

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 187/TT/2011

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff of combined elements from DOCO to 31.3.2014 for combined assets (part) for Asset-1: 400 kV D/C Lucknow(new)-Lucknow(old) line with associated bays at both end, Asset-2: 765 kV S/C Ballia Lucknow line alongwith associated bays at both ends, Asset-3: 765/400 kV, 1500 MVA ICT I at Ballia S/S alongwith associated bays Asset-4: 765/400 kV, 1500 MVA ICT I at Lucknow S/S alongwith associated bays Asset-5: Associated bays at Biharshariff and Sasaram end (for Biharshariff-Sasaram 400 kV quad T/I under supplementary transmission System for DVC Maithon Right Bank project) 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 period.

Date of Hearing : 9.10.2014

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam and 16 others

Parties present : Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatasen, PGCIL
Mrs. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted as follows:-

- (a) The instant petition covers 5 assets which are part of DVC main in Northern Region. Asset 1 to Asset 4 were commissioned on 1.3.2012



- (b) Asset 5 has been commissioned in four parts i.e. Asset 5(a): One 400 kV line bay at Biharshariff Sub-station with 50 MVAR reactor and one 400 kV line bay at Sasaram with 400 kV Biharshariff-Sasaram Ckt-III - commissioned on 1.2.2012, Asset 5(b) One 400 kV line bay at Biharshariff Sub-station with 50 MVAR reactor associated with 400 kV S/C Biharshariff-Gaya T/L - commissioned on 1.2.2012, Asset 5(c) One 400 kV line bay at Sasaram Sub-station associated with 400 kV S/C Sasaram-Balia T/L - commissioned on 1.3.2012 and Asset 5(d): 2X 50 MVAR Bus reactor at Sasaram - commissioned on 1.4.2012;
- (c) As per the Investment Approval dated 29.8.2008, the instant assets were to be commissioned within 48 months i.e. 1.9.2012. All the assets were commissioned within the specified timeline; and
- (d) Based on the actual date of commercial operation, the certificates of commercial operation and revised tariff Forms have been submitted vide affidavit dated 1.8.2013.

2. The representative of PSPCL submitted as follows:-

- a) The petitioner should submit the actual date of commercial operation of all the assets;
- b) The instant assets were not implemented in the sequence as envisaged in the investment approval;
- c) There are 4 breakers in 400 kV Biharshariff- Sasaram line, Biharshariff breakers commissioned on 1.2.2012 and Sasaram breakers commissioned on 1.3.2012. The petitioner should clarify that the date of commercial operation of the assets at the receiving end and the sending end should be same and the petitioner should ensure that there is no mismatch; and
- d) In case of Asset-1, the total completion cost is ₹5963 lakh against the apportioned approved cost of ₹15215 lakh. There is also huge over estimation of the cost of certain items likes tower steel, out-door lighting, misc. common equipment, etc. The petitioner should give the reasons for such huge over estimation.

3. The representative of petitioner clarified as follows:-

- a) The certificates of actual date of commercial operation of all the assets have been submitted vide affidavit dated 1.8.2013;



- b) It is not mandatory to commission the assets in the sequence given in the Investment Approval. The assets are required to be commissioned as per the system requirements and accordingly they have been commissioned. In Petition No. 89/TT/2012, the Commission has held that the assets should to be commissioned as per the system requirements.
- c) The bays at Biharshairff and Sasaram Sub-stations for the Biharshariff-Sasaram Transmission Line were commissioned on different dates because of interim arrangement taken up for facilitating evacuation of power from DVC Generation Project without commissioning of 400 kV Koderma-Gaya (Quad) T/L and 400 kV DC (Quad) Maithon-Gaya T/L. As per this interim arrangement, one ckt. of 400 kV Biharshariff-Sasaram (Quad) DC T/L and the ckt. of 765 kV Gaya-Balia T/L (charged at 400 kV) was connected in such a way that it forms (i) 400 kV Biharshariff-Gaya (Part of Gaya-Balia 765 kV SC T/L) and (ii) 400 kV Sasaram-Balia (Part of Gaya-Balia 765 kV SC D/L). CEA has granted in principle approval for this arrangement. The power is pooled in Biharshariff and it comes to Gaya, from Gaya to Sasaram and Sasaram to Fathepur. This is consistent with the interim arrangement. Once the Koderma-Gaya and Maithon-Gaya line comes up the normal arrangement would be restored; and
- d) As regards the cost variation of Asset-1, the length of 400 kV D/C Lucknow (new)-Lucknow (old) line was estimated to be 40 km in the FR. However, the actual length is only 2.862 km due to change in the location of the new 765 kV sub-station. This huge reduction in length has led the cost variation in case of Asset-1.

4. The Commission observed that the interim arrangement made by the petitioner for evacuation of power from DVC Generation Project should have been initially approved in the RPC and then by the petitioner's Board. The approval of CEA is not sufficient in the instant case. The Commission directed the petitioner to obtain its Board's approval.

5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its response to the issues raised by PSPCL during the hearing and also to submit the following information on affidavit before 10.11.2014 with a copy to all the respondents:-

- (i) The basis for arriving at the FR cost;
- (ii) Cost & expenditure incurred for interim arrangement;
- (iii) Copy of the approval of the interim arrangement by its Board;

- (iv) Form 5-B and Form-6 for all the assets; and
- (v) The reasons for such huge cost variation in case of out-door lighting and misc. common equipment.

6. The Commission directed that due date of filing the information should be complied with and information received after the date shall not be considered while passing the order.

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

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

