Thank you for your letter. We greatly appreciate the research and time you have put into your reply to our concerns.

Just to clarify the issue our complaints are about the lack of due process and not the decision itself. There is no statutory framework around a Board of Inquiry that can be judicially reviewed to test lack of due process and competence, or whatever.

You state that an official from the Environmental Protection Agency forwarded our correspondence to the Chair of the Turitea Board of Inquiry and attached her response to us. I have attached her response in Appendix 1.

The Chair’s response does not address most of our complaints and dismisses them as being covered in the body of the report. Most of our complaints are not covered or addressed in the report, for example, the Board’s statement that no turbines will be visible from Huatau when in fact three are visually intrusive. Initially our complaints were made to the Chair of the Environment Court and a selection of these is attached in Appendix 2.

In her response to our complaints the Chair attempts to address two of our complaints. Firstly, which family established Huatau Marae. The final report still states on page ES-19, “this marae was established by the Adams family”, while on page ES-21 states, ‘it was the Jones whanau and not the Adams who had established the Marae”. Such errors are unacceptable when correction was requested via written submission. Secondly, the Chair attempts to justify embracing Palmerston North City Council’s (PNCC) request to determine the status of Huatika without an opportunity to respond to the information provided by PNCC. An opportunity to respond is fundamental to courtroom process. The Chair quotes from District Plans that are dated 2010, i.e. changed after the fact. Correspondence relating this and other sleights of hand by PNCC are in Appendix 3.

The blog mentioned is administered by another party independent of us. The blog does not state that the decision was based on the partial asset sale of Mighty River Power. My interpretation is that the blogger believes that the poor process, incompetence, bias or whatever of the Board has led to a fraudulent consent decision that taints part of Mighty River Power’s asset base when it is partially sold.

Yours sincerely

John Adams (On behalf of Huatau and the Adams)