

# $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{MC}^3$ toward carbon neutrality

"Industry Associates, Affiliates & Sources" OLDENDORFF

BEL BIOMASS CMACGM

APOLLO SC MONTON ALEON C & M

VIRONMENTAL

IGOSIA 🎆 🚱 ITTCON

SFW/ALL

SEARATES Statista

# **Transforming Traditional CHP Fiber Supply**

E=MC<sup>3</sup> as a renewable-energy fiber, is a perfect substitute commodity, and seamless complimentary alternative to the use of wood pellets for combined heat and power production.

USDA

**High Energy** 

Heat Treated

Phytosanitized

**Densified Biomass Chips** 

**Maine's Forests Have Consistantly Served: Our European Neighbors for Over 400 Years** 

One Vessel at a Time.

**E=MC<sup>3</sup>** maximizes greenhouse gas reduction and moves toward verifiable carbon-neutrality: The perfect substitute for wood pellets.

Exponential expansion of the wood pellet industry threatens global climate stability. To reverse the imminent catastrophic damages we must recognize the issues as follows:

# Traditional Wood Pellet Consumption Burden on the Environment

Wood pellet consumption in the European Union in 2019, as measured in million metric tonnes (MMt), reveals that the UK alone consumed 9.2 MMt, followed by Italy at 3.4 MMt, Denmark at 3 MMt, Germany at 2.3 MMt, and France at 1.8 MMt – for a total of 19.7 MMt per year. [1] The report predicts wood pellet demand will expand to 30.8 MMt in 2020.[2] Research reveals annual "global production of wood pellets would increase from 38.9 to 120 MMt between 2019 and 2050."[3]

The Southern Environmental Law Center reports that "Drax imported over 4.4 million tonnes of wood pellets from the southeastern U.S. and this equates to over 32,500 hectares (80,309 acres) of forests that were harvested in 2018 alone to supply wood pellets." [4] This conversion of 4.4 MMt equal to 80,309 acres means that every 1 MMt of wood pellets requires 18,252 acres of timber harvest. By 2050 the global annual consumption will reach 120 MMT/year and require 2.10 million acres of forest harvest per year.

The production of wood pellets requires approximately 2.4 times the annual pellet production volume. One million metric tonnes of wood pellets will require 2.4 million US short tons of raw fiber after harvesting, debarking, chipping and size classification, and drying shrinkage during the extensive heating process. By 2050 the total deforestation of forests in terms of material tonnage will be approximately 288 million tons of raw fiber. This is an entirely unsustainable volume of raw fiber and an overall stripping of 2.1 million acres of forest per year – or roughly 32% of the entire land mass of Massachusetts – at this rate it would take 3-years to clear-cut the entire state.

"Emissions from US-sourced biomass burnt in the UK are projected to rise to 17 million–20 million tonnes of  $CO_2$  a year by 2025."[5] "The most negative impacts on carbon concentrations in the atmosphere is derived from harvesting ... natural forests."[6] "Where whole trees are harvested and used for energy, not only is the stored carbon in the tree released to the atmosphere immediately, but the tree's future carbon sequestration capacity is lost.)[7]

# Transforms Traditional Supply Processes Toward True Carbon Neutrality Goals

 $E = MC^3$ 

Heat Treated – High Energy Phytosanitized High Density CHP Biomass Chips

# The production of E=MC<sup>3</sup><sup>o</sup>

Utilizes **ZERO** forest harvesting

Processes only forest residue and wastes

Phytosanitized chips are 100% Bark Free

Heat treatment - processing reduces raw material by 20%

1 MMt exported = 1.2 M US Ton (residue/waste only)

Vessel Stowage exceeds wood pellet density stow.

The smallest impacts on the climate are derived of the use of residues and wastes from forest harvesting or forest industries, that imply no additional harvesting, and would otherwise be burnt as waste or left to decay, thereby releasing carbon to the atmosphere in any case. [8] **E=MC**<sup>3</sup> © Utilizes only that waste and residue left over from merchantable harvests for timber and lumber production such as Mass Timber, Cross Laminated Timber (CLT), furniture manufacturing and as waste from harvests necessary for paper manufacturing.

No raw material is derived from cutting, none is left in forest to decay, and all waste is a byproduct of a forest harvest use in a production of a fiber or timber product that will continue to sequester its carbon for the life-cycle of that product – in construction that can be 50 to 75 years.

**Environmental Obligations Demand Changes:** 

**Starting with Identification and Reduction of Carbon Emissions Threats** 

# **Reduce Threats to Global Environment**

- 1.) End Clear-Cutting Intrusive Forest Harvesting
- 2.) Fiber Origination source only Residues and Wastes
- 3.) Curtail Carbon Intensive Trucking to Reduce GHG Emissions
- 4.) Transition to Rail Transport GHG Emission Reduced 84%
- 5.) Centralize Fiber Aggregate, Classify, Process for Quality Assurance
- 6.) Exceed EU Import Mandates Phytosanitation
- 7.) Densify for Effective, Efficient and Low Cost Material Handling
- 8.) Eliminate:

Costly Storage Buildings, Chip-Pile Management, Port Handling – Movement & Covering, Inclement Weather – Climate Exposure;

- 9.) Ocean Freight cost Reduction exceed Wood Pellet Density/Stowage Value
- 10.) Financial Benefits from Acting Responsibly
- 11.) Replicate the Above.

# Adherence Assures Meaningful Carbon Emission Reductions

# 1.) End Clear-Cutting - Intrusive Forest Harvesting

# Intrusive Harvesting Impacts – EU

**Based on 1 EU Company** 

In 2019 one EU company alone consumed roughly <u>9 MMt</u> of wood pellets (or roughly <u>21.6 M-US tons</u> of raw wood chip fiber per year). This requires active management and harvesting of <u>4,600 sq. miles</u> of forests or <u>2.94 m acres</u> Slightly smaller than the entire State of Connecticut.

"An estimated <u>4,600 square miles</u> of forest are needed to feed the voracious Drax plant." [9] Roughly <u>2.94 million acres</u> annually - Roughly <u>8,066 acres a day</u> to maintain operations. Replanted trees will take <u>50 Years</u> to regrow. Despite the decarbonization claims, the CO2 emitted from the Drax plant is far greater today than when coal fuel was burned. [10]

### Intrusive Harvesting Impacts US-SE Based on 1 SE Based Company

US-SE region expected to export 13.6 MMt annually by 2030

At the time of this report in 2017 80,000 acres were being harvested annually.

By 2030 this will increase to 280,000 acres annually to keep up with demand.

