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Lack of intra-state infrastructure that would enable access to the huge US inter-state gas pipeline network

Independent producers, private ownership of mineral rights and too recent anti-flaring regulations

On site power generation and CNG

Stricter regulations, EPA’s growing oversight and increased public pressure

North Dakota (ND) presents the paradoxical case of being at the doorstep of a huge network of gas pipelines, opening access to the vast US market, while flaring at the level of 30% of the Associated Petroleum Gas (APG) produced as of 2014. However, ND is a recent producing state, rural and remote, lacking intra-state gas gathering facilities and pipelines.

This paradox results from a combination of factors: the local oil industry is composed of multiple independent producers that rarely possess the policies nor the financial capacity needed to internalize the cost of gas gathering facilities, particularly in times of low prices; oil and gas subsurface rights are privately owned and neither subject to the ‘delay rental’ clause nor to the power eminent domain when it comes to gathering lines; effective anti-flaring regulations have been lacking until July 2014.

While waiting for the completion of substantive investments in gas gathering and intra-state pipelines, on-site power generation using APG is increasingly becoming an option. It comes as a substitute for costly non-local diesel fuel, particularly with the development of gas turbine technology able to use APG with notable amounts of NGLs. Overall, CNG and power production appear to be the dominant options for APG use in ND.

Recent stricter requirements and penalties on oil producers engaged in flaring, US EPA’s growing oversight on the state level and increased public pressure, are expected to both reduce flaring and increase APG use in the next few years.
Gas Flaring in North Dakota, 2010-16 (expected)

- In 1999, ND flared just 3% of gas produced, while the figure for gas flaring was up to 30% of gas produced as of 2014, or about 10.3 billion cubic feet each month. (Texas flares less than 1% of its shale oil in comparison).

- About $100 million worth of gas is estimated to be flared in ND every month.
The recently exploited Bakken Formation, an oil–wet shale formation of approximately 200,000 square miles in area is situated within the Williston Basin.

The Williston Basin covers parts of ND, South Dakota, Montana, and the Canadian provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

In the American section of the Williston Basin, the Bakken Formation occupies most of western ND and northeastern Montana.

Crude oil accounted for 87.3% of the value of a barrel of Bakken oil in late 2012, while NGLs made up 8.9% and dry gas (methane) accounted for just 3.7%.

