

ATTACHMENT
ENGINEERING ANALYSIS FOR CONTROL TECHNOLOGY
BRUNSWICK CELLULOSE, INC.
JUNE 2007

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY | 1 |
| 2.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS FOR NO. 4 MULTI-FUEL BOILER (ID F1) | 2 |
| 2.1 SOURCE DESCRIPTION | 2 |
| 2.2 TECHNOLOGY REVIEW | 3 |
| 3.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS FOR NO. 6 RECOVERY BOILER (ID M24) | 15 |
| 3.1 SOURCE DESCRIPTION | 15 |
| 3.2 TECHNOLOGY REVIEW | 16 |
| 4.0 SUMMARY OF REASONABLE MEASURES FOR BRUNSWICK MILL | 21 |
| APPENDIX | 22 |

1.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) has requested an analysis using four factors to determine potential emission reductions that are reasonable for selected emission units at the Brunswick Mill. The fourth factor, “remaining useful life”, indicates that a detailed engineering analysis is required if the expected remaining useful life is beyond the year 2018. The Mill believes that the emission units of interest will continue operating beyond 2018. Thus, GP has prepared this engineering analysis.

The control technology engineering analysis in this application follows the “top-down” approach. The “top-down” approach starts with the most stringent control technology alternative that has been applied to same or similar sources and provides a basis for determining if such an alternative is “reasonable”. Following are the basic steps of a “top-down” analysis:

- 1) Identify all control technologies
 - a) All typically in use
 - b) Determined as BACT and listed in USEPA *RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse*
 - c) In use at Georgia-Pacific Corporation facilities
- 2) Eliminate technically or economically infeasible options
- 3) Rank remaining control technologies by control effectiveness
- 4) Evaluate most effective controls and document results (including non-air quality effects)
- 5) Identify reasonable measures

GP performed the 5 steps for each visibility-affecting pollutant individually. Georgia EPD has determined that sulfur dioxide (SO₂) is the only relevant pollutant.

The following sections provide a detailed engineering analysis for the No. 4 Power Boiler and No. 6 Recovery Boiler.

2.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS FOR NO. 4 MULTI-FUEL BOILER (ID F1)

2.1 SOURCE DESCRIPTION

The Mill operates No. 4 Power Boiler to generate supplemental steam for the facility. Along with other boilers, No. 4 Power Boiler work together with other steam sources to supply a mill-wide common header of steam. The No. 4 Power Boiler was constructed in 1961 as a Combustion Engineering combination boiler rated at 400,000 lbs./hr. when firing bark and other fuel, or at 525,000 lbs./hr., when on oil or gas only, all at 1275 psi and 825°. The boiler is equipped to burn natural gas. The boiler was rebuilt in December 2005 to become an over-fire air designed boiler. Bark comes from the Atlas bin in the woodyard, through a metering and blowing system. The bark drops from the cyclone through a distributor into the furnace. The bark burns partially in suspension and partially on the traveling grate. Ash dropping through the grate and from other sources is sluiced to an ash settling pond in the waste treatment area. The gases pass from the boiler to mechanical collectors where the ash is eventually deposited into the sluicing system.

Power Boiler 4 operates independently and exhausts to the atmosphere through a dedicated single stack via a two-chamber electrostatic precipitator (ESP). Table 1 presents the operating and design information for No. 4 Power Boiler.

Table 1. Summary of Design and Existing Pollution Control Parameters, Brunswick Cellulose

| Parameter | Boiler 4 |
|--|--|
| Manufacturer | Combustion Engineering |
| Year Manufactured | 1961 with major rebuild 2005 |
| Design | 400,000 lbs to 525,000 lbs steam/hr |
| MMBtu/hr | 800 |
| Fuels | Woodwaste/Bark, oil, gas, tire derived fuel, wastewater treatment sludge |
| <u>Existing Controls</u> | |
| SO ₂ | None |
| NO _x | Good Combustion |
| PM | ESP |
| Current SO ₂ Emission Limit | 2002 TPY |

The Boiler is currently in compliance with the Boiler MACT PM standard, well ahead of the compliance date of September 13, 2007.

2.2 TECHNOLOGY REVIEW

Step 1a-Identification of Control Technologies-Typical Technologies in Use in the United States

Emission control equipment that may be considered to control sulfur dioxide emissions from boilers includes wet and dry scrubbers and flue gas desulfurization techniques such as lime injection. The use of clean fuels can also be considered as an additional alternative to add-on controls.

Step 1b-Identification of Control Technologies-Review of RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse (RBLC)

Searches of the RBLC were conducted to identify control technologies for the control of SO₂ emissions from combination boilers. The specific category searched was

- External Combustion- -11

The clearinghouse listed the use of clean fuels, wet and dry scrubbers and flue gas desulfurization techniques such as duct sorbent injection as the control technologies.

Step 1c-Identification of Control Technologies-Review of Technologies in Use at Georgia-Pacific Corporation Facilities

Georgia-Pacific operates numerous combination boilers and bark boilers within the US. SO₂ control technologies include wet scrubbing, dry scrubbing, lime injection, and the use of clean fuels.

Step 2-Technical Feasibility Analysis-Eliminate Technically Infeasible Options

All of the technology options are technically feasible. The most significant site-specific issue is the congested nature of the operating area. The Boiler location is very close to the Turtle River which limits the possible locations for installing new equipment for various scenarios.

Step 3 – Ranking the Technically Feasible Alternatives to Establish a Control Hierarchy

The ranking of the technologies and removal rates are:

1. Wet scrubbing with caustic at approximately 95%+
2. Dry scrubbing with limestone injection at greater than 90%
3. In duct sorbent injection at approximately 60-70%
4. Cleaner fuels at approximately 30% to 95%
5. Wet Scrubbing with water alone at approximately 30%.

Step 4-Control Effectiveness Evaluation

Wet Scrubbers

When first considering only wet scrubbing with caustic or dry scrubbing, the analysis only needs to consider the lower cost of the two. GP has worked closely with one scrubber supplier, Turbosonic, to determine high SO₂ removal options for use with wet scrubbers for similar boilers within Georgia-Pacific.

Detailed Design Information Applied in Cost Estimates

The Spray Tower Scrubber, as estimated, reduces the amount of SO₂ from the flue gas stream by passing the gas through a liquid that contains alkali. The flue gas enters radially at the bottom of the unit flowing vertically upward through the vessel, and counter-current to an alkali solution. The clean (scrubbed) flue gas is passed through a chevron-type mist eliminator for removal of large water droplets prior to exiting through the top of the scrubber vessel. The mist eliminator is equipped with an internal water wash header that is activated intermittently to wash away potential formations of reaction salts. The alkali solution, by way of contacting the flue gas surface, promotes the absorption of the acid gas and the reduction of SO₂ from the gas stream. The alkali solution used for this study is dilute caustic. The caustic solution is introduced into the top of the vessel by way of four (4) zoned headers that contain multiple spray nozzles per header. These nozzles are arranged to ensure that the flue gas stream is in complete contact with the downward flowing solution. The solution drains to the bottom of the absorber vessel's reservoir where it is recycled back to the spray headers by pumps. The absorber vessel and all of its associated parts are constructed of 316L stainless steel.

A 50% Caustic solution is used as the scrubbing medium to achieve the required absorption of SO₂. The 50% Caustic is added to the Scrubber's top spray header allowing the exiting flue gas to see the highest pH. The system maintains the appropriate concentration of dissolved solids in the recycle solution by blowing down some of the liquid based on reservoir conductivity. The 50% Caustic is conveyed to the scrubber's upper header by a metering pump initiated by a pH analyzer loop located in the recycle reservoir. In order to account for the evaporation that occurs during the scrubbing cycle, makeup water is provided to the recycle reservoir based on a level control loop located in the recycle reservoir.

The clean flue gas exits the Scrubber and enters a new 12'-3" diameter 316L stainless steel Stack mounted on top of the new Spray Tower Scrubber outlet. The Stack will terminate at an elevation of 199 feet above grade. Aircraft warning lights and a warning light maintenance platform are not expected. The stack is sized for a flue gas velocity of approximately 35 ft/sec. The lower velocity in the

Stack is critical to prevent water carry over from Stack sidewalls (as would occur when operating at higher velocities) or what is referred to as “raining” from the Stack exit. Stainless steel material was chosen to allow for good resistance to acid attack that is possibly present in the saturated flue gas. Placement of the stack on top of the Scrubber is critical to the overall design due to the fact that any water formation on the Stack wall will drain back to the Scrubber located below. Keeping the Stack wet from bottom to top is also a benefit for prevention of material acid attack based on the fact that acid attack occurs mainly in the wet/dry interface in a Stack.

