

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

Petition No. 53/TT/2013

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Raipur Wardha T/L alongwith FSC at Wardha under WRSS-II Set-A Scheme of Western Region from DOCO to 31.3.2014

Date of Hearing : 25.2.2014

Coram : Shri Gireesh B.Pradhan, Chairperson
Shri M. Deena Dayalan, Member
Shri A.K. Singhal, Member
Smt. Neerja Mathur, Member, Ex-Officio

Petitioner : PGCIL

Respondents: : MPPMCL and 7 others

Parties present : Smt. Seema Gupta, PGCIL
Shri A.M. Pavgi, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL,
Smt. Sangeeta Edwards, PGCIL,
Shri P. Saraswath, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.K. Venkatasan, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for 400 kV D/C Raipur Wardha T/L alongwith FSC at Wardha under WRSS-II SET-A Scheme of Western Region;
- b) As per Investment Approval (IA) dated 24.7.2006 the asset was scheduled to be commissioned within 48 months from the date of IA i.e. 1.9.2010. However, the asset was put under commercial operation on 1.1.2013 and thus there is a delay of 29 months;



- c) The reasons for delay were submitted vide affidavit dated 18.9.2013. The delay was mainly on account of delay in getting Railway clearance and forest clearance in Maharashtra. The final stage forest clearance was given by Maharashtra on 1.9.2012 and the tree cutting permission on 1.11.2012. The line is passing through the wildlife corridor and hence MoE&F sought the comments of National Tiger Conservation Authority and this led to considerable delay. He submitted that the proposal for railway clearance was submitted on 6.8.2009 and the clearance was given only on 24.12.2012. He further submitted that the conditions are beyond their control. Requested to condone the delay and allow the tariff as prayed;
- d) The Management Certificate and the revised tariff forms of the instant asset was filed along with the affidavit dated 19.9.2013;
- e) MSEDCL has filed reply to the petition.

2. The Commission observed that the estimated completion cost is much higher than the apportioned approved cost of the instant asset. In response, the representative of the petitioner submitted that the cost of the asset has gone up by ₹160 crore because of the increase in the quantity of insulators due to change in the configuration from twin conductors to quad conductors.

3. In response to Commission's query as to why there is no need to submit the RCE in the instant case, the representative of petitioner clarified that though the estimated completion cost of the instant asset is more than the apportioned approved cost, the overall cost of the project is within the estimated completed cost of the project and hence there is no requirement to file RCE in the instant case.

4. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the estimated cost, actual cost, IDC and IEDC of all the assets covered under the scheme and the reasons for variation in cost in detail. The petitioner was further directed to file rejoinder to the reply filed by MSEDCL, if any, before 20.3.2014.

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

By order of the Commission

Sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief Legal

