

Noise Control Engineering Journal

— An International Publication —

Volume 59, Number 2

March-April 2011

AUTOMOTIVE NOISE

Variability of automotive interior noise from engine sources

E. Hills, N. S. Ferguson and
B. R. Mace

DAMPING ON SHIPS

Measurement of spray-on damping effectiveness and application to bow thruster noise on ships

Jesse Spence

WIND TURBINES

Low frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines

Robert D. O'Neal,
Robert D. Hellweg, Jr. and
Richard M. Lampeter

TUBE RESONATORS

Experimental validation of the 1-D acoustical model for conical concentric tube resonators with moving medium

P. Chaitanya and M. L. Munjal

TRANSMISSION LOSSES

Interference effects in field measurements of airborne sound insulation of building facades

Umberto Berardi, Ettore Cirillo
and Francesco Martellotta

HVAC SYSTEMS

Aero-acoustic predictions of industrial dashboard HVAC systems

Stéphane Détry, Julien Manera,
Yves Detandt and Diego d'Udekem

OPEN-PLAN OFFICES

Open-plan office noise levels, annoyance and countermeasures in Egypt

Sayed Abas Ali

JET TEST STAND

Reduction of engine exhaust noise in a jet engine test cell

Wei Hua Ho, Jordan Gilmore and
Mark Jermy

TRAFFIC NOISE

Dynamic traffic noise simulation at a signalized intersection among buildings

F. Li, M. Cai, J. K. Liu and Z. Yu

BOOK REVIEW

Speech Dereverberation

Patrick A. Naylor and
Nikolay D. Gaubitch
Ahmed Y. Elghazouli
Michael Barron

Seismic Design of Buildings to Eurocode 8
Auditorium Acoustics and Architectural Design, 2nd Edition
Technology for a Quieter America

The National Academy of Engineering

Low frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines

Robert D. O'Neal^{a)}, Robert D. Hellweg Jr.^{b)} and Richard M. Lampeter^{b)}

(Received: 5 October 2010; Revised: 7 January 2011; Accepted: 8 January 2011)

A common issue raised with wind energy developers and operators of utility-scale wind turbines is whether the operation of their wind turbines may create unacceptable levels of low frequency noise and infrasound. In order to answer this question, one of the major wind energy developers commissioned a scientific study of their wind turbine fleet. The study consisted of three parts: 1) a world-wide literature search to determine unbiased guidelines and standards used to evaluate low frequency sound and infrasound, 2) a field study to measure wind turbine noise outside and within nearby residences, and 3) a comparison of the field results to the guidelines and standards. Wind turbines from two different manufacturers were measured at an operating wind farm under controlled conditions with the results compared to established guidelines and standards. This paper presents the results of the low frequency noise and infrasound study. Since the purpose of this paper is to report on low frequency and infrasound emissions, potential annoyance from other aspects of wind turbine operation were not considered, and must be evaluated separately. © 2011 Institute of Noise Control Engineering.

Primary subject classification: 14.5.4; Secondary subject classification: 21.8.1

1 INTRODUCTION

Early down-wind wind turbines in the US created low frequency noise; however current up-wind wind turbines generate considerably less low frequency noise. Epsilon Associates, Inc. (“Epsilon”) was retained by NextEra Energy Resources, LLC (“NextEra”), formerly FPL Energy, to investigate whether the operation of their wind turbines may create unacceptable levels of low frequency noise and infrasound. This question has often been posed to NextEra, and other wind energy developers and operators of utility-scale wind turbines. NextEra is one of the world’s largest generators of wind power with approximately 7,600 net megawatts (MW) in operation as of July 2010.

The project was divided into three tasks: 1) literature search, 2) field measurement program, and 3) comparison to criteria. Epsilon conducted an extensive literature search of the technical and scientific literature on the effects of low-frequency noise and infrasound and existing criteria in order to evaluate low-frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines. After

completion of the literature search and selection of criteria, a field measurement program was developed to measure wind turbine noise to compare to the selected criteria.

The frequency range 20–20,000 Hz is commonly described as the range of “audible” noise. The frequency range of low frequency sound is generally from 20 Hertz (Hz) to 200 Hz, and the range below 20 Hz is often described as “infrasound”. However, audibility extends to frequencies below 20 Hz.

