

**Public Health Impacts
of
Wind Turbines**

Prepared by:
Minnesota Department of Health
Environmental Health Division

In response to a request from:
Minnesota Department of Commerce
Office of Energy Security

May 22, 2009

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	ii
Tables.....	iii
Figures.....	iii
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Site Proposals.....	1
1. Bent Tree Wind Project in Freeborn County.....	3
2. Noble Flat Hill Wind Park in Clay, Becker and Ottertail Counties.....	3
B. Health Issues.....	6
II. Elementary Characteristics of Sensory Systems and Sound.....	6
A. Sensory Systems.....	6
1. Hearing.....	6
2. Vestibular System.....	7
B. Sound.....	8
1. Introduction.....	8
<i>Audible Frequency Sound.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Sub-Audible Frequency Sound.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Resonance and modulation.....</i>	<i>9</i>
2. Human Response to Low Frequency Stimulation.....	10
3. Sound Measurements.....	10
III. Exposures of Interest.....	11
A. Noise From Wind Turbines.....	11
1. Mechanical noise.....	11
2. Aerodynamic noise.....	11
3. Modulation of aerodynamic noise.....	12
4. Wind farm noise.....	14
B. Shadow Flicker.....	14
IV. Impacts of Wind Turbine Noise.....	15
A. Potential Adverse Reaction to Sound.....	15
<i>Annoyance, unpleasant sounds, and complaints.....</i>	<i>15</i>
B. Studies of Wind Turbine Noise Impacts on People.....	17
1. Swedish Studies.....	17
2. United Kingdom Study.....	17
3. Netherlands Study.....	17
4. Case Reports.....	18
V. Noise Assessment and Regulation.....	19
1. Minnesota noise regulation.....	19
2. Low frequency noise assessment and regulation.....	19
3. Wind turbine sound measurements.....	22
4. Wind turbine regulatory noise limits.....	24
VI. Conclusions.....	25
VII. Recommendations.....	26
VIII. Preparers of the Report:.....	26
IX. References.....	27

Tables

Table 1: Minnesota Class 1 Land Use Noise Limits	19
Table 2: 35 dB(A) (nominal, 8 Hz-20KHz) Indoor Noise from Various Outdoor Environmental Sources	22

Figures

Figure 1: Wind turbines.....	2
Figure 2: Bent Tree Wind Project, Freeborn County	4
Figure 3: Noble Flat Hill Wind Park, Clay, Becker, Ottertail Counties.....	5
Figure 4: Audible Range of Human Hearing	9
Figure 5: Sources of noise modulation or pulsing.....	13
Figure 6: Annoyance associated with exposure to different environmental noises	20
Figure 7: 1/3 Octave Sound Pressure Level Low frequency Noise Evaluation Curves.....	21
Figure 8: Low Frequency Noise from Wind Farm: Parked, Low Wind Speed, and High Wind Speed	23
Figure 9: Change in Noise Spectrum as Distance from Wind Farm Changes	24

I. Introduction

In late February 2009 the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) received a request from the Office of Energy Security (OES) in the Minnesota Department of Commerce, for a “white paper” evaluating possible health effects associated with low frequency vibrations and sound arising from large wind energy conversion systems (LWECS). The OES noted that there was a request for a Contested Case Hearing before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (PUC) on the proposed Bent Tree Wind Project in Freeborn County Minnesota; further, the OES had received a long comment letter from a citizen regarding a second project proposal, the Lakeswind Wind Power Plant in Clay, Becker and Ottertail Counties, Minnesota. This same commenter also wrote to the Commissioner of MDH to ask for an evaluation of health issues related to exposure to low frequency sound energy generated by wind turbines. The OES informed MDH that a white paper would have more general application and usefulness in guiding decision-making for future wind projects than a Contested Case Hearing on a particular project. (Note: A Contested Case Hearing is an evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, and may be ordered by regulatory authorities, in this case the PUC, in order to make a determination on disputed issues of material fact. The OES advises the PUC on need and permitting issues related to large energy facilities.)


In early March 2009, MDH agreed to evaluate health impacts from wind turbine noise and low frequency vibrations. In discussion with OES, MDH also proposed to examine experiences and policies of other states and countries. MDH staff appeared at a hearing before the PUC on March 19, 2009, and explained the purpose and use of the health evaluation. The Commissioner replied to the citizen letter, affirming that MDH would perform the requested review.

A brief description of the two proposed wind power projects, and a brief discussion of health issues to be addressed in this report appear below.

A. Site Proposals

Wind turbines are huge and expensive machines requiring large capitol investment. Figure 1 shows some existing wind turbines in Minnesota. Large projects require control of extensive land area in order to optimize spacing of turbines to minimize turbulence at downwind turbines. Towers range up to 80 to 100 meters (260 to 325 feet), and blades can be up to 50 meters long (160 feet) (see Tetra Tech, 2008; WPL, 2008). Turbines are expected to be in place for 25-30 years.

Figure 1: Wind turbines



1. Bent Tree Wind Project in Freeborn County

This is a proposal by the Wisconsin Power and Light Company (WPL) for a 400 megawatt (MW) project in two phases of 200 MW each (requiring between 80 and 130 wind turbines). The cost of the first phase is estimated at \$497 million. The project site area would occupy approximately 40 square miles located 4 miles north and west of the city of Albert Lea, approximately 95 miles south of Minneapolis (Figure 2) (WPL, 2008). The Project is a LWECS and a Certificate of Need (CON) from the PUC is required (*Minnesota Statutes 216B.243*). The PUC uses the CON process to determine the basic type of facility (if any) to be constructed, the size of the facility, and when the project will be in service. The CON process involves a public hearing and preparation of an Environmental Report by the OES. The CON process generally takes a year, and is required before a facility can be permitted.

WPL is required to develop a site layout that optimizes wind resources. Accordingly, project developers are required to control areas at least 5 rotor diameters in the prevailing (north-south) wind directions (between about 1300 and 1700 feet for the 1.5 to 2.5 MW turbines under consideration for the project) and 3 rotor diameters in the crosswind (east-west) directions (between about 800 and 1000 feet). Thus, these are minimum setback distances from properties in the area for which easements have not been obtained. Further, noise rules promulgated by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA; *Minnesota Rules Section 7030*), specify a maximum nighttime noise in residential areas of 50 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)). WPL has proposed a minimum setback of 1,000 feet from occupied structures in order to comply with the noise rule.

2. Noble Flat Hill Wind Park in Clay, Becker and Ottertail Counties

This is a LWECS proposed by Noble Flat Hill Windpark I (Noble), a subsidiary of Noble Environmental Power, based in Connecticut. The proposal is for a 201 MW project located 12 miles east of the City of Moorhead, about 230 miles northwest of Minneapolis (Figure 3) (Tetra Tech, 2008). The cost of the project is estimated to be between \$382 million and \$442 million. One hundred thirty-four GE 1.5 MW wind turbines are planned for an area of 11,000 acres (about 17 square miles); the site boundary encompasses approximately 20,000 acres. Setback distances of a minimum of 700 feet are planned to comply with the 50 dB(A) noise limit. However, rotor diameters will be 77 meters (250 feet). Therefore, setback distances in the prevailing wind direction of 1,300 feet are planned for properties where owners have not granted easements. Setbacks of 800 feet are planned in the crosswind direction.

Figure 2: Bent Tree Wind Project, Freeborn County





Figure 3: Noble Flat Hill Wind Park, Clay, Becker, Ottertail Counties



B. Health Issues

The National Research Council of the National Academies (NRC, 2007) has reviewed impacts of wind energy projects on human health and well-being. The NRC begins by observing that wind projects, just as other projects, create benefits and burdens, and that concern about impacts is natural when the source is near one's home. Further, the NRC notes that different people have different values and levels of sensitivity. Impacts noted by the NRC that may have the most effect on health include noise and low frequency vibration, and shadow flicker. While noise and vibration are the main focus of this paper, shadow flicker (casting of moving shadows on the ground as wind turbine blades rotate) will also be briefly discussed.

