Match .....	3-79
5.	Availability of Low Cost Expansion .....	3-80

E.	Analysis of the Likelihood of Success of TC Alaska’s Project.....	3-83
1.	Introduction and Summary .....	3-83
2.	Methodology for Analyzing the Project’s Likelihood of Success .....	3-84
3.	Analysis of Likelihood of Success Criteria Under AGIA Section 170 .....	3-85
a.	TC Alaska Has Submitted a Plan for its Project That is Technically Feasible, Reasonable, and Specific. ....	3-85
b.	TC Alaska Has Demonstrated the Technical and Financial Ability To Construct the Project. ....	3-98
c.	TC Alaska Has Submitted a Reasonable Commercial Plan Which, Coupled With Economic and Political Factors, Should Help To Encourage Firm Shipping Commitments .....	3-106
d.	TC Alaska’s Ability To Overcome Barriers To Obtaining Firm Shipping Commitments.....	3-119
e.	Other Factors Which Indicate TC Alaska’s Project Has A Reasonable Prospect of Securing Firm Shipping Commitments .....	3-153
F.	Summary .....	3-160
G.	References.....	3-161

## **CHAPTER FOUR LNG**

A.	Introduction and Summary of Analysis of LNG Project Options.....	4-1
B.	Background .....	4-3
C.	The LNG Project Options .....	4-7
D.	The Y Line Option .....	4-9
E.	Analysis of the NPV of the LNG Project Options.....	4-12
1.	Calculation of LNG Prices .....	4-12
2.	LNG Volumes.....	4-20
3.	Costs and Schedule Related to LNG Scenarios .....	4-20
4.	Comparison of LNG and TC Alaska Costs and Tariffs.....	4-28
5.	Estimated State NPV <sub>5</sub> .....	4-34
6.	Comparison of Estimated NPVs Produced by the TC Alaska Project and the LNG Options. ....	4-35
F.	TC Alaska’s Project Has a Greater Likelihood of Success Than Any of the LNG Options. ....	4-43
1.	An LNG Project Would Be Significantly More Complex, and Thus More Risky, Than an Overland Route. ....	4-43
2.	An LNG Project Would Be More Difficult To Finance Than an Overland Route .....	4-46
3.	There Is a Significant Risk LNG Would Not Provide Open Access to Future Explorers, In Contrast With the TC Alaska Project .....	4-47
4.	The Major North Slope Producers Have Indicated Their Preference for An Overland Route Over the LNG Options. ....	4-48
5.	An LNG Project Will Require Proven and Committed Reserves (Certified by Experts) to be Dedicated to the Project. ....	4-50

6.	Exporting LNG To Asia Presents Regulatory and Political Barriers That the TC Alaska Project Would Not Face.....	4-50
7.	An Overland Route Has a Better Opportunity than an LNG Project To Spur a Petrochemical Industry.....	4-52
G.	Conclusion .....	4-54
H.	References.....	4-56

**CHAPTER FIVE      COMPARISON OF THE TC ALASKA PROPOSAL WITH THE PROPOSAL BY BP/CONOCOPHILLIPS**

A.	Introduction and Summary of Conclusions .....	5-1
B.	The History of SGDA and TAPS Illustrates the Risks Posed by a Producer-Owned Pipeline .....	5-4
1.	The State's Experience Under SGDA .....	5-4
2.	TAPS.....	5-7
C.	TC Alaska—Commitments; Producer Project—No Commitments.....	5-9
1.	Capital Structure .....	5-9
2.	Expansion .....	5-13
3.	Rolled-in Rates.....	5-14
4.	Commitments To Hold an Open Season and File at FERC, and Other Issues That Could Result in a Delay of the Producer Project.....	5-17
D.	A Producer-owned Pipeline Has an Incentive to Act in Ways That Are Contrary to the Best Interests of the State .....	5-20
E.	Both TC Alaska and the Producer Projects Lack Firm Shipping Commitments.....	5-24
F.	Comparison of the Costs to the State Following the TC Alaska Project Path or the Producer Project Path.....	5-26
G.	TC Alaska's Offer of Equity Partnership.....	5-29
H.	The Upstream Inducements Provided by AGIA are Valuable and Incentivize the Producers to Commit Gas to the TC Alaska Project .....	5-30
I.	It is in the State's Interest to Pursue the TC Alaska Project.....	5-32
J.	Conclusion .....	5-33
K.	References.....	5-34

