

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Coram:

- 1. Shri Ashok Basu, Chairman**
- 2. Shri K.N. Sinha, Member**

**IA No. 9/2003 in
Petition No. 8/2003**

In the matter of

Transmission Tariff for 400 KV Meerut-Mandola Circuit I & II and ICT II & ICT III at Meerut sub-station with associated bays in Northern Region.

And in the matter of

Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

..... **Petitioner**

Vs

1. Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Jaipur
2. Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Shimla
3. Punjab State Electricity Board, Patiala
4. Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd, Panchkula
5. Power Development Department, Govt. of J&K, Srinagar
6. Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd., Lucknow
7. Delhi Power Supply Co. Ltd., New Delhi
8. Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh
9. Uttaranchal Power Corporation Ltd., Dehradun

....**Respondents**

The following were present:

1. Shri U.K. Tyagi, GM, PGCIL
2. Shri P.C. Pankaj, AGM, PGCIL
3. Shri P.N. Prayas, PGCIL
4. Shri A.K. Behl, CM, PGCIL
5. Shri C. Kannan, CM, PGCIL
6. Shri D. Sen, PGCIL
7. Shri K.K. Mittal, XEN (ISP), RVPN
8. Shri J.S. Bhargava, AEM (ISP), RVPN
9. Shri R.K. Arora, XEN, HVPN
10. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, SE, PSEB
11. Shri J.K. Gupta, Consultant, PSEB
12. Shri A.K. Tandon, UPPCL
13. Shri Mahesh Chandra, UPCL

ORDER
(DATE OF HEARING: 17.9.2003)

The petitioner, PGCIL, through this petition sought approval of transmission tariff in respect of 400 kV Meerut Mandola Circuit I & II and ICT II & III at Meerut sub-station with associated bays in Northern Region. A prayer was made for approval of provisional tariff, for which an interlocutory application (No.9/2003) has also been filed. The IA is listed after notice.

2. In compliance of the Commission's directions as contained in the order dated 11.3.2003, the details of apportioned approved cost of the elements of Tehri Transmission System, the financial package and a single line diagram of the transmission system have been furnished. Shri S.S. Sharma for the petitioner stated that Meerut-Mandola Circuit II and ICT II at Meerut sub-station with associated bays had been put under commercial operation with effect from 1.4.2003. The ICT III at Meerut sub-station with associated bays had also been put under commercial operation with effect from 1.7.2003. Shri Sharma stated that the only remaining asset Meerut-Mandola Circuit I, would be put under commercial operation soon and, the date of commercial operation of this asset would be furnished to the Commission.

3. We noticed that there were vast differences between apportioned approved cost and the estimated completion cost of the assets covered in this petition. The estimated completion cost of the assets is substantially less than their apportioned approved cost. The representative of the petitioner could not explain the reasons. We direct that the reasons for the variations be properly explained by the petitioner through an appropriate affidavit.

4. Shri K.K. Mittal, XEN (ISP), RRVPNL stated that the assets covered in this petition for which tariff is claimed are part of Tehri Transmission System associated with the Tehri Hydro-electric Project which is yet to be commissioned. Therefore, these assets cannot be used for evacuation of power. Thus, Shri Mittal denied any liability to pay the transmission charges, as no power was flowing through these assets. Shri Mittal was supported by the representatives of PSEB and HVPN on this issue. Shri T.P.S. Bawa, SE, PSEB further stated that the assets would not strengthen the existing transmission system and were surplus to the existing transmission lines.

5. Upon hearing we had directed the petitioner to file certain additional details on affidavit, including the details of quantum of power being carried on these assets. The representative of respondent No.6, was also directed to confirm the benefits flowing from these assets consequent to their commercial operation.

6. The petitioner in its affidavit has submitted that the power flow on Meerut-Mandola line is about 200 MW. It is stated that commissioning of 400 kV Mandola sub-station has enabled inter-connection of Meerut area with Central Sector generating stations and has improved the quality and reliability of power supply to load centres near Meerut. Per contra, respondent No.6 has reported that infinitesimally small quantity of power flows on the lines and in the absence of generation at Tehri HEP, the transmission assets do not serve any useful purpose. UPPCL has furnished the following sample flow at 1300 hrs on 19.9.2003 on these lines at Metore sub-station:

220 kV Nara (Muzaffar Nagar)	25 MW export
220 kV Modipuram Circuit I	45 MW export
220 kV Modipuram Circuit II	30 MW export
220 kV Simbholi	0 MW export

7. In view of the conflicting claims of the parties on the issue of power flow and the usefulness of the transmission assets, we consider it appropriate to obtain views of NREB. Accordingly, we direct Member Secretary NREB to file an appropriate affidavit placing on record the factual position in this regard, latest by 25.11.2003 and be also present for hearing on the next date.

8. List this petition for hearing on 4.12.2003

Sd/-
(K.N. SINHA)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(ASHOK BASU)
CHAIRMAN

New Delhi dated the 29th October, 2003