"The use of wood and other biomass will <u>increase at an average annual</u> rate of <u>4.4 %</u> from 2014 through 2040" [11]



## **Negative Perceptions – Damaging to Industry**

Surprise! Greedy Green Energy Corporatists are Clear Felling Protected Forests for Biomass [12]

The Obvious Biomass Emissions Error [13]

A Trifecta of Green Lunacy: The law of unintended consequences kicks in [14]

Wood-burning power plants: Misguided climate change solution? [15]

Green Shock: Entire Forests Being Murdered to Produce Wood Pellet Biomass [16]

Hardwood forest cut down to feed Power plant, Channel 4 Dispatches claims [17]

Dangerous delusions: biomass is not a renewable energy source [18]

Negative Effects of Biomass [19]

The biomass industry should come clean about its environmental impact [20]

## 2.) Fiber Origination - source only Residues and Wastes



100% Debarked, fiber waste from **Paper Manufacturing** plants. Typically reduced to < 20% MC prior to arrival. Blended with other residues and wastes. Photos: *Apollo – Bucksport Mill* 



Waste materials, 100% debarked, derived from **Regional Lumber Mills**. Shavings, wood chips, screened and sized for processing biomass. Photos: *Apollo & Maine Biomass Exports* – *Irving Mill* 



Removing the smaller, weaker trees by **Thinning Forests** (left) produces a more natural and healthier stand (right) that will be more resilient to wildfire and insect infestations. Photos: *Glenn Kohler/DNR* 

Major tree removal companies deliver tree trunks and branches to the aggregate yard for processing. Raw material is typically delivered free or at a nominal dipping fee paid to the yard. Photo: *MB Exports* – *Searsport Yard* 

Residue generated by merchantable timber harvests. For every 1,000 cubic feet delivered to a mill, there is approximately 28 cubic feet of slash and logging residue created and left in forest. Residues would arrive on rail cars at about 75 Mt per car (replacing 2.5 truck loads over the road. Source: U.S. Forest Service



Fiber chips produced from softwood residuals and wastes. Photos: MB Exports - Searsport Yard



#### Fiber Origination – Residuals come from well managed and properly certified forests

- Maine contains an estimated 17.6 million acres of forest land and covers 89.1% of the land area in the State. Most of the forest land, 95.3 %, is classified as timberland, meaning that it exceeds a minimum level of productivity and is not legislatively reserved from timber harvesting.
- Forest land, in Maine there is an estimated **23.9 billion live trees**  $\geq$ 1 in d.b.h.
- ➤ These trees have a total above ground biomass of 713.8 million tons and, looking at trees ≥5 in d.b.h., a total net volume of 27.3 billion ft3. The ratio of net growth to removals is 1.4:1.
- Certificated Fiber: 1.55 M acres FSC; 2.83 M acres SFI and 3.26 M acres both FSC and SFI = 7.64 M acres total
- As a result of merchantable forest harvest the residual and waste is abundant. <u>https://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru\_fs160.pdf</u>

### Sustainability Statistics Considering all Four (4) Mega Forest Regions

м	lajor Landowr Harvest Acrea	iers ge	
Certifications	Acres	Owners	
FSC	1,548,319	11	
SFI	2,831,237	7	
FSC & SFI	3,257,579	1	
	7,637,135	19	
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro	to define annual om the land throu	l cuts and to oversee all agh licensed logging compa	nie
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro Logging Co	to define annual om the land throu ontractors and	l cuts and to oversee all agh licensed logging compa <b>Trucking Firms</b>	nie
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro Logging Co Total	to define annual om the land throu ontractors and 86	l cuts and to oversee all ugh licensed logging compa Trucking Firms	nie
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro Logging Co Total Within 50 mi	to define annual om the land throu ontractors and 86 53	l cuts and to oversee all ugh licensed logging compa Trucking Firms 	nie
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro Logging Co Total Within 50 mi Beyond 50 mi	to define annual om the land throu ontractors and 86 53 33	l cuts and to oversee all ugh licensed logging compa Trucking Firms 62% 38%	nie
censed, certified Forester equired to supply fiber fro Logging Co Total Within 50 mi Beyond 50 mi	to define annual om the land throu ontractors and 86 53 33 5,000,000	l cuts and to oversee all ugh licensed logging compa Trucking Firms 62% 38% US Tons Available	nie

#### Certifications

# Fiber Statistics: Specifications – Classification & Testing

#### WOOD CHIPS - SOFTWOOD

#### Spruce/Pine/Fir – and Hemlock

Maine wood chips are produced from paper-quality, SPF fiber. Harvested from within a 17.7 million acre wood basket in the state of Maine. Maine fiber is chosen for its extremely high quality and designer suitability in the manufacture of paper and pulp, particleboard, MDF and wood pellets.

#### PROCESSED - VALUE ADDED

Maine softwood chips are harvested from base-cut trees, debarked, and chipped according to design specifications. They are screened and size-filtered to spec and finish as pristine softwood chips.

#### **TYPICAL WOOD CHIP SPECIFICATIONS**

#### Spruce/Pine/Fir – and Hemlock

Accepts:	.45 cm - 4.5 cm	90% Maximum
Overs:	4.5 cm	5% Maximum
Fines:	.45 cm	5% Maximum
Bark		<1% Maximum





					Giga	joule	e valı	ue by	Moi	isture	e Co	ntent	t i				
	20	1	1	-		11	110	34157			6	22		14	12	1	N.
e	18	11		-	2	5	1	And De		nada	2//	AL DECENT	and and a second	5	1	-	2.
u	16-		1.F		A.	1	7 8	a Ci	- 2-	5	1		0	ALCON ST		· La	
ic to	14	N.	Th	M	1	to	4			112426	1997		832	A B		RED	AN P
letr	12		1	M	de	AVAS	2	4	4		3			Ten al	Sugar .	1	12
r m	10		1 P	YP-	C.	A	R.	91	2	5	22	1AN		A STATE	THE REAL	1	1
s pe	8	4	Zr	to fe	1	1	1	-	21	1 a		-			pet-	The second	12
ule	6			YS	T.	7	P		5 1	1	24			44	ab.	1	
ajo	4	0	以	X	F	3-2			1	T/		MA.	12	-			YE
Gig	4	T	FE	7	XA		VP	NE		12	-	1		10	5	C.C.	S
	2		A	TH		07	4	14					A	1	MIL	24	
	0	-	-	10				-				-				-	
		0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75
					M	oistu	ire C	onte	nt or	1 a %	We	t Bas	is				

1.1 Forest, plantation and	1.1.1 Whole trees	1.1.1.1 Broadleaf	
other virgin wood	without roots	1.1.1.2 Coniferous	
		1.1.1.5 Blends and mixtures	
	1.1.2 Whole trees with	1.1.2.1 Broadleaf	
	roots	1.1.2.2 Coniferous	Wood
		1.1.2.5 Blends and mixtures	
	1.1.3 Stemwood	1.1.3.1 Broadleaf	
		1.1.3.2 Coniferous	
		1.1.3.3 Blends and mixtures	Growing
	1.1.4 Logging residues	1.1.4.3 Stored, Broadleaf	Biomass
	Variation 1994	1.1.4.4 Stored, Coniferous	
		1.1.4.5 Blends and mixtures	
	1.1.5 Stumps/roots	1.1.5.1 Broadleaf	
		1.1.5.2 Coniferous	
		1.1.5.5 Blends and mixtures	GROWING-STOCK
	1.1.6 Bark (from forestry	operations) <sup>a</sup>	TREES



Design Mixture -100% Coniferous. "Max 1% bark only from logging operations - residuals on site. No short rotation coppice, no brush or bushes, no leaves, no needles.

