

## Questions asked January 18, 2008

Nick King (G2 Energy)

1) We never received estimates (for the items 3, 4, 5 of Exhibit B, Proposal Economic Benefits Summary) listed in the RFP. Can we get these?

### **ANSWER:**

**Item 3, (At no cost to the County, Developer will supply the power for the existing and any future collection system and flare blowers. County estimated annual savings \$ \_\_\_\_\_ credited to proposal) was answered in answer #12 in the December 7, 2007 response to questions. The average usage of the flare is 10,700 kWh per month. The average usage for the rest of the facility is 4,500 kWh per month. The average cost per kWh is \$0.1820.**

**Item 4, Developer will operate and maintain the flare station. Yes / No. (County's estimated annual savings \$ \_\_\_\_\_ credited to proposal). The estimated cost to the County to operate and maintain the flare station is approximately \$12,000. This estimate includes contract rate for consulting firm to monitor and service the flare, miscellaneous replacement parts, and County labor to provide certain maintenance services.**

**Item 5, Developer will operate the existing and future collection system and provide minor maintenance. Yes / No. (County's estimated annual savings \$ \_\_\_\_\_ credited to proposal). The estimated cost to the County to operate and maintain the current collection system is approximately \$28,000. This estimate includes contract rate for consulting firm to monitor and service the collection system, miscellaneous replacement parts, repair costs for services outside the scope of the monitoring and service contract, and County labor to provide certain other maintenance services.**

Jim Bier (Ameresco)

2) What is the capacity (in gallons) of the condensate storage tank located at the flare station?

**ANSWER: The capacity of the condensate tank is approximately 3,000 gallons.**

3) Has the County determined the estimated annual savings for the developer operating and maintaining the flare station and wellfield. How does the County plan to estimate future cost for expanding systems?

**ANSWER: For the answer to the first part of the question, see answer to question #1 above. For the second part of the question, the County has contracted with a landfill gas consulting firm to a) design adding two additional vadose zone wells to be located adjacent to soil probes 4 and 5 to control gas migrating to landfill property boundaries adjacent to those probes, and b) create a Master Plan for the Landfill Gas Collection System for expansion of the existing system, or development**

**of a separate gas collection system if warranted, to comply with NSPS regulations in the current active landfill modules. This Master Plan probably will not be available until later this summer. Future development costs are undetermined at this time.**

4) Have the below questions previously submitted been answered by the County and PGE?

A). What has been the historical variance of methane and nitrogen in the waste stream? Other testing data available?

**ANSWER: Methane concentration readings taken monthly at the flare have been compiled into a chart and graph and is available on the [www.buttecounty.net](http://www.buttecounty.net) website [http://www.buttecounty.net/publicworks/divisions/engineering/engineering\\_assets/LFG/Bidder%20Charts%20presentation.xls](http://www.buttecounty.net/publicworks/divisions/engineering/engineering_assets/LFG/Bidder%20Charts%20presentation.xls).**

**As noted earlier, the gas collection system has been run very aggressively since the late summer of 2007 to control methane gas migration to the landfill perimeter. Very recently, the vadose zone wells have been partially closed, which has increased the methane gas concentration at the flare consistent with readings earlier in the year. For the last six months, methane, CO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>2</sub> and balance gases have exhibited the following ranges: methane low 36.1% to high of 45.4% with an average around 42%; CO<sub>2</sub> 30.5% - 35.5%; O<sub>2</sub> 0.1% - 1.0%; balance gas 19.1% - 32.4%. The initial Source Performance Test of 2004 will be put on the web site by Wednesday.**

B) Has an electrical interconnect study ever been conducted for the Neal Road Landfill? If not, what is the closest distance to a PG&E transmission and distribution line?

**ANSWER: The County has not conducted an interconnect study for the landfill. The County was able to contact a local new business representative, who researched the question and responded last week that there is information available, but the appropriate process was to contact the Interconnect Department. The County is forwarding the following information for your use. Chris Gillis, Sr. Project Manager, PG&E Generation Interconnect Department, Email: [CxCl@pge.com](mailto:CxCl@pge.com). As the County stated in an earlier response, Developers should seek this information.**