**CHAPTER SIX      FINDINGS AND DETERMINATION**

	Commissioners' Findings.....	6-1
	Commissioners' Determination .....	6-2

## Figures

---

Figure 2-1:	Pipeline Flow .....	2-2
Figure 2-2:	Natural Gas Production .....	2-2
Figure 2-3:	Potential LNG Trading Routes from Alaska.....	2-4
Figure 3-1.	Map of TransCanada Pipeline Operations	3-4
Figure 3-2.	Present Value of \$100 Cash Flow in Future.....	3-14
Figure 3-3.	Present Value of \$100 Cash Flow in Future Years .....	3-15
Figure 3-4.	Sensitivity of State NPV to Discount Rates .....	3-17
Figure 3-5.	NPV Modeling .....	3-18
Figure 3-6.	Annual Henry Hub Price.....	3-21
Figure 3-7.	EIA-Based Henry Hub and AECO Price Forecasts to 2045 (Nominal dollars) .....	3-24
Figure 3-8.	Wood Mackenzie-Based Henry Hub Forecast to 2045 (Nominal dollars) .....	3-25
Figure 3-9.	Wood Mackenzie Basis Forecast .....	3-26
Figure 3-10.	Wood Mackenzie-Based Henry Hub and AECO Price Forecasts to 2045 (Nominal dollars) .....	3-27
Figure 3-11.	Black and Veatch Henry Hub and AECO Price Forecasts to 2045 (Nominal dollars) .....	3-29
Figure 3-12.	U.S. Gas-fired Power Generation Demand Distribution Range.....	3-30
Figure 3-13.	WCSB Finding and Development Cost Curve (Real 2008 \$) .....	3-31
Figure 3-14.	U.S. Lower 48 Industrial Demand Distribution Range .....	3-32
Figure 3-15.	Relative Impact of Price Drivers on AECO HUB Price Formation, 2022 (Nominal \$).....	3-33
Figure 3-16.	Distribution Range of AECO Price Forecasts over Time (Nominal \$) .....	3-34
Figure 3-17.	AECO Price Forecasts (Nominal \$).....	3-35
Figure 3-18.	Production Profile for Proposal Base Case .....	3-42
Figure 3-19.	Production Profile for Conservative Base Case .....	3-43
Figure 3-20.	Subproject Component Cost Ranges—Derivation Process .....	3-47
Figure 3-21.	Proposal Base Case Cost Distribution—Alaska Pipeline .....	3-49
Figure 3-22.	Proposal Base Case Cost Distribution—Yukon-BC Pipeline.....	3-50
Figure 3-23.	Proposal Base Case Cost Distribution - GTP.....	3-51
Figure 3-24.	Proposal Base Case Cost Distribution—Integrated Project .....	3-52
Figure 3-25.	Project Cost Risk: Comparing Project Escalation with Project Scope Risks Showing Cost Uncertainty and Risk Increasing With Escalation Rates .....	3-54
Figure 3-26.	Tariff Distributions by Project Throughput:Smaller Projects Give Higher Tariffs.....	3-57
Figure 3-27.	State NPV5 Tornado Diagram: The Relative Importance of Different Project Risks .....	3-64
Figure 3-28.	State NPV5 Sensitivity to Price .....	3-65
Figure 3-29.	Comparing TC Alaska Pipeline Tariff (Nominal \$) with Various AECO Price Forecasts .....	3-66