Low frequency sound has several definitions. American National Standards ANSI/ASA S12.2¹ and ANSI S12.9 Part 4² have provisions for evaluating low frequency noise, and these special treatments apply only to sounds in the octave bands with 16, 31.5, and 63-Hz mid-band frequencies. For these reasons, in this paper on wind turbine noise, we use the term “low frequency noise” to include 12.5 Hz–200 Hz with emphasis on the 16 Hz, 31 Hz and 63 Hz octave bands with a frequency range of 11 Hz to 89 Hz.

International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standard 60050-801:1994³ defines “infrasound” as “Acoustic oscillations whose frequency is below the low frequency limit of audible sound (about 16 Hz).” This definition is *incorrect* since sound remains audible at frequencies well below 16 Hz provided that the sound level is sufficiently high. In this paper we define infrasound to be below 20 Hz, which is the limit for the standardized threshold of hearing. Since there is no sharp

^{a)} Epsilon Associates, Inc., 3 Clock Tower Place, Suite 250, Maynard MA 01754; email: roneal@epsilonassociates.com.

^{b)} Epsilon Associates, Inc., 3 Clock Tower Place, Suite 250, Maynard MA 01754.




Fig. 1—Low frequency average threshold of hearing from ISO 226⁶ and Watanabe and Moeller⁷.

change in hearing at 20 Hz, the division into “low-frequency sound” and “infrasound” should only be considered “practical and conventional.”

2 EFFECTS AND CRITERIA OF LOW FREQUENCY SOUND AND INFRASOUND

We performed an extensive world-wide literature search of over 100 scientific papers, technical reports and summary reports on low frequency sound and infrasound—hearing, effects, measurement, and criteria. Leventhall⁴ presents an excellent and comprehensive study on low frequency noise from all sources and its effects. The Leventhall report also presents criteria in place at that time, which does not include some of the more recently developed ANSI/ASA standards on outdoor environmental noise and indoor sounds.

The United States government does not have specific criteria for low frequency noise. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has guidelines for the protection of public health with an adequate margin of safety in terms of annual average A-weighted day-night average sound level (L_{dn}), but there are no corrections or adjustments for low frequency noise. The US Department of Transportation (DOT) has A-weighted sound pressure level criteria for highway projects and airports, but these do not have adjustments for low frequency noise. The following sections describe the low frequency and infrasound criteria to which wind turbine sounds are compared in later sections.

2.1 Threshold of Hearing and Audibility

Moeller and Pedersen⁵ present an excellent summary on human perception of sound at frequencies below 200 Hz. The ear is the primary organ for sensing infrasound. Hearing becomes gradually less sensitive for

decreasing frequencies. But, humans with a normal hearing organ can perceive infrasound at least down to a few hertz if the sound level is sufficiently high.

The threshold of hearing is standardized for frequencies down to 20 Hz⁶. Based on extensive research and data, Moeller and Pedersen propose normal hearing thresholds for frequencies below 20 Hz; however, their proposed threshold is higher than that obtained by Watanabe and Moeller⁷. To be conservative, we have used the data from Watanabe and Moeller⁷ for the region below 20 Hz. (See Fig. 1.) Moeller and Pedersen⁵ suggest that the curve for low frequency thresholds for normal hearing is “probably correct within a few decibels, at least in most of the frequency range.”

The hearing thresholds show considerable variability from individual to individual with a standard deviation among subjects of about 5 dB independent of frequency between 3 Hz and 1000 Hz with a slight increase at 20–50 Hz. This implies that the audibility threshold for 97.5% of the population is greater than the values in Fig. 1 minus 10 dB and for 84% of the population is greater than the values in Fig. 1 minus 5 dB. Moeller and Pedersen suggest that the “pure-tone threshold can with a reasonable approximation be used as a guideline for the thresholds also for [low frequency] non-sinusoidal sounds”⁵; ISO 226 has thresholds for frequencies at and above 20 Hz and approximately equates the thresholds and equal loudness contours for non-sinusoidal sounds to those in the standard for sinusoidal sounds⁶.

As frequency decreases below 20 Hz, if the noise source is tonal, the tonal sensation ceases. Below 20 Hz tones are perceived as discontinuous. Below 10 Hz it is possible to perceive the single cycles of a tone, and the perception changes into a sensation of pressure at the ears.

