

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition No. 95/TT/2011

Subject: Determination of transmission tariff from estimated DOCO: 1.7.2011 to 31.3.2011, for Transmission System Associated with SEWA-II HEP in Northern Region for Tariff block 2009-14 Period.

Date of hearing: 16.2.2012

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

Petitioner: PGCIL

Respondents: Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Ltd., and 16 others

Parties present: Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL
Shri Tej Pal Singh, PSPCL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri R.B. Sharma, BSES, JSEB

The representative of the petitioner submitted that the present petition is filed for determination of transmission tariff of 132 kV SEWA-II Mahanpur Kathua line and 132 kV Mahanpur Kathua line which is part of Transmission System Associated with SEWA-II in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that as per the investment approval the transmission scheme was scheduled to be commissioned within 27 months from the date of placing of Letter of Award for tower package, i.e., by 1.6.2008. The assets were commissioned on 1.9.2011 and there was a delay of 38 months. He also submitted that PDD, J&K handed over the transmission line on "as is" where is 'basis' on 23.6.2009 after a period of three years. The petitioner had to initiate the whole process for incomplete left over works including forest clearance, railway line crossing clearance, power line crossing clearance, ROW problems and compensation claims after taking over the transmission line. As the delay is due to delay in handing over by

PDD, J&K, the representative of the petitioner requested to condone the delay and to allow the tariff as claimed in the petition.

3. The representative of BRPL submitted that the transmission tariff for Asset-I and Asset II of the Transmission System Associated with SEWA-II HEP was approved by the Commission in Petition no. 73/2010 and Petition no. 325/2010, respectively. Both the Asset I and Asset II are combined with Asset-III of the Transmission System Associated with SEWA-II HEP and covered in the current petition. IDC & IEDC for Asset-I that was disallowed in Petition No.73/2010 cannot be considered again. IDC & IEDC should not be allowed for 38 months of time over-run. The element wise break-up of the project cost, given in Form 5B, show variation in the cost of sub-station equipment, tower steel, conductor and hardware fittings. Despite a time over-run of 38 months there was no increase in overall cost. Though time over-run of 38 months was attributed to PDD, J&K by the petitioner, the ultimate responsibility lies with the petitioner and hence the time over-run should not be condoned.

4. The representative of PSPCL submitted that the petitioner must provide the date of charging, period of trial operation, the regular operation and energy flow on first day. He submitted that the IDC for the period of 38 months delay should not be allowed. He also submitted that the estimated completion cost is ₹8847 lakh against the approved cost of ₹9847 lakh, which is higher inspite of time over-run and it shows that the petitioner's estimate cost in FR is on a higher side. The O&M charges should be allowed as per regulations and excess claim should be not allowed. He also submitted that the petitioner has a statutory obligation under Section 38 of the Electricity to co-ordinate with various governments for completion of project in time and the petitioner should have coordinated with PDD, J&K for completion of the transmission line.

5. In response to the submissions of BRPL and PSPCL, the representative of the petitioner submitted that after taking over the project from PDD, J&K, in June 2009, PGCIL was required to get the forest clearance, railway line crossing clearance and power line crossing clearance, which took time. The delay was not attributable to it and all efforts were made to complete the project at the earliest.

6. Order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
6.3.2012