

A Turitea wind farmer, going by the screen name **Rob** may in fact be John Love.

**Here he wants the fact that the wind farm is right on two fault lines to be hidden from investors in MRP!!!**

**Thanks to our vigilant readers for spotting this on interest.co.nz**

<http://www.interest.co.nz/news/59129/government-launches-website-new-zealand-residents-details-energy-soes-set-be-partially-pr>

by **OMG** | 03 May 12, 2:15pm

1

Vote up!

A slick site. I checked out MRP's 2011 Annual Report,

<http://www.mightyriver.co.nz/Results/Financial-Information/Reports/2011-Annual-Report.aspx>

They say nothing about their Turitea and Puketoi wind farms on earthquake fault lines - the Wellington fault and Northern Ohariu faults. Why is that? Will they come clean in their prospectus?

<http://nzwindfarms.wordpress.com/>

- [reply](#)

- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **Rob** | 03 May 12, 4:16pm

1

Vote up!

Why does this matter, and why would they need to? Do airports?

- [reply](#)

- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **OMG** | 03 May 12, 4:34pm

1

Vote up!

Facepalm. What a silly thing to say. I'd want assurance that the turbines weren't going to collapse along with any money I use to buy shares. Do you own buildings in the Christchurch CBD? Looking to buy a bridge in NY? Any investment requires due diligence, how many NZ mums and dads are able to do that? Let Mighty River Power state categorically the wind farms are completely safe and I may pull out my cheque book - although the question of growth in electricity use to justify investing is yet to be answered. I see they rightly raise the issue of no current growth in the annual report. In fact when you think about it what will consumption look like if there is an economic collapse as so many here are predicting. What will the shares be worth then? Lots of questions unanswered at this stage.

- [reply](#)

- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **Rob** | 03 May 12, 6:33pm

1

[Vote up!](#)

No it isn't, if you look on a map of EQ fault lines, that will show you where they are in relation to the turbines, They will also have been engineered to withstand large EQ's as per NZ building codes, or they will need to be strengthened to meet them. Under your argument, a business that has buildings should disclose that they are also in EQ zones, or disclose if there was a fire in the future, the building may be condemned, It is all part of research the buyer must carry out. There is no one forcing people to buy shares. It is a little like the finance companies, where investors needed to do their own research too, how much handholding do people need?. Any business could be affected by an EQ, but how many would disclose that. Not to mention that a business would normally have insurance to cover that sort of thing. I have never seen an apartment for sale in Wellingtons CBD that has an EQ warning with it.

Plus are they legally required to disclose this?

- [reply](#)

- Report Comment
- 

by **OMG** | 03 May 12, 7:03pm

2

Vote up!

Thank you **ROB**, BTW, are you a well known Turitea wind farmer? Is the substation on your airstrip and the 125 m high turbines close by, along with 53 metre high transmission towers with the Northern Ohariu fault, running straight through them? The Wellington fault is right next to them on the other side.

Let me clear up one thing for you, airports are horizontal, turbines are vertical.

The investing public is protected by a raft of legislation from fraud. Are you are making a pitch to the naive and gullible for your own financial gain?

Yes, under the Securities Act a full disclosure is required.

**See section 43F**

**Prohibition of distribution of investment statement**

- (1)The FMA may, at any time, make an order prohibiting the distribution of an investment statement if the FMA is of the opinion that the investment statement—
  - (a)is likely to deceive, mislead, or confuse with regard to any particular that is material to the offer of securities to which it relates; or
  - (b)is inconsistent with any registered prospectus referred to in it; or
  - (c)does not comply with this Act or the regulations.

Here's some homework for you. Check it out, and please share your views with us all.  
<http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1978/0103/latest/DLM3724900.html>

- [reply](#)

- Report Comment
- 

by **Rob** | 03 May 12, 10:35pm

1

Vote up!

I would think hydro would be more of a risk of failure from an EQ, than wind. A large EQ may knock out a few turbines, but with a hydro station, damage will affect the whole thing. You do have to realise that these turbines are well engineered, as they have to cope with vertical huge wind loads on them, perhaps even larger lateral loads than they would experience an EQ. Both Hydro and Wind are still better than Nuclear in an EQ zone, as was seen in Japan.

I read this on this website <http://ramblingsdc.net/Australia/WindPower.html>

Wind turbines are highly resistant to damage from earthquakes and tsunamis. None of the 1746 wind turbines in Japan were damaged by the earthquake and tsunami of 2011/03/11.)

- [reply](#)

- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **OMG** | 03 May 12, 10:53pm

3

Vote up!

Give your **deliberate misinformation** a rest. The nearest Japanese wind turbines were **300km** from the epicentre. The nearest Turitea turbines to the Wellington fault are less than **100 metres away, right on an epicentre**. The Northern Ohariu fault runs right through the southern group of turbines. This is the biggest con in the country's history and people are waking up to it.

Your desperation is on show for all to see.

- [reply](#)

- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **Rob** | 03 May 12, 11:36pm

1

[Vote up!](#)

Why were they allowed to be built in the first place then, and why haven't the media got onto this? It is possible to create earthquake resistant structures. And even if they all instantly collapse from a mag 9 earthquake, is it going to cause major problems to NZs energy needs, as wind generation is still a relatively small part of NZs generation. That

is one reason why energy generation is shared around the country, and we use different types, so to share the risk. You don't put all your eggs into one basket. Companies do also have insurance to cover losses. But if you think it is too risky, don't invest. I am actually sure the wind farm will be at the bottom of peoples minds if a major earthquake happens anyway, as it will likely result in major loss of life in Wellington and major damage.

- [reply](#)
  
- [Report Comment](#)
- 

by **OMG** | 04 May 12, 12:18am

3

Vote up!

You're not fooling anyone. You know the corruption inside out. ;-)  
<http://nzwindfarms.wordpress.com/>

• [reply](#)

• [Report Comment](#)