

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
NEW DELHI**

Petition No. 58/TT/2013

Subject : Determination of transmission tariff for extension of 400/220 kV Ballabgarh Sub-station(Realignment Work) under 765 kV system for Central Part of Northern Grid Part-III, for Tariff block 2009-14 period in Northern Region.

Date of Hearing : 20.10.2015.

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

Petitioner : Power Grid Corporation of India Limited (PGCIL)

Respondents : Rajasthan Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited and 16 others

Parties present : Shri S.K. Venkatesan, PGCIL
Shri M.M. Mondal, PGCIL
Shri S.S. Raju, PGCIL
Shri Mukesh Khanna, PGCIL
Shri Rakesh Prasad, PGCIL
Smt. Manju Gupta, PGCIL

Record of Proceedings

The representative of the petitioner submitted that:-

- a) The instant petition has been filed for determination of transmission tariff for Extension of 400/220 kV Ballabgarh S/S (Realignment Work) under 765 kV system for Central Part of Northern Grid Part-III for tariff block 2009-14;
- b) As per Investment Approval (IA) dated 3.11.2009, the project is scheduled to be commissioned within 30 months from the date of IA i.e. 1.6.2012 against which the asset covered in instant petition was commissioned on 1.12.2012. Accordingly, there was time over-run of six months in commissioning of the asset;



- c) The petition covers realignment work and line is shifted into a different Dia. There was problem of increase in short circuit level at Ballabgarh Sub-station and in complete Delhi ring. Ballabgarh Sub-station on one side was connected to and other side to Gurgaon. There was a proposal to divert this line from Ballabgarh Sub-station and connect directly from Dadri to Gurgaon to reduce short circuit level at Ballabgarh Sub-station;
- d) There were two options and they were (i) to bypass the Ballabgarh Sub-station and connect it directly from Dadri to Gurgaon and (ii) to open the main breakers of Dia and pass the line through tie-breaker of Ballabgarh Sub-station so that in case of emergency, main breaker may be closed at Ballabgarh Sub-station. The second option was adopted in the instant scheme;
- e) There is minor diversion of line and only one breaker is required as half Dia was already complete;
- f) CEA and RPC has approved the instant scheme;
- g) The total estimated completion cost is ₹163.67 lakh against the apportioned approved cost of ₹151.72 lakh. There is nominal cost over-run in comparison to FR cost;
- h) Provisional tariff has been given vide order dated 25.3.2013. The petitioner has submitted tried up auditor cost up to 31.3.2014 and requested to consider latest auditor certificate cost;
- i) RCE is under approval and shall be submitted alongwith revised tariff forms upon approval; and
- j) The representative of petitioner requested to condone the delay and allow the tariff.

2. In response to a query of the Commission regarding why the realignment work at Ballabgarh Sub-station has not been carried out under O&M Expenses as it is a minor work. The representative of petitioner clarified that this is entirely new scheme under a new Investment Approval and have procured 6 CTs, 3 LAs, and 1 circuit breaker;

3. The Commission directed the petitioner to submit the following information by 30.11.2015 with a copy to all the respondents, failing which the orders will be passed on the basis of the information available on record.



- a) Reason for increase in cost, since estimated completion cost is ₹163 lakh against FR cost of ₹152 lakh;
- b) The approval for the same by the RPC/CEA (The copy of minutes of 10th meeting of TCC and 11th meeting of NRPC dated 27.1.2009 and summary records of 20th meeting of standing Committee held on 13.10.2008 at Chamba, Uttarakhand does not include the realignment of Ballabgarh Sub-station);
- c) SLD of the Ballabgarh Sub-station;
- d) Details of work/equipment required for Realignment of Ballabgarh Sub-station alongwith reason for realignment work ;
- e) Reason why the realignment work at Ballabgarh has not been carried out under O&M expenses; and
- f) There is delay of 6 months in commissioning of asset. The chronology of the various activities, period of activity in respect of delay, alongwith documentary evidence in the following format:-

Activity	Period of activity				Reason(s) for delay
	From	To	From	To	

4. The Commission directed the respondents to file their reply by 11.12.2015 with an advance copy to the petitioner who shall file its rejoinder, if any by 18.12.2015. The additional information/replies/rejoinder shall be filed within the due date mentioned above. In case no information is filed within the due date, the matter shall be considered based on the available records.

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

By order of the Commission

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