The Scrubber, ID Fan and Stack location would be determined at a future date. This analysis assumes the footprint will be located within 500 feet of the boiler building. A new steel frame structure will support the Scrubber and Stack. An access stairway is included in the factored estimate. The Spray Tower Scrubber has a 30' by 27' footprint and the Scrubber absorber vessel is 22' in diameter and stands approximately 61' tall. The bottom of the absorber is raised above grade to allow for access to auxiliary equipment located underneath at grade and to raise the scrubber above the site flood plain elevation. The steel structure will terminate at the Stack testing platform level. The scrubber is completely field welded in place due to its large size. New 10' x 10' ductwork is added to transfer flue gas from the existing western most roof mounted ESP chamber outlet to a new ID fan inlet and from the ID Fan outlet to the Spray Tower Scrubber's inlet. Installation of the Spray Tower Scrubber unit will involve modifying the existing ESP chamber outlet from an upward outlet to a horizontal outlet to facilitate better flue gas flow to the new scrubber system. Money is included in the estimate to study the effect of reconfiguring the ESP outlet. Ductwork support steel is also included in the factored estimate. Demolition of the existing ESP chamber's outlet plenum, stub stack and testing platform are included in the factored estimate. The existing ID Fan and associated drive will also be demolished and a new piece of ductwork will be installed in its place.

In order to account for the increased pressure drop created by the additional ductwork (4" w.c. drop through ductwork) and the Spray Tower Scrubber (3" w.c. drop through Scrubber), a new ID fan will be included. The ID Fan will be sized to overcome all of the pre-existing equipment and ductwork pressure drops and the additional 7" w.c. loss through the Spray Tower Scrubber and the new ductwork. A new variable speed drive will be installed on the fan. The incremental cost of the fan horsepower required for the additional Scrubber and associated ductwork pressure drop is included in the operating cost for the Spray Tower Scrubber. The existing Precipitator will now be under negative draft. The existing Precipitator will have to be evaluated for potential leaks. Money is included in the estimate as an allowance to evaluate and tighten-up the boiler systems to prevent air infiltration.

The 50% Caustic will be pumped from a new 50% Caustic Tank located near the new scrubber area. The tank will be enclosed in a new dike. The tank has multiple in-tank electric heaters installed to maintain appropriate caustic temperature. Two (2) new Caustic Metering Pumps will take suction from the new tank. One (1) Metering Pump will operate at a time and furnish makeup caustic to the new Spray Tower Scrubber's top spray header.

Five (5) new Scrubber Recycle Pumps will be furnished. Four (4) pumps will operate at a time with one (1) on standby. Each pump will be dedicated to a single Scrubber spray header. As the Boiler is turned down or fuel sulfur content is lowered, pumps and their associated spray header can be shutdown to conserve horsepower. No new Make-up Water Booster Pumps are required. The mill water in the new scrubber area is available with pressure in excess of 100 psig. Mill water is used for Scrubber make-up due to evaporation during operation and for supply of water to the mist eliminator water wash header.

A new motor control center (MCC) Room and a new Rack Room was also included in the factored estimate in order to provide an area to house the electrical equipment for the new ID Fan drives and the new pump drives. The MCC Room and the Rack Room are double-decked and raised a minimum of 18 feet above the existing flood plain elevation. A new 13,800 volt/480 volt transformer is also included in the estimate.

The analysis scaled the direct equipment costs from the 190,000 acfm units to the boiler-specific sizes using the 6/10th rule for estimating costs for both boiler-specific applications. To estimate total cost of installation, GP applied the same site-specific installation percentage of total job to the preferred arrangement. The following table calculates the total cost of installation by applying one case of scrubber equipment and the installation factors. As the table indicates, the independent scrubber arrangement provides lower costs.

Table 2. Estimated Total Capital Investment for Caustic Scrubber

| Parameter | Value |
|---|------------|
| Base Engineering Case (Alternate Mill) | |
| Flow Rate (acfm) | 190,000 |
| Total Direct Costs (\$) | 10,820,645 |
| Installation Costs (\$) | 8,709,355 |
| % Installation of Direct Costs | 80.5% |
| Total Capital Investment (\$) | 19,530,000 |
| Brunswick Cellulose Case | |
| Flow Rate (acfm) | 420,000 |
| Total Direct Costs (\$) - Scaled | 9,673,036 |
| % Installation of TCI cost (used default) | 80.5% |
| Installation Costs (\$) | 7,785,664 |
| Total Capital Investment (\$) | 17,458,701 |

Table 2 has errors - revised 10/20/07

17,458,701? these don't give

Example:

Boiler No 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Direct Cost for 420,000 acfm} &= (420,000 \text{ acfm} / 190,000 \text{ acfm})^{0.6} \times (\text{Direct Cost for 190,000 acfm}) \\ &= (420,000 / 190,000)^{0.6} \times \$10,820,645 = \$17,420,000 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Total Capital Investment} = \text{Direct Cost} + \text{Installation Cost}$$

Tables 3 and 4 present the unit costs and total annual operating costs, respectively.

Table 3. Site-Specific Unit Costs for Operating Cost Calculations, Brunswick Cellulose

| Parameter | Value |
|--|--------|
| Direct Operating Costs | |
| Operating factor (hr/yr): | 8760 |
| Operating labor rate (\$/hr): | 19 |
| Maintenance labor rate (\$/hr): | 20.90 |
| Operating labor factor (hr/sh): | 0.5 |
| Maintenance labor factor (hr/sh): | 0.5 |
| Electricity price(\$/kWhr): | 0.033 |
| Caustic price (\$/ton): | 468 |
| Solvent (water) price (\$/1000 gal): | 0.27 |
| Wastewater treatment cost (\$/1000 gal): | 0.88 |
| Indirect Operating Costs | |
| Overhead rate (fraction): | 0.6 |
| Annual interest rate (fraction): | 0.07 |
| Control system life (years): | 20 |
| Capital recovery factor (system): | 0.0944 |
| Taxes, insurance, admin. factor: | 0.04 |
| Total Indirect Cost Multiplier | 0.134 |

reasonable?

Table 4. Calculation of Total Annual Costs for Wet Scrubbers, Brunswick Cellulose

| Parameter | Boiler 4 | |
|------------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | Throughput | Annual \$ |
| Operating Labor | 547.5 hr | 10,403 |
| Maintenance labor | 547.5 hr | 11,443 |
| Electricity : pumps | | 82,860 |
| Electricity :NaOH metering | | 352 |
| Electricity :Tank Heaters | | 43,113 |
| Cost for Fan Pressure Losses | | 85,830 |
| Caustic Use | 5,890 tons | 2,759,074 |
| Water Use | 97,863 kgal | 26,423 |
| Water Treatment | 34,521 kgal | 30,379 |
| Total Indirect Costs (\$) | | <u>2,333,756</u> |
| Total Annual Costs (\$/yr) | | 5,384,200 |

4,225,000
7,274,880
see 10/20/07
revision

The analysis computed the cost effectiveness by dividing the total annual costs into the actual SO₂ uncontrolled emission rates for 2002 multiplied by the design removal rate.

This equates to: $\$5,384,200 / (1642 \text{ tons} \times 95\%) = 3,451 \text{ \$/ton}$

As the boiler is a multi-fuel boiler, the actual uncontrolled emissions reflect the fuel selection. Actual reported emissions to EPD reflect the actual fuels used. While caustic usage would be lower for fuels other than fuel oil, the installed cost would be the same. Thus, to operating with continuous control, the denominator (uncontrolled tons) would be less resulting in a higher value for cost effectiveness.

These high cost effectiveness values reflect a control system designed for 95% removal over an entire year, including peak concentrations.

GP believes that adding a wet control system such as a scrubber may significantly impact the dissolved solid load to the Mill's wastewater treatment system. A non-air quality environmental effect of the wet scrubber will be the increase in total dissolved solids (*e.g.*, sodium salts) to the Turtle River. At this time, GP has not completed a refined engineering analysis or developed a possible chemical profile of blowdown from a wet scrubber. These impacts must be addressed as part of the next phase of engineering design.

Dry Scrubbing

GP commissioned Jacobs Engineering to conduct a detailed engineering cost estimate to install a dry scrubbing system, capable of over 95% at two facilities: Port Hudson, Louisiana and Rincon, Georgia. The Port Hudson equipment was fully installed in 2007 while the Rincon facility estimate was limited to only +/- 30%. The results of the Rincon analysis indicated that the total installed cost and cost effectiveness values were significantly higher than wet scrubbing. The following table summarizes the side-by-side comparison of a multi-fuel boiler rated at approximately 165,000 acfm and 1400 tons SO₂ "pre-control" emissions.

The Port Hudson equipment design accommodated approximately 441,000 acfm and is comparable in size to the Brunswick No. 4 Power Boiler. The total installed cost of the Port Hudson equipment (2006 \$) is \$75MM.

GP believes that the dry scrubbing and wet scrubbing options are comparable in removal efficiency. However, as the costs for dry scrubbing are higher than wet scrubbing, this analysis did not further determine site-specific cost values.

