

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. TT/41/2013

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for Asset I: 765 kV, 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor under Bus Reactor at Ballia S/S; Asset II: 765 kV Line bays at Sasaram S/s (for 765 kV Sasaram-Fatehpur TL under SASAN Project) under Common Scheme for 765 kV Pooling Station and Network for NR, Import by NR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER and Common scheme for network for WR and Import by WR from ER and from NER/SR/WR via ER in ER for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.8.2014

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

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

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Ms. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Ms. Swapnil Verma, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-



- (a) As per Investment Approval dated 29.8.2008, the project is scheduled to be progressively completed within 48 months from the date of investment approval i.e. by 1.9.2012. Asset-I, i.e., 765 kV, 240 MVAR Switchable Line Reactor under Bus Reactor at Ballia Sub-station was put under commercial operation on 1.10.2012, after a delay of one month and Asset-II, i.e., 765 kV line bays at Sasaram Sub-station (for 765 kV Sasaram- Fatehpur transmission line under Sasan Project) was put under commercial operation on 1.3.2013, after a delay of five months;
- (b) The petitioner has submitted reasons for delay in the commissioning of the assets, vide affidavit dated 2.7.2013. The delay of one month in the commissioning of Asset I was due to non-availability of compacted leveled land and heavy rain, and the delay of five months in the commissioning of Asset II is due to visa related issue of ZTR personnel, rain and transportation problem;
- (c) Replies of BRPL and PSPCL have been received and rejoinder will be filed.

2. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No. 6, submitted as under:-

- (a) 765 kV S/C Gaya- Balia line which is a part of the project is not operational, as is evident from ERLDC website. This petition is for utilizing the 765 kV Gaya bay at Balia, with the switched line reactor, to be used as bus reactor. The proposal to use the line reactor as bus reactor is not justified;
- (b) As per Form 2 of the petition, the transmission assets of this scheme will have one circuit breaker for Gaya bay and one circuit breaker for the switchable line reactor. The use of 2 Nos. 765 kV breakers is not justified since it would increase the transmission tariff on account of capital cost and also on account of O&M charges whereas for connecting the line reactors, one No. breaker is adequate;
- (c) The petitioner should give justification for proposing 1200 MVAR reactive compensation for just one Balia- Lucknow line. The petitioner should also provide the sketch/ drawing of the relevant transmission system.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent No. 12, submitted that the assets were scheduled to be commissioned progressively within 48 months from the date of investment approval. He submitted that since the petitioner has not given any justification for time over-run, IDC and IEDC should be disallowed.



4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit, with advance copy to the respondents, by 22.9.2014:-

- (a) Documentary evidence in support of the reasons cited for delay in the commissioning of the assets, i.e. (i) non-availability of compacted leveled land, (ii) rain (MET Department data for the months lost due to rain and report from the print media, and (ii) visa related issues for ZTR personnel;
- (b) Justification for proposing 1200 MVAR reactive compensation for just one Balia- Lucknow line, and also the sketch/ drawing of the transmission system.

5. In case the above information is not received by 22.9.2014, the Commission shall be at liberty to issue order without taking into consideration the submission made by the petitioner subsequently.

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

By order of the Commission

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