Noise originates from mechanical equipment inside the nacelles of the turbines (gears, generators, etc.) and from interaction of turbine blades with wind. Newer wind turbines generate minimal noise from mechanical equipment. The most problematic wind turbine noise is a broadband "whooshing" sound produced by interaction of turbine blades with the wind. Newer turbines have upwind rotor blades, minimizing low frequency "infrasound" (i.e., air pressure changes at frequencies below 20-100 Hz that are inaudible). However, the NRC notes that during quiet conditions at night, low frequency modulation of higher frequency sounds, such as are produced by turbine blades, is possible. The NRC also notes that effects of low frequency (infrasound) vibration (less than 20 Hz) on humans are not well understood, but have been asserted to disturb some people.

Finally, the NRC concludes that noise produced by wind turbines is generally not a major concern beyond a half mile. Issues raised by the NRC report and factors that may affect distances within which wind turbine noise may be problematic are discussed more extensively below.

II. Elementary Characteristics of Sensory Systems and Sound

A. Sensory Systems

1. Hearing

Sensory systems respond to a huge dynamic range of physical stimuli within a relatively narrow dynamic range of mechanical, chemical and/or neuronal (electrophysiological) output. Compression of the dynamic range is accomplished by systems that respond to logarithmic increases in intensity of physical stimuli with arithmetically increasing sensory responses. This general property is true for hearing, and has been recognized since at least the mid-19th century (see e.g., Woodworth and Schlosberg, 1964). "Loudness" is the sensory/perceptual correlate of the physical intensity of air pressure changes to which the electro-mechanical transducers in the ear and associated neuronal pathways are sensitive. Loudness increases as the logarithm of air pressure, and it is convenient to relate loudness to a reference air pressure (in dyne/cm² or pascals) in tenths of logarithmic units (decibels; dB). Further, the ear is sensitive to only a relatively narrow frequency range of air pressure changes: those between approximately 20 and 20,000 cycles per second or Herz (Hz). In fact, sensitivity varies within this range, so that the sound pressure level relative to a reference value that is audible in the middle of the range

(near 1,000 Hz) is about 4 orders of magnitude smaller than it is at 20 Hz and about 2 orders of magnitude smaller than at 20,000 Hz (Fig. 3). Accordingly, measurements of loudness in dB generally employ filters to equalize the loudness of sounds at different frequencies or "pitch." To approximate the sensitivity of the ear, A-weighted filters weigh sound pressure changes at frequencies in the mid-range more than those at higher or lower frequencies. When an A-weighted filter is used, loudness is measured in dB(A). This is explained in greater detail in Section B below.

The ear accomplishes transduction of sound through a series of complex mechanisms (Guyton, 1991). Briefly, sound waves move the eardrum (tympanic membrane), which is in turn connected to 2 small bones (ossicles) in the middle ear (the malleus and incus). A muscle connected to the malleus keeps the tympanic membrane tensed, allowing efficient transmission to the malleus of vibrations on the membrane. Ossicle muscles can also relax tension and attenuate transmission. Relaxation of muscle tension on the tympanic membrane protects the ear from very loud sounds and also masks low frequency sounds, or much background noise. The malleus and incus move a third bone (stapes). The stapes in turn applies pressure to the fluid of the cochlea, a snail-shaped structure imbedded in temporal bone. The cochlea is a complex structure, but for present purposes it is sufficient to note that pressure changes or waves of different frequencies in cochlear fluid result in bending of specialized hair cells in regions of the cochlea most sensitive to different frequencies or pitch. Hair cells are directly connected to nerve fibers in the vestibulocochlear nerve (VIII cranial nerve).

Transmission of sound can also occur directly through bone to the cochlea. This is a very inefficient means of sound transmission, unless a device (e.g. a tuning fork or hearing aid) is directly applied to bone (Guyton, 1991).

2. Vestibular System

The vestibular system reacts to changes in head and body orientation in space, and is necessary for maintenance of equilibrium and postural reflexes, for performance of rapid and intricate body movements, and for stabilizing visual images (via the vestibulo-ocular reflex) as the direction of movement changes (Guyton, 1991).

The vestibular apparatus, like the cochlea, is imbedded in temporal bone, and also like the cochlea, hair cells, bathed in vestibular gels, react to pressure changes and transmit signals to nerve fibers in the vestibulocochlear nerve. Two organs, the utricle and saccule, called otolith organs, integrate information about the orientation of the head with respect to gravity. Otoliths are tiny stone-like crystals, embedded in the gels of the utricle and saccule, that float as the head changes position within the gravitational field. This movement is translated to hair cells. Three semi-circular canals, oriented at right angles to each other, detect head rotation. Stimulation of the vestibular apparatus is not directly detected, but results in activation of motor reflexes as noted above (Guyton, 1991).

Like the cochlea, the vestibular apparatus reacts to pressure changes at a range of frequencies; optimal frequencies are lower than for hearing. These pressure changes can be caused by body movements, or by direct bone conduction (as for hearing, above) when vibration is applied directly to the temporal bone (Todd et al., 2008). These investigators

found maximal sensitivity at 100 Hz, with some sensitivity down to 12.5 Hz. The saccule, located in temporal bone just under the footplate of the stapes, is the most sound-sensitive of the vestibular organs (Halmagyi et al., 2004). It is known that brief loud clicks (90-95 dB) are detected by the vestibular system, even in deaf people. However, we do not know what the sensitivity of this system is through the entire range of sound stimuli.

While vestibular system activation is not directly felt, activation may give rise to a variety of sensations: vertigo, as the eye muscles make compensatory adjustments to rapid angular motion, and a variety of unpleasant sensations related to internal organs. In fact, the vestibular system interacts extensively with the “autonomic” nervous system, which regulates internal body organs (Balaban and Yates, 2004). Sensations and effects correlated with intense vestibular activation include nausea and vomiting and cardiac arrhythmia, blood pressure changes and breathing changes.

While these effects are induced by relatively intense stimulation, it is also true that A-weighted sound measurements attuned to auditory sensitivity, will underweight low frequencies for which the vestibular system is much more sensitive (Todd et al., 2008). Nevertheless, activation of the vestibular system *per se* obviously need not give rise to unpleasant sensations. It is not known what stimulus intensities are generally required for for autonomic activation at relatively low frequencies, and it is likely that there is considerable human variability and capacity to adapt to vestibular challenges.

B. Sound

1. Introduction

Sound is carried through air in compression waves of measurable frequency and amplitude. Sound can be tonal, predominating at a few frequencies, or it can contain a random mix of a broad range of frequencies and lack any tonal quality (white noise). Sound that is unwanted is called noise.


Audible Frequency Sound

Besides frequency sensitivity (between 20 and 20,000 Hz), humans are also sensitive to changes in the amplitude of the signal (compression waves) within this audible range of frequencies. Increasing amplitude, or increasing sound pressure, is perceived as increasing volume or loudness. The sound pressure level in air (SPL) is measured in micro Pascals (μPa). SPLs are typically converted in measuring instruments and reported as decibels (dB) which is a log scale, relative unit (see above). When used as the unit for sound, dBs are reported relative to a SPL of 20 μPa . Twenty μPa is used because it is the approximate threshold of human hearing sensitivity at about 1000 Hz. Decibels relative to 20 μPa are calculated from the following equation:

$$\text{Loudness (dB)} = \text{Log} \left(\left(\text{SPL} / 20 \mu\text{Pa} \right)^2 \right) * 10$$

Figure 4 shows the audible range of normal human hearing. Note that while the threshold sensitivity varies over the frequency range, at high SPLs sensitivity is relatively consistent over audible frequencies.