Source: UNDEERC, 2013
What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota Industrial Commission (NDIC)</td>
<td>The NDIC is the primary regulator for the state’s oil and gas industry and sets standards regarding gas flaring in the state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Framework for APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NDIC regulation on gas flaring and gas capture - Section 38-08-06.4 of the North Dakota Century Code (as of August, 2013, new regulations take effect as of July, 2014) | • ND law permits limited amounts of gas flaring in the first year after an oil well enters production if particular oil production limits are adhered to.  
• According to the law, after the one year period stipulated above, flaring of gas must stop and the well must be:  
  • “capped,  
  • connected to a gas gathering line,  
  • equipped with an electrical generator that consumes at least 75% of gas from the well  
  • equipped with a system that takes at least 75% of gas and NGL volume from well for beneficial consumption by means of compression to liquid use for fuel, transport to a processing facility, production of chemicals or fertilizers conversion to liquid fuels, separating and collecting over 50% of the propane and heavier hydrocarbons; or  
  • equipped with other value added process as approved by the industrial commission which reduce the volume or intensity of the flare by more than 60%” (N.D. CENT. CODE § 38-08-06.4 (2013)).  
• If the well is operating while breaking any of the above stipulations, the producer must pay royalties to royalty owners equal the value of the flared gas and are required to pay a gross production tax on the flared gas at a preset rate  
• If any of the above-mentioned methods to capture the gas is demonstrated as being economically infeasible, NDIC may grant an exemption. |
What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Framework for APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Order 24665, released on July 1, 2014. | • The order stipulates that as of October 1, 2014, all Bakken and Three Forks oil and gas wells must capture at least 74% of produced gas. Failing this, the producers will be subject to production restrictions. By January 1, 2015, this capture percentage rises to 77%; by 2016, to 85%; and by 2020 to 90.
• The order also addresses the flowback period that was not addressed by the NDIC rules:
  • Producers are given 90 days post first production to produce at maximum efficient rate (the volume of the first 14 days are not counted as this is where the bulk of the fracturing liquid is removed).
  • After the first 14 days, the producers must use the next 76 days to assess how to connect the well to a gathering facility or to utilize remote capture processes to meet the gas capture volume. Failing this, the producer will be subject to production reduction (“capturing 60% of gas through remote capture results in a production allowable of up to 200 barrels a day. Failing to employ gas capture technology results in a restriction of 100 barrels a day until remedied” (Ehrman, 2015).) |
### What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Framework for APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Siting and eminent domain federal rules for gas pipelines. | • In the 1930’s – 1940’s, Congress creates nationwide siting and eminent domain authority for natural gas pipelines in order to preempt state barriers to infrastructure build-up.  
• The interstate natural gas pipelines require federal approval in the US. Every new or modified pipeline requires a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Gathering lines, even if they are inter-state and intrastate distribution pipelines are outside of FERC’s jurisdiction.  
• To accelerate permitting procedures, “FERC instituted pre-filing and EPAct 2005 made FERC the lead agency responsible for coordinating federal agency authorizations and compliance with National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") during pipeline certificate application reviews.” (Klass et al., 2014)  
• FERC is said to have facilitated a significant build-out of new pipeline infrastructure to move new sources of shale gas on the East Coast and in Texas and efforts still continue to expedite the process for review and approval of interstate gas pipelines in areas of major new gas production.  
• This abundance of infrastructure (whose cost is not borne by the operator necessarily) has increased competition and has decreased gas prices. While low gas prices act as a dis-incentive in areas rich in oil and wet gas where infrastructure to move oil and NGLs is prioritized, the abundance of infrastructure makes it much easier to commercially develop and transport natural gas discoveries in the U.S.. |
What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Framework for APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EPA’s proposed rules on August 18, 2015 to cut methane and VOC emissions from the oil and natural gas industry and clarify permitting requirements | • The EPA announced changes to the new source performance standard (NSPS) - establishing minimum performance standards for new or modified sources of air pollution – and draft amendments to the control techniques guidelines (CTGs) (that help achieve the NSPS) for the oil and natural gas industry. The goal is to further reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) and methane emissions by 40–45% from 2012 levels by 2025. The proposed measures would add emission limits for any new, modified, and reconstructed sources [leaks, compressors, completions and pneumatic devices]. EPA also issued amended CTGs for states that have failed to achieve mandatory limits on VOC emissions. States must consider these CTGs when evaluating their individual regulatory programs and for enforcement actions.  
• Finally, states are free to adopt and expand their own VOC and methane reduction program under EPA’s new NSPS.  
• The proposed rules are under comments. |
What is the legal and fiscal framework in place to stop flaring and incentivize APG use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Fiscal Framework for APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>Taxes and Royalties</td>
<td>Royalty payments and state taxes on flared gas for producers that fail to get a written exemption for future flaring from the NDIC after the first year of oil production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The special context of North Dakota’s regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Legal framework</th>
<th>Fiscal framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ND’s regulations arose from a specific collaboration between the NDIC and the industry association, the North Dakota Petroleum Council (the “Council”).</td>
<td>• In a desire to understand what would be achievable and realistic regulations, the NDIC first only provided the Petroleum Council with a set of flaring goals. In turn, the Council consulted with its membership on each goal in order to review possible unintended consequences and analyze best solutions, eliminating those that were impractical. Most importantly, the Council found that flaring was principally due to the lack of processing capacity in ND. In addition, the council proposed making the gas capture plans part of the drilling permit process whereby producers would be responsible for proving to the NDIC how they planned on capturing the APG in order to obtain the permit. To show the good faith of the producers, the council also proposed an affidavit requirement showing that the gas capture plan has been provided to a listed group of midstream gathering companies in the area. The Council also proposed a timeline of implementation and penalties for non-compliance under the form of production curtailment (which would act as an incentive to comply) (Ehrman, 2015).</td>
<td>• This cooperative industry-regulatory relationship has been subject to criticism for fear of “regulatory capture.” Some analysts have concluded that the interest of the Council in this cooperation stems from the fact that the industry feared the EPA’s federal oversight over oil wells and wanted to pre-empt it, that the industry is commercially interested in capturing this wasted gas, that many of the Council’s members voluntarily already implemented some kind of anti-flaring technology (Ehrman, 2015). Lastly, 10 mineral rights holders brought lawsuits against 10 oil producers in North Dakota in October 2013; which has urged producers to react.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legal obstacles to APG use in the Bakken Formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal obstacles to APG use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Legal Obstacles            | • Private property rights in the state mean that companies must engage in short term lease agreements with landowners or mineral rights owners to drill for oil. This short time horizon leading companies to drill and fracture oil wells before natural gas gathering lines are made available has been cited by local stakeholders as a reason for high incidence of flaring in ND. However in other US States, leases might include “delay rental” clauses to enable the producer to keep and extend the lease if a well is not drilled on time or delayed in particular because of a pipeline.  
  • Additionally, the NDIC has cited difficulty attaining permission from landowners for pipeline connection activities which can significantly slow down the process of gas gathering line installation as well. Unlike in other US states, in ND the power of eminent domain has not been granted to gathering lines. To reduce the impact on landowners, the energy policy commission announced plans to create an energy corridor along Allete’s existing 465-mile electric transmission right-of-way.  
  • In an attempt to reduce flaring, the participation of the producers of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation needs to be tackled. The Reservation is controlled by the Tribes and is difficult to regulate given the uncertainty as to who has jurisdiction over mineral development: ‘The composition of land on the reservation is made up of “a variety of differing legal tenures (e.g., tribally-owned lands, federally-owned lands, allottee-owned lands, and non-Indian-fee-owned lands)”’ (Ehrman 2015). The Tribes issued anti-flaring rules that conflict with the NDIC’s rules and what prevails remains unclear. Until 2008, the Tribes agreed to give jurisdiction over oil wells to the State of ND but they then decided that ‘oil and gas wells are “subject to applicable federal, tribal, and state regulatory provisions for the life of the well”’ (Ehrman 2015). |
### Technical Obstacles to APG Use in the Bakken Formation

