

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. TT/300/2013

Subject : Approval of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Agra-Sikar line along with bays under System Strengthening Scheme in Northern Region for Sasan & Mundra UMPPs for tariff block 2009-14

Date of Hearing : 26.8.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B. Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Shri A.S. Bakshi, Member

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.

Respondents : Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. and 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Ms. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Ms. Swapnil Verma, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri R.B. Sharma, Advocate, BRPL
Shri Padamjit Singh, PSPCL
Shri T.P.S. Bawa, PSPCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted as under:-

- (a) As per Investment Approval dated 10.12.2009, the project is scheduled to be completed within 32 months from the date of investment approval, i.e. by 1.9.2012. Asset-a, i.e., 400 kV D/C Quad Agra Sikar line along with associated bays at Agra Sub-station, was put under commercial operation on 1.1.2014,



and Asset-b, i.e., 2 Nos. 400 kV line bays for 400 kV D/C Agra- Sikar line including 2 Nos. 50 MVAR Line Reactors under Bus Reactor operation mode at 400/220 kV Sikar Sub-station, was put under commercial operation on 1.8.2013;

- (b) The petitioner has submitted reasons for delay in the commissioning of the assets, vide affidavit dated 30.6.2014. The delay of sixteen months in the commissioning of Asset- a is mainly due to increase in line length from 320 km to 392 km, re-routing of transmission line because of Sariska Tiger Sanctuary coming in the way and ROW problems;
- (c) There is cost over-run in case of Asset-a. Asset-b is within the cost;
- (d) Replies of UPPCL, PSPCL and BRPL have been received. Rejoinder to the reply of UPPCL has been filed, and rejoinder to the replies of BRPL and PSPCL will be filed.

2. The representative of PSPCL, Respondent No. 6, submitted as under:-

- (a) Since 400 kV Agra-Sikar line is delayed, the petitioner proposes to commission 400 kV line bays at Sikar for Agra Ckts. 1 and 2 and to use these two line bays as bus reactors for Sikar. Moreover, there is one 80 MVAR bus reactor at Neemrana and another 80 MVAR bus reactor at Sikar. With this capacity of 160 MVAR reactors available, there is no justification to have additional 2x50 MVAR line reactors at Sikar to be used as bus reactor. This proposal of using line reactors as bus reactors for the period from 1.8.2013 to 1.1.2014 was not envisaged in the approved scheme of the petitioner, and is not acceptable;
- (b) There are 4 circuit breakers for controlling 2 Nos. 50 MVAR line reactors which is double the requirement. Each line reactor gets connected to the bus through its own circuit breaker and the line circuit breaker in series. The provision of line circuit breaker is unjustified. The additional capital cost and additional O&M charges of the line circuit breakers is of no use to the beneficiaries and is not acceptable.

3. Learned counsel for BRPL, Respondent No. 12, submitted that there is substantial cost over-run in respect of Asset-a. The reasons cited by the petitioner like difference in award rate and estimated rate are very casual in nature and cost over-run should not be allowed. As regards Asset-b, though there is no overall cost over-run, there are cost



over-run in various elements. The judgment of Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal for Electricity dated 28.11.2013 in Appeal No. 165 of 2012 is applicable in the present case, and therefore the cost of individual elements with reference to apportioned approved cost should be considered. There is time over-run in both the assets and the reason cited by the petitioner is that the line passed through Sariska Tiger Sanctuary. Since the petitioner is well conversant with such problems in the construction of transmission lines, and should have factored it in its investment approval. In view of this, IDC and IEDC during the period of delay should be borne by the petitioner.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information on affidavit, with advance copy to the respondents, by 26.9.2014:-

- (a) Documentary proof of approval given by appropriate authority for re-routing of the transmission line because of the Sariska Tiger Sanctuary;
- (b) Reason for not including ₹16.95 lakh towards cost of land in the original estimate as shown in Form 5B;
- (c) Details of acquisition of land, i.e., whether the said land has been acquired at Sikar Sub-station or Agra Sub-station;
- (d) Schedule for application in respect of highway clearance and Railway crossing and the time frame envisaged for getting these clearances along with actual date of application, actual date of receipt along with documentary evidence in regard to these and efforts made for getting the clearances expedited.

5. In case the above information is not received by 26.9.2014, the Commission shall be at liberty to issue order without taking into consideration the submission made by the petitioner subsequently.

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

By order of the Commission

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

