CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th Floor, Chanderlok Building, 36 Janpath, New Delhi- 110001
Ph: 23753942 Fax-23753923

Petition No. 162/TT/2014

Date: 6.6.2014

To
The Deputy General Manager,
Power Grid Corporation of India Limited,
Saudamini, Plot No. 2,
Sector-29, Gurgaon-122001

Subject: Transmission Tariff for (i) 400 KV D/C Raipur (Existing)- Raipur PS (Durg) T/L with associated bays, (2) 400 KV D/C Raighar PS (Near Kotra)- Raighar (existing) S/S T/L with associated bays, & (3) ICTSs & Reactors at Raighar (Kotra) and Raipur (Durg) with associated bays under Establishment of pooling stations at Raighar (Kotra) and Raipur for IPP Generation Projects in Chhatisgarh (Set A/ DPR-1) in WR for tariff block 2009-14.

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the Commission's earlier letter dated 20.9.2013 on the above mentioned subject seeking certain information, by 7.10.2013 and to say that the said information has not been received. I request you to furnish the aforesaid information, along with the following further information on affidavit, with advance copy to respondents/ beneficiaries, latest by 30.6.2014:-

1) Details of Add Cap incurred in FY 2013-14.
2) Data for capital cost benchmarking, in accordance with the Commission's orders dated 27.4.2010 & 16.6.2010, for transmission lines and substations;
3) Status of Asset-3, Asset-5, Asset-6, Asset-7 & Asset-8 covered in the Investment Approval.
4) Clarification in regard to regular use of assets along-with documentary proof?
5) Detailed justification along with documentary evidence for delay along with PERT chart for the project.
6) Clarification for the ambiguity between line length in form-2 and 5B (In Form 5B, of Asset-2 the petitioner has submitted that reason for increase in expenditure by 68% for tower steel is due to increase in line length by

500 mtr but in Form-2 the petitioner has submitted increase of just 288 mtr. Further, the petitioner has submitted justification like minimizing ROW constraints after considering various crossing and available line corridors, optimizing route alignment etc.).

7) Comparative chart along with cost impact showing change in assumptions like crossings, no. of towers etc. in FR and actual. The petitioner must also clarify how optimization of route has been done;
8) Reasons for decrease in line length from 250 km to 239.8 km in respect of Asset-3. Also comparative chart showing change in no. of towers, conductors, etc., in FR and actual alongwith cost impact;
9) The reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-2:-

   a) 2.3 Earth wire (21.5% increase in Cost)
   b) 2.5 Hardwire Fittings (23.4% increase in Cost)
   c) 5.1 Control Room & Office Building including HVAC (29.3% increase in Cost)
   d) 5.2 Township and Colony (84.3% decrease in Cost)
   e) 5.3 Roads & Drainage (84.52% increase in Cost)
   f) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (127.8% increase in Cost)
   g) 6.1 Switchgear (172.47% increase in cost)
   h) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (110.81% increase in cost)
   i) 6.5 PLCC (33.66% increase in cost)
   j) 6.6 HVDC/FSC/OPGW/TELECOM(65.26% decrease in cost)
   k) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (126.60% increase in cost)
   l) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (87.58% increase in cost)
   m) 6.12 Auxiliary System (112.90% increase in cost)

10) The reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-3:-

   a) 2.5 Hardwire Fittings (43.69% increase in Cost)
   b) 2.8 Erection, Stringing & Civil Works including foundation (63.89% increase in Cost)
   c) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (303.94% increase in Cost)

d) 6.3 Compensating Equipment (Reactor, SVCs) (44.67% decrease in cost)
e) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (35.14% decrease in cost)
f) 6.6 HVDC/FSC/OPGW/TELECOM(24.30% decrease in cost)
g) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (49.04% increase in cost)
h) 6.8 Outdoor Lighting (81.97% decrease in cost)
i) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (151.61% increase in cost)
j) 6.12 Auxiliary System (64.68% decrease in cost)

11) The reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-4:

a) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (325.03% increase in Cost)
b) 6.2 Transformers (39.17% decrease in cost)
c) 6.3 Compensating Equipment (Reactor, SVCs) (36.34% decrease in cost)
d) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (35.14% decrease in cost)
e) 6.6 HVDC/FSC/OPGW/TELECOM (53.59% decrease in cost)
f) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (74.95% decrease in cost)
g) 6.8 Outdoor Lighting (81.97% decrease in cost)
h) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (90.53% increase in cost)
i) 6.12 Auxiliary System (36.97% decrease in cost)

12) The reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-5:

a) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (312.10% increase in Cost)
b) 6.2 Transformers (25.15% decrease in cost)
c) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (71.95% decrease in cost)
d) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (40.20% decrease in cost)
e) 6.8 Outdoor Lighting (74.35% decrease in cost)
f) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (34.06% increase in cost)

13) The reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-6:-

a) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (558.58% increase in Cost)
b) 6.2 Transformers (27.12% decrease in cost)
c) 6.3 Compensating Equipment (Reactor, SVCs) (34.19% decrease in cost)
d) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (33.31% decrease in cost)
e) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (178.57% increase in cost)
f) 6.12 Auxiliary System (41.86% decrease in cost)

14) Reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per Form 5B in case of Asset-7:-

a) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (486.50% increase in cost)
b) 6.2 Transformers (28.21% decrease in cost)
c) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (53.91% decrease in cost)
d) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (33.12% decrease in cost)
e) 6.8 Outdoor Lighting (75.39% decrease in cost)
f) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (47.06% increase in cost)

15) Reasons for difference in actual award rate and FR Cost for following items as per form 5B in case of Asset-8:-

a) 5.4 Foundation for Structure (486.72% increase in Cost)
b) 6.2 Transformers (28.23% decrease in cost)
c) 6.4 Control, Relay & Protection Panel (52.46% decrease in cost)
d) 6.7 Busbars/Insulators/conductors (32.78% decrease in cost)
e) 6.8 Outdoor Lighting (75.06% decrease in cost)
f) 6.11 Structure for Switchyard (59.89% increase in cost)

16) The date of application and grant for forest clearance/railway clearance, if any, required for the assets under consideration in the petition.

17) Progress of generating station from whom the system was planned as this system is part of HCPTC approved by the Commission under Regulatory Approval.

18) Confirmation regarding action in regard to commissioning of all the bays claimed under this petition as CoD letters are not clear about the same;

19) Base data of assets and cost forming basis for preparation of FR. In this regard the largest variation is in the foundation for structure which is a civil construction item. Detailed computation for foundation cost be submitted.

.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
(Dr. P.K. Sinha)
A C (Legal)