

# CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

## Petition No. 117/2010

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for 220/132 kV, 100 MVA ICT-II at Sitarganj along with associated bays under System Strengthening Scheme in Uttaranchal in Northern Region for tariff block 2009-14 period- Remand from Appellate Tribunal for Electricity

Date of Hearing : 20.3.2014

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

Petitioner : PGCIL

Respondents: : Uttakhand Power Corporation Ltd.

Parties present : Shri M.G. Ramachandran, Advocate, PGCIL  
Ms. Anushree Bardhan, Advocate, PGCIL  
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL,  
Ms. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL  
Ms. Seema Gupta, PGCIL  
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL  
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

### Record of Proceedings

The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted as under:-

- a) The investment approval was accorded on 13.7.2004 for completion of the project within 24 months from the date of first letter of award. Letter of Award was given on 30.3.2005, for the manufacture and supply of ICT and its installation. Thus, the scheduled date of commissioning of the project is 1.4.2007.



- b) During the period from March 2007 onwards, the work in the switchyard area could not be carried out on account of court's stay orders till 21.4.2008. Non-availability of CRGO steel and the consequent delay in the supply of ICT till June 2007 is covered by the decision of Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity (hereinafter "the Tribunal") in other cases. Heavy rains at Sitarganj area affected the erection work of both ICT-I and ICT-II. ICT-II was received on the site on 15.4.2009, and activities relating to erection and commissioning of ICT-II were completed in two months. Approval for charging was granted by CEA on 10.7.2009 after inspection on 2.7.2009. ICT-II was commissioned on 1.8.2009. Thus, the delay in the commissioning of ICT was due to reasons beyond the control of PGCIL;
- c) The Commission in its order dated 16.3.2012 in the instant petition did not condone the delay of beyond August 2008, i.e. from September, 2008 to July, 2009, and accordingly IDC and IEDC for a period of 11 months were disallowed. Aggrieved by the order PGCIL filed an appeal before the Tribunal. In its decision dated 24.9.2013 in Appeal No. 107 of 2012, the Tribunal directed the Commission to examine the reasons for the delay in the commissioning of the ICT afresh, considering all the relevant particulars furnished by parties and decide the matter by passing reasoned order, uninfluenced by its earlier findings and the observations made by the Tribunal;
- d) Transmission charges shall be borne by the State of Uttarakhand till 30.6.2011. From July, 2011 onwards, the sharing of transmission charges shall be governed by the provisions of Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Sharing of Inter-state transmission charges and losses) Regulations, 2010, as amended.
2. The representative of PSPCL submitted that reply would be filed within one week. He submitted that the cost of ICT-II is ₹366 lakh whereas the cost of ICT-I is only ₹150 lakh. He further requested PGCIL to submit reasons for increase in cost of switchgear, land and civil works as shown in Form 5 B.
3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information, on affidavit, with copy to the respondents, by 30.4.2014:-
- (i) The reasons for variation in cost of ICT-I and ICT-II;
  - (ii) PERT Chart(s) of the project, indicating all the activities envisaged (a) before start of project, and (b) revised chart after the delay;
  - (iii) The time required for filtration of oil in 100 MVA ICT;
  - (iv) The precautions required while filling/filtration of transformer oil during rainy season as per recommendations of OEM or CBIP manual along with a copy of aforesaid recommendations;
  - (v) The time required for commissioning of a 100 MVA transformer after delivery at site along with phasing of different activities;

- (vi) The time required for completing the foundation work of the 100 MVA transformer, when there is no hindrance on any account;
- (vii) PERT chart of LILO of 220 kV Tanakpur-Bareilly transmission line at Sitarganj along with associated bays, clearly indicating the critical activities, envisaged before start of project and revised after delay;
- (viii) Duration of delay due to construction of 132 kV line by PTCUL with start and end dates of delay;
- (ix) Details of delay, indicating start and end dates of delay due to standing crop in the fields including type of crops, harvesting period and details of effort made by PGCIL to mitigate the delay.

4. The Commission directed PGCIL to file its comments, on the reply of PSPCL, if any, by 30.4.2014.

5. Subject of the above, the order in the petition was reserved.

By order of the Commission

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