Figure 4: Audible Range of Human Hearing



Equivalence curves for different frequencies, when sound meter readings in dB are taken with A or C-weighting filters. (Adapted from EPD Hong Kong SAR, 2009)

Sub-Audible Frequency Sound

Sub-audible frequency sound is often called infrasound. It may be sensed by people, similar to audible sound, in the cochlear apparatus in the ear; it may be sensed by the vestibular system which is responsible for balance and physical equilibrium; or it may be sensed as vibration.

Resonance and modulation

Sound can be attenuated as it passes through a physical structure. However, because the wavelength of low frequency sound is very long (the wavelength of 40 Hz in air at sea level and room temperature is 8.6 meters or 28 ft), low frequencies are not effectively attenuated by walls and windows of most homes or vehicles. (For example, one can typically hear the bass, low frequency music from a neighboring car at a stoplight, but not the higher frequencies.) In fact, it is possible that there are rooms within buildings exposed to low frequency sound or noise where some frequencies may be amplified by resonance (e.g. $\frac{1}{2}$ wavelength, $\frac{1}{4}$ wavelength) within the structure. In addition, low frequency sound can cause vibrations within a building at higher, more audible frequencies as well as throbbing or rumbling.

Sounds that we hear generally are a mixture of different frequencies. In most instances these frequencies are added together. However, if the source of the sound is not constant, but changes over time, the effect can be re-occurring pulses of sound or low frequency modulation of sound. This is the type of sound that occurs from a steam engine, a jack hammer, music and motor vehicle traffic. Rhythmic, low frequency pulsing of higher frequency noise (like the sound of an amplified heart beat) is one type of sound that can be caused by wind turbine blades under some conditions.

2. Human Response to Low Frequency Stimulation

There is no consensus whether sensitivity below 20 Hz is by a similar or different mechanism than sensitivity and hearing above 20 Hz (Reviewed by Møller and Pedersen, 2004). Possible mechanisms of sensation caused by low frequencies include bone conduction at the applied frequencies, as well as amplification of the base frequency and/or harmonics by the auditory apparatus (eardrum and ossicles) in the ear. Sensory thresholds are relatively continuous, suggesting (but not proving) a similar mechanism above and below 20 Hz. However, it is clear that cochlear sensitivity to infrasound (< 20 Hz) is considerably less than cochlear sensitivity to audible frequencies.

Møller and Pedersen (2004) reviewed human sensitivity at low and infrasonic frequencies. The following findings are of interest:

- When whole-body pressure-field sensitivity is compared with ear-only (earphone) sensitivity, the results are very similar. These data suggest that the threshold sensitivity for low frequency is through the ear and not vestibular.
- Some individuals have extraordinary sensitivity at low frequencies, up to 25 dB more sensitive than the presumed thresholds at some low frequencies.
- While population average sensitivity over the low frequency range is smooth, sound pressure thresholds of response for individuals do not vary smoothly but are inconsistent, with peaks and valleys or “microstructures”. Therefore the sensitivity response of individuals to different low frequency stimulation may be difficult to predict.
- Studies of equal-loudness-levels demonstrate that as stimulus frequency decreases through the low frequencies, equal-loudness lines compress in the dB scale. (See Figure 4 as an example of the relatively small difference in auditory SPL range between soft and loud sound at low frequencies).
- The hearing threshold for pure tones is different than the hearing threshold for white noise at the same total sound pressure.

3. Sound Measurements

Sound measurements are taken by instruments that record sound pressure or the pressure of the compression wave in the air. Because the loudness of a sound to people is usually the primary interest in measuring sound, normalization schemes or filters have been applied to absolute measurements. dB(A) scaling of sound pressure measurements was intended to normalize readings to equal loudness over the audible range of frequencies at low loudness. For example, a 5,000 Hz (5 kHz) and 20 dB(A) tone is expected to have the same intensity or loudness as a 100 Hz, 20 dB(A) tone. However, note that the absolute sound pressures would be about 20,000 μ Pa and 40,000 μ Pa, respectively, or about a difference of 20 dB (relative to 20 μ Pa), or as it is sometimes written 20 dB(linear).

Most sound is not a single tone, but is a mixture of frequencies within the audible range. A sound meter can add the total SPLs for all frequencies; in other words, the dB readings over the entire spectrum of audible sound can be added to give a single loudness metric. If sound is reported as A-weighted, or dB(A), it is a summation of the dB(A) scaled sound pressure from 20 Hz to 20 kHz.

In conjunction with the dB(A) scale, the dB(B) scale was developed to approximate equal loudness to people across audible frequencies at medium loudness, and dB(C) was developed to approximate equal-loudness for loud environments. Figure 4 shows isopleths for 20 dB(A) and 105 dB(C). While dB(A), dB(B), dB(C) were developed from empirical data at the middle frequencies, at the ends of the curves these scales were extrapolated, or sketched in, and are not based on experimental or observational data (Berglund et al., 1996). As a result, data in the low frequency range (and probably the highest audible frequencies as well) cannot be reliably interpreted using these scales. The World Health Organization (WHO, 1999) suggests that A-weighting noise that has a large low frequency component is not reliable assessment of loudness.

The source of the noise, or the noise signature, may be important in developing equal-loudness schemes at low frequencies. C-weighting has been recommended for artillery noise, but a linear, unweighted scale may be even better at predicting a reaction (Berglund et al., 1996). A linear or equal energy rating also appears to be the most effective predictor of reaction to low frequency noise in other situations, including blast noise from mining. The implication of the analysis presented by Berglund et al. (1996) is that annoyance from non-tonal noise should not be estimated from a dB(A) scale, but may be better evaluated using dB(C), or a linear non-transformed scale.

However, as will be discussed below, a number of schemes use a modified dB(A) scale to evaluate low frequency noise. These schemes differ from a typical use of the dB(A) scale by addressing a limited frequency range below 250 Hz, where auditory sensitivity is rapidly changing as a function of frequency (see Figure 4).

III. Exposures of Interest

A. Noise From Wind Turbines

1. Mechanical noise

Mechanical noise from a wind turbine is sound that originates in the generator, gearbox, yaw motors (that intermittently turn the nacelle and blades to face the wind), tower ventilation system and transformer. Generally, these sounds are controlled in newer wind turbines so that they are a fraction of the aerodynamic noise. Mechanical noise from the turbine or gearbox should only be heard above aerodynamic noise when they are not functioning properly.

2. Aerodynamic noise

Aerodynamic noise is caused by wind passing over the blade of the wind turbine. The tip of a 40-50 meter blade travels at speeds of over 140 miles per hour under normal operating conditions. As the wind passes over the moving blade, the blade interrupts the laminar flow of air, causing turbulence and noise. Current blade designs minimize the amount of turbulence and noise caused by wind, but it is not possible to eliminate turbulence or noise.

Aerodynamic noise from a wind turbine may be underestimated during planning. One source of error is that most meteorological wind speed measurements noted in wind farm literature are taken at 10 meters above the ground. Wind speed above this elevation, in

the area of the wind turbine rotor, is then calculated using established modeling relationships. In one study (van den Berg, 2004) it was determined that the wind speeds at the hub at night were up to 2.6 times higher than modeled. Subsequently, it was found that noise levels were 15 dB higher than anticipated.

Unexpectedly high aerodynamic noise can also be caused by improper blade angle or improper alignment of the rotor to the wind. These are correctable and are usually adjusted during the turbine break-in period.