**Agencies**

- **ND lacks pipeline and processing infrastructure.** Unlike states such as Texas and Oklahoma, that have a long history of petroleum exploitation that created a comprehensive networks of pipelines, processing facilities, and marketing hubs, ND’s recent history in petroleum production indicates that it has a limited transportation and processing infrastructure in place.

- **The North Dakota Pipeline Authority provides additional factors contributing to the state’s high flaring rates:** “the size of the Bakken oil field dwarfs the state’s existing natural gas gathering infrastructure; North Dakota itself is “rural and remote” with winter conditions that limit the construction season; and the industry does not construct gathering pipelines until after producers complete and test wells to determine how much oil and gas the well will produce” (Klass et al., 2014). Those factors came in addition to the legal issues highlighted before.

- **Midstream companies are however attracted to the Bakken because of the NGLs.** But given the scarcity of gathering and processing facilities, the mid-stream companies have the upper hand in the negotiation in the Bakken. To avoid the imposition of exorbitant fees and terms by midstream companies, producers have to partner and amass volumes of oil to have more balanced negotiations with midstream companies.

- **In 2014, 2 midstream companies agreed to increase gathering capacity on Aux Sable Midstream’s pipeline network.** A ND company announced a plan to build a 375-mile natural gas pipeline connecting northwestern ND with upper Midwestern commercial and residential markets provided that it receives sufficient capacity commitments from producers.

- **Since existing pipeline capacity is scarce, producers have limited choices if they want to comply with the regulations:** internalize the cost of gathering and processing facilities and build their own by partnering together and with midstream companies despite the current downturn in prices, practice “green completion processes” that separate and recover the gas to prevent emission, or invest in research to investigate gas capture solutions and localized APG use.
What are some current APG use projects that could serve as blueprints for future projects?

Summary of Evaluated Technologies with Qualitative Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Gas Use Range, Mcfd</th>
<th>NGL Removal Requirement</th>
<th>Scalability to Resource</th>
<th>Ease of Mobility</th>
<th>Likelihood of Deployment at Small Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power – Grid Support</td>
<td>1000–1800</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Very scalable</td>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power – Local Load</td>
<td>300–600</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Very scalable</td>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNG</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Scalable</td>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>1,000,000*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not scalable</td>
<td>Not mobile</td>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Scalable</td>
<td>Not easy</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas-to-Liquids</td>
<td>1,000,000*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Scalable</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Typical commercial-scale plant.

Source: EERC, 2013

The University of North Dakota’s Energy & Environmental Research Center (“EERC”) studied the potential for on site and local power generation, CNG, and Gas to liquids APG use projects in the Bakken oil fields. Power generation seems the most likely option. It also answered a surge in demand:

- Increasing demand for power in the Williston Basin region has generated significant interest in APG for, in particular, on-site power generation for drilling and other shale oil production processes in the region. One of two electric utilities serving the area, the Basin Electric Power Cooperative (BEPC), forecasted a load increase from 600 MW to 1900 MW between 2010 and 2025.
On site power generation is becoming an option with the development of technology such as the ‘Lean, Premixed, Prevaporized (LPP) combustion technology’ (Roby et al., 2014), that is able to convert liquid fuels into a substitute for natural gas. Other technologies include steam turbines and microturbines. This is especially important for Bakken flare gas which is rich in NGLs, a fact which was viewed to make the APG “unsuitable” as a fuel for traditional natural gas fired turbines for on site power generation. The EERC also analyzed how flared gas could be used in diesel generators powering remote drilling rigs. They showed ‘that 1.8 billion cubic feet of gas “could be used annually to power 200 drilling rigs in North Dakota, saving over $72 million in fuel cost”’ (Ehrman, 2015).

