CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 287/2009

Sub: Approval of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Gorakhpur-Lucknow transmission lie and 400 kV D/C Bareilly-Mandola line, associated with Tala Hydro Electric Power, East-North interconnector and Northern Region transmission system for the period from 2009-14.

Date of hearing	:	24.6.2010
Coram	:	Shri V.S.Verma, Member Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member
Petitioner	:	Powerlinks Transmission Ltd.
Respondents	:	PGCIL, RRVPNL, AVVNL, JVVNL, JdVVNL, PSEB, HPPC, UPPCL, J&K, DTL, HPSEB, Chandigarh Administration, UPCL, NCR, BSES Yamuna, BSES Rajdhani and NDPL
Parties present	:	Shri Ajay Bagri, TPL Shri Suresh Sachdev, TPL Shri B.A.Chaudhari, TPL Shri Nita Jha, TPL Shri U.K.Tyagi, PGCIL Shri M.M.Mondal, PGCIL Shri Raghuveer Prasad Verma, RVVPNL

This petition has been filed by Powerlinks Transmission Ltd. for approval of transmission tariff in respect for 400 kV D/C Gorakhpur-Lucknow transmission line and 400 kV D/C Bareilly-Mandola line, associated with Tala Hydro Electric Power, East-North inter-connector and Northern Region transmission system for the period 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014, based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (herein after referred to as "the 2009 regulations").

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that additional capital expenditure of Rs. 4.27 crore for replacement of insulators in the National Capital Region (NCR) and Rs. 3.97 crore for shifting of tower with pile foundation due to change in river course at location No. 246 of 400 kV D/C Gorakhpur-Lucknow transmission line be allowed in tariff. In reply to a query of the Commission whether expert technical advice was obtained for replacing the porcelain insulators with polymer insulators, the representative of the petitioner submitted that decision to that effect was taken in meeting held on 9.3.2008 under the aegis of Secretary, Ministry of Power after tripping of a large number of 400 kV transmission lines in the NCR on 7th and 9th March 2008. As the transmission line was commissioned in 2006, the Commission directed the petitioner to explore resale of the porcelain insulators removed for installation of the polymer insulators in the NCR. The representative of the respondent, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. submitted that these were good insulators and could fetch a good price in the market.

3. In reply to another query of the Commission as to whether all the porcelain insulators of the Bareilly-Mondola transmission line were replaced and the number of towers and length of the transmission line in which they were replaced, the representative of the petitioner submitted that out of 633 transmission towers, insulators were replaced in 176 towers in 61 km out of a total line length of 231 km. The Commission directed the petitioner to furnish this information and details of insulators replaced and total number of insulators in the line.

4. The representative of the Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. submitted that the lines were maintained above 98% availability for which CTU was availing incentives. During the foggy months in the NCR, there were flashovers across the insulators because of deposition of pollutants on the porcelain insulators. He further submitted that loss of revenue on account of grid failure would be much higher than the cost of replacing the insulators and therefore, the beneficiaries of the transmission system stood to gain by replacement of the insulators. The Commission directed Power Grid to calculate loss of revenue on account of grid failure as a sample for the information of all concerned.

5. The Commission enquired from Power Grid if any action had been taken to implement the directions in para 8 (iv) of the minutes of the meeting take by the Secretary, Ministry of Power, to provide exact location of stone quarries, brick kilns, sugarcane, bagesse burning areas etc. as decided in the meeting. The representative of the Power Grid replied that he would submit the required information.

6. With regard to laying of the pile foundation for the location No. 246 of 400 kV D/C Gorakhpur-Lucknow transmission line, the petitioner submitted that the Random Rubble Revetment wall could not protect the foundation of the tower. Hence pile foundation at that location was envisaged and the works was being carried out on priority as the meandering river Ghagra was shifting course and was 10 meter away from the transmission tower. In reply to a querry of the Commission, the representative of the Power Grid clarified that pile foundation becomes necessary if the tower is in the river bed. In response to a further quarry of the petitioner submitted that it was in the process of completion.

7. The Commission directed the petitioner as well as the respondent, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. to file the above information on affidavit latest by 23.7.2010 with an advance copy to each other and the respondents.

8. Subject to above, order in the petition was reserved.

Sd/-(T.Rout) Joint Chief (Law)