3. Modulation of aerodynamic noise

Rhythmic modulation of noise, especially low frequency noise, has been found to be more annoying than steady noise (Bradley, 1994; Holmberg et al., 1997). One form of rhythmic modulation of aerodynamic noise that can be noticeable very near to a wind turbine is a distance-to-blade effect. To a receptor on the ground in front of the wind turbine, the detected blade noise is loudest as the blade passes, and quietest when the blade is at the top of its rotation. For a modern 3-blade turbine, this distance-to-blade effect can cause a pulsing of the blade noise at about once per second (1 Hz). On the ground, about 500 feet directly downwind from the turbine, the distance-to-blade can cause a difference in sound pressure of about 2 dB between the *tip* of the blade at its farthest point and the *tip* of the blade at its nearest point (48 meter blades, 70 meter tower). Figure 5 demonstrates why the loudness of blade noise (aerodynamic noise) pulses as the distance-to-blade varies for individuals close to a turbine.

If the receptor is 500 feet from the turbine base, in line with the blade rotation or up to 60° off line, the difference in sound pressure from the *tip* of the blade at its farthest and nearest point can be about 4-5 dB, an audible difference. The tip travels faster than the rest of the blade and is closer to (and then farther away from) the receptor than other parts of the blade. As a result, noise from other parts of the blade will be modulated less than noise from the tip. Further, blade design can also affect the noise signature of a blade. The distance-to-blade effect diminishes as receptor distance increases because the relative difference in distance from the receptor to the top or to the bottom of the blade becomes smaller. Thus, moving away from the tower, distance-to-blade noise gradually appears to be more steady.

Another source of rhythmic modulation may occur if the wind through the rotor is not uniform. Blade angle, or pitch, is adjusted for different wind speeds to maximize power and to minimize noise. A blade angle that is not properly tuned to the wind speed (or wind direction) will make more noise than a properly tuned blade. Horizontal layers with different wind speeds or directions can form in the atmosphere. This wind condition is called shear. If the winds at the top and bottom of the blade rotation are different, blade noise will vary between the top and bottom of blade rotation, causing modulation of aerodynamic noise. This noise, associated with the blades passing through areas of different air-wind speeds, has been called aerodynamic modulation and is demonstrated in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Sources of noise modulation or pulsing



In some terrains and under some atmospheric conditions wind aloft, near the top of the wind turbine, can be moving faster than wind near the ground. Wind turbulence or even wakes from adjacent turbines can create non-uniform wind conditions as well. As a result of aerodynamic modulation a rhythmic noise pattern or pulsing will occur as each blade passes through areas with different wind speed. Furthermore, additional noise, or thumping, may occur as each blade passes through the transition between different wind speed (or wind direction) areas.

Wind shear caused by terrain or structures on the ground (e.g. trees, buildings) can be modeled relatively easily. Wind shear in areas of flat terrain is not as easily understood. During the daytime wind in the lower atmosphere is strongly affected by thermal convection which causes mixing of layers. Distinct layers do not easily form. However, in the nighttime the atmosphere can stabilize (vertically), and layers form. A paper by G.P. van den Berg (2008) included data from a study on wind shear at Cabauw, The Netherlands (flat terrain). Annual average wind speeds at different elevations above ground was reported. The annual average wind speed at noon was about 5.75 meters per second (m/s; approximately 12.9 miles per hour(mph)) at 20 m above ground, and about 7.6 m/s (17 mph) at 140 m. At midnight, the annual averages were about 4.3 m/s (9.6 mph) and 8.8 m/s (19.7 mph) for 20m and 140 m, respectively, above ground. The data show that while the average windspeed (between 20m and 140m) is very similar at noon and midnight at Cabauw, the windspeed difference between elevations during the day is

much less than the difference at night (1.85 m/s (4.1 mph) and 4.5 m/s (10 mph), respectively). As a result one would expect that the blade angle can be better tuned to the wind speed during the daytime. Consequently, blade noise would be greater at night.

A number of reports have included discussion of aerodynamic modulation (van den Berg, 2005; UK Department of Transport and Industry, 2006; UK Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, 2007; van den Berg, 2008). They suggest that aerodynamic modulation is typically underestimated when noise estimates are calculated. In addition, they suggest that detailed modeling of wind, terrain, land use and structures may be used to predict whether modulation of aerodynamic noise will be a problem at a proposed wind turbine site.

4. Wind farm noise

The noise from multiple turbines similarly distant from a residence can be noticeably louder than a lone turbine simply through the addition of multiple noise sources. Under steady wind conditions noise from a wind turbine farm may be greater than noise from the nearest turbine due to synchrony between noise from more than one turbine (van den Berg, 2005). Furthermore, if the dominant frequencies (including aerodynamic modulation) of different turbines vary by small amounts, an audible beat or dissonance may be heard when wind conditions are stable.

B. Shadow Flicker

Rhythmic light flicker from the blades of a wind turbine casting intermittent shadows has been reported to be annoying in many locations (NRC, 2007; Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee, 2008). (Note: Flashing light at frequencies around 1 Hz is too slow to trigger an epileptic response.)

Modeling conducted by the Minnesota Department of Health suggests that a receptor 300 meters perpendicular to, and in the shadow of the blades of a wind turbine, can be in the flicker shadow of the rotating blade for almost 1½ hour a day. At this distance a blade may completely obscure the sun each time it passes between the receptor and the sun. With current wind turbine designs, flicker should not be an issue at distances over 10 rotational diameters (~1000 meters or 1 km (0.6 mi) for most current wind turbines). This distance has been recommended by the Wind Energy Handbook (Burton et al., 2001) as a minimum setback distance in directions that flicker may occur, and has been noted in the Bent Tree Permit Application (WPL, 2008).

Shadow flicker is a potential issue in the mornings and evenings, when turbine noise may be masked by ambient sounds. While low frequency noise is typically an issue indoors, shadow flicker can be an issue both indoors and outdoors when the sun is low in the sky. Therefore, shadow flicker may be an issue in locations other than the home.

Ireland recommends wind turbines setbacks of at least 300 meters from a road to decrease driver distraction (Michigan State University, 2004). The NRC (2007) recommends that shadow flicker is addressed during the preliminary planning stages of a wind turbine project.

IV. Impacts of Wind Turbine Noise

A. Potential Adverse Reaction to Sound

Human sensitivity to sound, especially to low frequency sound, is variable. Individuals have different ranges of frequency sensitivity to audible sound; different thresholds for each frequency of audible sound; different vestibular sensitivities and reactions to vestibular activation; and different sensitivity to vibration.

Further, sounds, such as repetitive but low intensity noise, can evoke different responses from individuals. People will exhibit variable levels of annoyance and tolerance for different frequencies. Some people can dismiss and ignore the signal, while for others, the signal will grow and become more apparent and unpleasant over time (Moreira and Bryan, 1972; Bryan and Tempest, 1973). These reactions may have little relationship to will or intent, and more to do with previous exposure history and personality.

Stress and annoyance from noise often do not correlate with loudness. This may suggest, in some circumstances, other factors impact an individual's reaction to noise. A number of reports, cited in Staples (1997), suggest that individuals with an interest in a project and individuals who have some control over an environmental noise are less likely to find a noise annoying or stressful.

Berglund et al. (1996) reviewed reported health effects from low frequency noise. Loud noise from any source can interfere with verbal communication and possibly with the development of language skills. Noise may also impact mental health. However, there are no studies that have looked specifically at the impact of low frequency noise on communication, development of language skills and mental health. Cardiovascular and endocrine effects have been demonstrated in studies that have looked at exposures to airplane and highway noise. In addition, possible effects of noise on performance and cognition have also been investigated, but these health studies have not generally looked at impacts specifically from low frequency noise. Noise has also been shown to impact sleep and sleep patterns, and one study demonstrated impacts from low frequency noise in the range of 72 to 85 dB(A) on chronic insomnia (Nagai et al., 1989 as reported in Berglund et al., 1996).

Case studies have suggested that health can be impacted by relatively low levels of low frequency noise. But it is difficult to draw general conclusions from case studies. Feldmann and Pitten (2004) describe a family exposed during the winter to low frequency noise from a nearby heating plant. Reported health impacts were: "indisposition, decrease in performance, sleep disturbance, headache, ear pressure, crawl parästhesy [crawling, tingling or numbness sensation on the skin] or shortness of breath."