Dry Sorbent Injection

DSI is a post-process SO₂ control system. O'Brien and Gere furnish a DSI system using Trona, as a dry powder, pneumatically injected into the Boiler's outlet ductwork. The Trona is injected into the hot ductwork region where the flue gas temperature is approximately 700°F. O'Brien & Gere's experience shows that this flue gas temperature presents the best environment for SO₂ control for this type of Power Boiler. Trona is a naturally occurring mineral that is chemically known as sodium sesquicarbonate or hydrated sodium bicarbonate (Na₃HCO₃CO₃•2H₂O). Trona in-duct injection systems may also enhance the capture of mercury (Hg), nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and hydrogen chlorides (HCl) in the flue gas stream. The exact amount of Hg and HCl capture is not quantified by O'Brien and Gere. O'Brien & Gere stated the following in their budgetary quote for a similar GP Boilers at another facility:

“Application specific variables including, but not limited to: fuel blend, flue gas temperature, contaminant loading, duct configuration, Trona residence time, and back-end control device performance all influence Trona duct injection performance.”

O'Brien & Gere highly recommends performance of a site-specific duct injection demonstration prior to implementation of a full-scale system design / installation.” The cost of this test and study are included in the capital estimate.

Though technically feasible, the Mill does have some concern with this option. First, the use of these systems is very limited. We found one facility in Colorado actively using a trona based DSI system. Second, the available suppliers of trona are very limited. In fact, we only learned of only one US based location for mining trona in Sweetwater County, Wyoming. Use of trona would be more attractive in a water-scarce region and located much closer to the trona supply. It would place the Mill's operations at risk to select a technology with just one supply location so far away and dependent on rail transportation. Third, the literature reports that trona-based DSI has the potential to cause a brownish or orange plume due to a conversion of nitrogen oxide to nitrogen dioxide in the flue gas. When we asked the vendors of DSI technology about this phenomenon, they could not guarantee that under all conditions we would not experience the brownish plume. Given the applicable opacity limits, this would be a major factor against selection of this technology.

Installation of this system includes the addition of a new Trona Storage Silo that has a capacity to store seven (7) days of sorbent. Normally, thirty (30) - to - forty (40) micron sized Trona is stored in the silo, as delivered. A Bin Vent Filter (pulsed jet baghouse type) is installed on the roof of the Silo to capture

dust during truck unloading into the Silo. An access and platform system is installed to maintain this installed equipment. The required isolation gate(s), hopper(s), and feeder(s) are furnished along with an installed in-line Mill to re-size the Trona to fifteen (15) microns for injection purposes. A blower system pneumatically conveys the Trona in a dry form directly to the Boiler's outlet duct by way of a pneumatic piping system. Installation of the Silo and associated auxiliary equipment will be in the area of the powerhouse. An injection nozzle is installed in the hot area of the flue gas ductwork to receive and distribute the powdered Trona into the gas stream.

O'Brien and Gere states that approximately two-thirds of the Trona that is injected into the ductwork system will be captured by the particulate matter control system. The remaining one-third passes through the ductwork and out of the stack in a gaseous state. O'Brien and Gere have not determined if the existing ESP can handle the increased solids loading with no change in performance. No money was included in this capital estimate to modify the ESP to accept the Trona injection from the boiler.

$$(420,000 \text{ acfm for Power Boiler 4}) / (386,000 \text{ acfm for base estimate})^{0.6} \times \text{Total Installed Cost of } \$12,520,000 \text{ for base estimate} = 1.05 \times \$12,520,000 = \$13,170,000$$

The operating costs are Trona usage, operating labor and maintenance. For Power Boiler 4, the uncontrolled baseline emission rate is 1642 tpy (reported in 2002). The removal efficiency of 70% would remove 1150 tpy.

5.7 x 750 x 2000
powd \$150 \$150/x 450 tons
4500 tons of 67,000

The estimated Trona usage is 5.7 pound of Trona per pound of SO₂. The estimated cost for Trona delivered is \$150 per ton. Thus the Trona usage annual cost is approximately \$150/ton Trona x 5.7 ton Trona/ton SO₂ x 1642 ton SO₂ = \$1.40MM.

750 *0.7 MM/yr*

The operating labor cost is estimated to be 2 man-hours per shift x 3 shifts per day x 365 days per year and a rate of \$16/ hour. This operating cost is = 2 x 3 x 365 x 16 = \$35,000.

The annual maintenance cost is estimated at 1.5% of TIC.

Thus the total direct operating cost is: \$1.40MM + \$35,000 + 1.5% x \$13,170,000 = \$1.63 MM/yr.

The other indirect annual operating costs are capital recovery cost ($0.0944 \times \text{TIC}$), administrative, property tax and insurance ($2.5\% \times \text{TIC}$), or equal to $0.1194 \times \text{TIC}$. The annual indirect cost is thus:
Annual Indirect costs = $0.1194 \times \$13,170,000 = \1.57 MM/yr .

Total Annual costs = $\$1.63 \text{ MM} + 1.57 \text{ MM} = \3.2 MM/yr

The cost effectiveness is thus $\$3.2 \text{ MM/yr} / 1150 \text{ tpy removed} = \$2,790 / \text{ton SO}_2 \text{ removed}$.

GP believes that this is not economically feasible for such an undemonstrated technology.

Clean Fuels

As mentioned above, Power Boiler 4 combusts several fuels and only the residual fuel oil has a significant quantity of sulfur. The actual annual use of oil reflected steam demands and ability to burn cheaper fuels, especially woodwaste. In 1998 and 2002, the annual usage rates were approximately 11.1 MMgal and 6.5 MMgal, respectively. Presently, the Mill is undergoing several changes on this emissions unit to increase its ability to continuously burn design rates of bark and woodwaste. After these changes, the fuel oil usage will be lower than in past years.

Fuel oil with lower sulfur concentration is available from our present supplier. Our supplier has indicated that the #6 oil is available in 1.25%, 1.0%, and 0.70% S concentration. The annual cost for using a cleaner fuel includes direct costs (marginal price difference in oil cost) and indirect costs.

per year?
The existing fuel oil storage system includes one large tank that serves a common distribution system for Power Boiler 4, Recovery Boiler 6 and the Lime Kiln. The total throughput of the tank may reach 13.5 MMgal. If a cleaner fuel oil was to be applied to the Power Boiler 4 alone, then the use of a second tank would be required to avoid a significant annual penalty for cleaner fuel distributed to the Recovery Boiler No. 6 and Lime Kiln. Note that these other emission units capture most of the sulfur in the oil fired and thus a lower sulfur concentration would not significantly reduce emissions from these units.

In 2007, the Mill began construction of a new fuel oil storage tank to replace the existing aging tank directly along the Mill property line. The siting, erection and installation (Total Installed) cost is \$3.6MM for the tank alone. A tank for a dedicated Power Boiler 4 tank would be similar in design and cost. The indirect annual costs are: capital recovery cost ($0.0944 \times \text{TIC}$), administrative, property tax and insurance ($2.5\% \times \text{TIC}$), or equal to $0.1194 \times \text{TIC}$. The annual indirect cost is thus:

Annual Indirect costs = $0.1194 \times \$3.6\text{MM} = \0.43 MM/yr .

should not need to be as large?

The annual direct costs are the marginal price increase (as a function of S%) and new tank maintenance.

The analysis estimated annual tank maintenance costs at 1% of TIC, or \$0.36MM.

no, this is \$0.036 MM

Thus, separate from the fuel oil price difference, any fuel scenario will increase annual costs by \$0.43MM + 0.36 MM = \$0.8 MM/yr.

0.036 = 0.47

Determining marginal costs of fuel oils with different sulfur concentrations is reasonably certain for a short "future". As the period of time for a fuel forecast is extended, uncertainty rapidly increases. The following table presents the present available rates for No. 6 fuel oil at Brunswick:

Unit Costs for Various No. 6 Fuel Oil Grades for Brunswick Cellulose

| Sulfur % , No. 6 Fuel Oil | Max \$/bbl |
|---------------------------|------------|
| 2.62 – current for Mill | \$46.00 |
| 1.25 | \$46.89 |
| 1.00 | \$51.75 |
| 0.70 | \$54.72 |

The analysis computed the cost effectiveness for each fuel scenario by determining the difference in sulfur from the current case and computing the difference in SO2 emissions with the USEPA Section 1 AP-42 factor:

$$\text{Lbs SO}_2/1000 \text{ gallons} = [157 \times \text{Sulfur \%}]$$

The fuel costs and emissions are linear to the amount of gallons used. Thus, the analysis computed cost effectiveness using a common value of 5 MMgal/year.

The following table summarizes the annual marginal fuel costs and emissions reduced for this scenario.

