

EXHIBIT 8

Callahan, Beth

991

From: Kevin Thurston [kzthurston2004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 8:36 AM
To: Chamberlain, Kristen
Cc: Callahan, Beth
Subject: Re: Roxbury File

Kristen and Beth:

Thank you so much for your assistance. We are primarily interested in copying testimony on file from Record Hill Wind LLC, Warren Brown and RSE dealing with noise issues. I would like to come by your office again in the middle of the day today to make the copies. I am out of town the rest of the week. What time works for you? And do you have a sense of how much paper we're talking about (i.e., how long this might take and what the apprx. cost might be?)?

Thanks,

Kevin

--- On Tue, 6/2/09, Chamberlain, Kristen <Kristen.Chamberlain@maine.gov> wrote:

From: Chamberlain, Kristen <Kristen.Chamberlain@maine.gov>
Subject: Roxbury File
To: kzthurston2004@yahoo.com
Cc: "Callahan, Beth" <Beth.Callahan@maine.gov>
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2009, 5:03 PM

Hi Kevin-

It was nice to meet you today. I spoke with Beth and asked our management and administrative staff about how a file might be copied.

It turns out that we typically do not provide copies of application materials to interested parties because we do not have the staff time or resources to reasonably accommodate such requests in a timely manner. In addition, we are reluctant to release the official record to a copy center.

The best way for you or your uncle to review all or a portion of the file is to come to our office and make copies. The file is organized by subject and is available anytime during business hours (8-5). If we know someone is coming we can arrange a room and access to photocopiers.

I did speak with Beth and the responses to public comments are not yet available. I understand that Beth and your uncle are in touch with each other so I'm sure he will know as soon as they are finished.

992

Beth explained that the file is organized by subject, so if you are interested in a particular document or subject, it should be easy to navigate to what you are looking for.

Also, much of the initial application is available on our website.

I hope this helps. Beth may be able to offer additional guidance regarding the file.

I would contact her if you need more information on this project.

Regards,

Kristen Chamberlain, Project Manager

Bureau of Land and Water Quality

Department of Environmental Protection

(207) 287-6733

(207) 287-7826 (fax)

kristen.chamberlain@maine.gov

Callahan, Beth

993

From: Steve Thurston [thurston.steve@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 9:51 PM
To: Callahan, Beth
Cc: Fisk, Andrew C
Subject: Re: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline

Dear Beth,

After checking my schedule it would be better for me if the file could be available next Monday or Tuesday and if there could be a meeting with you, and if possible Andrew Fisk and/ or Jim Cassida on the same day. There are a number of significant issues that have not been fully addressed in the Q and A and I would like to have the opportunity, just as Dora Mills, RSE, Warren Brown, and the applicant have had to freely exchange information with the DEP prior to the draft decision being rendered.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience. Thanks very much for your consideration.

Regards,
 Steve Thurston

On Mon, Jul 20, 2009 at 6:12 PM, Steve Thurston <thurston.steve@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Beth,

Thanks for the response. Terry Karkos, reporter for the Sun Journal told me another reporter heard it from a DEP staff person while discussing a different project, so not exactly straight from the horses mouth.

However, according to the information in the RHW LLC DEP file, it is my understanding that RHW LLC removed their pre-development sound study when Warren Brown suggested it was "unfamiliar, both in the literature and practically" and in the sound study for the substitute turbines merely attempted to show the project would not exceed 45dBA at night without determining what the actual nighttime ambient sound level measurements are.

I testified several weeks ago that the law requires a pre-development ambient sound study if the project will produce more than 40dBA at protected locations. The new study for the Siemens turbines indicates that SDR sounds are likely to occur, but were not included in the CADNA model. Adding 5 DB to the predicted noise level of 37 dBA to account for the likely hood of blade thump puts the prediction of noise generated by the project at 42 dBA at protected locations, which triggers the pre-development ambient sound level requirement.

Am I misreading the law, or does the DEP have a different interpretation of it?

Also, I would like to schedule a time to review the file at your earliest convenience. Please advise if any days this week, except Tuesday 7/21, would be convenient.

Is the deadline for public comment still July 27th?

Have you agreed to a 15 day response period between the draft decision and the final decision, as Jim Cassida told me was a reasonable request, and occasionally granted?

Thanks very much,
 Steve Thurston

On Mon, Jul 20, 2009 at 8:34 AM, Callahan, Beth <Beth.Callahan@maine.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Thurston,

I am not aware of any sound level studies that are being conducted by the applicant at this time. The most recent study that the applicant conducted and submitted was due to the change in turbine specification. This study was required by the Department, and it can be viewed in the Department's file and it is also posted on the DEP's website for public viewing. Following this most recently submitted study, no other sound level studies have been submitted to the Department for review.

Thank you,

BETH CALLAHAN

Project Manager

ME Dept. of Environmental Protection

Division of Land Resource Regulation

From: Steve Thurston [<mailto:thurston.steve@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2009 7:59 AM
To: Callahan, Beth; Fisk, Andrew C
Subject: Fwd: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline

Dear Beth and or Andrew,

I have yet to receive an answer to my questions regarding additional ambient noise testing by RHW. Perhaps Beth is on vacation and if so, could Andrew please respond ASAP?