Figure 3-30.	Producer NPV <sub>10</sub> Tornado Diagram: The Relative Importance of Different Project Risks .....	3-68
Figure 3-31.	Pipeline Tariffs Under Proposal, Conservative, and Low Volume Cases.....	3-70
Figure 3-32.	State NPV <sub>5</sub> Under Proposal, Conservative, and Low Volume Cases.....	3-72
Figure 3-33.	Aggregate Producer NPV Under Proposal, Conservative, and Low Volume Cases .....	3-73
Figure 3-34.	Impact of Contract and Depreciation Periods on AECO Tariff .....	3-74
Figure 3-35.	Reserve Risk: Producer NPV Assuming No YTF Gas .....	3-76
Figure 3-36.	Reserve Risk: Yearly Net Back Cash Flow .....	3-77
Figure 3-37.	State of Alaska NPV <sub>5</sub> with and without \$500m match .....	3-79
Figure 3-38.	AGIA Roll-in-Rate Provision .....	3-82
Figure 3-39.	Schedule Risk of Proposal Base Case.....	3-92
Figure 3-40.	Impact of Commercial Terms of Transportation Contracts to AECO Tariff ....	3-109
Figure 3-41.	Impact of Commercial Terms of Transportation Contracts to Producer NPV <sub>10</sub> and NPV <sub>15</sub> .....	3-110
Figure 3-42.	Tariff Consequences of Cost Overruns With and Without 100% Debt Financing .....	3-115
Figure 3-43.	TransCanada NPV <sub>8.8</sub> Sensitivity Consequences of Cost Overruns With and Without 100% Debt Financing.....	3-116
Figure 3-44.	TransCanada NPV <sub>8.8</sub> For Different Project Configurations.....	3-123
Figure 3-45.	U.S. Government NPV <sub>5</sub> For Different Project Configurations.....	3-127
Figure 3-46.	State NPV <sub>5</sub> For Different Project Configurations.....	3-128
Figure 3-47.	Percentage Price Drop Necessary to Generate NPV of Zero For Producers' Proved Reserves .....	3-131
Figure 3-48	Aggregate Producers NPV <sub>10</sub> - 4.5 BCF/d Proposal Base Case With and Without Price Uncertainty .....	3-132
Figure 3-49.	Real AECO Price Forecasts vs. Tariff + Fuel.....	3-133
Figure 3-50.	Aggregate Producers NPV <sub>10</sub> Uncertainty for the 3.5, 4.0, and 4.5 Bcf/d Cases .....	3-134
Figure 3-51.	Impact of Different Periods of Fiscal Uncertainty for Producer NPV <sub>10</sub> .....	3-139
Figure 4-1.	Asian LNG Price Formula: The Historical Period	4-13
Figure 4-2.	Japanese 'S' Curve for LNG Pricing: The Historical Period .....	4-14
Figure 4-3.	More Recent Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese, and Chinese LNG Prices Related to Crude Oil Price.....	4-15
Figure 4-4.	Asian LNG and Henry Hub Prices in the Different Scenarios (Real 2007).....	4-17
Figure 4-5.	Historical Oil to Gas Price Ratio .....	4-18
Figure 4-6.	Cost-Risk Profile for the LNG Base Case GTP Plant Construction.....	4-21
Figure 4-7.	Cost-Risk Profile for the LNG Base Case Delta Junction to Valdez Pipeline Construction .....	4-22
Figure 4-8.	Cost-Risk Profile for the LNG Base Case LNG Plant Construction.....	4-24
Figure 4-9.	Execution Cost Probability Distribution for a 4.5 Bcf/d Integrated LNG Project.....	4-26
Figure 4-10.	Tariff Comparison: 4.5 Bcf/d LNG vs. TC Alaska Proposal Base Case .....	4-28