# Fiber Statistics: Specifications – Classification & Testing

Supply Target	Specificat	tions for Co	<b>D-firing of</b> ( met for prefer	CHP Plants U rential off-take.	<u>K</u>	
Certifications: Species: Bark Content	Sustaina Respons Conifero < 2%	bility Forestr ible Forestry us: Predicte	ry Initiative® ® (FSC) Stand Spruce, Pin d to meet Ash	(SFI) Standards ards. e, Fir and Heml requirement -	and Certified ock can debark to <	1%
Characteristics Total Moisture Ash Content Greens	Unit % %	Basis AR OD	Typical	Min. Ta 30	arget Max. 35 40 <1	Table
Lea Pine Need Foreign Matter Particle Sizes:	ves % Iles % % mm	AR AR AR	None None None	mm		
Ov Acce Und Chlorine Sulpher Nitrogen	vers % epts % lers % % %	AR AR OD OD OD		> 40 x 20 ≤ 40 x 20 ≤ 1 mm	0 95 < .10 < .05 < .70	Trace Amt.
For Buyer A. R. = As Re Oven Dry = OD The Impact of Bark Co Jandacka, Jozef Peer F Engineering, Faculty of 26 Zilma, Slovakia Ra https://bioresources. Finding: Ash content of <u>Production and Deliv</u> All processed materia and with Certified Res Heat treatment as def minutes throughout th $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{MC}^{3}$ Heat treatment throughout the entire	eceived (For S ontent of Woo Reviewed Arti of Mechanica dovan.nosek cnr.ncsu.edu, decreses in th ery Methodol als shall be in sponsible Fo ined by the a he entire profi ent Predict profile of the	celler A. D. = A od Biomass o cle; Bioresou I Engineering @fstroj.uniza /BioRes 11/E ne range of .0 logy: n accordance restry <sup>®</sup> (FSC) S pplication of file of the work red to meet 60 e wood (inclu	s Delivered) n Biofuel Pro rces.com Deg g, University of a.sk Retrieve BioRes 11 1 1333 to .0444% with Sustain Standards. 556°C for a mini od (including 0°C for a mini ding at its co	operties; Holubc partment of Pow of Zilma, Univer from: 44 Nosek HJ I 5 per 1% decreas ability Forestry inimum duration gat its core). mum duration re).	ik, Michael & ver zitma 1, 010 mpact Bark%2 se in bark conte Initiative® (SFI) on of 45 continuou	nt. Standards Jous Js minutes
	<u>Specific</u> Gravity	Density	Weight per Cord	Specific Gravity	Density	Weight per Cord
Sampled Softwood		(10/10)			(10/12)	(10/00/0)
Spruce, Canadian		34		0.45	28.0	
Pine, Northern White		36			25.0	
Fir, Balsam		45			25.0	
Hamlack Eastern		50			28.0	

	<u>Specific</u> <u>Gravity</u>	Density ( <i>lb/ft</i> <sup>3</sup> )	Weight per Cord (Ib/cord)	Specific Gravity	Density ( <i>Ib/ft</i> <sup>3</sup> )	Weight per Cord <i>(lb/cord</i> )
Sampled Softwood						
Spruce, Canadian		34		0.45	28.0	
Pine, Northern White		36			25.0	
Fir, Balsam		45			25.0	
Hemlock, Eastern		50			28.0	
				Average SW	26.5	

# Fiber Statistics: Specifications – Classification & Testing

<u>Total Acre</u>	<u>rs - Millions</u>				<u>Est.</u>					
<u>Timberlan</u>	d Acres - Million	<u>Regions</u>	Green	Green	<u>40% MC</u>	<u>20% MC</u>	BTU - Cord	Forest Vol.	<u>17.7</u>	Forest Vol.
<u>Species</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Available</u>	$\underline{MC}$	Lbs./CF	Lbs./CF	Lbs./CF	Dried	<u>Today</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>2060</u>
Eastern White Pine	Pinus strobus	ME & E. CA	50%	36	32	25	14.30	5.2%	920,400	899,600
Eastern/Red Spruce	Picea rubens	ME & E. CA	50%	34	30	28	15.90	17.4%	3,079,800	3,010,200
Eastern Balsam Fir	Abies balsamea	ME & E. CA	50%	45	40	25	14.30	15.2%	2,690,400	2,629,600
Eastern Red Cedar	Juniperus virginiana	ME & E. CA	50%	28	25	22	12.20	10.3%	1,823,100	1,781,900
Eastern Hemlock	Tsuga canadensis	ME & E. CA	50%	50	44	28	15.90	5.8%	1,026,600	1,003,400
						Timberland	Acres - Million	53.9%	9.540.300	9.324.700



1641 Sigman Road PO Box 919 Conyers, GA 30012 1-770-922-8000 ext 303

#### **Report of Analysis**



BEL2690						
TS Laurent - Osahada of	Maine, LLC	Company Contact:	Art 207-930-5168			
East Main Street						
RT 1 Searsport, ME 049	74					
BEL ID Number:	BEL190245-1	Sample Weight (kg):	1.38			
Product / Commodity:	Wood Chips Fresh Cut	Sample Received:	2/11/2019			
Sample Designation:	50% Hemlock- 20% Pine - 15% Spruce - 5% Fir	Report Date:	2/21/2019			
Date Sampled:	2/19/2019	Report Code:				
		Purchase Order #:				
Parameter	As-Received	Dry Basis	Analytical Method			
Total Moisture (%)	43.59		ISO 18134-1			
Ash (%)	0.28	0.49	ISO 18122			
Volatiles (%)	45.22	80.16	ISO 18123			
Fixed Carbon (%)	10.90	19.34	By Difference			
GCV (GJ/Tonne)	11.77	20.87	ISO 18125			
NCV cV (GJ/Tonne)	10.07	19.63	ISO 18125			
NCV cP (GJ/Tonne)	9.97	19.56	ISO 18125			
Carbon (%)	29.75	52.73	ISO 16948			
Hydrogen (%)	3.37	5.98	ISO 16948			
Nitrogen (%)	0.07	0.12	ISO 16948			
Oxygen (%)	22.94	40.67	ISO 16948			
Sulfur (%)	0.01	0.01	ISO 16994			
Chlorine (%)	< 0.005	< 0.005	ISO 16994			

#### 1641 Sigman Road Conyers, GA 30012 www.biomassenergylab.co

BEL-ME201111 Osahada of Maine 177East Main Street Searsport, ME 04974

#### Report of Analysis



#### Contact: Arthur House

BEL ID Number: Product / Commodity: Sample Designation: Date Sampled:	ME201111 Wood Chips <u>Fresh Cut</u> Hemlock Chips 3/12/2019		Sample Weight (kg): Sample Received: Report Date: Report Code: Purchase Order #:	4.95 3/24/2019 3/31/2019	
Parameter		As-Received	Dry Basis	Analytical Method	
Total Moisture (%)		52.54		CEN/EN 14774-1	
Ash (%)		0.20	0.43	CEN/EN 14775	
Volatiles (%)		39.02	82.21	CEN/EN 15148	
Fixed Carbon (%)		8.23	17.35	By Difference	
GCV (GJ/Tonne)		9.83	20.71	CEN/EN 14918	
NCV cV (GJ/Tonne)		8.02	19.46	CEN/EN 14918	
NCV cP (GJ/Tonne)		7.92	19.39	CEN/EN 14918	
Carbon (%)		24.60	51.84	CEN/EN 15104	
Hydrogen (%)		2.89	6.09	CEN/EN 15104	
Nitrogen (%)		0.11	0.23	CEN/EN 15104	
Sulfur (%)		< 0.01	0.01	CEN/EN 15104	
Oxygen (%)		19.65	41.41	CEN/EN 15104	
Chlorine (%)		< 0.005	< 0.005	CEN/EN 15289	

All samples cut in Waldo and Hancock County - Maine. All samples were air dried for 30 days then debarked and chipped on day 32. Samples were then sent to the lab for testing.



