## CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION NEW DELHI

## Petition No. 85/TT/2011

Subject: Petition for determination of Transmission Tariff from

expected DOCO to 31.03.2014 for Combined elements: (i) Koteshwar - Tehri Pooling Point (Koteshwar) 400 kV D/C line (Expected DOCO: 01.04.2011) (II) LILO of Tehri-Meerut 765 kV lines (Charged at 400 kV level) at Tehri Pooling Ponit (Koteshwar) (loop in with 400 kV D/C Triple Snowbird line and Loop out with 765 kV s/c lines (Expected DOCO: 01.04.2011) (III) 400 kV Tehri Pooling Point (Koteshwar Gas Insulated Substation (GIS) - New (Expected DOCO: 01.04.2011) under transmission system associated with Koteshwar HEP for tariff block

2009-14 period in Northern Region.

**Date of Hearing** : 20.6.2013

Coram : Shri V. S. Verma, Member

Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member

Petition : PGCIL

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16

Others

Parties Present : Shri S. S. Raju, PGCIL

Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL Shri T P S Bawa, PSPCL

Shri R. B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL

## **Record of Proceedings**

The representative of the petitioner submitted that they have already made their submissions and requested the Commission to issue order in the matter.

- 2. The representative of PSPCL submitted that-
  - (a) As per the Investment Approval in June 2005, the transmission system associated with Koteshwar HEP was scheduled to be commissioned within 27 months from the date of Letter of Award (LOA). The LOA was awarded in March 2006 and accordingly, the transmission system was scheduled to

- be commissioned in June 2008. However, the transmission system was commissioned in 2011 and there was a delay of 33 months;
- (b) As per Section 38(2)(b) of the Electricity Act, 2003, the petitioner is required to coordinate with the generating companies relating to the inter-State transmission. In this case, absence of coordination has led to huge time over-run;
- (c) The Fire Fighting System would be required only in 2016/2017, when the 765 kV system would come up and there is no requirement at present whereas the petitioner has placed order for the Fire Fighting System; and
- (d) The issue of delay should be settled between the petitioner and Koteshwar HEP and the beneficiaries should not be saddled with liabilities for cost and time over-run.
- 3. The learned counsel for BRPL submitted that there was lack of coordination between the petitioner and the generator. He also pointed out that had the transmission system been commissioned as scheduled, it would have been stranded in the absence of corresponding generation.
- 4. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-
  - (a) There was constant coordination with the generator in different forums as regards evacuation of power from Koteshwar HEP;
  - (b) The time over-run is due to local issues like land acquisition and RoW issues and detailed justifications for delay have already been submitted. The delay is not attributable to the petitioner and hence the time over-run should be condoned.
  - (c) Delay in commissioning of the transmission system did not affect the flow of power as the generation project was also delayed; and
  - (d) The Fire Fighting System is required as the sub-station is a GIS. He sought some time to make written submissions regarding the requirement of Fire Fighting System.
- 5. The Commission directed the petitioner to file its written submissions regarding Fire Fighting System by 5.7.2013. The Commission clarified that no further hearing would be held.
- 6. Subject to the above, order in the petition was reserved.

By the order of the Commission,

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