

## CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Petition No. 315/2010

Sub: Determination of transmission tariff for Pole-I of +/- 500 kV 2500 MW Baila- Bhiwandi HVDC Bi-pole including HVDC transmission line associated with Barh Generation Project (3X 660 MW) in Eastern Region from the date of commercial operation to 31.3.2014.

Date of hearing : 23.6.2011

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd, Gurgaon

Respondents : Uttar Pradesh Power Corporation Limited & Others.

Parties present : 1. Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL  
2. Shri J.Mazumder , PGCIL  
3. Shri M.M Mondal , PGCIL  
4. Shri Rajeev Gupta , PGCIL  
5. Shri T.P.S Bawa , PSPCL

### Record of Proceedings

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, Power Grid Corporation of India Limited for determination of transmission tariff for Pole-I of +/- 500 kV 2500 MW Baila-Bhiwandi HVDC Bi-pole including HVDC transmission line (hereinafter referred to as 'the transmission assets') associated with Barh Generation Project (3 X 660 MW) in Eastern Region from 1.9.2010 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 norms for Baila- Bhiwadi HVDC station (1250 MW X 2) have not been specified in 2009 regulations and , therefore, the petitioner has proposed to consider the O&M for each pole (1250 MW) of Baila and Bhiwadi HVDC stations

as 2.5 times of norms provided for 500 MW HVDC back to back station. He further submitted that currently the bi-pole is being used in metallic return path mode and both the poles of the line are being utilized. Moreover, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons (SOR) for the 2009 regulations, each pole of Bi-pole HVDC lines has been considered as one ckt. of the AC / HVDC transmission line. Accordingly, the petitioner has claimed the O&M expenses for Double Circuit quad conductor HVDC transmission line.

3. In reply to a query regarding delay in the commissioning of the project, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the delay was on account of delay in Barh generation project. However, the line has been commissioned on the request on Northern Region beneficiaries as ratified in NRPC meeting.

4. The representative of the respondent, Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. (PSPCL) successor of PSEB (Respondent No. 7) submitted that the O&M norms for both the transmission lines of Balia-Bhiwandi HVDC Bi-pole should be calculated together on the basis of single circuit AC line with 4 bundled conductors (Quad) instead of double ckt. AC line as the sub-conductors in one pole of HVDC line is only 4 and the number of sub-conductors in bundled conductor (Quad) double ckt. AC line is 24.

5. In respect of the Bi-pole terminal at Balia Bhiwandi, the representative of the PSPCL further submitted that the O&M norms for the terminal should be calculated on the basis of 2000 MW Talchar-Kolar Bi-pole. He further raised the issue of underutilization of the Balia-Bhiwadi Bi-pole due to non-commissioning of LIL0 of second ckt. of 400 kV Kahalgaon –Patana line and non utilization of 400 kV Barh-Balia line. He also raised the issue of high cost variation in item 5.1 i.e Control room and Office building including HVAC and high cost of item 6.9 i.e Emergency DG set, in Form 5B of the petition.

6. The representative of the petitioner submitted that reply to the contentions of the PSPCL has already been furnished in the rejoinder filed by the petitioner. He further submitted that the component of expenditure towards different works could not be exactly furnished in the standard format of Form 5B and expenditure indicated against some items in Form 5B included expenditure towards some other works besides the exact item name indicated in Form 5B.

7. The commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information/justification, latest by 15.7.2011 on affidavit with advance copy to the respondents.

- (a) Statement clearly indicating the expenditure towards each work under the claims indicated in Form 5-B;
- (b) Reason and justification for huge cost variation of work under item 5.1; and
- (c) Reasons for high cost in item 6.9.

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

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