1641 Sigman Road Conyers, GA 30012 www.biomassenergylab.com

#### **Report of Analysis**

Osahada of Maine 177East Main Street Searsport, ME 04974



Page 1 of

Company Contact: Art House

BEL ID Number(s):	BEL-ME11001		Sample Weight (kg):	3.65	
Product/Commodity:	Biomass		Sample Received:	3/7/2019	
Sample Designation:	Hog Fuel Bion	nass	Report Date:	3/14/2019	
Packaging:	Plastic Bag		Report ID:	BEL-ME11001	
Date Sampled:	N/A		Purchase Order #	N/A	
Compositional Analysis:	Proximate/Ultin	nate Analysis			
Parameter		As-Received	Oven Dry	Analytical Method	
Total Moisture (%)		23.62		CEN/EN 14774-1	
Ash (%)		0.98	1.29	CEN/EN 14775	
Volatiles (%)		62.58	81.93	CEN/EN 15148	
Fixed Carbon (%)		12.81	16.78	By Difference	
Gross Calorific Value	e (GJ/Tonne)	15.56	20.37	CEN/EN 14918	
Net Calorific Value (	cV)(GJ/Tonne)	14.04	19.10	CEN/EN 14918	
Net Calorific Value (	cP)(GJ/Tonne)	13.96	19.03	CEN/EN 14918	
Carbon (%)		38.89	50.91	CEN/EN 15104	
Hydrogen (%)		4.71	6.16	CEN/EN 15104	
Nitrogen (%)		0.26	0.33	CEN/EN 15104	
Sulfur (%)		0.01	0.01	CEN/EN 15289	
Oxygen (%)		31.54	41.29	By Difference	
Chlorine (ppm)				ASTM D6721	

Chies Wiberg

#### Prepared By:

Results shown on this certificate represent only the quantity of sample which was submitted for analysis. BCL does not assume responsibility for selection, representation, and/or sample identifications. Analyses are carried on within the scoge of Principal's instructions and with due are and skill in conformity with BCL Terms and Condition of Business. Claims in respect of services provided will be considered only if based spon failure to take due care proven by the in respect of services provided will be considered only if exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal. Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal to 10 (the Principal Liability shall in no circumstances whitstower exceeds a total aggregate sum equal total total sum equal total sum equal

Page 1 of 1



Results shown on the certificate requested roly the quartity of anying which was submitted for analysis. Bit: does not sensing wavepointing to execution, requestances, and/or anying including and provide any of the sense of the sense of the sense of the sense skill. Cleans in mapped of services provided will be considered only Flasted upon blank to bake due are prove to the Provides Liability shall no concensioners which due to any sense of the sense to concensioners which has areas. This Certificate is not intended to releve the parties to any relevant tasks contract from the relevance of the sense of the sense. This Certificate is not intended to releve the parties to any relevant tasks contract from the

#### **Report of Analysis**

Osahada of Maine

1641 Sigman Road Conyers, GA 30012 www.biomassenergylab.com





Page 1 of 1

Company Contact: Art House

BEL ID Number(s):	BEL190101		Sample Weight (kg):	5.67	
Product/Commodity:	Wood Chips		Sample Received:	7/31/2018	
Sample Designation:	Mixed Conife	rs	Report Date:	8/8/2018	
Packaging:	Plastic Bag		Report ID:	BEL-ME190101	
Date Sampled:	N/A		Purchase Order #	N/A	
Compositional Analysis:	Proximate/Ultin	nate Analysis			
Parameter		As-Received	Oven Dry	Analytical Method	
Total Moisture (%)		28.96		CEN/EN 14774-1	
Ash (%)		2.66	3.74	CEN/EN 14775	
Volatiles (%)		56.77	79.91	CEN/EN 15148	
Fixed Carbon (%)		11.59	16.32	By Difference	
Gross Calorific Value	(GJ/Tonne)	13.28	18.69	CEN/EN 14918	
Net Calorific Value (o	:V)(GJ/Tonne)	11.74	17.47	CEN/EN 14918	
Net Calorific Value (o	P)(GJ/Tonne)	11.65	17.40	CEN/EN 14918	
Carbon (%)		33.68	47.41	CEN/EN 15104	
Hydrogen (%)		4.22	5.94	CEN/EN 15104	
Nitrogen (%)		0.32	0.46	CEN/EN 15104	
Sulfur (%)		0.02	0.03	CEN/EN 15289	
Oxygen (%)		30.14	42.42	By Difference	
Chlorine (ppm)				ASTM D6721	

Prepared By: Chis Wiberg

Results shown on this certificate represent only the quantity of sample which was submitted for analysis. BEL does not assume responsibility for selection, representation, and/or sample identifications. Analyses are carried on within the exceed Principian's instructions and with due care and skill in conformity with BEL Terms and Conditions of Business. Claims in respect of services provided will be considered only if based upon failure to take due care proven by the Principal. Liability shall in on diruminances whatoover exceed a total aggregate sum equaut to 10 (ten) times the amount of the fee paid for the service.

Page 1 of 1



### 3.) Curtail Carbon Intensive Trucking to Reduce GHG Emissions

More than <u>70,000 US tons of wood</u> harvested, transported, and delivered <u>every day</u> from US forests = <u>2,333 Truck Load Movements per</u> <u>day</u> [21]

### **Carbon Emission Analysis**

Assume all truck transport is regional and located within 50-miles of the facility.

Export Commodity:	Industrial Wood Pellets for CHP
Export Volume:	13,600,000,000 Metric Tonnes
U.S. Tons Required:	32,600,000 Short Tons of Raw Whole Tree Fiber
US Tons Per Truckload:	30 US Short Ton or 27 Metric Tonnes per load
Total Truckloads Required:	1,088,000 Truck loads
Distance - Harvest to Plant:	50 miles (each way) or 100-miles per load (averaged)
Total Miles Traveled:	54,400,000 Miles Driven
Carbon Calculations:	Average truck in US emits 161.8 grams of CO2 per ton mile
Total Carbon Emitted:	54,400,000 ton miles X 161.8 grams = 8,802 MT Annually

Projected 2030 Export Volume - in MT Converted to US Short Tons Calculated by Miles Required to Deliver to Facility

<u>Ton Miles</u>	<u>Grams CO2</u>	<u>Total Grams</u>	<u>Annual MT CO2</u>
54,400,000	161.8	8,801,920,000	8,802

Medium- and heavy-duty trucks in the United States emitted 444 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2019. Greenhouse gas emissions from these modes of transportation have increased by more than 90 percent since 1990. It is estimated that the U.S. accounts for 18 percent of global road freight CO2 emissions. Source: *Statista, Published by Ian Tiseo, Apr 23, 2021* [22]

### 4.) Transition to Rail Transport – GHG Emission Reduced 84%

Log Truck	300,000	UST per yea	r to Facil	ity													
Distance Miles	<u>Weight</u> Cargo UST	Emission Factor	Grams of CO2	MT of	S Per L Mile 1	oaded Truck		<u>\$ Per</u> Truck		<u>\$ Per US</u> Ton		<u>\$ for 300</u> <u>USTPY</u>	<u>Annual</u> <u>Tons</u>	Annual Loads	Grams of CO2	MT of CO2 Per Load	
200	30	161.8	970800	0.971	s	3.50	\$	700.00	\$	23-33	S	7,000,000	300,000	10,000	9,708,000,000	9,708	100%
175	30	161.8	849450	0.849	\$	3.50	\$	612.50	\$	20.42	\$	6,125,000	300,000	10,000	8,494,500,000	8,495	100%
150	30	161.8	728100	0.728	\$	3.50	\$	525.00	\$	17.50	\$	5,250,000	300,000	10,000	7,281,000,000	7,281	100%
125	30	161.8	606750	0.607	S	3.50	\$	437-50	\$	14.58	\$	4,375,000	300,000	10,000	6,067,500,000	6,068	100%
100	30	161.8	485400	0.485	\$	3.50	\$	350.00	\$	11.67	\$	3,500,000	300,000	10,000	4,854,000,000	4,854	100%
75	30	161.8	364050	0.364	\$	3.50	\$	262.50	\$	8.75	\$	2,625,000	300,000	10,000	3,640,500,000	3,641	100%
50	30	161.8	242700	0.243	\$	3.50	\$	175.00	\$	5.83	\$	1,750,000	300,000	10,000	2,427,000,000	2,427	100%
25	30	161.8	121350	0.121	\$	3.50	\$	87.50	\$	2.92	\$	875,000	300,000	10,000	1,213,500,000	1,214	100%
							1	Average	ŝ	13.13	\$	3.937.500			Average	5,461	100%

