

Why the change?

I NOTE with interest that Ian Buchanan from Western Power (Geologist's ideas rejected, *Gazette*, April 5) confirmed the southeastern terminal and the re-commissioning of the transmission line are required in addition to the eastern terminal.

Just 12 months ago, Western Power was offering the southeastern terminal as one alternative to the eastern terminal, as it is required to do so by law under the Economic Regulation Authority's regulatory test for network augmentations.

Perhaps Mr Buchanan would like to explain why, in the space of 12 months, the southeastern terminal has changed from being an alternative to the eastern terminal to a requirement in addition to the eastern terminal? Were Western Power's projections for increases in electricity demand so wrong?

Mr Buchanan states that "planning electricity infrastructure is not that simple".

The fact is that it could be much simpler. But Western Power has no incentive to pursue the simplest option of all.

If Western Power was truly serious about energy efficiency, it would be working with the Government to introduce programs and tariff structures that could reduce electricity demand by more than 20 per cent.

Reductions in consumption would negate the need for complex projects such as the eastern terminal.

Western Power doesn't make money out of energy efficiency measures.

Western Power makes money by charging a fee to the electricity retailers like Synergy and Horizon Power for transmitting the power from the electricity generators.

The more electricity it transmits, the more money it makes.

I challenge the Government to put a stop to the eastern terminal and work with Western Power and the other power utilities to come up with a comprehensive program to reduce electricity demand in WA.

*Gary Warden,
Piesse Brook.*