Summary of Fuel Cost Increases for Various No. 6 Fuel Oil Cases, Brunswick Cellulose

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sulfur % , No. 6 Fuel Oil | 2.62 | 1.25 | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| Max \$/bbl (Colonial Oil 12/06) | \$46.00 | \$46.89 | \$51.75 | \$54.72 |
| So2 Emissions for 5 Mmgal/yr | 1,028 | 491 | 393 | 275 |
| Emission Change (tpy) | NA | 538 | 636 | 754 |
| Fuel Cost (\$/yr) | \$5,476,190 | \$5,581,827 | \$6,160,714 | \$6,514,286 |
| Fuel Cost Increase (\$/yr) | NA | \$105,636 | \$684,524 | \$1,038,095 |

To compute the cost effectiveness, the analysis added the Direct costs (shown above) with the indirect annual costs of \$0.8MM/yr. The following table summarizes the cost effectiveness values for these fuel scenarios.

Summary of Cost Effectiveness Values for Various No. 6 Fuel Oil Cases, Brunswick Cellulose

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Sulfur % , No. 6 Fuel Oil | 1.25 | 1.00 | 0.70 |
| Emission Change (tpy) | 538 | 636 | 754 |
| Cost Increase (\$/yr) | 105,636 | 684,524 | 1,038,095 |
| Indirect Costs (\$/yr) <i>Tank</i> | <i>470,800,000</i> | <i>470,800,000</i> | <i>470,800,000</i> |
| Total Annual Costs (\$/yr) | 905,636 <i>675,000</i> | 1,484,524 <i>1,154,000</i> | 1,838,095 <i>1,508,000</i> |
| Cost Effectiveness (\$/ton removed) | 1,684 | 2,335 | 2,439 |

-330,000 allocated

The Brunswick believes that all these fuel options are not economically feasible.

Step 5-Identify Reasonable Measures

GP believes that each technically feasible option is not economically feasible. Thus, while the options have the potential to reduce emissions, each option is not reasonable.

3.0 ENGINEERING ANALYSIS FOR NO. 6 RECOVERY BOILER (ID M24)

3.1 SOURCE DESCRIPTION

The recovery boiler is at the heart of the Kraft chemical recovery process. It fulfills the following essential functions:

- (1) Evaporates residual moisture from the black liquor solids.
- (2) Burns the organic constituents.
- (3) Supplies heat for steam generation.
- (4) Reduces oxidized sulfur compounds to sulfide.
- (5) Recovers inorganic chemicals in molten form.
- (6) Conditions the products of combustion to minimize chemical carryover.

Heavy black liquor from the pulping process is sprayed directly into the recovery boiler. The liquor droplets dry and partially pyrolyze before falling onto the char bed. Incomplete combustion in the porous char bed causes carbon and carbon monoxide to act as reducing agents, thus converting sulfate and thiosulfate to sulfide. The heat is sufficient to melt the sodium salts, which filter through the char bed to the floor of the recovery boiler. The "smelt" then flows by gravity through water-cooled spouts to the associated smelt dissolving tanks.

The Recovery Boiler No. 6 is a low odor, non-direct contact evaporator design. The Tampella recovery furnace was started up in September 1990 and designed to process 4.5×10^6 lbs. black liquor solids per day. The boiler rating is 740,000 lb. steam per hour at 1250 psig and 72% liquor solids feed. Black liquor is supplied from the 72% storage tank to the saltcake mix tank where saltcake from the precipitator is added. The liquor leaving the mix tank overflows to a retention tank and is heated via an indirect heater to approximately 245°F prior to injection into the boiler. The stationary firing is through 8 liquor guns, 2 on each boiler wall. Smelt discharges from 4 spouts on the north wall of the boiler to a dissolving tank on the bottom floor. In the dissolving tank the smelt is dissolved in weak wash and forms green liquor. The green liquor is then pumped to the green liquor surge tank in the recausticizing area for processing into white liquor. The dissolving tank has a weak wash scrubber to scrub sulfur compounds.

The flue gases leaving the recovery boiler are processed in a 2-chamber Environmental Elements electrostatic precipitator with 4 T/R sets per chamber. One chamber can support 70% of rated capacity. Saltcake collected in the precipitator from the flue gases is returned to the saltcake mix tank.

The exiting flue gases from the precipitator are monitored for opacity and TRS. Current limits on opacity and TRS are 35% for 6 minutes and 5.0 ppm for 8 hours, respectively. Under normal operating conditions the boiler's opacity and TRS run 10% and 1 ppm, respectively.

3.2 TECHNOLOGY REVIEW

Step 1a-Identification of Control Technologies-Typical Technologies in Use in the United States

Emission control equipment that might be considered to control SO₂ emissions from a recovery boiler would include any one of a number of absorption (*i.e.*, scrubbing) processes, a flue gas desulfurization (FGD) system, and combustion controls.

Gas Absorption

Gas absorption systems are designed to maximize contact between the gas and liquid solvent in order to permit interphase diffusion of the SO₂. Absorbers found to adequately disperse the liquid include packed towers, plate or tray towers, and spray chambers. When water is the liquid solvent, absorbers are analogous to wet scrubbers used for the reduction of particulate matter emissions (see discussion above). Thus, this type of equipment can be used to reduce both types of contaminants. SO₂ emission reductions of 90-98% can be expected using gas absorption systems. Packed tower absorbers may achieve efficiencies as high as 99.9%. However, if the pollutant concentration entering the absorber is relatively low, then the SO₂ removal efficiency will be much lower.

The absorbent may be limestone, dual alkali, sodium solutions, ammonia-based solutions, citrate process or magnesium oxide process. These technologies are utilized to control SO₂ emissions in the chemical industry and for some types of combustion-related equipment. Absorption is the process whereby one or more gaseous contaminants are selectively dissolved into a relatively nonvolatile liquid. The liquid contains the equilibrium concentrations of the gaseous component.

The effluent from an absorber would be discharged to a wastewater treatment plant and not reused in the Mill.

Gas absorption systems usually have significant pressure drops, in the range of 6-8 inches w.c. This may require additional expenditures for a new fan that is designed to handle the added pressure drop. These systems also require routine maintenance to clean out or replace the packing material.

Flue Gas Desulfurization

This technology has been used on coal-fired boilers and works in one of two ways. The first method works by injecting fine particles of dry limestone into the combustion chamber of the boiler. The limestone (calcium carbonate) reacts with the sulfur dioxide gases to form calcium sulfate. The calcium sulfate must then be removed from the boiler exhaust gas stream as particulate matter. The second method works by adding wet slurry of limestone into a wet scrubber that is controlling the flue gases from the boiler. The wet limestone also reacts to form calcium sulfate, but as a wet slurry, and not a dry particulate, as is the case with the first method. This second method results in the generation of a sludge (usually as calcium sulfate or gypsum) that must be sent to an off-site landfill (in some cases, there may be a way to reuse the sludge, if impurities are not present such as for making gypsum wall board). Both of these methods provide relatively high removal efficiencies, generally 90% and higher, depending upon the specific application.

Combustion Control and High Black Liquor Solids Content

No. 6?
Proper combustion control is an effective means to control SO₂ emissions from recovery boilers. SO₂ emissions are formed by the oxidation of reduced sulfur compounds in recovery boilers. These emissions vary depending upon the sulfur content of the black liquor being burned, the quantity of oxygen available in the combustion chamber, and the black liquor dry solids content. A separate permit application is under preparation for the No. 3 Recovery Boiler to increase the high black liquor solids content and therefore emit lower quantities of SO₂ than traditional direct contact evaporator (DCE) recovery boilers. In fact, the RBLC lists "high solids firing" as a BACT control technology for recovery boilers.

Combustion control to reduce SO₂ emissions is inherent in the design of a recovery boiler due to the chemical reactions that take place inside of the combustion chamber when black liquor is combusted. Black liquor normally contains a number of sulfur-bearing compounds when it is generated from the Kraft pulping process. When black liquor is oxidized, most of the oxidized sulfur compounds are converted to sulfides. These inorganic compounds, primarily sodium sulfide and sodium sulfate, recovered in molten form at the bottom of the boiler bed, are referred to as "smelt". The smelt is drained through the bottom of the recovery boiler into a smelt dissolving tank. The majority of remaining sulfur compounds that leave the smelt bed as a sodium fume from the reduction process are tied up with the boiler bottom ash as sodium sulfate, thereby

reducing SO₂ emissions discharged from the boiler. Likewise, when black liquor is co-fired with oil and its sulfur, the sulfur is bound with the sodium fume.

The capture of SO₂ is primarily dependent upon the boiler bed temperature. Typically, a hot char bed will promote more rapid adsorption of SO₂ into the smelt and generate sufficient amounts of sodium fume to tie up the majority of the remaining SO₂ as sodium sulfate. A properly operated recovery boiler will result in an SO₂ capture efficiency of 99% or better. This is why SO₂ emissions from well-operated recovery boilers usually have an average SO₂ concentration in the exhaust gas well under 100 ppmv.