Rail Car	300,000	UST per yea	ar to Facil	ity																					
Distance Miles	Weight Cargo UST	Emission Factor	Grams of CO2	MT of CO2	51	Per Loaded Mile Rail	5	<u>SPer Rail</u> <u>SPe</u> <u>Car</u> I		<u>Rail \$ Per US</u> Ir <u>Ton</u>		<u>\$ Per US</u> Ton		<u>\$ Per US</u> Ton		<u>\$ Per US</u> Ton		<u>\$ Per US</u> Ton			Annual Tons	Annual Loads	Grams of CO2	MT of CO2 Per Load	
200	75	22.9	343500	0.344	\$	4.13	\$	\$25.00	S	11.00	s	3,300,000	300,000	4,000	1,374,000,000	1,374	14%								
175	75	22.9	300563	0.301	\$	4.50	\$	787.50	\$	10.50	\$	3,150,000	300,000	4,000	1,202,250,000	1,202	14%								
150	75	22.9	257625	0.258	\$	5.00	\$	750.00	\$	10.00	\$	3,000,000	300,000	4,000	1,030,500,000	1,031	14%								
125	75	22.9	214688	0.215	\$	5.70	\$	712.50	\$	9.50	\$	2,850,000	300,000	4,000	858,750,000	859	14%								
100	75	22.9	171750	0.172	\$	6.75	\$	675.00	\$	9.00	\$	2,700,000	300,000	4,000	687,000,000	687	14%								
75	75	22.9	128813	0.129	\$	8.50	\$	637.50	\$	8.50	\$	2,550,000	300,000	4,000	515,250,000	515	14%								
50	75	22.9	85875	0.086		NA		NA		NA			300,000	4,000	343,500,000	344	14%								
25	75	22.9	42937-5	0.043		NA		NA		NA			300,000	4,000	171,750,000	172	14%								
									\$	9.75	\$	2,925,000			Average	773	14%								
Transition Po	oint						4	lverage Savings		26%	\$	1,012,500 26%			-	GHG Reduced	86%								

#### Target Procurement = ~ 70% of Fiber Inbound by Rail and ~ 30% on Local Trucks



#### **Other Benefits of Rail:**

- Rail sidings located ~ 50 miles apart
- ~ 2.5 Truckloads per rail car
- Loggers increase fiber supply 2.5x
- Opens Work to Smaller Companies
- Residuals/Slash Removed Faster
- Thinning/Clearing more Efficient
- Reduced Forest Fire Hazards
- Reduced truck traffic
- Lower accident incidents
- Increase rail service (efficiencies)
- Activates rail service
- Provides Job Opportunities
- Enhances Local Economies

To: Searsport Fiber Hub Inbound Fiber 65% to 70% - By rail to reduce truck use - reduce GHG by ~ 86%



# 5.) Centralize Fiber, Aggregate, Classify, Process for Quality Assurance



# **Cost Efficiencies by Operating Fiber Hub – Aggregation Yard** Production of Low Cost – Low Value Residual and Waste Fiber

# Blending Material From Various Sources to Achieve Low Cost Conifer - Softwood Fiber Only

Fiber As-Received:	<u>Average 50-mile Radius</u>	<u>Annual US</u>	Va	ulue Per US	Ext	tended Yard	Ti	pping Fee	<u>Bl</u>	ended Values
Desc	<u>ription</u>	<u>Ton Available</u>	<u>Ton</u>	n As Received	<u>Co</u>	st Received	<u>Pa</u>	aid to Yard	N	et Yard Costs
Residual Derived from Merchan	table Harvests	150,000	\$	29.00	\$	4,350,000			\$	4,350,000.00
Small Diameter From Forest Clea	ring	250,000	\$	32.00	\$	8,000,000			\$	8,000,000.00
Whole Tree Residual Softwood	Chipped in Forest by Logger	90,000	\$	34.00	\$	3,060,000			\$	3,060,000.00
Lumber Mill - Factory Residuals	, Shavings, and Waste	6,000	\$	28.00	\$	168,000			\$	168,000.00
Tree Clearing - Thinnings, Trim	nings - Power Line Maintenance	10,000	\$	(10.00)			\$	100,000.00	\$	(100,000.00)
Residential Debris - Roadside C	eaning - Clean Debris and Waste	5,000	\$	(10.00)			\$	50,000.00	\$	(50,000.00)
Disaster Clearing - Fire Prevention	on Contractors	5,000	\$	(15.00)			\$	75,000.00	\$	(75,000.00)
Municiple Removals - Softwood	Only - Received to Yard	500	\$	(25.00)			\$	12,500.00	\$	(12,500.00)
	Totals	516,500	\$	7.88			\$	237,500	\$	15,340,500
<b>Research Sample of Mater</b>	als: Conducted 2020 thru 202	22	e N	ET Cost Re	ece	ived to Ya	ard	l p/US-T	\$	29.70

• NET Cost Received to Yard p/US-T 29.70

Note: With cooperation and goal sharing by Strategic Alliance Partners one can consistently achieve these low costs targets of raw fiber before processing through the Phytosanitation System.



## From Forest to Furnace – Streamlined – Toward Carbon Neutral

## 6.) Exceed EU-2014 Import Mandate – Phytosanitation

"On June 17, 2014 the European Union published amendments to its principle plant health directive (Council Directive 2000/29/EC) which regulates the import of plants and plant products including forestry products. Member countries of the European Union are to adopt the requirements within their laws, regulations, etc. by 30 September 2014. The Requirements will come into force for imports arriving on or after October 1, 2014. Wood must be: - heat Treated or.... by using approved processes. At present the E.U. has not approved any fumigation products. Heat treatment is defined as the application of 56 C for a minimum duration of 30 continuous minutes throughout the entire profile of the wood (including at its core)."



*Since 1945 Thompson Dryers* have been pioneering drying; patenting, perfecting and servicing dryer systems across many industries. Take a tour around one of our single-pass rotary drying systems. Thompson's believes equipment should work like it's supposed to and you deserve the very best solution for your drying needs. [24]

# **Trailer Mounted Phyto Heater Dryer**

520 Trailer Mounted Phyto Heater Dryer System



Design Drawing Only: TD Dryers



<u>Wood Chip No Bark</u>	<u>MT Year</u>	<u>MC%</u>
Feedstock - In	165,000	35
Feedstock - Out	150,000	30



# $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{MC}^3_{\circ}$







Thompson 520 Mobile Wood Phytosanitary Heater Design production

Project: Revision Date: By: Page: 5-ft-diamet Thompson heater, 150

Mobile Phyto 2 23-Feb-2021 Parker Robb 1 of 1 Thompson Dehydrating Company, Inc. 2953 SW Wanamaker Dr. Topeka, KS ( +1 (785) 273,7722



# 7.) Densify for Effective, Efficient and Low Cost Material Handling



**The Apollo ISC Big Bale Press (BBP65)** is part of our Big Bale Packaging and the most efficient and flexible compressing and packing system available on the market today. The Big Bale press in itself is a compact, fully automatic installation for compressing, packing and palletizing bulk products. The Big Bale Press can be used for a wide range of compressible and cohesive products, such as peat, biomass and compost. As designed this system will bale up to 300,000 Metric Tonnes of wood chips annually, with a compression ratio of ~ 1.65 to 1 (roughly 24.5 lbs/cf to 40.4 lbs/cf in bale. [25]

### **Rock Solid - Perfectly Sized to Fit:**

Shipping Containers – No Wasted Space

Tightly Arranged Vessel – handy sized 28 – 30 KMt

US & EU Trucks/Rail and Transport



# 8.) Eliminate:

# Costly Silo Storage or Warehouse Buildings,



# Chip-Pile Management,



## Port Handling – Movement& Covering,



### Inclement Weather – Climate Exposure.



Bales are hermetically sealed in a watertight and airtight sturdy plastic seal wrapping. Wrapping is Double layered to provide strong, rigid, and nearly Impenetrable during movement, storage, loading And unloading and long-term inventory stacking. Quality and Integrity can be held a year – outside.

