

# CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

## Record of Proceedings

### Petition No. 271/2009

Sub: Approval of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Ramagudam-Bhadrawati (Chandrapur) Transmission system in Southern Region and Western Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing : 15.3.2011

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Gurgaon

Respondents : KPTCL, APTRANSCO, KSEB, TNEB, Govt. of Pondicherry, APEPDCL, APSPDCL, APCPDCL, APNPDCL, BESCO, GESCOM, HESCO, MESCOM, CESC, Govt. of Goa, MPPTCL, MSEDCL, GUVNL, Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu, Dadra Nagar Haveli, CSEB and MPAKVNIL.

Parties present : Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL  
Shri Rajeev Gupta, PGCIL  
Shri M.M.Mondal, PGCIL  
Shri Manoj Dubey, MPPTCL

This petition has been filed for approval of transmission tariff in respect of 400 kV D/C Ramagudam-Bhadrawati (Chandrapur) Transmission system (hereinafter referred to as 'the transmission system') in Southern Region and Western Region for the period from 1.4.2009 to 31.3.2014, in terms of 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 an additional capital expenditure of ₹ 324.00 lakh during 2013-14 has been claimed for 'tower strengthening' which has become necessary for the transmission system due to change in the wind zone.

3. The representative of the Madhya Pradesh Power Trading Company Limited (MPPTCL) submitted its written reply to the petition during the course of hearing. The representative of the petitioner requested for one week`s time to file its rejoinder.

4. The representative of the MPPTCL submitted that tower strengthening should be undertaken at those places where there has been some incidence of tower failure on account of changes in the wind zone. However, a generalized approach of strengthening of all the suspension towers of a transmission line which has never experienced any failure in last 20 years of its commissioning cannot be considered as prudent exercise. The representative of MPPTCL also submitted that the prayer of the petitioner for additional capital expenditure on account of tower strengthening is not in conformity with Regulation 9 (2) (v) of the 2009 regulations and should not be allowed.

5. The Commission observed that there was a solitary instances of collapse of the transmission tower in the year 1998 and no subsequent failure has been reported. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the report of the failure of towers during the year 1998 on affidavit, latest by 25.3.2011, with advance copy to the respondents

6. The Commission further directed the petitioner to file its rejoinder to the reply of MPPTCL, latest by 25.3.2011 with advance copy to the respondents.

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

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