

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition No.258/2009

Subject: Approval of tariff for Vindhyachal STPS, Stage-II (1000 MW) for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing: 6.5.2010

Coram: Shri S.Jayaraman, Member
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: NTPC Ltd

Respondents: MPPTCL, NSEDCL, GUVNL, CSPDCL, ED, Goa, ED, Daman & Diu, ED, D & NH.

Parties present: 1. Shri V.K.Padha, NTPC
2. Shri S.K.Sharma, NTPC
3. Shri Manish Garg, NTPC
4. Shri V.K.Tandon, NTPC
5. Shri Ajay Dua, NTPC
6. Shri Manoj Saxena, NTPC
7. Shri Sankar Saran, NTPC
8. Shri S.Agarwal, NTPC
9. Shri Sachin Jain, NTPC
10. Shri V.K.Garg, NTPC
11. Ms, Shilpa Agarwal, NTPC

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, NTPC, for approval of tariff for Vindhyachal STPS, Stage-II (1000 MW) (hereinafter referred to as "the generating station") for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014, based on the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and Conditions of Tariff) Regulations, 2009 (hereinafter referred to as "the 2009 regulations").

2. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the tariff for the generating station for the period 2009-14 has been filed in terms of the 2009 regulations specified by the Commission. He further submitted that in addition to the additional capital expenditure covered under Regulations 9(1), 9(2) and 19(e) of the 2009 regulations it has claimed additional expenditure which are necessary for the efficient operation of the generating station during its life time and detailed legal submissions on the admissibility of such expenditure has been filed. He also submitted that its claim for additional capital expenditure (projected) mainly related to Ash handling system and environmental system. The representative pointed to the claim for Rs.5.10 crore towards

TAC system of Stage-II by its affidavit dated 8.4.2010 and submitted that the term 'TAC' should be meant as 'Transport Air Compressor', which was required for augmentation of dry ash extraction system for fire fighting. The representative also submitted that it has filed additional information as required by the Commission and has served copy to the respondents.

3. On a specific query by the Commission as to whether the projected expenditure of Rs.2.50 crore claimed towards the Effluent Treatment Plant (ETP) was related to the generating station (Stage-II) or was common to all the four stages of the generating station (Stage-I to Stage-IV), the representative clarified that the expenditure claimed was in relation to the generating station only.

4. On a further query as to whether the consent of the Ministry of Environment and Forest (MoEF), Gol vide its letter dated 5.2.2009 specifically indicated the installation of the online CO₂ system, as claimed, the representative of the petitioner clarified that MoEF, Gol by its letter had directed the monitoring of emission levels within the vicinity of the generating station. The representative further clarified that effective monitoring of emission levels would not be possible without the said monitoring instruments.

5. The prayer of the petitioner seeking exemption from filing the details as per Form 9A and 9B, for existing station as on 1.4.2009, was rejected by the Commission and the petitioner was directed to submit the same, latest by 21.5.2010.

6. The Commission also directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit, with copy to the respondents, latest by latest by 21.5.2010:

(a) As regards the expenditure of Rs.5.10 crores on erection and commissioning of Transport Air Compressor (TAC), required for augmentation of dry ash extraction, the techno-economic details of the system/assets proposed to be installed, need to be furnished. Also, petitioner to clarify as to whether the said amount pertains to the cost of one or more TAC, along with other assets required for the augmentation of dry ash extraction system;

(b) As regards the expenditure of Rs.2.50 crore on ETP, petitioner to clarify as to whether a common ETP was constructed for all the Stages (I to IV) of the generating station or separate ETPs were envisaged for individual stages. Also, in case if a common ETP was planned for all the stages, then the petitioner to clarify as to whether the said expenditure pertains to the apportioned cost of the generating station or the cost of common ETP.

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

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