

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Record of Proceedings

Petition No. 275/2010

Sub: Approval for transmission tariff for transmission system associated with Vindhyachal Stage-I in 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 : MPPTCL, MSEDCL, GUVNL, Govt. of Goa, Daman and Diu, Dadra Nagar Haveli, CSEB and MPAKVNL.

Parties present : Shri S.Raju, 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 transmission system (hereinafter referred to as 'the transmission system') associated with Vindhyachal Stage-I in 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 additional capital expenditure of ₹34.09 lakh and ₹204.19 lakh projected to be incurred during 2010-11 and 2013-14, respectively has been claimed for New Lightning Arresters for Reactors and 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 no instances of collapse of the transmission tower in regard to 400 kV S/C Itarsi-Indore, Ckt-I. However, two transmission tower failure has been reported during the years 1997 and 1999 in Itrasi-Indore, Ckt-II. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the report of the failure of above these towers 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)