Annoyance, unpleasant sounds, and complaints

Reported health effects from low frequency stimulation are closely associated with annoyance from audible noise. "There is no reliable evidence that infrasounds below the hearing threshold produce physiological or psychological effects" (WHO, 1999). It has not been shown whether annoyance is a symptom or an accessory in the causation of

health impacts from low frequency noise. Studies have been conducted on some aspects of low frequency noise that can cause annoyance.

Noise complaints are usually a reasonable measure of annoyance with low frequency environmental noise. Leventhall (2004) has reviewed noise complaints and offers the following conclusions:

- “ The problems arose in quiet rural or suburban environments
The noise was often close to inaudibility and heard by a minority of people
The noise was typically audible indoors and not outdoors
The noise was more audible at night than day
The noise had a throb or rumble characteristic
The main complaints came from the 55-70 years age group
The complainants had normal hearing.
Medical examination excluded tinnitus.

- “ These are now recognised as classic descriptors of low frequency noise problems.”

These observations are consistent with what we know about the propagation of low intensity, low frequency noise. Some people are more sensitive to low frequency noise. The difference, in dB, between soft (acceptable) and loud (annoying) noise is much less at low frequency (see Figure 4 audible range compression). Furthermore, during the daytime, and especially outdoors, annoying low frequency noise can be masked by high frequency noise.

The observation that “the noise was typically audible indoors and not outdoors” is not particularly intuitive. However, as noted in a previous section, low frequencies are not well attenuated when they pass through walls and windows. Higher frequencies (especially above 1000 Hz) can be efficiently attenuated by walls and windows. In addition, low frequency sounds may be amplified by resonance within rooms and halls of a building. Resonance is often characterized by a throbbing or a rumbling, which has also been associated with many low frequency noise complaints.

Low frequency noise, unlike higher frequency noise, can also be accompanied by shaking, vibration and rattling. In addition, throbbing and rumbling may be apparent in some low frequency noise. While these noise features may not be easily characterized, numerous studies have shown that their presence dramatically lowers tolerance for low frequency noise (Berglund et al., 1996).

As reviewed in Leventhall (2003), a study of industrial exposure to low frequency noise found that fluctuations in total noise averaged over 0.5, 1.0 and 2.0 seconds correlated with annoyance (Holmberg et al., 1997). This association was noted elsewhere and led (Broner and Leventhall, 1983) to propose a 3dB “penalty” be added to evaluations of annoyance in cases where low frequency noise fluctuated.

In another laboratory study with test subjects controlling loudness, 0.5 – 4 Hz modulation of low frequency noise was found to be more annoying than non-modulated low

frequency noise. On average test subjects found modulated noise to be similarly annoying as a constant tone 12.9 dB louder (Bradley, 1994).

B. Studies of Wind Turbine Noise Impacts on People

1. Swedish Studies

Two studies in Sweden collected information by questionnaires from 341 and 754 individuals (representing response rates of 68% and 58%, respectively), and correlated responses to calculated exposure to noise from wind farms (Pedersen and Waye, 2004; Pedersen, 2007; Pedersen and Persson, 2007). Both studies showed that the number of respondents perceiving the noise from the wind turbines increased as the calculated noise levels at their homes increased from less than 32.5 dB(A) to greater than 40 dB(A). Annoyance appeared to correlate or trend with calculated noise levels. Combining the data from the two studies, when noise measurements were greater than 40 dB(A), about 50% of the people surveyed (22 of 45 people) reported annoyance. When noise measurements were between 35 and 40 dB(A) about 24% reported annoyance (67 of 276 people). Noise annoyance was more likely in areas that were rated as quiet and in areas where turbines were visible. In one of the studies, 64% respondents who reported noise annoyance also reported sleep disturbance; 15% of respondents reported sleep disturbance without annoyance.

2. United Kingdom Study

Moorhouse et al. (UK Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, 2007) evaluated complaints about wind farms. They found that 27 of 133 operating wind farms in the UK received formal complaints between 1991 and 2007. There were a total of 53 complainants for 16 of the sites for which good records were available. The authors of the report considered that many complaints in the early years were for generator and gearbox noise. However, subjective analyses of reports about noise (“like a train that never gets there”, “distant helicopter”, “thumping”, “thudding”, “pulsating”, “thumping”, “rhythmical beating”, and “beating”) suggested that aerodynamic modulation was the likely cause of complaints at 4 wind farms. The complaints from 8 other wind farms may have had “marginal” association with aerodynamic modulation noise.

Four wind farms that generated complaints possibly associated with aerodynamic modulation were evaluated further. These wind farms were commissioned between 1999 and 2002. Wind direction, speed and times of complaints were associated for 2 of the sites and suggested that aerodynamic modulation noise may be a problem between 7% and 25% of the time. Complaints at 2 of the farms have stopped and at one farm steps to mitigate aerodynamic modulation (operational shutdown under certain meteorological conditions) have been instituted.

3. Netherlands Study

F. van den Berg et al. (2008) conducted a postal survey of a group selected from all residents in the Netherlands within 2.5 kilometers (km) of a wind turbine. In all, 725 residents responded (37%). Respondents were exposed to sound between 24 and 54 dB(A). The percentage of respondents annoyed by sound increased from 2% at levels of 30 dB(A) or less, up to 25% at between 40 and 45 dB. Annoyance decreased above 45 dB. Most residents exposed above 45 dB(A) reported economic benefits from the

turbines. However, at greater than 45 dB(A) more respondents reported sleep interruption. Respondents tended to report more annoyance when they also noted a negative effect on landscape, and ability to see the turbines was strongly related to the probability of annoyance.

4. Case Reports

A number of un-reviewed reports have catalogued complaints of annoyance and some more severe health impacts associated with wind farms. These reports do not contain measurements of noise levels, and do not represent random samples of people living near wind turbines, so they cannot assess prevalence of complaints. They do generally show that in the people surveyed, complaints are more likely the closer people are to the turbines. The most common complaint is decreased quality of life, followed by sleep loss and headache. Complaints seem to be either from individuals with homes quite close to turbines, or individuals who live in areas subject to aerodynamic modulation and, possibly, enhanced sound propagation which can occur in hilly or mountainous terrain. In some of the cases described, people with noise complaints also mention aesthetic issues, concern for ecological effects, and shadow flicker concerns. Not all complaints are primarily about health.

Harry (2007) describes a meeting with a couple in Cornwall, U.K. who live 400 meters from a wind turbine, and complained of poor sleep, headaches, stress and anxiety. Harry subsequently investigated 42 people in various locations in the U.K. living between 300 meters and 2 kilometers (1000 feet to 1.2 miles) from the nearest wind turbine. The most frequent complaint (39 of 42 people) was that their quality of life was affected. Headaches were reported by 27 people and sleep disturbance by 28 people. Some people complained of palpitations, migraines, tinnitus, anxiety and depression. She also mentions correspondence and complaints from people in New Zealand, Australia, France, Germany, Netherlands and the U.S.

Phipps (2007) discusses a survey of 619 households living up to 10 kilometers (km; 6 miles) from wind farms in mountainous areas of New Zealand. Most respondents lived between 2 and 2.5 km from the turbines (over 350 households). Most respondents (519) said they could see the turbines from their homes, and 80% of these considered the turbines intrusive, and 73% considered them unattractive. Nine percent said they were affected by flicker. Over 50% of households located between 2 and 2.5 km and between 5 and 9.5 km reported being able to hear the turbines. In contrast, fewer people living between 3 and 4.5 km away could hear the turbines. Ninety-two households said that their quality of life was affected by turbine noise. Sixty-eight households reported sleep disturbances: 42 of the households reported occasional sleep disturbances, 21 reported frequent sleep disturbances and 5 reported sleep disturbances most of the time.

The Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee for the Town of Union (2008) documents complaints from people living near wind turbines in Wisconsin communities and other places in the U.S. and U.K. Contained in this report is an older report prepared by the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation in 2001 in response to complaints in Lincoln County, Wisconsin. The report found essentially no exceedances of the 50 dB(A) requirement in the conditional use permit. The report did measure spectral data

accumulated over very short intervals (1 minute) in 1/3 octave bands at several sites while the wind turbines were functioning, and it is of interest that at these sites the sound pressure level at the lower frequencies (below 125 Hz) were at or near 50 dB(A).

Pierpont (2009) postulates wind turbine syndrome, consisting of a constellation of symptoms including headache, tinnitus, ear pressure, vertigo, nausea, visual blurring, tachycardia, irritability, cognitive problems and panic episodes associated with sensations of internal pulsation. She studied 38 people in 10 families living between 1000 feet and slightly under 1 mile from newer wind turbines. She proposes that the mechanism for these effects is disturbance of balance due to “discordant” stimulation of the vestibular system, along with visceral sensations, sensations of vibration in the chest and other locations in the body, and stimulation of the visual system by moving shadows. Pierpont does report that her study subjects maintain that their problems are caused by noise and vibration, and the most common symptoms reported are sleep disturbances and headache. However, 16 of the people she studied report symptoms consistent with (but not necessarily caused by) disturbance of equilibrium.

V. Noise Assessment and Regulation

1. Minnesota noise regulation

The Minnesota Noise Pollution Control Rule is accessible online at: <https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/rules/?id=7030> . A summary of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) noise guidance can be found online at: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/programs/noise.html> . The MPCA standards require A-weighting measurements of noise; background noise must be at least 10 dB lower than the noise source being measured. Different standards are specified for day and night, as well as standards that may not be exceeded for more than 10 percent of the time during any hour (L10) and 50 percent of the time during any hour (L50). Household units, including farm houses, are Classification 1 land use. The following are the Class 1 noise limits:

Table 1: Minnesota Class 1 Land Use Noise Limits

Daytime		Nighttime	
L50	L10	L50	L10
60 dB(A)	65 dB(A)	50 dB(A)	55 dB(A)


These noise limits are single number limits that rely on the measuring instrument to apply an A-weighting filter over the entire presumed audible spectrum of frequencies (20 Hz to 20 KHz) and then integrating that signal. The result is a single number that characterizes the audible spectrum noise intensity.

2. Low frequency noise assessment and regulation

Pedersen and Waye (2004) looked at the relationship between total dB(A) sound pressure and the annoyance of those who are environmentally exposed to noise from different sources. Figure 6 demonstrates the difficulty in using total dB(A) to evaluate annoyance. Note how lower noise levels (dB(A)) from wind turbines engenders annoyance similar to

much higher levels of noise exposure from aircraft, road traffic and railroads. Sound impulsiveness, low frequency noise and persistence of the noise, as well as demographic characteristics may explain some of the difference.

Figure 6: Annoyance associated with exposure to different environmental noises



Reprinted with permission from Pedersen, E. and K.P. Waye (2004). Perception and annoyance due to wind turbine noise—a dose-response relationship. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 116: 3460. Copyright 2004, Acoustical Society of America.


Kjellberg et al. (1997) looked at the ability of different full spectrum weighting schemes to predict annoyance caused by low frequency audio noise. They found that dB(A) is the worst predictor of annoyance of available scales. However, if 6 dB (“penalty”) is added to dB(A) when dB(C) – dB(A) is greater than 15 dB, about 71% of the predictions of annoyance are correct. It is important to remember that integrated, transformed measurements of SPL (e.g. dB(A), dB(C)) do not measure frequencies below 20 Hz. While people detect stimuli below 20 Hz, as discussed in above sections, these frequencies are not measured using an A-weighted or C-weighted meter.

The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends that if dB(C) is greater than 10 dB more than dB(A), the low frequency components of the noise may be important and should be evaluated separately. In addition, WHO says “[i]t should be noted that a large proportion of low-frequency components in noise may increase considerably the adverse effects on health.” (WHO, 1999)

Many governments that regulate low frequency noise look at noise within bands of frequencies instead of summing the entire spectrum. A study by Poulsen and Mortensen (Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2002) included a summary of low frequency noise guidelines. German, Swedish, Polish, and Dutch low frequency evaluation curves were compared (see Figure 7). While there are distinctions in how the evaluation curves are described, generally, these curves are sound pressure criterion levels for 1/3 octaves from about 8 Hz to 250 Hz. Exceedance in any 1/3 octave measurement suggests that the noise may be annoying. However, note that regulations associated with low frequency

noise can be quite complex and the regulatory evaluations associated with individual curves can be somewhat different.

Figure 7: 1/3 Octave Sound Pressure Level Low frequency Noise Evaluation Curves



(Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2002)

The Danish low frequency evaluation requires measuring noise indoors with windows closed; SPL measurements are obtained in 1/3 octave bands and transformed using the A-weighting algorithm for all frequencies between 10 and 160 Hz. These values are then summed into a single metric called $L_{p,A,LF}$. A 5 dB “penalty” is added to any noise that is “impulsive”. Danish regulations require that 20 dB $L_{p,A,LF}$ is not exceeded during the evening and night, and that 25 dB $L_{p,A,LF}$ is not exceeded during the day.

Swedish guidance recommends analyzing 1/3 octave bands between 31.5 and 200 Hz inside a home, and comparing the values to a Swedish assessment curve. The Swedish curve is equal to the United Kingdom (UK) Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) low frequency noise criterion curve for overlapping frequencies (31.5 – 160 Hz).

The German “A-level” method sums the A-weighted equivalent levels of 1/3 octave bands that exceed the hearing threshold from 10 – 80 Hz. If the noise is not tonal, the measurements are added. The total cannot exceed 25 dB at night and 35 dB during the day. A frequency-dependent adjustment is applied if the noise is tonal.

In the Poulsen and Mortensen, Danish EPA study (2002), 18 individuals reported annoyance levels when they were exposed through earphones in a controlled environment to a wide range of low frequency environmental noises, all attenuated down to 35 dB, as depicted in Table 2. Noise was simulated as if being heard indoors, filtering out noise at

higher frequencies and effectively eliminating all frequencies above 1600 Hz. Noise levels in 1/3 octave SPLs from 8 Hz to 1600 Hz were measured and low frequencies (below 250 Hz) were used to predict annoyance using 7 different methods (Danish, German A-level, German tonal, Swedish, Polish, Sloven, and C-level). Predictions of annoyance were compared with the subjective annoyance evaluations. Correlation coefficients for these analyses ranged from 0.64 to 0.94, with the best correlation in comparison with the Danish low frequency noise evaluation methods.

As would be expected, at 35 dB nominal (full spectrum) loudness, every low frequency noise source tested exceeded all of the regulatory standards noted in the Danish EPA report. Table 2 shows the Danish and Swedish regulatory exceedances of the different 35 dB nominal (full spectrum) noise.

Table 2: 35 dB(A) (nominal, 8 Hz-20KHz) Indoor Noise from Various Outdoor Environmental Sources

	Traffic Noise	Drop Forge	Gas Turbine	Fast Ferry	Steel Factory	Generator	Cooling Compressor	Discotheque
Noise	67.6 dB(lin)	71.1 dB(lin)	78.4 dB(lin)	64.5 dB(lin)	72.7 dB(lin)	60.2 dB(lin)	60.3 dB(lin)	67.0 dB(lin)
Noise ≥ 20 Hz	35.2 dB(A)	36.6 dB(A)	35.0 dB(A)	35.1 dB(A)	33.6 dB(A)	36.2 dB(A)	36.6 dB(A)	33.6 dB(A)
	62.9 dB(C)	67.3 dB(C)	73.7 dB(C)	61.7 dB(C)	66.0 dB(C)	58.6 dB(C)	59.0 dB(C)	57.8 dB(C)
Danish Environmental Protection Agency	14.5 dB	21.5 dB *	14.8 dB	15.0 dB	13.1 dB	16.1 dB	14.0 dB	18.0 dB *
Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare	14.1 dB	19.7 dB	15.9 dB	16.8 dB	15.5 dB	18.3 dB	16.0 dB	10.0 dB

* includes 5 dB "penalty"


Noise adjusted to dB(lin), dB(A), dB(C) scales. Calculated exceedances of Danish and Swedish indoor criteria. (data from Danish Environmental Protection Agency, 2002)

In their noise guidance, the WHO (1999) recommends 30 dB(A) as a limit for "a good night's sleep". However, they also suggest that guidance for noise with predominating low frequencies be less than 30 dB(A).

