

CENTRAL ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
New Delhi

Petition No. 180/TT/2021

- Subject** : Petition for determination of transmission tariff for the 2019-24 tariff period for Asset-I: LILO of 400 kV S/C Lonikhand (MSETCL)-Kalwa (MSETCL) Line at Navi-Mumbai alongwith 400/220 kV Navi Mumbai (GIS Sub-station) at Navi Mumbai under the 'Western Region System Strengthening Scheme V'.
- Date of Hearing** : 26.7.2022
- Coram** : Shri Arun Goyal, Member
Shri P.K. Singh, Member
- Petitioner** : Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd.
- Respondents** : Madhya Pradesh Power Management Company Ltd. (MPPMCL) and 10 others
- Parties Present** : Ms. Swapna Sheshadari, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Jai Dhanani, Advocate, PGCIL
Shri Ravi Sharma, Advocate, MPPMCL
Shri S.S Raju, PGCIL
Shri D.K. Biswal, PGCIL
Shri Ved Rastogi, PGCIL
Shri A.K. Verma, PGCIL
Shri Anindya Khare, MPPMCL

Record of Proceedings

Case was called out for virtual hearing. After initial briefing of the case by the Petitioner, Member Technical recused himself from the hearing and it was heard by remaining two Members of the Commission.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner has made the following submissions:
- a. The instant petition is filed for the determination of transmission tariff of the 2019-24 tariff period for LILO of 400 kV S/C Lonikhand (MSETCL)-Kalwa (MSETCL) Line at Navi-Mumbai along with 400/220 kV Navi Mumbai (GIS Sub-station) at Navi Mumbai under the 'Western Region System Strengthening Scheme V'.
 - b. The Investment Approval (IA) of the project was accorded by Board of Directors of the Petitioner's Company vide letter dated 26.12.2007. The Revised Cost Estimate (RCE) of the project was approved by Board of Directors in November, 2012. Further, vide memorandum reference C/CP/RCE/RCE-II WRSS, RCE-II was approved by Board of Directors of the Petitioner's Company.



- c. The instant petition has been filed under Regulation 9 of the 2019 Tariff Regulations but does not fall under Regulation 5(2) of the 2019 Tariff Regulations but is very akin to that and therefore request the Commission to exercise the Power to Relax and Power to remove difficulty in the instant case.
- d. As per energization certificate dated 13.5.2019 issued by CEA, the LILO portion alongwith 400/220 kV GIS Navi Mumbai Sub-station is ready for charging from 13.5.2019, but MSETCL is not allowing to connect the LILO physically as they believe if the LILO gets connected they will have to bear the charges and their POC charges will increase. The details of various correspondences done with MSETCL regarding progress of construction work and tapping of LILO portion at their existing 400 kV S/C Lonikhand-Kalwaline have been submitted along with the instant petition.
- e. The letter dated 26.3.2019 was issued regarding completion of all construction works along with the request for charging of the LILO from the existing line. However, the charging of the system could not be done because MSETCL was not permitting connection with their existing line. Therefore, the trial run certificate form WRLDC could not be obtained due to absence of power source from both the ends under the control of MSETCL. Accordingly, requested to exercise the Power to Relax and Power to Remove Difficulty and approve the COD of the transmission asset.
- f. The reasons for time over-run is due to:
 - i. Delay in finalisation of land for sub-station near Navi Mumbai.
 - ii. Delay in getting forest approval for transmission line (LILO portion)
 - iii. Delay due to Right of Way issues and cable laying in transmission line.
- g. The reasons for cost variation in the asset was:
 - i. Increase in line compensation and cable cost
 - ii. Increase in land cost of sub-station
 - iii. Increase in township and colony cost
 - iv. Increase in sub-station equipment cost
 - v. Increase in IDC and IEDC
- h. The Initial Spares (IS) claimed are within the norms under the 2019 Tariff Regulations.
- i. The scheme was discussed in the 34th meeting of the Standing Committee on Power System Planning in WR held on 9.5.2012 and 35th meeting of the Standing Committee on Power System Planning in WR held on 3.1.2013 in the presence of MSETCL. MSETCL was aware and did not raise any objection to the fact that the Petitioner was constructing the LILO and the same will be terminated at Kudus.



3. The learned counsel for MPPMCL sought time to file reply in the matter and made the following submissions:

- a. There was no prayer for relaxation of the provisions and charging of the LILO and therefore the same should not be allowed.
- b. Some of the pages in the petition are illegible and some in vernacular language. The Petitioner may be directed to re-submit the legible and translated copies of these pages or provide an affidavit stating that they are not relying on those documents.

4. In response to the Commission's query on the status of the downstream network, the learned counsel for the Petitioner has submitted that the downstream network has not been constructed. She requested the Commission to direct MSETCL to submit the status of the downstream network and to submit its reply in the matter.

5. In response to another query of the Commission on whether MSETCL was present and has made any formal submission in any of the meetings, learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that MSETCL was present and will file the information on the affidavit regarding the presence of MSETCL in these meetings. Further, the representative of the Maharashtra was present in the WRPC meeting and has made submissions regarding the matter.

6. The Commission observed that the Petitioner has submitted that 2 Nos. 400 kV GIS bays are surplus and available due to termination of 400 kV D/C Vapi-Navi Mumbai line at Kudus (MSETCL) Sub-station instead of Navi Mumbai (originally envisaged) and directed the Petitioner to clarify, on affidavit by 10.8.2022, whether these surplus bays are covered in the instant petition and whether tariff has been granted for these bays. The Petitioner to file the translated and legible pages of the petition as requested by MPPMCL.

7. After hearing the parties, the Commission directed the Respondents, including MSETCL, to file their replies, if any, by 16.8.2022 with an advance copy to the Petitioner and the Petitioner to file its rejoinder, if any, by 24.8.2022. The Commission observed that due date for filing the reply, rejoinder and additional information should be strictly adhered to and no extension of time shall be granted.

8. The petition shall be listed for hearing in due course for which a separate notice will be issued to the parties concerned.

By order of the Commission

sd/-
(V. Sreenivas)
Joint Chief (Law)

