

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 194/TT/2012

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff of elements for associated line bays for 765 kV S/C Fatehpur Agra T/L at Fatehpur and Agra S/S under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Stations and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and Common Scheme for Network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.11.2013

Coram : Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. (PGCIL)

Respondents: : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. & 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Prashant Sharma,PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal,PGCIL
Shri B.K. Sahoo, PGCIL
Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate for BRPL
Shri G. Das, NDMC
Shri H.M. Saxena, NDMC
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL



Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted as under:-

- a) The petitioner filed this petition on 28.6.2012 for determination of transmission tariff of associated line bays for 765 kV S/C Fatehpur Agra T/L at Fatehpur and Agra Sub-stations under common schemes. The Fatehpur-Agra line is covered under a different petition.
- b) Investment approval for the project was accorded by the Board of Directors of PGCIL on 29.8.2008, and the project was to be completed progressively within 48 months from the date of investment approval, i.e. by 1.9.2012. The asset was put under commercial operation on 1.6.2012. Revised Tariff Forms have been filed vide affidavit dated 29.7.2013;
- c) Replies of BRPL, Respondent No. 12, and PSPCL, Respondent No. 6 have been received, and rejoinders would soon be filed.

2. The representative of PSPCL submitted as under:-

- a) The letter of declaration of commercial operation (DOCO) enclosed with the petition is incomplete and time of charging of line bays has not been indicated. Moreover, the petition is for determination of tariff of bays, whereas the line reactors are also covered in the letter of DOCO;
- b) As per the petition, the purpose was to evacuate power from various generation projects of DVC. The petitioner therefore should first have commissioned the two lines i.e. 400 kV Maithon-Gaya D/C quad and 400 kV Koderma-Gaya D/C quad, to inject power into Gaya 400 kV bus, which should then have been stepped up to 765 kV for transmission of power through two lines of 765 kV. However, these lines of 400 kV from DVC Maithon/Koderma have not been commissioned. With the input power from DVC thermal stations not being available at Gaya, as a result of non-commissioning of the Maithon-Gaya and Koderma-Gaya lines, the purpose of having 3X1500 MVA ICTs and 765 kV outgoing lines from Gaya is defeated. Under section 38 (c) of the Electricity Act, 2003, it is the function of Central Transmission Utility to ensure development of an efficient, coordinated and economical system of inter-state transmission lines;



- c) As per DOCO certificate, the Fatehpur-Agra line was charged just 8 minutes before DOCO. This shows that the criteria of trial operation were not fulfilled in this case. Moreover, the DOCO letter is dated 13.6.2012, whereas the line was commissioned on 1.6.2012. This letter was sent to all the authorities including NRLDC and POSOCO after 13.6.2012 and hence the date of commissioning shifts to 1.7.2012;
- d) The petitioner has claimed expenditure of ₹8738.66 lakh as on date of commercial operation. Detailed break-up, giving cost of major items of equipment at Fatehpur and Agra has not been given. The cost of land has increased ten-fold, from ₹40.91 lakh to ₹408.70 lakh. Justification for the increase has also not been shared by the petitioner. The split up of 330 MVAR Reactors at Fatehpur and 240 MVAR Reactors at Agra may also be given so that the cost-overrun could be assessed.

3. The learned counsel of BRPL submitted that there is huge overestimation in the project. Against the apportioned approved cost of ₹12053 lakh, the estimated completion cost of the assets is expected to be ₹10362 lakh, resulting in considerable saving. There is major cost over-run in so far as the cost of land is concerned. As regards time over-run, as against the date of completion of work shown as 23.2.2012 in Form 5C, the asset was commissioned on 1.6.2012. He requested the Commission to disallow the time over-run of three months.

4. The representative of the petitioner clarified that both the lines were held up due to delay in forest clearance. The petitioner commissioned Gaya-Balia line and reconfigured Biharshariff- Sasaram one circuit into Biharshariff-Gaya and Sasaram-Balia. In this manner 400 kV became available at Gaya, which gave two-fold benefits of having transfer machine capacity towards 220 kV supplying to BSEB besides making available 765 voltage at the 765 kV bus at Gaya. Therefore they could charge the line upto Fatehpur giving the better capacity towards the Northern region. For this, CEA gave in-principle approval on 25.1.2012. Seven days later, all these issues were discussed in NRPC and ERPC. The missing pages in the DOCO letter have been given in the course of hearing to the representative of PSPCL. Since the 2009 Tariff Regulations does not define trial run, the petitioner has considered the successful test charge as the trial run. Moreover, the concerned RLDC was informed about the declaration of commercial operation in advance. The cost details and split up cost of the Agra have been submitted as per the 2009 Tariff Regulations. It is difficult to submit

equipment- wise details of cost as it is a big project covering 45 elements. The date of completion is as per the awarded contract and not as per the investment approval.

5. In response to a query of the Commission regarding increase in cost of land, the representative of the petitioner clarified that the it was because the land was very fertile, and in prime location in Agra.

6. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following on affidavit, with copy to the respondents within 10 days:-

- (a) Whether power has been transmitted without Gaya-Koderma and Maithon-Koderma lines?
- (b) Detailed break-up, giving cost of major items of equipment at Fatehpur and Agra;
- (c) The split up of 330 MVAR Reactors at Fatehpur and 240 MVAR Reactors at Agra;
- (d) Rejoinder to the replies of respondents.

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

By the order of the Commission

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