3. Wind turbine sound measurements

Figure 8 shows examples of the SPLs at different frequencies from a representative wind turbine in the United Kingdom. Sound pressure level measurements are reported for a Nordex N-80 turbine at 200 meters (UK Department of Transport and Industry, 2006) when parked, at low wind speeds, and at high wind speeds. Figure 8 also includes, for reference, 3 sound threshold curves (ISO 226, Watanabe & Moller, 85 dB(G)) and the DEFRA Low Frequency Noise Criterion Curve (nighttime).

Figure 8: Low Frequency Noise from Wind Farm: Parked, Low Wind Speed, and High Wind Speed




(UK Department of Transport and Industry, 2006)

In general, sound tends to propagate as if by spherical dispersion. This creates amplitude decay at a rate of about -6 dB per doubling of distance. However, low frequency noise from a wind turbine has been shown to follow more of a cylindrical decay at long distances, about -3 dB per doubling of distance in the downwind direction (Shepherd and Hubbard, 1991). This is thought to be the result of the lack of attenuation of low frequency sound waves by air and the atmospheric refraction of the low frequency sound waves over medium to long distances (Hawkins, 1987).

Figure 9 shows the calculated change in spectrum for a wind farm from 278 meters to 22,808 meters distant. As one moves away from the noise source, loudness at higher frequencies decreases more rapidly (and extinguishes faster) than at lower frequencies. Measurement of A-weighted decibels, shown at the right of the figure, obscures this finding.

Figure 9: Change in Noise Spectrum as Distance from Wind Farm Changes



(UK Department of Transport and Industry, 2006)

Thus, although noise from an upwind blade wind turbine is generally broad spectrum, without a tonal quality, high frequencies are efficiently attenuated by both the atmosphere, and by walls and windows of structures, as noted above. As a result, as one moves away from a wind turbine, the low frequency component of the noise becomes more pronounced.

Kamperman and James (2008) modeled indoor noise from outdoor wind turbine noise measurements, assuming a typical vinyl siding covered 2X4 wood frame construction. The wind turbine noise inside was calculated to be 5 dB less than the noise outside. Model data suggested that the sound of a single 2.5 MW wind turbine at 1000 feet will likely be heard in a house with the windows sealed. They note that models used for siting turbines often incorporate structure attenuation of 15dB. In addition, Kamperman and James demonstrate that sound from 10 2.5 MW turbines (acoustically) centered 2 km (1½ mile) away and with the nearest turbine 1 mile away will only be 6.3 dB below the sound of a single turbine at 1000 feet (0.19 mile).

4. Wind turbine regulatory noise limits

Ramakrishnan (2007) has reported different noise criteria developed for wind farm planning. These criteria include common practices (if available) within each jurisdiction for estimating background SPLs, turbine SPLs, minimum setbacks and methods used to

assess impacts. Reported US wind turbine noise criteria range from: ambient + 10 dB(A) where ambient is assumed to be 26 dB(A) (Oregon); to 55 dB(A) or "background" + 5 dB(A) (Michigan). European criteria range from 35 dB(A) to 45 dB(A), at the property. US setbacks range from 1.1 times the full height of the turbine (consenting) and 5 times the hub height (non-consenting; Pennsylvania); to 350 m (consenting) and 1000 m (non-consenting; Oregon). European minimum setbacks are not noted.

VI. Conclusions

Wind turbines generate a broad spectrum of low-intensity noise. At typical setback distances higher frequencies are attenuated. In addition, walls and windows of homes attenuate high frequencies, but their effect on low frequencies is limited. Low frequency noise is primarily a problem that may affect some people in their homes, especially at night. It is not generally a problem for businesses, public buildings, or for people outdoors.

The most common complaint in various studies of wind turbine effects on people is annoyance or an impact on quality of life. Sleeplessness and headache are the most common health complaints and are highly correlated (but not perfectly correlated) with annoyance complaints. Complaints are more likely when turbines are visible or when shadow flicker occurs. Most available evidence suggests that reported health effects are related to audible low frequency noise. Complaints appear to rise with increasing outside noise levels above 35 dB(A). It has been hypothesized that direct activation of the vestibular and autonomic nervous system may be responsible for less common complaints, but evidence is scant.

The Minnesota nighttime standard of 50 dB(A) not to be exceeded more than 50% of the time in a given hour, appears to underweight penetration of low frequency noise into dwellings. Different schemes for evaluating low frequency noise, and/or lower noise standards, have been developed in a number of countries.

For some projects, wind velocity for a wind turbine project is measured at 10 m and then modeled to the height of the rotor. These models may under-predict wind speed that will be encountered when the turbine is erected. Higher wind speed will result in noise exceeding model predictions.

Low frequency noise from a wind turbine is generally not easily perceived beyond ½ mile. However, if a turbine is subject to aerodynamic modulation because of shear caused by terrain (mountains, trees, buildings) or different wind conditions through the rotor plane, turbine noise may be heard at greater distances.

Unlike low frequency noise, shadow flicker can affect individuals outdoors as well as indoors, and may be noticeable inside any building. Flicker can be eliminated by placement of wind turbines outside of the path of the sun as viewed from areas of concern, or by appropriate setbacks.

Prediction of complaint likelihood during project planning depends on: 1) good noise modeling including characterization of potential sources of aerodynamic modulation noise and characterization of nighttime wind conditions and noise; 2) shadow flicker modeling; 3) visibility of the wind turbines; and 4) interests of nearby residents and community.

VII. Recommendations

To assure informed decisions:

- Wind turbine noise estimates should include cumulative impacts (40-50 dB(A) isopleths) of all wind turbines.
- Isopleths for dB(C) - dB(A) greater than 10 dB should also be determined to evaluate the low frequency noise component.
- Potential impacts from shadow flicker and turbine visibility should be evaluated.

Any noise criteria beyond current state standards used for placement of wind turbines should reflect priorities and attitudes of the community.