Step 1b-Identification of Control Technologies-Review of RACT/BACT/LAER Clearinghouse

Searches of the RBLC were conducted to identify control technologies for the control of SO₂ emissions from recovery boilers.

The specific categories searched are listed below:

- External Combustion-Other-11.999
- Kraft Pulp Mills-30.002
- Pulp & Paper Production Other than Kraft-30.004
- Other Wood Products Industry Sources-30.999

The results of the searches are summarized below:

- Boiler design and good engineering practices
- No controls
- High solids firing
- Limit of 30% sulfidity in black liquor
- Combustion control
- Low odor design boiler
- Combustion control
- Good process controls

Step 1c-Identification of Control Technologies-Review of Technologies in Use at Georgia-Pacific Corporation Facilities

With the exception of the Camas, Washington Mill (see related discussion above under particulate matter), all of the Georgia-Pacific recovery boilers utilize combustion control techniques to minimize the generation of SO₂ emissions. An additional benefit of using the wet scrubbers is lower SO₂ emissions. However, the

scrubbers were installed primarily to recover heat to generate process water for the Mill, and not to reduce SO₂ emissions.

Step 2-Technical Feasibility Analysis-Eliminate Technically Infeasible Options

Systems that inject chemicals into the combustion chamber as a means to control SO₂ emissions will interfere with the recovery process that is taking place inside of a recovery boiler. For this reason, flue gas desulfurization using the “dry limestone” method is not considered technically feasible or a demonstrated technology to reduce SO₂ emissions from recovery boilers. Additionally, there are no known recovery boilers in the U.S utilizing this particular type of SO₂ control.

The use of a flue gas desulfurization system that employs the wet limestone slurry method (outside of the boiler) would be technically feasible, as would the use of a gas absorption system with a caustic solution (*e.g.*, sodium hydroxide).

However, the inherent design of a recovery boiler and the use of combustion control techniques result in low SO₂ emissions. Because of this fact, the use of additional downstream SO₂ controls, such as a wet adsorption tower, cannot be economically justified since the average inlet SO₂ concentration directed to the control device is usually well under 100 ppmv.

Annual SO₂ concentrations for the No. 6 Recovery Boiler during based on stack testing performed between 1999 to 2003 averaged less than 38 ppmv. EPA BART guidelines specify that emissions from start-up are not subject to review. While it is technically feasible to use a scrubber to control SO₂ emissions from a recovery boiler, it would not be economically feasible to install SO₂ controls on a source that has such a low exhaust gas stream concentration during normal operations.

Combustion control and gas absorption system with a caustic solution are technically feasible for use in reducing SO₂ emissions in recovery boilers.

Step 3-Ranking the Technically Feasible Control Alternatives to Establish a Control Hierarchy

Dry flue gas desulfurization systems were eliminated due to technical infeasibility. The only remaining control technologies are the use of an SO₂ adsorption device (scrubber) and the inherent design of a recovery boiler that also employs combustion control techniques.

A conventional SO₂ scrubber can reduce SO₂ emissions from 90-98%, depending upon the degree of control required. Higher control efficiencies (99+%) require larger and more expensive scrubbers. As discussed above, the inherent design of recovery boilers already results in SO₂ removal efficiencies of 99+%.

Step 4-Control Effectiveness Evaluation

The No. 6 Recovery Boiler at the Brunswick Cellulose Mill utilizes a non-direct contact evaporator (NDCE), low odor design, and staged combustion control techniques. Furthermore, as discussed above, SO₂ emissions, based on stack tests conducted during 1999 through 2003 averaged less than 38 ppmv when burning only black liquor.

When a recovery boiler is only burning black liquor, the inherent design of the unit results in a control efficiency that is roughly equivalent to the control efficiency achieved through the use of an SO₂ scrubber. Further, SO₂ scrubber can not remove additional SO₂ emissions in applications with a loading at 38 ppm.

The remaining technology, combustion control, is therefore considered to be the most effective control technology for reducing sulfur dioxide emissions from recovery boilers. Combustion control is part of the inherent design of the No. 6 Recovery Boiler.

Step 5-Select Reasonable Measures

There is no NSPS limit for SO₂ emissions from recovery boilers. Typical SO₂ emissions from recovery boilers operating in the United States range from 100 to 300 ppmv.

Brunswick Cellulose believes the only reasonable measures for the No. 6 Recovery Boiler is Boiler Design and Combustion Control.

4.0 SUMMARY OF REASONABLE MEASURES FOR BRUNSWICK MILL

The analysis presented a “top-down” analysis for the Power Boiler No. 4 and Recovery Boiler No .6. While there are several technically feasible options, each option above current technology in place is not economically feasible and thus not reasonable.

The following table summary presents the summary of the technically feasible options.

Summary of Engineering Analysis, Brunswick Cellulose, Inc.

| Emission Unit | Existing Controls | Evaluated Technology | \$/ton |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| No. 6 Recovery Boiler | Combustion Control | Combustion Control | 0 |
| No. 4 Power Boiler | ESP | Caustic Scrubber (95%) | 3,450 |
| No. 4 Power Boiler | ESP | Duct Sorbent Injection | 2,740 |
| No. 4 Power Boiler | ESP | Low Sulfur Oil | 1,684 -2,439 |

APPENDIX

EPA FACT Sheets

Capital Cost Calculations for Wet Scrubber Options by Jacobs Engineering Group (2007)

TOTAL COST SUMMARY - JE PRIME CODE

ESTIMATE DATE: 08/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 18DCS000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORGIAPAC\VRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\18DCS000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\18DCS000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R



| PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | W-H | QTY | UNIT | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | TOTAL COST |
|---|---|--------|--------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| DIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | 14,565 | 0 | 0 | \$773,825 | \$3,088,455 | \$2,605 | \$1,350,000 | \$5,195,885 |
| 51 | DEMOLITION | 1,550 | 0 | 0 | \$92,235 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$92,235 |
| 52 | SITE EARTHWORK/ING | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 53 | SITE IMPROVEMENTS | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$311,753 | \$311,753 |
| 54 | PILING, CAISSONS | 0 | 3,637 | LF | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$363,712 | \$363,712 |
| 55 | BUILDINGS | 0 | 1 | LOT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$630,000 | \$630,000 |
| 56 | CONCRETE REFRACTORY | 1,957 | 184 | CY | \$68,373 | \$0 | \$81,886 | \$0 | \$170,259 |
| 57 | MASONRY | 7,362 | 210 | TN | \$381,114 | \$0 | \$709,238 | \$0 | \$1,070,353 |
| 58 | STRUCTURAL STEEL | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 59 | ROOFING AND SIDING | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 60 | FIRE PROOFING | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 61 | PROCESS DUCTWORK (NON-BUILDING) | 11,752 | 3,917 | LF | \$823,506 | \$0 | \$623,506 | \$0 | \$1,247,013 |
| 62 | INSULATION - PIPE, EQUIPMENT & DUCTWORK | 1,084 | 54 | EA | \$51,959 | \$129,897 | \$109,114 | \$792,827 | \$792,827 |
| 63 | INSURANCE | 2,273 | 9,053 | LF | \$108,650 | \$236,854 | \$207,635 | \$0 | \$290,370 |
| 64 | ELECTRICAL | 578 | 20,784 | SF | \$25,979 | \$0 | \$25,979 | \$0 | \$51,959 |
| 65 | PAINTING, PROTECTIVE COATINGS | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 66 | FURNITURE, LAB & SHOP EQUIPMENT | 41,152 | 0 | 0 | \$2,115,941 | \$3,406,247 | \$1,760,165 | \$3,448,292 | \$10,820,645 |
| TOTAL DIRECT COSTS \$7/WH \$51.42 | | | | | | | | | |
| CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | 8,230 | 34.0% | BL | \$425,005 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$425,005 |
| 76 | TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$131,682 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$131,682 |
| 77 | PREMIUM TIME | | 13.8% | BL | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 78 | CRAFT FRINGE BENEFITS (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$320,983 | \$320,983 |
| 79 | CRAFT PER DIEM (\$5 PER HOUR ON 100% OF THE HOURS) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 80 | PAYROLL TAXES & INSURANCE (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 81 | SMALL TOOLS (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 82 | CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 83 | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 84 | FIELD STAFF (IN WAGE RATES) | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 85 | NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE & PERMITS | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 86 | CONSTRUCTION HOME OFFICE COST (INC. WITH CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION FEE) | | | | \$0 | \$174,812 | \$86,008 | \$86,207 | \$349,028 |
| 87 | CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | 450 | 10.1% | YOC LESS EQ. | \$31,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,400 |
| 88 | CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION HOME OFFICE & FEE | 8,680 | | | \$286,158 | \$0 | \$277,226 | \$385,946 | \$969,330 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS \$7/WH \$754.346 | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS (TCC) \$7/WH \$2,870.287 | | | | | | | | | |
| PROJECT INDIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT | 49,832 | 4.5% | TIC | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$876,880 | \$876,880 |
| 90 | ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | 77,34 | 10.0% | TIC | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 |
| 91 | STUDY COST | | 0.3% | TIC | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| 92 | OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 93 | OWNER'S COST | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$645,389 | \$645,389 |
| 94 | SPARE PARTS | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 95 | NON-CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | | | | \$49,950 | \$0 | \$0 | \$89,200 | \$139,150 |
| 96 | ALLOWANCE FOR UNFORESEEN ESCALATION | | 6.0% | TIC | \$292,024 | \$384,587 | \$212,540 | \$787,585 | \$1,676,735 |
| 97 | ROUND OFF | | 4.8% | TIC | \$0 | \$0 | \$298,119 | \$252,781 | \$956,487 |
| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS \$7/WH \$77.34 | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS \$8,966,000 | | | | | | | | | |