Below 100 Hz, the dynamic range of the auditory system decreases with decreasing frequency, and the compressed dynamic range has an effect on equal loudness contours: a slight change in sound level can change the perceived loudness from barely audible to loud. This combined with the large variation in individual hearing may mean that a low frequency sound that is inaudible to some may be audible to others, and may be relatively loud to some of those for whom it is audible. Loudness for low frequency sounds grows considerably faster above threshold than for sounds at higher frequencies⁵.

Non-auditory perception of low frequency and infrasound occurs only at levels above the auditory threshold. In the frequency range of 4–25 Hz and at “*levels 20–25 dB above [auditory] threshold it is possible to feel vibrations in various parts of the body, e.g., the lumbar, buttock, thigh and calf regions. A feeling of pressure may occur in the upper part of the chest and the throat region*” [emphasis added]⁵.

2.2 ANSI S12.9-Parts 4 and 5—Evaluating Outdoor Environmental Sound

American National Standard ANSI/ASA S12.9-2007/Part 5⁸ has an informative annex which provides guidance for designation of land uses compatible with existing or predicted annual average adjusted day-night average outdoor sound level (DNL). Ranges of the DNL are outlined, within which a specific region of compatibility may be drawn. These ranges take into consideration the noise reduction in sound level from outside to inside buildings as commonly constructed in that locality and living habits there. There are adjustments to day-night average sound level to account for the presence of low frequency noise, and the adjustments are described in ANSI S12.9 Part 4, which use a sum of the sound pressure levels in octave bands with center frequencies of 16, 31 and 63 Hz.

ANSI S12.9/Part 4 identifies two thresholds: annoyance is minimal when the 16, 31.5 and 63 Hz octave band sound pressure levels are each less than 65 dB and there are no rapid fluctuations of the low frequency sounds. The second threshold is for increased annoyance which begins when rattles occur, which begins at L_{LF} 70–75 dB. L_{LF} is 10 times the logarithm of the ratio of time-mean square sound pressure in the 16, 31.5, and 63-Hz octave bands divided by the square of the reference sound pressure.

The adjustment procedure for low frequency noise to the average annual A-weighted sound pressure level in ANSI S12.9/Part 4 uses a different and more complicated metric and procedure (Equation D.1) than those used for evaluating low frequency noise in rooms contained in ANSI/ASA S12.2. (See Sec. 2.3). Since

we are evaluating low frequency noise and not A-weighted sound levels, we do not recommend using the procedure for adjusting A-weighted levels. Instead we recommend using the following two guidelines from ANSI S12.9/Part 4: a sound pressure level of 65 dB in each of the 16-, 31.5-, and 63 Hz octave bands as an indicator of minimal annoyance, and 70–75 dB for the summation of the sound pressure levels from these three bands as an indicator of possible increased annoyance from rattles.

2.3 ANSI/ASA S12.2—Evaluating Room Noise

ANSI/ASA S12.2-2008¹ discusses criteria for evaluating room noise, and has two separate provisions for evaluating low frequency noise: (1) the potential to cause perceptible vibration and rattles, and (2) meeting low frequency portions of room criteria curves. Since the ANSI S12.2 criteria are for indoor sounds, in order to determine equivalent outdoor criteria for comparison to outdoor measurements, data from Sutherland⁹ and Hubbard and Shephard¹⁰ were used to determine typical noise reductions from outdoor to indoor with windows open. (The Appendix of this paper describes the noise reductions used to determine equivalent outdoor criteria to indoor criteria.) Table A1 presents octave band noise reductions applied in this evaluation along with the average low frequency octave band noise reductions from outdoor to indoors from Refs. 9 and 10 for open and closed windows. Table A2 presents the one-third octave band noise reductions applied in the analysis that were determined in the same manner using data from the same references.

Vibration and Rattles: Outdoor low frequency sounds of sufficient amplitude can cause building walls to vibrate and windows to rattle. Homes have low values of transmission loss at low frequencies, and low frequency noise of sufficient amplitude may be audible within homes. Window rattles are not low frequency noise, but may be caused by low frequency noise. ANSI/ASA S12.2 presents limiting levels at low frequencies for assessing (a) the probability of *clearly* perceptible acoustically induced vibration and rattles in lightweight wall and ceiling constructions, and (b) the probability of *moderately* perceptible acoustically induced vibration in similar constructions. The limiting sound pressure levels in the octave bands with center frequencies of 16, 31.5 and 63 Hz are presented in Table 1.

