

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Review Petition No. 12/2011 in Petition No. 193/2010

Subject : Review of order dated 5.5.2011 in Petition No. 193/2010 in respect of approval of transmission tariff for combined assets (a) 400 kV Ramagundam-Hyderabad D/C transmission line (b) 400 kV S/C Gooty-Neelmangala transmission line (c) 400 kV Hyderabad-Kurnool-Gooty transmission line and (d) 400 kV S/C Khammam-Nagarjunasagar transmission line along with associated bays and equipment under Ramagundam Stage III Transmission System in Southern Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014 under Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999.

Date of Hearing : 20/10/2011

Coram : Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson
Shri. S. Jayaraman, Member
Shri. V.S. Verma, Member
Shri. M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner : TANGEDCO, Chennai

Respondents : PGCIL

Parties present : Shri S. Balaguru, TANGEDCO
Shri S. Vallinayagam
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma, PGCIL
Shri R.R. Rajesh, PGCIL

The learned counsel for the review petitioner, TANGEDCO, submitted that the review petition has been filed seeking review of the Commission's order dated 5.5.2011 in Petition No.93/2010 on two grounds. Firstly, in the ROP for the hearing dated 23.12.2010, the submissions of the representative of the petitioner have been recorded to the effect that anemometers based on the report of the standing committee of experts on the failure of towers of PGCIL during January, 2009 to June, 2009 are being installed and the data of the anemometers have been sent to SERC, Chennai for study purposes and feedback from SERC is awaited. PGCIL has not submitted any report from SERC which suggests that the towers require

strengthening. Therefore, the impugned order has been passed without considering the basic information sought in the RoP. Secondly, PGCIL cannot design towers using Serial No. 3 IS-802-1995 with zero percent wind in broken wire condition applicable from 1995-2001 when the administrative approval of Ministry of Power, Government of India for these transmission lines were accorded on 29.8.2001. The present transmission lines commissioned on 1.11.2004 and 1.5.2005 were constructed as per Serial No. 5 IS-802-1995 with 75 percent wind in broken wire condition which required no strengthening at all. It has been specifically pleaded by PGCIL in its affidavit dated 28.9.2010 filed in Petition no. 193/2010 that design practice mentioned at Sl. No. 5 IS : 802-1995 with 75 % wind in Broken Wire Condition (BWC) is being followed from 2001 onwards and no incident of failure of towers on 400 kV transmission lines has occurred. The observation of the Commission in Para 15 of the impugned order that "the transmission lines were designed as per Serial No. 3 IS: 802-1995 with zero percent wind in broken wire condition applicable from 1995-2001 which has now been modified to 75 % wind in BWC with narrow front wind" is an error apparent on the face of record.

2. The representative of PGCIL submitted that reply to the RoP has been submitted and the Commission has passed the order after considering the submission of PGCIL. He further submitted that the anemometer study being undertaken by SERC is a big study which will take considerable time. PGCIL is having wind zone maps based on which the towers are being designed. He further clarified that the transmission lines covered in the present petition were designed as per Serial No. 3 IS-802-1995 with zero percent wind in broken wire condition. The Committee formed by BIS in 2001 recommended the design of 75% broken wind zone condition. The recommendations of the Committee were received in 2003. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the design of 75% broken wind zone condition has been implemented in the transmission lines. Accordingly, PGCIL has gone for the strengthening of the towers and additional capitalisation has been claimed. He submitted that no case has been made out for review of the impugned order.

4. The Commission observed that the basic issue to be decided in the present petition is whether additional capitalisation allowed in the impugned order was dependent on the report of the SERC. The Commission allowed PGCIL to make submission on the issue for the purpose of deciding the admissibility of the review petition.

5. The petition shall be listed for hearing on 8.12.2011 on the question of admissibility of the review petition.

Sd/-

(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
2.11.2011