DETAIL DIRECT COST

ESTIMATE DATE: 06/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06187

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DCR000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORGIA PACIFIC\BIG ISLAND\16DCR000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DCR000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1.xls\PRIME CODE TCS

| LINE NO. | PRIME CODE | QTY. | UNIT | W/H/ UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'S | COST/ W.H. | TOTAL LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | UNIT COST | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|----------|------------|------|------|-----------|--------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 46 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 68 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 69 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 70 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 73 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 78 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 82 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



DETAIL DIRECT COST

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
JOB NUMBER: 18DC0000
CONSTRUCTION DURATION: 78D
ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
QUESTIMATING@PACVIRGINIA@BIG ISLAND#DC0000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM#BIG ISLAND#DC0000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER#18DC0000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1-#4#PRIME CODE TCS

ESTIMATE DATE: 08/05/08
REVISION NO.: 1
ESTIMATOR: WSL
PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HEINSON
EST. FILE #: 06157

Table with columns: LINE NO., PRIME CODE, DESCRIPTION, QTY, UNIT, W.H./UNIT, TOTAL W.H.'S, COST/W.H.'S, TOTAL COST, LABOR, PROCESS EQUIPMENT, MATERIAL, SUB CONTRACTS, UNIT COST, TOTAL ALL COSTS. Includes sub-sections for DEMOLITION, SITE IMPROVEMENTS, PILING, CAISSONS, BUILDINGS, and CONCRETE.



JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 18DC0000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\VRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\18DC0000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\18DC0000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM\18DC0000\PRIME CODE TCS

ESTIMATE DATE: 06/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 EST. FILE #: 06157
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON

DETAIL DIRECT COST

| LINE NO. | PRIME CODE | OR DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W/H/ | TOTAL W.H.'S | COST/ W.H.'S | TOTAL COST | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | UNIT COST | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|------------------------------|------------|--|-------|------|-----------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DIRECT COST - DETAILS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 344 | | PIPING | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 345 | | FACTORED FROM INSTALLED PROCESS EQUIPMENT COST | 1 | LOT | 11,752.13 | 11,752 | \$53.05 | \$623,506 | \$623,506 | \$0 | \$0 | \$623,506 | \$623,506 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,247,013 | \$1,247,013 |
| 346 | | | 3,817 | LF | 3.00 | 11,752 | \$43.05 | \$623,506 | \$623,506 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 347 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 348 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 349 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 350 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 351 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 352 | | INSULATION - PIPE, EQUIPMENT & DUCTWORK | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 353 | | REINSULATE - FILL IN FOR EXISTING ID FAN | 320 | SF | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$50.00 | \$16,000 | \$50.00 | \$16,000 |
| 354 | | REINSULATE - PRECIPITATOR OUTLET TO TANK | 800 | SF | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$50.00 | \$44,800 | \$50.00 | \$44,800 |
| 355 | | INSULATION - FILL IN TO TANK | 8,250 | SF | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$50.00 | \$412,500 | \$50.00 | \$412,500 |
| 356 | | INSULATION - ID FAN TO SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER INLET | 2,079 | SF | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$50.00 | \$103,860 | \$50.00 | \$103,860 |
| 357 | | INSULATION - 50% CAUSTIC DRY TANK - 13" DIAMETER X 10' STRAIGHT SIDE PLUS TOP & BOTTOM | 1,220 | SF | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$50.00 | \$60,000 | \$50.00 | \$60,000 |
| 358 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 359 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 360 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 361 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 362 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 363 | | FACTORED FROM INSTALLED PROCESS EQUIPMENT COST | 1 | LOT | S/C | 0 | \$44.83 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$155,877 | \$155,877 | \$155,877 | \$155,877 |
| 364 | | | 1 | LOT | S/C | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$792,427 | \$792,427 | \$792,427 | \$792,427 |
| 365 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 366 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 367 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 368 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 369 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 370 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 371 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 372 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 373 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 374 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 375 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 376 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 377 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 378 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 379 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 380 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 381 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 382 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 383 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 384 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 385 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 386 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 387 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 388 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 389 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 390 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 391 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 392 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 393 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 394 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 395 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 396 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 397 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 398 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 399 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 400 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 401 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 402 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 403 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 404 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 405 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 406 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 407 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 408 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 409 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 410 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 411 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 412 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 413 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 414 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 415 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 416 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 417 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 418 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 419 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 420 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 421 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 422 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 423 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 424 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 425 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 426 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 427 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 428 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 429 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 430 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 431 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 432 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 433 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 434 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 435 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 436 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 437 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 438 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 439 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 440 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 441 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 442 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 443 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 444 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 445 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 446 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 447 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 448 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 449 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 450 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 451 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 452 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 453 | | | | </ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPACVIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUB

CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COST - CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06157

| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W.H./UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'s | COST/W.H. | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------|--|--------|------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 75 | CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (LABOR COST ONLY) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | CAPITAL - CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR - ALLOWANCE @ 20 % OF DIRECT LABOR HOURS FOR BELOW LISTED ITEMS | 41.152 | WH | 0.20 | 8,230 | \$39.49 | \$325,005 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$325,005 |
| | CONS EQUIP OPERATION - CRANE | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | WELDER QUALIFICATIONS | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | RAINED OUT LABOR | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | SAFETY TRAINING | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | SCAFFOLDING (Rental Incl. W/ Constr. Eq. Rental) | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | UNLOAD AND STORE BULK MATERIAL | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | WAREHOUSEMAN | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | TOOL MAN | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | FIRE WATCH | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | YARD CREWS | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | SPECIAL HAULING / RIGGING | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | STARTUP - CRAFTSMEN | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | CLEAN UP | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | EMPLOYMENT & RANDOM DRUG TESTS | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | MOVE IN / MOVE OUT LABOR | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | WATER / ICE | | | | 0 | \$39.49 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|--------------|--|------------------|--|------------|--|------------|------------------|
| 75 | TOTAL - CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | | | | 8,230 | | \$325,005 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$325,005 |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|--------------|--|------------------|--|------------|--|------------|------------------|



CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COST - PREMIUM TIME

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
REVISION NO.: 1
ESTIMATOR: WSJ
PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HEN
EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - B

| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | TOTAL WEEKLY W.H.'S | TOTAL PREMIUM W.H.'S | PREMIUM COST ADDER | TOTAL COST |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|

78 PREMIUM & EFFICIENCY LOSS TIME CALCULATION WORKSHEET

CAPITAL PREMIUM TIME COST: \$23.25 BASED ON BARE WAGE RATE OF:

TOTAL CRAFT HOURS: 49,382 HRS

CRAFT HOURS WORKED ON 40 HR WEEK (0 HRS PT) 0 HRS
 CRAFT HOURS WORKED ON 50 HR WEEK (10 HRS PT) 9,876 HRS
 CRAFT HOURS WORKED ON 60 HR WEEK (20 HRS PT) 0 HRS
 CRAFT HOURS WORKED ON 70 HR WEEK (30 HRS PT) 0 HRS
 CRAFT HOURS WORKED ON 84 HR WEEK (44 HRS PT) 0 HRS

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-------|-------|---------|------------------|
| 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$13.33 | \$131,682 |
| 100.0% | 49,382 | 9,876 | 9,876 | \$13.33 | \$0 |
| 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$13.33 | \$0 |
| 0.0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$13.33 | \$0 |
| 100.0% | 49,382 | 9,876 | 9,876 | \$13.33 | \$0 |
| TOTAL CAPITAL PREMIUM TIME COST | | | | | \$131,682 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|------------------|
| 78 | TOTAL | | | | \$131,682 |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|------------------|

CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COST - NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE AND PERMITS

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD

ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\WIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_1



