

Budget - Microsoft Outlook

File Edit View Go Tools Actions Help

New Reply Reply to All Forward Send/Receive Find Type a contact to find

Back Messages

Sensitive

**Mail**

Favorite Folders

- Inbox (6)
- Unread Mail
- For Follow Up
- Sent Items

All Mail Folders

- Xcluded From Archive
- Search Folders
- Burner Replacements
- Condensate Storage backup
- Cooling Towers
- Experience Reviews
- General Information - forms
- JOF Fuel Switch - FGC
- JOF455 (Long Range Ash Disposal)
- KIF FGD
- KIF PRB Fuel Switch
- KIF Projects
- KIF Projects - Ash
- Deleted Items
- KIF450 (Gypsum)
- KIF530 (Develop Flyash, Gypsum, and bottom ash)
  - Budget
  - Design
  - Environmental
  - Meeting Agendas and Notes
  - Meetings
  - Parsons
  - Peer Review
  - Send us something

**Budget**

Arranged By: Date Newest on top

Older *3 files*

Cahill, Don P 01/09/2006  
RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure  
Stan,  
Reminder! Please submit "Project Closures" to Scott, Lenny and I for review ~ 3 days in advance of issue.

Long, S. Scott 01/09/2006  
RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure  
Based on these numbers, the cost performance rating for final budget was 8% off resulting in a rating of 4. This make the composite cost rating a 4.5

Haber, Stanley M. 01/09/2006  
KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure  
Team,  
The referenced project is scheduled for closure on 1/13/06. I plan on mentioning this project closure in the

**RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure**

Cahill, Don P

From: Haber, Stanley M.

Cc: Peterson, Leonard J.; Long, S. Scott

Stan,

Reminder! Please submit "Project Closures" to Scott, Lenny and I for review ~ 3 days in advance of issue. Our goal is to catch any necessary revisions prior to sending out the the world.

Don

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Long, S. Scott

**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:46 PM

**To:** Haber, Stanley M.

**Cc:** Cahill, Don P; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Petty, Harold L.; Lankford, Brian S.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Bowers, Larry C; Smith, H. Michael; Tolliver, James W.; Hughes, Michael; Purkey, Ronald E.

**Subject:** RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Based on these numbers, the cost performance rating for final budget was 8% off resulting in a rating of 4. This make the composite cost rating a 4.5

3 Items

**Haber, Stanley M**

---

**From:** Cahill, Don P  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 4:10 PM  
**To:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Cc:** Peterson, Leonard J.; Long, S. Scott  
**Subject:** RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Stan,

Reminder! Please submit "Project Closures" to Scott, Lenny and I for review ~ 3 days in advance of issue. Our goal is to catch any necessary revisions prior to sending out the the world.

Don

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Long, S. Scott  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:46 PM  
**To:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Cc:** Cahill, Don P; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Petty, Harold L.; Lankford, Brian S.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Bowers, Larry C; Smith, H. Michael; Tolliver, James W.; Hughes, Michael; Purkey, Ronald E.  
**Subject:** RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Based on these numbers, the cost performance rating for final budget was 8% off resulting in a rating of 4. This make the composite cost rating a 4.5

Need to include reason for delay in not meeting schedule in the schedule section of the PJ closure report.

Not sure about rating of 5 for "exceeds" on benefits. This reference to capacity "by FY07" seems to be a left-over performance measure comment from the earlier PJ revisions when the budget was \$16M and the scope included gypsum. When R3 of the PJ was created and approved, shouldn't the performance measure have been changed to "by FY06" to conform with the new schedule and project plan? What rating best represents the project's benefit performance?

Scott Long  
Mgr., Project Development  
Fossil Power Group  
LP 2G-C  
751-7282

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:18 PM  
**To:** Cahill, Don P; Long, S. Scott; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Purkey, Ronald E.; Petty, Harold L.; Hughes, Michael; Lankford, Brian S.; Tolliver, James W.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Smith, H. Michael; Bowers, Larry C  
**Subject:** KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Team,

The referenced project is scheduled for closure on 1/13/06. I plan on mentioning this project closure in the ASH projects meeting on 1/9/06 and reviewing the closure in the EDS POD meeting

03/14/2009

TVA-00027171

on 1/13/06. For your benefit, I have attached the following information:

1. The PSI
2. The project closure report from the CPJ system
3. TVA form 4013 (for fixed assets)
4. The project history report from the CPJ system

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Stan

03/14/2009

TVA-00027172

**Haber, Stanley M**

---

**From:** Long, S. Scott  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:46 PM  
**To:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Cc:** Cahill, Don P; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Petty, Harold L.; Lankford, Brian S.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Bowers, Larry C; Smith, H. Michael; Tolliver, James W.; Hughes, Michael; Purkey, Ronald E.  
**Subject:** RE: KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Based on these numbers, the cost performance rating for final budget was 8% off resulting in a rating of 4. This make the composite cost rating a 4.5.

Need to include reason for delay in not meeting schedule in the schedule section of the PJ closure report.

Not sure about rating of 5 for "exceeds" on benefits. This reference to capacity "by FY07" seems to be a left-over performance measure comment from the earlier PJ revisions when the budget was \$16M and the scope included gypsum. When R3 of the PJ was created and approved, shouldn't the performance measure have been changed to "by FY06" to conform with the new schedule and project plan? What rating best represents the project's benefit performance?

Scott Long  
Mgr., Project Development  
Fossil Power Group  
LP 2G-C  
751-7282

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:18 PM  
**To:** Cahill, Don P; Long, S. Scott; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Purkey, Ronald E.; Petty, Harold L.; Hughes, Michael; Lankford, Brian S.; Tolliver, James W.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Smith, H. Michael; Bowers, Larry C  
**Subject:** KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure

Team,

The referenced project is scheduled for closure on 1/13/06. I plan on mentioning this project closure in the ASH projects meeting on 1/9/06 and reviewing the closure in the EDS POD meeting on 1/13/06. For your benefit, I have attached the following information:

1. The PSI
2. The project closure report from the CPJ system
3. TVA form 4013 (for fixed assets)
4. The project history report from the CPJ system

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Stan

03/14/2009

TVA-00027173

**Haber, Stanley M**

---

**From:** Haber, Stanley M.  
**Sent:** Monday, January 09, 2006 2:18 PM  
**To:** Cahill, Don P; Long, S. Scott; Peterson, Leonard J.; Catlett, James H; Baugh, James S.; Purkey, Ronald E.; Petty, Harold L.; Hughes, Michael; Lankford, Brian S.; Tolliver, James W.; Whitt, Jeffrey E; Franklin, Thomas; Smith, H. Michael; Bowers, Larry C  
**Subject:** KIF530 (French Drains): Project Closure  
**Attachments:** KIF530 Project Success Index 2006 01 13.doc; KIF530 ClosureReport 2006 01 09.pdf; KIF530 Project Closure 4013.doc; kif530 PrcClosureReportProjectHistory.pdf

Team,

The referenced project is scheduled for closure on 1/13/06. I plan on mentioning this project closure in the ASH projects meeting on 1/9/06 and reviewing the closure in the EDS POD meeting on 1/13/06. For your benefit, I have attached the following information:

1. The PSI
2. The project closure report from the CPJ system
3. TVA form 4013 (for fixed assets)
4. The project history report from the CPJ system

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Stan

03/14/2009

TVA-00027174

## Project Success Index

**Project Name:** Develop Fly Ash, Gypsum, and Bottom Ash Disposal Capacity

**Location:** Kingston

**PCN** KIF530

### COST PERFORMANCE

Original Approved Project Cost (cost after project development, i.e., at initial FPEP approval):	2756
Final Approved Project Cost (cost estimate at the end of preliminary engineering):	2756
Actual Project Cost:	2531

Cost Performance Evaluation: Compare the actual costs to both the Original and the Final Approved Budgets

Under Original by 10% or less	5 pts	Under Final by 5% or less	5 pts
Under Original between 10% and 30%	4 pts	Under Final between 5% and 20%	4 pts
Over Original by 10% or less	2 pts	Over Final by 5% or less	2 pts
Over Original between 10% and 30%	1 pt	Over Final between 5% and 20%	1 pt
Over or under Original more than 30%	0 pts	Over or under Final more than 20%	0 pts

Rating for Original Budget (OR) performance: 5      Rating for Final Budget (FR) performance: 5

Rating for Cost Performance (average of ratings for Original and Final costs)  $CP = [(OR + FR) / 2] =$  5

### SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE

Original Return to Operation Date (date identified at initial FPEP approval):	09/16/05
Final Approved Return to Operation Date (date at last FPEP approval of the project):	09/16/05
Actual Return to Operation Date:	09/30/05

Schedule Performance Evaluation: Compare the Actual Date to the Final Approved Date

Earlier than Approved Schedule by more than 1 week	5 pts
Earlier than Approved Schedule by less than 1 week but more than 1 day	4 pts
On approved Schedule ( $\pm$ 24 hours)	3 pts
Later than Approved Schedule by less than 1 week but more than 1 day	1 pt
Later than Approved Schedule by more than 1 week	0 pts

Rating for Schedule Performance  $SP =$  0

### BENEFIT PERFORMANCE

Identify each of the benefits claimed for the project in the initial (first FPEP) approved package. For each of those claimed, identify under the "Measure" whether the actual achieved benefit "Exceeded", "Met", or "Failed" to meet the claimed benefit.

Benefit Claim	Measure
Permitted disposal capacity for flyash and bottom ash by FY07	Exceeded

Exceeded all performance measures (benefits)	5 pts
Met all performance measures (benefits) and exceeded some	4 pts
Met all performance measures (benefits) or none required for this project	3 pts
Met most of performance measures (benefits) and results satisfactory	2 pts
Met some performance measures (benefits) but results unsatisfactory	1 pt
Met none of the performance measures (benefits)	0 pts

Rating for Benefit Performance  $BP =$  5

### PROJECT SUCCESS INDEX (PSI)

$PSI = [(CP + SP + BP) / 3] =$  3.3      Project Engineer: Stanley M. Haber      Date: 01/13/06

# Project Closure Report

**Project Name**

KIF--DEVELOP FLY ASH & BOTTOM ASH DISPOSAL CAPACITY

**CSF:** Achieve excellence in the Asset optimization and production processes.

**Project ID**

KIF530

**Rev#**

4

## I. Project Description

**Organization**

Owner: FPG  
Lead: Yard Operations

**Location**

Loc: KIF

**Technical Contact**

Name: HEDGE COTH, MELISSA A  
Phone: 423/751-6426

**Responsible Mgr**

Name: BAUGH, JAMES S  
Phone: 423/751-6137

**Project**

Type: Capital  
Cat: REGULATORY  
Prgm: FPG - Ash Handling

**Estimated Actual**

Start Date: 07/30/2003  
In-Srvc Date: 09/16/2005 09/30/2005  
Outage Date:

**Problem Description**

Analysis of recent dike failure in the existing dredge cells has raised uncertainties regarding the current long-term disposal plans for fly ash and bottom ash. An emergency cell was developed (O&M) which will provide a maximum of three years of fly ash and bottom ash capacity.

**News Release**

N/A

**Cost**

Original Estimate	Preliminary Estimate	Definitive Estimate	Actual Cost	Original Variance (\$)	Original Variance (%)	Preliminary Variance (\$)	Preliminary Variance (%)	Definitive Variance (\$)	Definitive Variance (%)
\$2,756	\$2,756	\$2,756	\$2,531	-\$225	-8	-\$225	-8	-\$225	-8

**Cost Comments**

Final costs within approved limits.

**Schedule**

Original In-Service	Preliminary In-Service	Definitive In-Service	Actual In-Service	Original Variance	Preliminary Variance (Days)	Definitive Variance (Days)
09/16/2005	09/16/2005	09/16/2005	09/30/2005	14	14	14

**Schedule Comments**

Assets placed in service on 9/30/2005 (14 days negative).

**Assets Planned to be placed in-service and/or Assets to be Retired**

No information available

**Actual Assets placed in-service and/or Assets Retired**

Expansion of dredge cell adjacent to existing dredge cell by construction of a new dike. Scope also included development of a waste stack for fly ash and bottom ash within the existing perimeter dikes of the active ash disposal area.

A part II permit package was submitted to Environmental Affairs.

Scope also included the design, materials procurement (pumps & piping, french drains), and installation as necessary to support the engineering study findings.

# Project Closure Report

**Project Name**

KIF--DEVELOP FLY ASH & BOTTOM ASH DISPOSAL CAPACITY

CSF: Achieve excellence in the Asset optimization and production processes.