VIII. Preparers of the Report:

Carl Herbrandson, Ph.D.
Toxicologist

Rita B. Messing, Ph.D.
Toxicologist
Supervisor, Site Assessment and Consultation

IX. References

- Balaban, C. and B. Yates (2004). Vestibuloautonomic Interactions: A Teleologic Perspective. In: The Vestibular System. Hightstein, S., R. Fay and A. Popper. New York, Springer.
- Berglund, B., P. Hassmen and R.F. Soames Job (1996). Sources and effects of low-frequency noise. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am* 99(5).
- Bradley, J.S. (1994). Annoyance caused by constant-amplitude and amplitude-modulated sounds containing rumble. *Noise Control Engineering Journal* 42(6): 203-208.
- Broner, N. and H.G. Leventhall (1983). Low Frequency Noise Annoyance Assessment by Low Frequency Noise Rating (LFNR) Curves. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 2(1): 20-28.
- Bryan, M.E. and W. Tempest (1973). Are our noise laws adequate. *Applied Acoustics* 6(3): 219.
- Burton, T., D. Sharpe, N. Jenkins and E. Bossanyi (2001). Wind Energy Handbook. West Sussex, England, John Wiley and Sons.
- Danish Environmental Protection Agency (2002) Laboratory evaluation of annoyance of low frequency noise. Authors Poulsen, T., Mortensen, F. R. Laboratoriet for Akustik, Danmarks Tekniske Universitet, <http://www.miljostyrelsen.dk/udgiv/publications/2002/87-7944-955-7/pdf/87-7944-956-5.pdf> Accessed: April 17, 2009
- EPD Hong Kong SAR (2009). Audible Range of the Human Ear. Environmental Protection Department, Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, People's Republic of China. [http://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/noise_education/web/ENG EPd_HTML/ml/intro_3.html](http://www.epd.gov.hk/epd/noise_education/web/ENG_EPd_HTML/ml/intro_3.html) Accessed: March 3, 2009
- Feldmann, J. and F.A. Pitten (2004). Effects of low frequency noise on man-a case study. *Noise and Health* 7(25): 23-28.
- Guyton, A. (1991). Textbook of Medical Physiology. 8th Ed. Philadelphia, WB Saunders.
- Halmagyi, G., I. Curthoys, S. Aw and J. Jen (2004). Clinical Applications of Basis Vestibular Research. In: The Vestibular System. Hightstein, S., R. Fay and A. Popper. New York, Springer.
- Harry, A. (2007). Wind turbines, noise, and health. February 2007, 62 pg. http://www.wind-watch.org/documents/wp-content/uploads/wtnoise_health_2007_a_harry.pdf Accessed: April 27, 2009
- Hawkins, J.A. (1987). Application of ray theory to propagation of low frequency noise from wind turbines. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Langley Research Center.
- Holmberg, K., U. Landström and A. Kjellberg (1997). Low frequency noise level variations and annoyance in working environments. *Journal of low frequency noise, vibration and active control* 16(2): 81-87.
- Kamperman, G.W. and R.R. James (2008). The "How To" Guide To Siting Wind Turbines To Prevent Health Risks From Sound. October 28, 2008. <http://www.windturbinesyndrome.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/11/kamperman-james-10-28-08.pdf> Accessed: March 2, 2009

- Kjellberg, A., M. Tesarz, K. Holmberg and U. Landström (1997). Evaluation of frequency-weighted sound level measurements for prediction of low-frequency noise annoyance. *Environment International* 23(4): 519-527.
- Large Wind Turbine Citizens Committee: Town of Union (2008). *Setback Recommendations Report*. Union, Rock County, Wisconsin. January 6, 2008, 318 pg. <http://betterplan.squarespace.com/town-of-union-final-report/LWTCC%20Town%20of%20Union%20Final%20Report%2001-14-08.pdf> Accessed: February 25, 2009
- Leventhall, G., P. Pelmear and S. Benton (2003). A review of published research on low frequency noise and its effects. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. 88 pg. http://eprints.wmin.ac.uk/4141/1/Benton_2003.pdf Accessed: April 14, 2009
- Leventhall, H.G. (2004). Low frequency noise and annoyance. *Noise and Health* 6(23): 59-72.
- Michigan State University (2004). *Land Use and Zoning Issues Related to Site Development for Utility Scale Wind Turbine Generators*. <http://web1.msue.msu.edu/cdnr/otsegowindflicker.pdf> Accessed: April 28, 2009
- Møller, H. and C.S. Pedersen (2004). Hearing at low and infrasonic frequencies. *Noise and Health* 6(23): 37.
- Moreira, N.M. and M.E. Bryan (1972). Noise annoyance susceptibility. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 21(4): 449.
- National Research Council (2007). *Environmental Impacts of Wind-Energy Projects*. Committee on Environmental Impacts of Wind Energy Projects, Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Division on Earth and Life Studies. 346 pg.
- Pedersen, E. (2007). *Human response to wind turbine noise*. The Sahlgrenska Academy, Göteborg University, Göteborg ISBN. 88 pg. https://guoa.ub.gu.se/dspace/bitstream/2077/4431/1/Pedersen_avhandling.pdf Accessed: March 9, 2009
- Pedersen, E. and W.K. Persson (2007). Wind turbine noise, annoyance and self-reported health and well-being in different living environments. *Occup Environ Med* 64(7): 480-6.
- Pedersen, E. and K.P. Waye (2004). Perception and annoyance due to wind turbine noise—a dose–response relationship. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 116: 3460.
- Phipps, Robyn (2007) *In the Matter of Moturimu Wind Farm Application. Evidence to the Joint Commissioners, Palmerston North. March 8-26, 2007* <http://www.ohariupreservationsociety.org.nz/hipps-moturimutestimony.pdf> Accessed: April 17, 2009
- Pierpoint, N. (2009). Wind Turbine Syndrome: A Report on a Natural Experiment (Pre-publication Draft). Santa Fe, NM, K-selected Books.
- Ramakrishnan, R. (2007) *Wind Turbine Facilities Noise Issues*. Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Aiolos Engineering Corporation <https://ozone.scholarsportal.info/bitstream/1873/13073/1/283287.pdf> Accessed: March 9, 2009

- Shepherd, K.P. and H.H. Hubbard (1991). Physical characteristics and perception of low frequency noise from wind turbines. *Noise control engineering journal* 36(1): 5-15.
- Staples, S.L. (1997). Public Policy and Environmental Noise: Modeling Exposure or Understanding Effects. *American Journal of Public Health* 87(12): 2063.
- Tetra Tech (2008). Public Utilities Commission Site Permit Application for a Large Wind Energy Conversion System, Noble Flat Hill Windpark I, LLC, Clay County, Minnesota. Docket No.: IP6687/WS-08-1134.
- Todd, N., S.M. Rosengren and J.G. Colebatch (2008). Tuning and sensitivity of the human vestibular system to low-frequency vibration. *Neuroscience Letters* 444(1): 36-41.
- UK Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (2007) Research into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise: Final report. Report by: University of Salford. Authors: A. Moorhouse, M.H., S. von Hünerbein, B. Piper, M. Adams,
http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1554/1/Salford_Uni_Report_Turbine_Sound.pdf
Accessed: March 6, 2009
- UK Department of Transport and Industry (2006) The measurement of low frequency noise at three UK wind farms. United Kingdom DTI Technology Programme: New and Renewable Energy. Contractor: Hayes McKenzie Partnership Ltd. Author: G. Leventhall, <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file31270.pdf> Accessed: March 9, 2009
- van den Berg, F., E. Pedersen, J. Bouma and R. Bakker (2008). Project WINDFARMperception: Visual and acoustic impact of wind turbine farms on residents. Final report, FP6-2005-Science-and-Society-20, Specific Support Action project no. 044628. June 3, 2008, 99 pg.
<http://www.windaction.org/?module=uploads&func=download&fileId=1615>
Accessed: May 11, 2009
- van den Berg, G.P. van den Berg, G.P. (2008). Wind turbine power and sound in relation to atmospheric stability. *Wind Energy* 11(2): 151-169.
- van den Berg, G.P. (2005). The Beat is Getting Stronger: The Effect of Atmospheric Stability on Low Frequency Modulated Sound of Wind Turbines. *Noise Notes* 4(4): 15-40.
- van den Berg, G.P. (2004). Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine sound. *Journal of Sound and Vibration* 277(4-5): 955-970.
- World Health Organization (1999). Guidelines for community noise. Geneva; OMS, 1999, 94 p. Ilus, Authors: Berglund, B., Lindvall, T., Schwela, D. H.
<http://www.bvsde.paho.org/bvsci/i/fulltext/noise/noise.pdf> Accessed: April 17, 2009
- Woodworth, R.S. and H. Schlosberg (1964). *Experimental Psychology*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Wisconsin Power & Light Company (2008). Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Site Permit Application for a Large Wind Energy Conversion System, Bent Tree Wind Project, Freeborn County, Minnesota. Docket No.: ET6657/WS-08-573