Applying the outdoor to indoor attenuations for wind turbine sources with windows open given in the last row of Table A1 to the ANSI/ASA S12.2 indoor sound pressure levels in Table 1 yields the equivalent

Table A1—Average low frequency octave band home noise reductions from outdoor to indoors in dB (from Ref. 9 and 10).

Noise Source	Window condition	Octave Band Center Frequency			
		16 Hz	31.5 Hz	63 Hz	125 Hz
Average aircraft and traffic sources	Closed windows	16	15	18	20
Average aircraft and traffic sources	Open windows	(11)*	(10)*	12	11
Average Wind Turbine	Closed windows	8	11	14	18
Average Wind Turbine	Open windows	(3)*+	(6)*+	9+	9+

* No data are available for windows open below 63 Hz octave band. The values for 16 Hz and 31 Hz were obtained by subtracting the difference between the levels for 63 Hz closed and open conditions to the 16 and 31 Hz closed values.

+ Used in this paper to determine equivalent outdoor criteria from indoor criteria in Tables 2 and 4

outdoor sound pressure levels that are consistent with the indoor criteria and are presented in Table 2.

Room Criteria Curves: ANSI/ASA S12.2 has three primary methods for evaluating the suitability of noise within rooms: a survey method—A-weighted sound levels, an engineering method—noise criteria (NC) curves, and a method for evaluating low-frequency fluctuating noise using room noise criteria (RNC) curves. ANSI/ASA S12.2 states “The RNC method

should be used to determine noise ratings when the noise from HVAC systems at low frequencies is loud and is suspected of containing sizeable *fluctuations or surging*.” [emphasis added] The NC curves are appropriate to evaluate low frequency noise from wind turbines in homes since wind turbine noise does not have significant fluctuating low frequency noise sufficient to warrant using RNC curves and since A-weighted sound levels do not adequately determine

Table A2—Average low frequency one-third octave band noise reduction in dB for homes from outdoor to indoors.

Condition	One-Third Octave Band Center Frequency, Hz												
	10	12.5	16	20	25	31.5	40	50	63	80	100	125	160
Open Window*	2	2	3	4	4.5	5	7	8	9	9	9	9	9
Average Closed Window with wind turbines ¹⁰	8	7	8	8	8	11	13	14	15	12	18	18	18

* Used to determine equivalent outdoor levels as shown in Table 7.

** Used to determine equivalent outdoor levels as shown in Table 9.

Table 1—ANSI/ASA S12.2 measured interior sound pressure levels for perceptible vibration and rattle in lightweight wall and ceiling structures.¹

Condition	Octave-band center frequency (Hz)		
	16	31.5	63
Clearly perceptible vibration and rattles likely	75 dB	75 dB	80 dB
Moderately perceptible vibration and rattles likely	65 dB	65 dB	70 dB

Table 2—Equivalent outdoor sound pressure levels to the ANSI/ASA S12.2 indoor sound pressure levels for perceptible vibration and rattle in lightweight wall and ceiling structures for wind turbines.

Condition	Octave-band center frequency (Hz)		
	16	31.5	63
Clearly perceptible vibration and rattles likely	78 dB	81 dB	89 dB
Moderately perceptible vibration and rattles likely	68 dB	71 dB	79 dB

if there are low frequency problems. [ANSI/ASA S12.2, Sec. 5.3 gives procedures for determining if there are large fluctuations of low frequency noise.]

Annex C.2 of ANSI/ASA S12.2 contains recommended room criteria curves for bedrooms, which are the rooms in homes with the most stringent criteria: NC and RNC criteria curve between 25 and 30. The recommended NC and RNC criteria for schools and private rooms in hospitals are the same. The values of the sound pressure levels in the 16–125 Hz octave bands for NC curves 25 and 30 are shown in Table 3. Applying the outdoor to indoor attenuations for wind turbine sources with windows open given in the last row of Table A1 to the ANSI/ASA S12.2 indoor sound pressure levels for NC-25 and NC-30 in Table 3 yields the equivalent outdoor sound pressure levels that are consistent with the indoor criteria and are presented in Table 4.