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | LABOR UNIT COST | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------|---|-------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 81 | NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE AND PERMITS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SALES & USE TAX | \$8,496,247 | EQ \$ | \$0.00 | \$0 | 5.00% | \$174,812 | 5.00% | \$88,008 | 5.00% | \$86,207 | \$174,812 |
| | 5% OF EQUIPMENT | | | \$0.00 | \$0 | | | | | | | \$86,008 |
| | 5% OF MATERIAL | \$1,760,165 | MATL \$ | \$0.00 | \$0 | | | | | | | \$86,207 |
| | 5% ON 50% OF SUBCONTRACT | \$1,724,146 | SUB \$ | \$0.00 | \$0 | | | | | | | \$86,207 |
| 81 | TOTAL NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE AND PERMITS | | | | \$0 | | \$174,812 | | \$88,008 | | \$86,207 | \$349,028 |

CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COST - CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATING\GEORPACVIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1.xls\PRIME CODE 1



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W.H./ UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'s | COST/ W.H. | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|---|------|------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 71 | CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | CRAFT START-UP SERVICES (3 CRAFT PERSONNEL @ 50 HOURS EACH) | 3 | WK | 150.00 | 450 | \$70.00 | \$31,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,500 |
| 71 | TOTAL CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | | | | | | \$31,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,500 |



JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1.xls\JPR

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COST - CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION FEE

| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY | UNIT | LABOR UNIT COST | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 99 | CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION FEE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | LABOR (INCLUDED IN WAGE RATES) | \$2,504,125 | LABS | | \$266,159 | | | | | | | \$266,159 |
| | EQUIPMENT | \$3,871,059 | EQS | 10.2% | | 0.00% | \$0 | | | | | \$0 |
| | MATERIAL | \$1,848,174 | MATS | | | | | 15.00% | \$277,226 | | | \$277,226 |
| | SUBCONTRACT | \$3,655,482 | SUBS | | | | | | | 10.00% | \$365,548 | \$365,548 |
| 99 | TOTAL CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION FEE | | | | \$266,159 | | \$0 | | \$277,226 | | \$365,548 | \$928,933 |

TOTAL CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION FEE AS A % OF TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST - EQUIP. = 10.1%

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST LESS PROCESS EQUIPMENT = \$9,236,717

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06457

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPACVIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOI



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W.H./ UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'s | COST/ W.H. | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | UNIT COST | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 88 | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT | 1 | LOT | 0 | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 88 | TOTAL - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT | 0 | | | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 | \$876,980 |
|----|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPACVIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1.xls\PRIME CODE TCS



| PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W.H./UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'s | COST/ W.H.'s | LABOR | | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT | | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT | | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|------------|--|------|------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----------|-----|----------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | UNIT COST | \$0.00 | | UNIT COST | \$0 | | UNIT COST | \$0 | | UNIT COST | \$1,943,247 | | |
| 90 | JACOBS | 1 | LOT | | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 |
| 90 | ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 |



JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 06157

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - STUDY COST

| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------|-------------|------|------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 90 | STUDY COST | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| | STUDY COST | 1 | LOT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| 90 | STUDY COST | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 96 | OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES | 1 | LOT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| 96 | TOTAL OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |



JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - OWNER'S COST

| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|--------------------|------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 91 | OWNER'S COST | | | | | | | | | | |
| | OWNER'S COST | 1 | LOT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$645,389 | \$645,389 | \$645,389 |
| 91 | TOTAL OWNER'S COST | | | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$645,389 | \$645,389 | \$645,389 |

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - SPARE PARTS

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB
 SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPAC\IRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BAI



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|--|------|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 70 | SPARE PARTS | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SPARE PARTS - ALLOWANCE OF 5% OF EQUIPMENT COST | 1 | LOT | \$0 | \$174,812 | \$174,812 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$174,812 |
| 70 | TOTAL SPARE PARTS | | | \$0 | \$174,812 | \$174,812 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$174,812 |

PROJECT INDIRECT COST - NON-CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE

ESTIMATE DATE: 09/05/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HE
 EST. FILE #: 06157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 16DC9000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G:\ESTIMATE\GEORPACVIRGINIA\BIG ISLAND\16DC9000 - BART BOILER PROGRAM\BIG ISLAND - #4 PB - SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER\16DC9000 - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER - BART BOILER PROGRAM_R1.x



| JE PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | QTY. | UNIT | W.H./ UNIT | TOTAL W.H.'s | TOTAL COST/ W.H. | TOTAL DIRECT LABOR | PROCESS EQUIPMENT UNIT COST | TOTAL PROCESS EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL UNIT COST | TOTAL MATERIAL | SUB CONTRACT UNIT COST | TOTAL SUB CONTRACTS | TOTAL ALL COSTS |
|---------------------|--|------|------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 71 | NON-CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | PROFESSIONAL SERVICES START-UP | 4 | WK | 150.00 | 600 | \$63.25 | \$49,950 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$49,950 |
| | PROFESSIONAL SERVICES START-UP - EXPENSES | 4 | WK | 0.00 | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,800 | \$19,200 | \$19,200 |
| | VENDOR START-UP SERVICES | 1 | LOT | | 0 | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 |
| 71 | TOTAL NON-CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | | | | | | \$49,950 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$69,200 | \$69,200 | \$119,150 |

ESTIMATE DATE: 08/03/06
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 08157

PROJECT INDIRECT COSTS - ALLOWANCE FOR UNFORESEEN

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIO ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 18DC0000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 G-ESTIMATING: GEORGIACORP\BIO ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER (18DC0000) - BART BOILER PROGRAM

| PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | DOLLARS | | | | SUBCONT. | TOTAL COST |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | LABOR | EQUIP. | MATERIAL | PERCENTAGES | | |
| DIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | |
| 50 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | \$77,362 | \$0 | \$261 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$77,623 |
| 51 | DEMOLITION | \$8,223 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$8,223 |
| 52 | FOUNDATIONS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 53 | SITE IMPROVEMENTS | \$311,753 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$311,753 |
| 54 | PILING, CAISSONS | \$383,712 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$383,712 |
| 55 | BUILDINGS | \$530,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$530,000 |
| 56 | CONCRETE | \$68,373 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$68,373 |
| 57 | MASONRY, REFRACTORY | \$381 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$381 |
| 58 | STRUCTURAL STEEL | \$708,238 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$708,238 |
| 59 | ROOFING AND SIDING | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 60 | MECHANICAL | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 61 | PROGRESS DUCTWORK (NON-BUILDINGS) | \$823,508 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$823,508 |
| 62 | PIPING | \$1,247,013 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$1,247,013 |
| 63 | INSULATION - PIPE, EQUIPMENT & DUCTWORK | \$762,827 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$762,827 |
| 64 | INSTRUMENTATION | \$108,114 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$108,114 |
| 65 | ELECTRICAL | \$108,114 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$108,114 |
| 66 | PAINTING, PROTECTIVE COATINGS | \$29,876 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$29,876 |
| 67 | FURNITURE, LAB & SHOP EQUIPMENT | \$29,876 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$29,876 |
| TOTAL DIRECT COSTS | | \$2,115,941 | \$3,418,247 | \$1,761,165 | | \$3,418,247 | \$10,822,645 |
| CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | |
| 75 | CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | \$28,028 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$28,028 |
| 76 | TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES (IN WAGE RATE) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 77 | PREMIUM TIME | \$131,682 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$131,682 |
| 78 | CRACK REPAIR (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 79 | CRACK REPAIR (\$5 PER HOUR ON 100% OF THE HOUR) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 80 | PAYROLL TAXES & INSURANCE (IN WAGE RATES) | \$320,883 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$320,883 |
| 81 | SMALL TOOLS (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 82 | CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 83 | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 84 | FIELD STAFF (IN WAGE RATES) & PERMITS | \$174,812 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$174,812 |
| 85 | NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE & PERMITS | \$31,500 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$31,500 |
| 86 | CRACK START-UP ASSISTANCE COST (INS. WITH CONTR) | \$286,159 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$286,159 |
| 87 | CONTRACTOR'S CONSTRUCTION HOME OFFICE & FEE | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS | | \$2,870,287 | \$3,671,059 | \$2,125,400 | | \$4,241,031 | \$12,907,776 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS (TCC) | | | | | | | |
| 88 | CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 89 | ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 90 | STUDY COST | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 91 | OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 92 | OWNERS COST | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 93 | NON-CRACK START-UP ASSISTANCE | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 94 | ALLOWANCE FOR UNFORESEEN | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 95 | ESCALATION | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 96 | EPC FEE | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 97 | CAPITAL INTEREST | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| 98 | ROUND OFF | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 10.0% | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS | | \$2,930,237 | \$3,645,871 | \$2,125,400 | | \$4,241,031 | \$18,817,355 |