Figure 4-11.	Fuel Loss Comparison: 4.5 Bcf/d LNG vs. TC Alaska Proposal Base Case ....	4-29
Figure 4-12.	Tariff Comparison Including Estimated Incremental Fuel Costs: 4.5 Bcf/d LNG vs. TC Alaska Proposal Base Case .....	4-30
Figure 4-13.	Tariff with Incremental Fuel Costs and Shipping Costs .....	4-31
Figure 4-14.	Tariff Build Up.....	4-33
Figure 4-15.	State Net Present Value Under Different LNG Project Configurations.....	4-34
Figure 4-16.	Margins of LNG Project versus a Pipeline Project.....	4-35
Figure 4-17.	State NPV: Comparing TC Alaska Proposal Base Case and 4.5 Bcf/d LNG Scenario Under Different LNG Contract Price Assumptions.....	4-36
Figure 4-18.	Major North Slope Producers' NPV: Comparing TC Alaska Proposal Base Case and 4.5 Bcf/d LNG Scenario Under Different LNG Contract Price Assumptions.....	4-37
Figure 4-19.	Price vs. Tariff for a 4.5 Bcf/d LNG Project and the 4.5 Bcf/d Proposal Base Case Pipeline Project.....	4-38
Figure 4-20.	Comparative State NPV <sub>5</sub> Distributions Associated with Project Cost Risk.....	4-39
Figure 4-21.	Comparative Producer NPV <sub>10</sub> Distributions Associated with Project Cost Risk .....	4-40
Figure 4-22.	State NPV Under LNG and TC Alaska Pipeline Cases .....	4-42
Figure 5-1:	Impact of Capital Structures on Tariff Rates.....	5-11
Figure 5-2:	Impact of 50/50 debt to equity ratio .....	5-12

## Tables

---

Table 2-1:	Contractor Expertise.....	2-11
Table 3-1.	NETL's Estimate of Economically Recoverable Natural Gas Reserves .....	3-41
Table 4-1.	Liquefaction Plant Cost Ranges .....	4-25
Table 4-2.	Stakeholder NPV for 4.5 LNG Project Under Alternative Scenarios-Base Case LNG .....	4-41

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A:** Public Comments and Responses
- Appendix B:** AGIA Statute
- Appendix C:** AGIA Overview and Completeness Review
- Appendix D:** TransCanada Correspondence Post Completion
- Appendix E:** Consultant Qualifications
- Appendix F:** Technical Team Analysis of the TransCanada AGIA Application
- Appendix G1:** AGIA NVP Report
- Appendix G2:** Assessment of Commercial Likelihood of Success (LOS) pursuant to AGIA Section 49.90.170(c)
- Appendix H:** Analysis and Findings Regarding TransCanada's AGIA Application
- Appendix I:** Potential LNG Production from North Slope Gas
- Appendix J:** Regulatory Issues Report
- Appendix K:** Expected Returns and Approval Economics
- Appendix L:** The Prospect Exploration Economics
- Appendix M:** Outlook for Yet-to-Find North Slope Natural Gas Resources
- Appendix N:** Briefing Paper on Wood Mackenzie Long Term Outlook
- Appendix O:** Summary of Findings for Resource Assessment and Field Development Study of the Thomson Sand, in the Point Thomson
- Appendix P:** Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline - Employment Impacts Modeling
- Appendix Q:** AGIA Training Strategic Plan - A Call to Action
- Appendix R1:** Summary Analysis of TransCanada Contingent Liability Issues
- Appendix R2:** Export License Considerations for LNG Export Terminal
- Appendix R3:** Lack of Open Access for LNG Export Terminal
- Appendix R4:** Competitive Analysis of Producer - Owned Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline
- Appendix R5:** Review of TransCanada's Corporate Integrity and Good Business Ethics as Required by AGIA
- Appendix R6:** Examples of Approved Capital Structure and Return on Equity (ROE) for Major New/Expansion Projects
- Appendix R7:** New Pipeline Projects that have used Negotiated Rates to Allocate the Risk of Potential Cost Overruns
- Appendix R8:** Producer-owned Pipeline
- Appendix S1:** Bennett Jones Report
- Appendix S2:** Comments on TransCanada's Business Ethics
- Appendix S3:** Rolled-in vs. Incremental Tolls
- Appendix T:** Applicable State and Federal Statutes
- Appendix U:** AGIA License