**Project ID**

KIF530

**Rev#**

4

**ARO Review (Status)**

N/A

**ARO Asset Description / Future Retirement Action / Regulation**

No information available

**Original Performance Measurement**

Permitted disposal capacity for fly ash and bottom ash by FY 2007.

**Definitive Performance Measurement**

Permitted disposal capacity for fly ash and bottom ash by FY 2007.

**Actual Performance Measurement**

Permitted disposal capacity for fly ash and bottom ash by FY 2006.

Actual O&M Savings	\$0	Actual Increased Revenue	\$0	PM Indicator	5	
--------------------	-----	--------------------------	-----	--------------	---	--

**Lessons Learned**



- Project Completion Notice**  
 **Project Cancellation Notice**

Title of Project Develop Fly Ash & Bottom Ash Disposal Capacity Project Work Document No. KIF530  
 Organization FPG - Yard Operations Location (County/State) Roane/TN

*Give details of changes in the completed work form that's authorized by the capital project. List all capital assets added (or retired) as a result of completing the authorized capital project. Assets should be listed at the retirement unit level. If the capital project is cancelled, prepare a write-off project journal voucher and attach a copy of this form as supporting documentation.*

Expansion of dredge cell adjacent to existing dredge cell by construction of a new dike. Scope will also include development of a waste stack for fly ash and bottom ash within the existing perimeter dikes of the active ash disposal area.

A part II permit package is to be submitted to Environmental Affairs. Scope will also include the design, materials procurement (pumps and piping, french drains), and installation as necessary to support the engineering study findings.

**Completion Analysis - Capital Assets Added (or Retired) - Retirement Unit Level:**

Completed as approved.

*Show below dates pertaining to the work order as a whole. If major phases of the work or major items of equipment were placed in service prior to work order completion, such dates should be listed in the space above.*

Date	Approved By:	Date Approved:
Construction Work Started on 01Jun05	Stan Haber	01Jun05
Project Completed on 14Nov05	Stan Haber	14Nov05
Assets Placed In or Removed From Service on 30Sep05	Harold Catlett	30Sep05
Accepted by Operating Organization on 30Sep05	Harold Catlett	30Sep05

**To be used by Fixed Assets Accounting**

Project Closed to Completed Plant by _____	Date _____
Project Closing Reviewed by _____	Date _____

# Tennessee Valley Authority Project Justification System

Date: 01/09/2006 01:05:13 PM

Owner Org FPG

Lead Org Yard Operations

Proj. Id: KIF530

Proj. Desc: KIF--DEVELOP FLY ASH & BOTTOM ASH DISPOSAL CAPACITY

Rev	PRC Status	PRC Approval	<250k Status	<250k Approval	Est. Type	Total Cost	In-Service Date	Base Year	Reason for Change
4	Approved	10/28/2005			Budget	2,511	9/16/2005	2005	Spent plan change to carry forward \$48K from FY05 to FY06 to complete project closure.
3	Approved	7/18/2005			Definitive	2,756	9/16/2005	2005	Scope Reduction + Budget Decrease of \$13,619K  The initial project was to permit and design a facility to contain fly ash, bottom ash, and gypsum inside the current ash pond. The project is now focused on the existing ash stack due to gypsum being permitted on the peninsula. Increased budget in FY05 is due to a change in design recommendation and construction technique. The design and permitting of the new gypsum disposal facility will be addressed under the scope of the KIF FGD addition project.  [This clears the previous action item (see R1) as there are no funding requirements identified by this revision for FY07 or later.  Upgraded estimate type to Definitive in support of Phase 3 authorization.
2	Not Reviewed	1/21/2005			Conceptual	200	9/30/2008	2005	Cash Flow, No Change to overall project budget
1	Under Review	10/1/2004			Conceptual	16,375	9/30/2008	2004	Initial approval was based on a dry fly ash system with no construction until FY'07. New project cash flow represents development of ash and gypsum disposal capacities with design and construction starting in FY'05.  Cash Flow, No Change to overall project budget
0	Under Review	6/30/2004			Conceptual	16,375	9/30/2008	2004	Initial approval was based on a dry fly ash system with no construction until FY'07. New project cash flow represents development of ash and gypsum disposal capacities with design and construction starting in FY'05.  New project.