### 9.) Ocean Freight cost Reduction exceed Pellet Density/Stowage Value

Ocean freight costs are directly related to the stowage value of any commodity. Industrial wood pellets weigh 40 lbs/cf.  $\mathbf{E}=\mathbf{MC}^3$  densified biomass chips weigh 40.6 lbs/cf or slightly more comparable to industrial wood pellets. Therefore, these two commodities weighing the same; there is no appreciable difference in the ocean freight density, stowage or loading variables. The stowage per vessel is equal.

They will have the same stowage as each other, but the ocean freight will differ in the exception that the ocean distance for industrial wood pellets is from Savannah, GA, USA to Liverpool GP with a distance of 3629.86 mi, (6722.49 km). The transit time is: 11 days 15 hours at an average speed of: 13 knots.

**E**=**M** $\mathbb{C}^3$ <sup>©</sup> is from Searsport, ME, USA to Liverpool GP with a distance of 2681.05 mi, (4965.29 km). The transit time is: 8 days 14 hours at an average speed of: 13 knots. This is a 3-day or 27% reduction of time on water each way or a 6-day round trip sailing time reduction, which allows more vessel turn around trips each year. [26]



# Vessel Loading Configurations – System and Equipment





Load Perfection:

PS-STA@OLDENDORFF.COM

OLDENDORFF @

### 28-30 KMT Cargo - Handy Size Under & Below Hatch

- Tightly Arranged Vessel
- **3** Cranes on Board
- 24 Mt Per Cranston Bar
- 7 Turns Per Hr (24 MT EA)
- 168 MT P/hr per/Crane
- 504 MT per Hr Total
- □ 60 Hrs. to Load ~ 30 KMt
- Content of the second secon
- Reciprocal Back Hauls (may be arranged)
- Same Ports Same Type Loads (may be arranged)
- 5 Dedicated Loads Per Year for 150 KMTPY cargo
- 150,000 MT Potential per Dryer System
- Dual HT System = 300 KMTPY With 2<sup>nd</sup> Dryer
- 10 Dedicated Loads Per Year for 300 KMTPY cargo

# 10.) Achieve Efficiency by promoting Strategic Alliances.

**Strategic Alliances** are established by and between landowners, loggers and transportation professionals. All fiber sourced is strictly derived of forest residuals and waste materials. No trees are harvested for this entire project. No forest land/acreage is deforested.

Relationships are established with Canadian Pacific Rail for transport and several laydown yards have been identified to enhance supply chain efficiency. Reliance upon rail transport will replace truck traffic and carbon emissions by roughly 86%. The Searsport laydown yard is under site control for 30-years with land lease cost at below market rate in consideration to an exchange for pass through costing, whereby payment is made upon loading and shipping vessels.

The aggregate yard acts as the central handling facility to ensure exacting specifications, in both quality, species, and sizing – also, to maintain a consistent and exacting record of Phytosanitation processes. The EU mandate of 56°C for 30 minutes to the core is exceeded at 60°C for 45minutes to the core (in expectation of increased mandates).

Densification of wood chips lowers the ocean freight rate and delivery time. The absence of need for buildings, chip piles, silos and costly port handling mitigates cost and environmental exposure to the commodity.

Direct contract relationships by Oldendorff Shipping and buyers or enduser distribution centers or CHP facilities will save significantly by eliminating a middleman exporter in the financial equation.

Partnering relationships with buyers or end-user distribution centers or CHP facilities will save significantly by providing an opportunity to own, lease or manage the fiber received to the aggregation yard. Gigajoule values can increase during natural drying periods with no costs.

# 11.) Replicate the Above.



# Financial Benefits from Acting Responsibly Comparison of Commodities – MC & Gj Values

#### **Analysis of Gigajoule Value Calculations**

**GJ/tonne = 19.2 - (0.2164\*MC)**, where MC is the moisture content in percent of total weight [27]

1	BDT-Gi				Gi			
	19.2	- (0.2164 * MC	)	=	GJ			
		Given MC%	55	=	7.30	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	54	-	7.51	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	53	=	7.73	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	52	-	7.95	Gj/tonne	E=MC <sup>3</sup> @ v	Wood Pellets
		Given MC%	51	-	8.16	Gj/tonne		Wood Pellets
		Given MC%	50	=	8.38	Gj/tonne	All Fred the all	Not total & Agent
		Given MC%	49	=	8.60	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	48	=	8.81	Gj/tonne	The second	And the state
		Given MC%	47	=	9.03	Gj/tonne	SAR LOS R	
		Given MC%	46	=	9.25	Gj/tonne	Malt R	THAT THAT IS THE
		Given MC%	45	=	9.46	Gj/tonne	ANDER	
		Given MC%	44	=	9.68	Gj/tonne	IN PARKE	A DE SECTION
		Given MC%	43	=	9.89	Gj/tonne	E and the second	The second second
		Given MC%	42	=	10.11	Gj/tonne	E E CAR	Mar and the
		Given MC%	41	=	10.33	Gj/tonne	a bandara	A Company of the
		Given MC%	40	=	10.54	Gj/tonne	27-3270	The State Bar
		Given MC%	39	=	10.76	Gj/tonne	the dia son	L'ERTHAND A B
		Given MC%	38	=	10.98	Gj/tonne	311 CX	MARK IN
		Given MC%	37	=	11.19	Gj/tonne	An - Wa	
		Given MC%	36	=	11.41	Gj/tonne	12 march	AL ARTA
		Given MC%	35	=	11.63	Gj/tonne	A MA	145 Carris
		Given MC%	34	=	11.84	Gj/tonne		VAC: MA
		Given MC%	33	=	12.06	Gj/tonne		LANDAN TEST
		Given MC%	32	=	12.28	Gj/tonne	NYY	-NANAS
		Given MC%	31	=	12.49	Gj/tonne	de tris	THE WAY
		Given MC%	30	=	12.71	Gj/tonne	Conten'	ARLE IN-
		Given MC%	29	=	12.92	Gj/tonne	NH CYN	A TINCA
		Given MC%	28	=	13.14	Gj/tonne	NIK TO	AND AND
		Given MC%	27	=	13.36	Gj/tonne		And the second s
		Given MC%	26	=	13.57	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	25	=	13.79	Gj/tonne	Targeted E=MC3©	
		Given MC%	24	=	14.01	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	23	=	14.22	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	22	=	14.44	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	21	=	14.66	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	20	=	14.87	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	19	=	15.09	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	18	=	15.30	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	17	=	15.52	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	16	=	15.74	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	15	=	15.95	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	10	=	17.04	Gj/tonne	Industrial Wood Pellets	
		Given MC%	5	=	18.12	Gj/tonne		
		Given MC%	0	=	19.20	Gj/tonne		