Thanks,
 Steve

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steve Thurston <thurston.steve@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 15, 2009 at 10:33 AM
Subject: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline
To: Beth.Callahan@maine.gov
Cc: Lynne Williams <lwill@earthlink.net>, "M. Horodyski" <mhorodyski@earthlink.net>

Dear Beth,

It has come to my attention that RHW may be doing a new pre-development background sound level assessment for the project in Roxbury, as my recent testimony indicated is required by law. Can you confirm this?

Since the DEP has hired its own professional to peer review RHW's first assesement, and since that professional, Warren Brown, found fault with the first assesement as the record indicates, it seems to me that the department would take a special interest in the conduct of any further assesements by the developer, since the developer has a vested interest in the outcome of such a test, and the developer's consultant has demonstrated that he cannot be relied upon to provide unbiased information.

995

I would propose that the DEP agree to oversee the conduct of the study and allow an expert from our side to "peer review" the conduct of that study. In this way, we can all agree on the methodologies to be employed, observe the testing, and hopefully eliminate any disputes about the results. I would further request that the DEP agree to pay for a third party expert of our choice in an amount commensurate with the fees paid to Warren Brown for similar work. We have no deep pockets to hire our own experts and have already spent a great deal of time and money providing the department with important testimony in this matter, which I hope the department agrees has been both constructive and helpful in your decision making process.

I look forward to your response at your earliest convenience. Thanks very much for your consideration.

Regards,
Steve Thurston

996

Callahan, Beth

997

From: sherwats2 [sherwats2@wildblue.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 10:23 AM
To: Callahan, Beth
Subject: Re: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline

Good Morning Beth

Thank you for organising a meeting on July 28th . 8.30 is a convenient time .

We will sent you an agenda no later that july 27 th early afternoon.

We will probably look at the files after the meeting , schedule and distance will not allow me to come twice , I believe it is the same for Mr Thurston , although I do not speak for him.

Regards

Monique Aniel , MD

----- Original Message -----

From: Callahan, Beth
To: Steve Thurston ; sherwats2
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 7:42 AM
Subject: RE: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline

Dear Mr. Thurston & Mrs. Aniel,

In response to your request, I have scheduled a meeting for you and Monique to come and discuss the Record Hill Wind Project for Tuesday, July 28 from 8:30-9:30am here at DEP's Augusta office. In attendance will be my supervisor and other DEP management. Due to scheduling conflicts, there are no other times available on Monday or Tuesday that management is available to meet. By no later than Monday, July 27, please provide an agenda which outlines the issues that you would like to discuss at the meeting.

In response to your other questions...

You are welcome to view the file this week. Please let me know in advance of your expected date and time of arrival so that I can reserve a room or cubicle for you to view the file.

It is preferable that all submissions be received no later than July 27. If any submissions are received after that, they will still be added to the Department's file; however, I cannot guarantee that I will have ample time to thoroughly review them.

A 15 day response period has not been determined at this time. I will discuss this with my supervisor and a determination will be made closer to the date that the draft decision is sent.

Thank you,
BETH CALLAHAN
Project Manager
ME Dept. of Environmental Protection
Division of Land Resource Regulation

From: Steve Thurston [mailto:thurston.steve@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 9:51 PM
To: Callahan, Beth
Cc: Fisk, Andrew C
Subject: Re: Record Hill Wind LLC timeline

Dear Beth,

After checking my schedule it would be better for me if the file could be available next Monday or Tuesday and if there could be a meeting with you, and if possible Andrew Fisk and/ or Jim Cassida on the same day. There are a number of significant issues that have not been fully addressed in the Q and A and I would like to have the opportunity, just as Dora Mills, RSE, Warren Brown, and the applicant have had to freely exchange information

998
with the DEP prior to the draft decision being rendered.

Please let me know at your earliest convenience. Thanks very much for your consideration.

Regards,
Steve Thurston

On Mon, Jul 20, 2009 at 6:12 PM, Steve Thurston <thurston.steve@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Beth,

Thanks for the response. Terry Karkos, reporter for the Sun Journal told me another reporter heard it from a DEP staff person while discussing a different project, so not exactly straight from the horses mouth.

However, according to the information in the RHW LLC DEP file, it is my understanding that RHW LLC removed their pre-development sound study when Warren Brown suggested it was "unfamiliar, both in the literature and practically" and in the sound study for the substitute turbines merely attempted to show the project would not exceed 45dBA at night without determining what the actual nighttime ambient sound level measurements are.

I testified several weeks ago that the law requires a pre-development ambient sound study if the project will produce more than 40dBA at protected locations. The new study for the Siemens turbines indicates that SDR sounds are likely to occur, but were not included in the CADNA model. Adding 5 DB to the predicted noise level of 37 dBA to account for the likely hood of blade thump puts the prediction of noise generated by the project at 42 dBA at protected locations, which triggers the pre-development ambient sound level requirement.

Am I misreading the law, or does the DEP have a different interpretation of it?

Also, I would like to schedule a time to review the file at your earliest convenience. Please advise if any days this week, except Tuesday 7/21, would be convenient.

Is the deadline for public comment still July 27th?

Have you agreed to a 15 day response period between the draft decision and the final decision, as Jim Cassida told me was a reasonable request, and occasionally granted?

Thanks very much,
Steve Thurston