ANSI/ASA S12.2 also presents a method to determine if the levels below 500 Hz octave band are too high in relation to the levels in the mid-frequencies which could create a condition of “spectrum imbalance”. The method for this evaluation is:

- Calculate the speech interference level (SIL) for the measured spectrum. [SIL is the arithmetic average of the sound pressure levels in the 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000 Hz octave bands.] Select the NC curve equal to the SIL value with a symbol NC(SIL).
- Plot the measured spectra and the NC curve equal to the SIL value on the same graph and

Table 3—ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency octave band sound pressure levels for noise criteria curves NC-25 and NC-30. [Table 1 from Ref. 1].

NC Criteria	Octave-band-center frequency, Hz			
	16	31.5	63	125
NC-25	80	65	54	44
NC-30	81	68	57	48

determine the differences between the two curves in the octave bands below 500 Hz.

- Estimate the likelihood that the excess low-frequency levels will annoy occupants of the space using Table 5.

2.4 Other Criteria

2.4.1 World Health Organization (WHO)

No specific low frequency noise criteria are proposed by the WHO. The Guidelines for Community Noise report¹¹ mentions that if the difference between

Table 4—Equivalent outdoor sound pressure levels to the ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency octave band sound pressure levels for noise criteria curves NC-25 and NC-30. [Table 1 from Ref. 1].

NC Criteria	Octave-band-center frequency, Hz			
	16	31.5	63	125
NC-25 equivalent outdoor	83	71	63	53
NC-30 equivalent outdoor	84	74	66	57

Table 5—Measured sound pressure level deviations from an NC (SIL) curve that may lead to serious complaints¹.

Octave-band frequency, Hz =>	Measured Spectrum—NC(SIL), dB			
	31.5	63	125	250
Possible serious dissatisfaction	*	6–9	6–9	6–9
Likely serious dissatisfaction	*	>9	>9	>9

* Insufficient data available to evaluate

Table 6—DEFRA proposed criteria¹³ for the assessment of low frequency noise disturbance: Indoor L_{eq} one-third sound pressure levels for non-steady and steady low frequency sounds.

Location	One-Third Octave Band Center Frequency, Hz												
	10	12.5	16	20	25	31.5	40	50	63	80	100	125	160
Non-Steady L_{eq} , dB	92	87	83	74	64	56	49	43	42	40	38	36	34
Steady L_{eq} , dB	97	92	88	79	69	61	54	48	47	45	43	41	39

the C-weighted sound level and A-weighted sound level is greater than 10 decibels, then a frequency analysis should be performed to determine if there is a low frequency issue. A document prepared for the World Health Organization states that “there is no reliable evidence that infrasounds below the hearing threshold produce physiological or psychological effects. Infrasounds slightly above detection threshold may cause perceptual effects but these are of the same character as for ‘normal’ sounds. Reactions caused by extremely intense levels of infrasound can resemble those of mild stress reaction and may include bizarre auditory sensations, describable as pulsation and flutter”¹².

2.4.2 The UK Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)

The report prepared by the University of Salford for the UK Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) on low frequency noise proposed one-third octave band sound pressure level L_{eq} criteria and procedures for assessing low frequency noise¹³. The guidelines are based on complaints of disturbance from low frequency sounds and are intended to be used by Environmental Health Officers.

Existing low frequency noise criteria from several countries were reviewed and experiences with low frequencies complaints were considered in developing the proposed guidelines. The criteria are “based on

5 dB below the ISO 226 average threshold of audibility for steady [low frequency] sounds.” However, the DEFRA criteria are at 5 dB lower than ISO 226 only at 20–31.5 Hz; at higher frequencies the criteria are equal to the Swedish criteria which are higher levels than ISO 226 less 5 dB. For frequencies lower than 20 Hz, DEFRA uses the thresholds from Ref. 7 less 5 dB.

The DEFRA criteria are based on measurements in an unoccupied room, and it was noted by a practicing consultant that measurements should be made with windows closed¹⁴. However, we conservatively used windows open conditions for our assessment to determine equivalent outdoor criteria since the DEFRA measurement procedure does not explicitly state measurements are with windows closed. If the low frequency sound is “steady” then the criteria may be relaxed by 5 dB. A low frequency noise is considered steady if either $L_{10}-L_{90} < 5$ dB or the rate of change of sound pressure level (Fast time weighting) is less than 10 dB per second in the third octave band which exceeds the criteria by the greatest margin.