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{MC}^3_{\circ}$ 

# **Financial Benefits from Acting Responsibly**

**Comparative Adjustment of Volume to Balance Gj Purchase** 

Justification for Substitution or Inclusion of E=MC <sup>3</sup> , Wood Chips in Place of Industrial Wood Pellets Analysis conducted on the basis of a Gigajoule Purchase = to 1 Million MT of Wood Pellets = 17 million Gj												
	Forward	US	\$ FOB Mt	<u>Gj/per-Mt</u>	<u>Per</u>	· Gj US \$	MMt Supply	<u>Gj Equivalent</u>	<u>An</u>	nual Supply US\$		
Industrial Wood Pellets												
	1Q22	\$	197.00	17.04	\$	11.56	1	17,036,000	\$	197,000,000		
	2Q22	\$	187.00	17.04	\$	10.98	1	17,036,000	\$	187,000,000		
	3Q22	\$	178.50	17.04	\$	10.48	1	17,036,000	\$	178,500,000		
	4Q22	\$	180.50	17.04	\$	10.60	1	17,036,000	\$	180,500,000		
Averaged - 22	2022	\$	185.75	17.04	\$	10.90	1	17,036,000	\$	185,750,000		
	2023	\$	172.50	17.04	\$	10.13	1	17,036,000	\$	172,500,000		
	2024	\$	173.00	17.04	\$	10.15	1	17,036,000	\$	173,000,000		
Predicted	2025	\$	173.50	17.04	\$	10.18	1	17,036,000	\$	173,500,000		
	Forward	US	\$ FOB Mt	<u>Gj/per-Mt</u>	Per	<u>Gj US \$</u>	MMt Supply	<u>Gj Equivalent</u>	<u>Anı</u>	nual Supply US\$		
E-MC3	1Q22	Ś	124.95	13.79	Ś	9.06	1	13.790.000	Ś	124.955.000		
L-IIICOS	2Q22	\$	116.75	13.79	\$	8.47	1	13,790,000	\$	116,755,000		
	3Q22	\$	107.85	13.79	\$	7.82	1	13,790,000	\$	107,855,000		
	4Q22	\$	112.75	13.79	\$	8.18	1	13,790,000	\$	112,745,500		
Averaged - 22	2022	\$	115.56	13.79	\$	8.38	1	13,790,000	\$	115,560,000		
	2023	\$	115.66	13.79	\$	8.39	1	13,790,000	\$	115,660,000		
-	2024	\$	115.76	13.79	\$	8.39	1	13,790,000	\$	115,760,000		
Predicted	2025	\$	115.86	13.79	\$	8.40	1	13,790,000	\$	115,860,000		
Adjustment to Purchas	se equivale	nt Gi	igajoules	to Wood Pe	llets							
	To provi	de an	equivalen	t Gigajoules, t	the w	ood chip i	ourchase volume	e is increased by	17.1	17%		
Wood Pelets	2023	\$	172.50	17.04	\$	10.13	1	17,036,000	\$	172,500,000		
E=MC3©	2023	\$	115.66	13.79	\$	8.39	1	17,036,000	\$	142,884,972		
Adjus	ted Volume	1,	,171,681	Metric Tonr	ies R	equired	E=MC3©	Savings	\$	29,615,028	17.17%	
Source: Argus Biomass M	Source : Argus Biomass Markets Issue 21-50 Wednesday December 15, 2021 FOB Northeast USA											

<u>Gj Value Formula:</u> GJ/tonne = 19.2 - (0.2164\*MC), where MC is the moisture content in percent of total weight.

# Financial Benefits from Acting Responsibly Analysis of Savings to CHP Facility by Substitution

Justification for Substitution or Inclusion of E=MC <sup>3</sup> Wood Chips in Place of Industrial Wood Pellets Analysis conducted on the basis of a Gigajoule Purchase = to 1 Million MT of Wood Pellets = 17 million Gj													
	Forward	US	Ś FOB Mt	Gi/per-Mt	Per	· Gi US Ś	MMt Supply	Gi Equivalent	An	nual Supply US\$			
Industrial	. c. mara			<u>og per ma</u>		0,000	<u></u>	<u>of Equivalent</u>	<u></u>	<u></u>			
Wood Pellets	1Q22	Ś	197.00	17.04	Ś	11.56	1	17.036.000	Ś	197.000.000			
	2022	Ś	187.00	17.04	Ś	10.98	1	17.036.000	Ś	187.000.000			
	3Q22	Ś	178.50	17.04	Ś	10.48	1	17.036.000	Ś	178.500.000			
	4022	Ś	180.50	17.04	Ś	10.60	1	17.036.000	Ś	180,500,000			
Averaged - 22	2022	Ś	185.75	17.04	Ś	10.90	1	17.036.000	Ś	185.750.000			
_ ٦	2023	\$	172.50	17.04	\$	10.13	1	17,036,000	\$	172,500,000			
	2024	\$	173.00	17.04	\$	10.15	1	17,036,000	\$	173,000,000			
Predicted	2025	\$	173.50	17.04	\$	10.18	1	17,036,000	\$	173,500,000			
	Forward	US	\$ FOB Mt	<u>Gj/per-Mt</u>	Per	Gi US \$	MMt Supply	<u>Gi Equivalent</u>	<u>An</u>	nual Supply US\$			
E=MC3©	1Q22	\$	124.95	13.79	\$	9.06	1	13,790,000	\$	124,955,000			
	2Q22	\$	116.75	13.79	\$	8.47	1	13,790,000	\$	116,755,000			
	3Q22	\$	107.85	13.79	\$	7.82	1	13,790,000	\$	107,855,000			
	4Q22	\$	112.75	13.79	\$	8.18	1	13,790,000	\$	112,745,500			
Averaged - 22	2022	\$	115.56	13.79	\$	8.38	1	13,790,000	\$	115,560,000			
. [	2023	\$	115.66	13.79	\$	8.39	1	13,790,000	\$	115,660,000	\$ 56,840,000		
	2024	\$	115.76	13.79	\$	8.39	1	13,790,000	\$	115,760,000			
Predicted	2025	\$	115.86	13.79	\$	8.40	1	13,790,000	\$	115,860,000			
Adjustment to Purchas	Adjustment to Purchase equivalent Gigajoules to Wood Pellets												
_	To prov	ide a	n equivale	nt Gigajoules, i	the w	ood chip	ourchase volume	e is increased by	32.9	5%			
Wood Pelets	2023	\$	172.50	17.04	\$	10.13	1	17,036,000	\$	172,500,000			
5,000											Difference		
E=IVIC3©	2023	\$	115.66	13.79	\$	8.39	1	13,790,000	\$	115,660,000	32.95%		
Added Mt Volun	<mark>ne Requirec</mark>	l to I	Equal Gj	235,388	\$	8.39	1, <b>235,3</b> 88	3,246,000	\$	10,361,492			
							Adjustment	17,036,000		126,021,492	26.94%	Savings	
			17 04	Wood Pellets		13 79	F=MC3@	Adjustment	23 5	4%			
			1/104	Wood reliets		13.75	2-11000	Aujustinent	2010				
Adjusted	Mt Volume	Req	uired		Pr	evious	1,000,000						
Adjus	ted Volume	1,	329,507	Metric Tonn	es Re	equired	E=MC3©	Savings	Ş	56,840,000	32.95%		
Here, a CHP	facility can	redu	ice its fib	er supply cos	ts by	32.95%	by a total subs	stitution of wo	od p	ellets as a suppl	y commodity		
with E=MC3	© however,	the	suggestic	on is to substi	itute	and or o	omplement t	ne traditional u	tiliz	ation of wood p	ellets with a		
marginal inf	lux of E=MC	3© a	is demon	strated herei	n.								
		<u>Cor</u>	<u>mmodit y</u>	<u>% Adjusted</u>	<u>Mt I</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>Original Gj</u>	<u>Adjusted Gj</u>	2	<u>Gj USD \$ FOB</u>	Delivered	USD \$	
Suggested N	<b>Nodification</b>	1000	d Pellets	35%	(	650,000	17,036,000	11,073,400	\$	10.13	<b>\$</b> 1	12,125,000	
		E	= <mark>MC3</mark> ©			432,386		5,962,600	\$	8.39	\$	50,009,740	
					1,	082,386		17,036,000			\$ 1	62,134,740	
								0	rigir	al Pellet USD \$	\$ 1	72,500,000	
							CHP Faci	lity Savings wit	h Su	bstitution	\$	10,365,260	
Savings % 6.01%											%		

Source ; Argus Biomass Markets Issue 21-50 Wednesday December 15, 2021 FOB Northeast USA <u>Gi Value Formula</u>; GJ/tonne = 19.2 - (0.2164\*MC), where MC is the moisture content in percent of total weight.

