

**Central Electricity Regulatory Commission  
New Delhi**

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Review Petition No. 12/2011 in Petition No. 193/2010**

Subject: Review of order dated 5.5.2011 in Petition No. 193/2010 in respect of approval of transmission tariff for combined assets (a) 400 kV Ramagundam-Hyderabad D/C transmission line (b) 400 kV S/C Gooty-Neelmangala transmission line (c) 400 kV Hyderabad-Kurnool-Gooty transmission line and (d) 400 kV S/C Khammam-Nagarjunasagar transmission line along with associated bays and equipment under Ramagundam Stage III Transmission System in Southern Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014 under Regulation 103 of the Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 1999

Date of Hearing: 8.12.2011

Coram: Dr. Pramod Deo, Chairperson  
Shri S.Jayaraman, Member  
Shri V.S.Verma, Member  
Shri M.Deena Dayalan, Member

Petitioner: TANGEDCO, Chennai

Respondent: PGCIL

Parties present: Shri S.Balaguru, TANGEDCO  
Shri S.Vallinayagam, Advocate, TANGEDCO  
Shri S.S.Raju, PGCIL  
Shri R.B.Singh, PGCIL  
Shri Gopalji, PGCIL

The learned counsel for the review petitioner, TANGEDCO, submitted as under:-

- (a) PGCIL has not complied with its commitment recorded in the ROP for the hearing dated 23.12.2010 in Petition No. 193/2010 to the effect that (i) anemometers are being installed based on the report of the standing committee of experts on the failure of towers of PGCIL during January, 2009 to June, 2009, (ii) the data of the anemometers have been sent to SERC, Chennai for study purposes and (iii) feedback from SERC is awaited. PGCIL has not submitted till date any report from SERC which suggests that the towers require strengthening.

Therefore, the impugned order has been passed without considering the basic information sought in the ROP.

- (b) Secondly, the averments made by PGCIL in Petition No.193/2010 that transmission lines were commissioned from March 2004 to May, 2005 contradicts their statement in affidavit dated 28.9.2010 in the said petition to the effect that new design practice mentioned at Sl. No. 5 (IS: 802-1995 with 75% wind in Broken Wire Condition) is being followed from 2001 onward and no incident of failures of towers on 400 kV transmission lines had occurred. When all the transmission lines mentioned in Petition No. 193/2010 were commissioned after 2001, PGCIL should not have sought additional capital expenditure for hip bracing as these lines had already been designed as per IS:802-1995 with 75% wind in Broken Wire Condition (BWC).
- (c) The statement made by PGCIL in its affidavit dated 26.8.2011 in reply to the present review petition is in direct contradiction to the statement made in Petition No. 193/2010. Since the transmission lines are commissioned after 2003, there is a failure on the part of PGCIL to properly design the tower and hence the cost cannot be passed on to the beneficiaries.

2. On a query of the Commission as to whether grid security can be compromised by not allowing tower strengthening, the learned counsel for the Petitioner replied in the negative. He further added that if the tower strengthening is required due to failure of PGCIL to incorporate suitable designs, PGCIL must bear such expenses which are required later.

3. The representative of the respondent, PGCIL, submitted that the issues raised by the petitioner have already been answered in its reply affidavit dated 29.11.2011, clearly indicating that SERC Report is independent of the tower strengthening activity being carried out. The tower strengthening is undertaken on all the lines designed after 1995, depending on priority, based on the recommendations of the Task Force headed by CEA. The recommendation of the Task Force for installation of anemometers was of general nature and was not directly linked with requirement of tower strengthening. The representative of the respondent further submitted that investment approval was accorded in August 2001 and Letter of Award (LoA) was placed in 2002. In 2002, the design of tower available was as per IS: 802-1995 with 0% wind in BWC whereas IS: 802- 1995 with 75% wind in BWC was finalized in June 2003, hence the lines were constructed as per the earlier design available at the time of placing LoA.

4. The Commission enquired from the representative of the respondent, PGCIL, the reason for mentioning the new design practice for suspension towers being followed from 2001 onwards in its affidavit dated 28.9.2010. The representative of the respondent clarified that from 2001 onwards, PGCIL started making design considering 75% wind in BWC.

5. The Commission directed the respondent to submit the detailed clarification along with relevant documents on the points raised by the petitioner, TANGEDCO, on affidavit, with advance copy to the petitioner TANGEDCO, before 5.1.2012. TANGEDCO may file its response if any within one week thereafter.

6. Subject to the above, order in the review petition was reserved.

Sd/-  
(T.Rout)  
Joint Chief (Law)  
21.12.2011