

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 213/TT/2015

&

Petition No. 233/TT/2015

Subject: Determination of transmission tariff for five assets under Implementation of 400 kV D/C Pallatana-Bongaigaon Transmission Line project in North Eastern Region for tariff block 2009-14 and 2014-19.

Date of Hearing: 28.1.2016

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

Petitioner: North East Transmission Company Limited (NETCL)

Respondents: Tripura State Electricity Corporation Limited and 8 others

Parties present: Shri Rajesh Kumar, NETCL
Shri Vishal Gupta, NETCL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that as per the directions of the Commission vide order dated 1.4.2015 in Petition No.224/TT/2012 separate petitions have been filed for the assets commissioned during 2009-14 and 2014-19 tariff periods.

2. The 400 kV D/C Palatana-Silchar Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line and the 400 kV D/C Silchar-Byrnihat Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line were commissioned on 1.9.2012 and 1.3.2012 respectively. The remaining assets namely 400 kV D/C Silchar-Azara Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line, 400 kV D/C Byrnihat-Bongaigaon Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line and 400 kV D/C Azara-Bongaigaon Twin Moose Conductor Transmission Line were commissioned on 27.7.2014, 22.2.2015 and 16.1.2015 respectively during the 2014-19 tariff period.



3. The petitioner has filed Petition No. 213/TT/2015 for determination of tariff for all five assets during 2014-19. The petitioner has filed Petition No. 233/TT/2015 for determination of tariff and truing-up in respect of the transmission lines commissioned during 2009-14.

4. The representative of the petitioner submitted that there is time over-run in respect of all five assets and the reasons for the same are not attributable to the petitioner. The representative of the petitioner requested for condonation of time over-run.

5. The Commission observed that there is increase as well in estimated completion costs as compared to costs as per the Investment approval. The representative of the petitioner submitted that the increase in costs was on account of various reasons such as hilly terrain, reserve forests and unavoidable diversions, low lying/water logging areas and increase in number of angle towers etc.

6. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the detailed break-up of approved costs under various heads/sub-heads and the completed cost of the instant assets in the respective petitions by 19.2.2016 on affidavit with a copy to the beneficiaries. The Commission further directed the respondents to file reply by 29.2.2016 and the petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 7.3.2016. The Commission also directed the petitioner and the respondents to file the information within the specified dates and observed that information received after the due date shall not be considered while passing the final order in the petition.

7. Subject to the above, the Commission reserved the order in the matter.

By Order of the Commission

sd/-
(T. Rout)
Chief (Legal)

