

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission
New Delhi**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition No. 92/TT/2011

Subject: Approval of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C transmission line from GIS pooling station Chamba-Jalandhar, 220 kV D/C TL from GIS pooling station Chamba-Chamera-III HEP and Jalandhar Sub-station extension under transmission system associated with Chamera-III HEP for tariff block 2009-14 period in Northern Region

Date of Hearing: 16.2.2012

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

Petitioner: PGCIL, New Delhi

Respondents: Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 18 others

Parties present: Shri S.S.Raju, PGCIL
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri Tej Pal Singh Bawa, PSPCL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate for BSES
Shri Sanjay Srivastav, BRPL
Shri Sunil Barnwal, BRPL

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, PGCIL, for determination of transmission tariff of transmission system associated with Chamera-III HEP in Northern Region.

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) The assets covered under the present petition are 400 kV D/C transmission line from GIS pooling station Chamba- Jalandhar, 220 kV D/C transmission line from GIS pooling station Chamba-Chamera-III HEP and Jalandhar Sub-station Extension (hereinafter referred to as "Asset I") and 220 kV D/C transmission line from GIS pooling station Chamba-Chamera-III HEP under transmission line associated with Chamera-III HEP (hereinafter

referred to as "Asset II"). While Asset II has been commissioned, Asset I is yet to be commissioned;

(b) The scheduled completion of the entire project is 39 months from the date of investment approval which works out to 1.8.2011. As against this, Asset II was commissioned on 1.11.2011. The delay of 3 months is on account of non-readiness of bay at Chamera III generating station of NHPC. Correspondence made with NHPC for early commissioning of the generating station will be submitted by PGCIL;

(c) Cost overrun has been mainly on account of increase in compensation payment arising out of increase in forest cover, for which detailed justification has already been submitted vide their affidavit dated 30.9.2011.

3. On a query of the Commission regarding Implementation Agreement between the petitioner and NHPC, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the Implementation Agreement was not implementable as both the parties had missed the zero date. The representative of the petitioner further stated that the details regarding the reasons of delay and the Implementation Agreements etc. would be submitted by the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for BRPL, respondent No. 12, submitted that there is a cost overrun of 13%. As regards element wise break-up, under the head "Total Preliminary Works", sub-head "Towers Steel", reason has been given as variation due to difference between award rate and estimate rate, which is not adequate.

5. Representative of PSPCL submitted that apportioned transmission charges should be clearly specified. It was also submitted that IDC for the 3 months should be disallowed as the said transmission line was not used by the beneficiaries during the period. He raised the issue of cost overrun, especially under the head "Total Preliminary Works" where the expenditure is more than double the estimate. He further submitted that O&M expenditure should be as per the regulations.

6. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information within two weeks:

- (a) Detailed justification for delay in commissioning of GIS pooling station Chamba-Jalandhar 220 kV D/C transmission line along with relevant documents;
- (b) Details of Implementation Agreement signed by the petitioner with NHPC and its implementation.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Joint Chief (Law)
23.2.2012