## CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

## Petition No. 250/GT/2014

Subject: Approval of tariff of Uri-II Hydro Electric Power Station for the period 2014-19

Petitioner	:	NHPC
Respondents	:	PDD, J&K & 12 Others
Date of hearing	:	29.3.2016
Coram	:	Shri Gireesh. B. Pradhan, Chairperson Shri A. K. Singhal, Member Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member Dr. M.K. Iyer, Member
Parties present	:	Shri Piyush Kumar, NHPC Shri Naresh Bansal, NHPC Shri A.K. Pandey, NHPC Shri Jitendra Kumar Jha, NHPC Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL Shri Abhay Pratap Singh, Advocate, TPDDL Ms. Ranjana Roy Gawai, Advocate, TPDDL Ms. Arunima Gautam, TPDDL

## Record of Proceedings

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NHPC for approval of tariff of Uri-II Hydro Electric Power Station (the generating station) for the period 2014-19 in terms of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2014.

2. During the hearing, the representative for the petitioner made detailed submissions in the matter and prayed that tariff of the generating stations for the period 2014-19 may be determined as claimed by the petitioner. He further submitted that rejoinder to the replies filed by the respondents UPPCL and BRPL have been submitted and the same may be considered.

- 3. The learned counsel for the respondent, BRPL mainly submitted as under:
  - (i) The capital cost admitted by the Commission in order dated 4.2.2016 in Petition No. 156/GT/2013 may be applied in the present petition, since the capital cost is yet to be approved by the Competent Authority.
- (ii) The petitioner has not filed documentary evidence to support its claim under additional capital expenditure for the period 2014-19. Hence, the same may not be allowed in terms of the judgment of Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 10.2.2015 in Appeal No. 13 of 2014.

(iii) Reply filed by it in the matter may be considered.

4. In response, the representative of the petitioner clarified that rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent BRPL may be considered.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent, TPDDL sought time to file its reply in the matter and requested for short adjournment to make its oral submissions in the matter.

6. The Commission after hearing the parties permitted TPDDL to file its reply by 21.4.2016 with copy to petitioner. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file the following additional information on affidavit, by 2.5.2016, with advance copy to the respondents:

- Copy of Security recommendations with respect to expenditure of ₹189 lakh claimed during 2014-15 for security purposes. Clarification as to whether this amount is a part of original scope of works/RCE or is additional requirement over and above RCE;
- (ii) Actual O&M expenditure for the year 2014-15 and for 2015-16 till date;
- (iii) Demand documents from Forest Department and Fishery Department for additional expenditure of an amount of ₹1136.15 lakh over and above RCE, claimed under the head "Environment and Ecology" during the year 2016-17 may be submitted;
- (iv) Justification for claim of an amount of ₹300.00 lakh during 2017-18 towards side protection work, road pavement work and flood protection work;
- (v) Amount of ₹195.87 lakh has been de-capitalized under major heads like TG access tunnel, concrete gravity dam, Power Channel, HRT and TRT. Since COD was in 2013 only, clarification as to why these amounts have been de-capitalized under major assets which are to remain in service throughout the life of the generating station shall be furnished;
- (vi) Status of approval of Revised Cost Estimates by Ministry of Power, Govt. of India;
- (vii) Documentary proof for each interest rate reset for each loan since infusion 2007-08 to 2015-16.

7. Matter shall be listed for hearing on 10.5.2016 to hear the arguments of the respondent TPDDL. Pleadings in the matter shall be completed prior to the said date of hearing and no extension of time shall be granted.

By Order of the Commission

**-Sd/-**(T. Rout) Chief (Legal)