PROJECT INDIRECT COSTS - ESCALATION

ESTIMATE DATE: 06/05/08
 REVISION NO.: 1
 ESTIMATOR: WSJ
 PROJECT MANAGER: LELAND HENSON
 EST. FILE #: 08157

JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER
 CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC
 LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA
 JOB NUMBER: 140C0000
 CONSTRUCTION DURATION: TBD
 ESTIMATE TYPE: CLASS 4
 GUESTIMATE@GEORGIA.PACIFIC.VIRGINIA#BIG ISLAND#4PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER(140C0000) - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER(140C0000) - TCS - BIG ISLAND - #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER(140C0000) - TCS

| PRIME CODE | DESCRIPTION | LABOR | | | | EQUIPMENT | | | | MATERIAL | | | | SUBCONTRACT | | | | TOTAL COST | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------|
| | | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | LABOR | EQUIPMENT | MATERIAL | SUBCONTRACT | TOTAL COST |
| DIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | MAJOR EQUIPMENT | \$773,825 | \$3,069,485 | \$2,400 | \$1,950,000 | \$5,165,688 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$374,708 |
| 51 | DEMOLITION | \$82,235 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$82,235 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$82,235 |
| 52 | SITE EARTHMOVING | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 53 | SITE IMPROVEMENTS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$317,753 | \$317,753 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$317,753 |
| 54 | PILING, CAISSONS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$943,712 | \$943,712 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$15,988 |
| 55 | BUILDINGS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$630,000 | \$630,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$15,186 |
| 56 | CONCRETE | \$88,373 | \$0 | \$81,856 | \$0 | \$170,229 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$12,250 |
| 57 | CONCRETE REFRACTORY | \$351,114 | \$0 | \$1,070,253 | \$0 | \$1,421,367 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$12,250 |
| 58 | STRUCTURAL STEEL | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 59 | ROOFING AND SIDING | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 60 | FIRE PROOFING | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 61 | PROCESS DUCTWORK (NON-BUILDING) | \$823,506 | \$0 | \$623,506 | \$0 | \$1,447,012 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$50,528 |
| 62 | PIPING | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 63 | INSULATION - PIPE, EQUIPMENT & DUCTWORK | \$51,959 | \$0 | \$109,114 | \$0 | \$161,073 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$39,041 |
| 64 | INSTRUMENTATION | \$129,897 | \$0 | \$200,970 | \$0 | \$330,867 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$20,357 |
| 65 | ELECTRICAL | \$108,950 | \$298,884 | \$207,835 | \$0 | \$613,669 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$12,860 |
| 66 | PAINTING | \$25,879 | \$0 | \$25,879 | \$0 | \$51,758 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$2,598 |
| 67 | FURNITURE, LAB & SHOP EQUIPMENT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| TOTAL DIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$2,115,841 | \$3,486,247 | \$1,780,165 | \$3,482,282 | \$10,820,645 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$348,625 |
| CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | \$325,005 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$325,005 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 76 | TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FACILITIES (IN WAGE RATE) | \$13,682 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13,682 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 77 | PREMIUM TIME | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 78 | CRAFT FRINGE BENEFITS (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$320,883 | \$320,883 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 79 | CRAFT PER DIEM (\$5 PER HOUR ON 100% OF THE HOUR) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 80 | PAYROLL TAXES & INSURANCE (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 81 | SMALL TOOLS (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 82 | CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 83 | FIELD STAFF (IN WAGE RATES) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 84 | NON-PAYROLL TAX, INSURANCE & PERMITS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 85 | CONSTRUCT ON HOME OFFICE COST (INC. WITH CONTRA | \$174,812 | \$0 | \$98,008 | \$0 | \$272,820 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$17,481 |
| 86 | CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | \$31,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$31,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 87 | CONTRACTORS CONSTRUCTION HOME OFFICE & FEE | \$286,189 | \$0 | \$277,228 | \$0 | \$563,417 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$27,723 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION INDIRECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$2,870,287 | \$3,671,659 | \$2,125,400 | \$4,241,031 | \$12,807,776 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$338,337 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS (TCC) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$2,870,287 | \$3,671,659 | \$2,125,400 | \$4,241,031 | \$12,807,776 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$376,962 |
| 88 | CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$576,880 | \$576,880 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 89 | ENGINEERING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,943,247 | \$1,943,247 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 90 | STUDY COST | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 91 | OUTSIDE CONSULTANT SERVICES | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 92 | OWNER'S COST | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$845,389 | \$845,389 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 93 | SPARE PARTS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$174,812 | \$174,812 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 94 | NON-CRAFT START-UP ASSISTANCE | \$48,850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$88,200 | \$137,050 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 95 | ALLOWANCE FOR UNFORESEEN | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 96 | CONSTRUCTION | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 97 | ERC FEE | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 98 | CAPITAL INTEREST | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| 99 | ROUND OFF | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$0 |
| TOTAL PROJECT COSTS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | \$2,870,287 | \$3,645,871 | \$2,125,400 | \$7,925,847 | \$16,817,355 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | \$38,487 |

"ALL-IN WAGE RATE"

| ITEM | CRAFT | | CONCRETE / MASONRY | | STRUCTURAL STEEL | | PIPING & MECHANICAL | | INSTRUMENTATION | | ELECTRICAL | | CRAFT SUPPORT (INC. OPERATORS) | |
|---|--------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---|--------------------------------|----------------|
| | NOTES | % | COST | % | NOTES | % | NOTES | % | NOTES | % | NOTES | % | NOTES | % |
| CONSTRUCTION "ALL-IN" WAGE RATE JOB: BART BOILER PROGRAM - BIG ISLAND #4 PB SPRAY TOWER SCRUBBER CLIENT: GEORGIA PACIFIC LOCATION: BIG ISLAND VIRGINIA JOB NUMBER: 140C9 000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BASE JOURNEYMAN | | | \$22.50 | | \$22.50 | | | | \$22.50 | | | | \$22.50 | |
| COMPOSITE RATE | | 87.35% | \$19.85 | 95.41% | \$21.89 | | 95.86% | \$22.47 | | 95.25% | \$21.43 | | \$21.43 | 97.37% |
| PAYROLL TAXES & INSURANCES: | 28.63% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION | | 10.00% | \$1.97 | 10.00% | \$2.17 | | 10.00% | \$2.26 | | 10.00% | \$2.14 | | \$2.14 | 10.00% |
| GENERAL LIABILITY | | 3.95% | \$0.76 | 3.95% | \$0.86 | | 3.95% | \$0.89 | | 3.95% | \$0.85 | | \$0.85 | 3.95% |
| EXCESS LIABILITY | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| FICA | | 7.65% | \$1.50 | 7.65% | \$1.63 | | 7.65% | \$1.72 | | 7.65% | \$1.64 | | \$1.64 | 7.65% |
| FLCA | | 0.80% | \$0.16 | 0.80% | \$0.17 | | 0.80% | \$0.18 | | 0.80% | \$0.17 | | \$0.17 | 0.80% |
| SUI | | 6.23% | \$1.22 | 6.23% | \$1.35 | | 6.23% | \$1.40 | | 6.23% | \$1.34 | | \$1.34 | 6.23% |
| OTHER | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| FRINGES | | 12.50% | \$2.46 | 12.50% | \$2.71 | | 12.50% | \$2.81 | | 12.50% | \$2.68 | | \$2.68 | 12.50% |
| PREMIUM TIME | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT LABOR | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| TEMPORARY FACILITIES | | 7.50% | \$1.47 | 7.50% | \$1.63 | | 7.50% | \$1.69 | | 7.50% | \$1.61 | | \$1.61 | 7.50% |
| SMALL TOOLS | | 7.50% | \$1.47 | 7.50% | \$1.63 | | 7.50% | \$1.69 | | 7.50% | \$1.61 | | \$1.61 | 7.50% |
| CONSUMABLES | | 7.50% | \$1.47 | 10.00% | \$2.17 | | 10.00% | \$2.25 | | 7.50% | \$1.61 | | \$1.61 | 7.50% |
| FIELD STAFF | | 25.00% | \$4.91 | 25.00% | \$5.42 | | 35.00% | \$7.86 | | 35.00% | \$7.50 | | \$7.50 | 25.00% |
| EQUIPMENT RENTAL | | 40.00% | \$7.86 | 35.00% | \$7.59 | | 35.00% | \$7.86 | | 25.00% | \$5.36 | | \$5.36 | 0.00% |
| CONSTRUCTION HOME OFFICE (ON TCS SHEET) | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| PER DIEM | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| CONTRACTOR FEE (ON TCS SHEET) | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | 0.00% | \$0.00 | | \$0.00 | 0.00% |
| TOTAL WAGE RATE WITH W/O OH & FEE | | 228.63% | \$44.93 | 226.13% | \$49.05 | | 236.13% | \$53.05 | | 223.63% | \$47.93 | | \$47.93 | 188.63% |