A sample summary of power generation scenarios and costs are provided from the EERC above.
**APG use case study: Statoil CNG project**

**Project Participants:**
- Statoil North America Inc.

**Project Description and Motivation:**
- As of June, 2014, Statoil is testing out a “mobile system” to transform APG to CNG at the well site (OGJ, 2014).
- Using the locally sourced CNG is expected to replace more costly diesel that is usually transported by truck, pipeline or rail from out of state.
- Construction of the refinery is reported to be about 60% complete.

**Project Location:**
- The project is located in Stark County near Dickinson in ND.

**Associated Gas Use:**
- The mobile system converts APG into CNG for in house use by Statoil. It should prevent 20% of the flaring that is currently occurring.

**Project Technology:**
- The system, known as the Last Mile Fueling Solution, employs a device the size of a standard 8 by 20 ft shipping container to compress the APG.
APG use case study: Vortex system to gather NGLs

- **Project Participants:**
  - Bismarck-based Carbontec Industries’ subsidiary: Bakken Frontier

- **Project Description and Motivation:**
  - Bakken Frontier is introducing the Vortex system to oil companies: The system separates out the liquids. The liquids are gathered by the system and shipped to a processing plant to be separated, processed and sold.
  - Vortex is already in use in Texas and other oil producing areas, with 1,400 systems already installed.
  - The system is said to be particularly appropriate for remote oil wells that are too far from the main natural gas pipeline: In those cases, the Vortex becomes the only tool to gather the liquids from those sites.
  - According to Bakken Frontier, oil companies likely will receive 80 cents to $1 per gallon of liquids, making US$670,000, minus freight, lease and royalty payments.

- **Associated Gas Use:**
  - The system gathers the NGLs of the APG, reducing the amount of energy flared by about 40%.

- **Project Technology:**
  - Vortex works by using the pressure of the natural gas to spin the liquids from the methane.
Annex: Other states’ legislation against flaring

- **Indiana**
  - “In the 1890s, Indiana enacted a statute prohibiting the release of natural gas from oil wells for longer than two days after the well was drilled. (...) When the state sought to enjoin Ohio Oil Company from violating the statute and wasting gas, Ohio Oil argued that the statute provided only for damages as a remedy, not an injunction. The Indiana Supreme Court disagreed and held that despite the limited remedies in the statute, common law doctrines of waste and nuisance allowed the state to enjoin the release and waste of such an important natural resource” (Klass et al., 2014).

- **Texas**
  - 1919: state legislature of Texas passed a comprehensive conservation law requiring the conservation of oil and gas, prohibiting waste and granting extensive regulatory and enforcement powers to the railroad commission (RRC).
  - 1925: Texas legislature passed a law permitting the flaring of associated or casing head gas from oil wells in Texas.
  - 1947: RRC issued an order shutting in all 615 oil wells in Seeligson Field in South Texas until flaring of casing head gas was eliminated and measures were taken to utilize the gas. Operator filed suits challenging the orders. The Texas Supreme Court upheld the RRC orders.
  - RRC further issued orders to shutdown 17 fields for gas flaring, and was again challenged. Texas supreme court once again upheld the RRC’s orders.
  - 1949: RRC won the battle: no flaring was possible without valid permit.
  - 1967: Texas Air Control Board adopted its first air quality regulations in line with the recently voted Clean Air Act.
  - 1969: EPA was created by a presidential executive order and Texas took over most of the air monitoring responsibilities from the federal government.

- **Alaska**
  - In 1971, the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (“AOGCC”) ordered offshore oil platforms operating in Cook Inlet to limit the burning of APG to what was needed for safety purposes, and to otherwise bring the gas to market or reinject it.
  - “Mobil Oil challenged the AOGCC’s regulations in court, but the Alaska Superior Court found the Commission had acted within its authority to prevent waste” (Klass et al., 2014).


North Dakota Industrial Commission, Department of Mineral Resources. (2009, August). Oil and Gas rulebook.


EPA Website: [http://www.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/actions.html](http://www.epa.gov/airquality/oilandgas/actions.html).