35%

<u>The Parameters</u>: For Analysis of Savings made possible by substitution or utilizing a partial substitution of E=MC3<sup>®</sup> Wood Chips in place of industrial wood pellets. This analysis starts with the values attributed to the purchase and supply of 1-million metric tonnes of industrial wood pellets with a Gj value of \$17.04 per Mt. for a Gj contract purchase of 17,036,00 Gj delivered. Using values established herein, the Gj value per Mt for E=MC3<sup>®</sup> Wood Chips is \$13.79 Gj/Mt. To increase the Gj value to an equivalent of wood pellets we must add an additional 23.54% to the base Gj of \$13.79 to achieve \$17.04 per Gj.

Here we adjust the volume of wood pellet consumption by 35% and remain with a total ocean freight volume of 1,082,386 Mt afloat. This adjustment lowers the overall cost to the CHP facility from \$172,500,000 to about \$162,134,740 for a savings of \$10,365,260 or about 6.01%. The total Gj purchase volume remains the same.

By reducing the Mt volume by

fiber volume decreases by

840,000 US Ton of fiber and annual acres saved = 6,388

#### FORWARD-LOOKING AND PREDICTIVE STATEMENTS

The representations depicted herein are based on exhaustive, multi-year cross industry disciplined research and development, primarily related to woody biomass as a sustainable source of renewable energy fiber for use in co-generation CHP facilities and in stand-alone power plants intended to rely only on biomass wood chips.

All predictions and statements, other than cited commentary derived of published or historical facts, included in this presentation that address activities, events or developments that we expect, believe or anticipate will or may occur in the future are forward-looking statements. The words "may," "estimated," "believe," "expect," "will," "anticipate," "plan," "intend," "foresee," "should," "would," "could," or other similar expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements, which are generally predictive but, not historical in nature.

The intent here is to combine those statements with reasoned prediction – helpful in a broad, macro sense, that can point to potential alternatives to traditional thinking and allow one to fulfill market demand, address climate change issues, reinvigorate forest industry revenue, enhance local and international economies and build enduring strategic alliances globally.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND INTEREST

By: Arthur T. House, EJD, MBA President of Construction Management Institute Developer of **E** = **MC3** Tel: 1-207-930-5168 Email: <u>Art@ArthurHouse.com</u> Web: <u>https://www.arthurhouse.com/e-mc3.shtml/</u>

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{MC}^3_{\circ}$ 

#### **Citations:**

[1] Statista, Wood pellet consumption in the European Union in 2019, by select country, Accessed at

https://www.statista.com/statistics/1191320/european-union-wood-pellet-production-by-majorcountry/#:~:text=The%20United%20Kingdom%20is%20a,metric%20tons%20of%20wood%20pellets

[2] Voegele, E., Biomass Magazine, July 23, 2020, Report: EU wood pellet demand expected to increase in 2020 Accessed at

https://biomassmagazine.com/articles/17231/report-eu-wood-pellet-demand-expected-to-increase-in-2020

[3] Funk, J., Forsell, N., Gunn, J., and Burns, D., GCB Bioenergy, Assessing the potential for unaccounted emissions from bioenergy and the implications for forests: The United States and global, (March 2022), Accessed at

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357634363\_Assessing the potential for unaccounted emissions from bioenergy and the implicat ions for forests The United States and global

[4] New Report Shows Wood Pellets from Drax's U.S. Mills Increase Carbon Emissions During the Timeframe Necessary to Address Climate Change, Accessed at <a href="https://www.southernenvironment.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/publications/Biomass\_Factsheet\_0719\_F\_Pgs.pdf">https://www.southernenvironment.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/publications/Biomass\_Factsheet\_0719\_F\_Pgs.pdf</a>

[5] Brack, D. Chatham House, & Walker, W., Woodwell *Climate Research, Greenhouse gas emissions from burning US-sourced woody biomass in the EU and UK,* Environment and Society Programme (October 2021) Page 2, Accessed at <a href="https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/2021-10-14-woody-biomass-us-eu-uk-research-paper\_0.pdf">https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/2021-10-14-woody-biomass-us-eu-uk-research-paper\_0.pdf</a>

[6] Brack, D. Chatham House, & Walker, W., Woodwell *Climate Research, Greenhouse gas emissions from burning US-sourced woody biomass in the EU and UK,* Environment and Society Programme (October 2021) Page 11, Accessed at

https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/2021-10-14-woody-biomass-us-eu-uk-research-paper\_0.pdf [7] Id.

[8] Funk, J., Forsell, N., Gunn, J., and Burns, D., GCB Bioenergy, Assessing the potential for unaccounted emissions from bioenergy and the implications for forests: The United States and global, (March 2022), Accessed at <a href="https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/2021-10-14-woody-biomass-us-eu-uk-summary.pdf">https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/2021-10-14-woody-biomass-us-eu-uk-summary.pdf</a>

[9] Accessed at https://wattsupwiththat.com/2019/02/07/the-obvious-biomass-emissions-error/ [10] Id.

[11] U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration 2014, Accessed at

https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Acres-of-Pellets-Fact-Sheet.pdf http://bit.ly/2tFsGSe

[12] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2016/11/26/surprise-greedy-green-energy-corporatists-are-clear-felling-protected-forests-for-biomass/

[13] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2019/02/07/the-obvious-biomass-emissions-error/

[14] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2017/02/23/a-trifecta-of-green-lunacy-the-law-of-unintended-consequences-kicks-in/

[15] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/11/09/wood-burning-power-plants-misguided-climate-change-solution/

[16] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2018/04/18/green-shock-entire-forests-being-murdered-to-produce-wood-pellet-biomass/

[17] https://theecologist.org/2018/apr/16/hardwood-forests-cut-down-feed-drax-power-plant-channel-4-dispatches-claims

[18] https://www.leonardodicaprio.org/dangerous-delusions-biomass-is-not-a-renewable-energy-source/

[19] https://sciencing.com/negative-effects-biomass-19624.html

[20] https://assets.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/01\_opener\_biomass\_video.mp4

[21] https://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/11/09/wood-burning-power-plants-misguided-climate-change-solution/

[22] https://www.statista.com/statistics/1120519/us-med-heavy-trucks-vehicle-ghg-emissions/

[23] https://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru\_fs160.pdf

[24] https://youtu.be/bns2qMiKgUQ

[25] https://apollobv.com/products/baling-debaling/baling

[26] https://www.searates.com/services/distances-time/

[27] <u>https://ens.dk/sites/ens.dk/files/Statistik/metode\_traeaffald.pdf</u>