Applying indoor to outdoor one-third octave band transfer functions for open windows (as presented in Table A2 from analysis of data in Refs. 9 and 10) yields equivalent one-third octave band sound pressure level proposed DEFRA criteria for outdoor sound levels. Table 6 presents the indoor DEFRA proposed criteria for non-steady and steady low-frequency sounds. Table

Table 7—Equivalent outdoor L_{eq} one-third sound pressure levels for non-steady and steady sounds to the DEFRA indoor criteria¹³ for the assessment of low frequency noise disturbance.

Location	One-Third Octave Band Center Frequency, Hz												
	10	12.5	16	20	25	31.5	40	50	63	80	100	125	160
Non-Steady Equivalent outdoor * L_{eq} , dB	94	89	86	78	68.5	61	56	51	51	49	47	45	43
Steady Equivalent Outdoor* L_{eq}	99	94	91	83	73.5	66	61	56	56	54	52	50	48

* With windows open

Table 8—Japan Ministry of Environment Guidance for evaluating complaints of low frequency noise: Reference one-third octave band sound pressure level values for complaints of rattling.

Location	One-Third Octave Band Center Frequency, Hz										
	5	6.3	8	10	12.5	16	20	25	31.5	40	50
Outdoor L_{eq} , dB	70*	71*	72*	73	75	77	80	83	87	93	99

* The reference values are several dB lower than the supporting data contained in Ref. 15. At 5 Hz, window rattles started at about 74 dB in one study and 79 dB in another; at 6.3 Hz, rattles started at 74 dB in the first study and at 78 dB in the second; and at 8 Hz, window rattle started at 74 dB in the first study and 77 dB in the second study.

7 presents the DEFRA equivalent outdoor criteria for non-steady and steady low frequency sounds.

2.4.3 Japan Ministry of Environment

The Japan Ministry of Environment has published a handbook to deal with low frequency noise problems and has established reference values for guidance in dealing with complaints of rattling windows and doors and complaints of “mental and physical discomfort”¹⁵. It was noted that traditional Japanese houses have relatively light-weight and sensitive windows and partitions¹⁶.

Table 8 presents the Japanese reference outdoor one-third octave band sound pressure level values for guidance in dealing with complaints of rattling from environmental sounds from 5 Hz to 50 Hz. From 10 Hz to 50 Hz the guidance levels are equal to the observed threshold of rattles from two studies with a total of 78 samples. However, for the bands centered at 5, 6.3 and 8 Hz, the reference values are several dB lower than the supporting data contained in these two studies¹⁵. At 5 Hz, the lowest observed window rattle was at 74 dB in one study and 79 dB in another; at 6.3 Hz, rattles started at 74 dB in the first study and at 78 dB in the second; and at 8 Hz, window rattle started at 74 dB in the first study and 77 dB in the second study. Thus the reference values at 5, 6.3 and 8 Hz in Table 8 are conservative in comparison to the other values by 4, 3, and 2 dB respectively.

Table 9 presents the Japanese reference one-third octave band sound pressure level values for guidance in dealing with complaints of mental and physical discomfort from environmental sounds when evaluated indoors. Evaluation measurements are to be performed with windows closed to the outside. The values in Table 9 are less stringent than the DEFRA values in Table 6 for non-steady sounds but more stringent than the DEFRA values for steady sounds in some one-third octave bands. In order to obtain equivalent outdoor sound levels, the average noise reduction from wind turbine noise with windows closed from Ref. 10 was applied to the Japan reference values. Table 9 presents the Japanese indoor reference values, the noise reduc-

tions for windows closed¹⁰ and the equivalent outdoor reference values. These equivalent outdoor values are less stringent than the equivalent outdoor DEFRA values in Table 7 for both non-steady sounds and steady sounds except for the 80 Hz band in which the Japanese level is 1 dB more stringent than the DEFRA level for steady sounds.

2.4.4 C-weighted minus A-weighted ($L_{pC} - L_{pA}$)

Leventhall⁴ and others indicate that the difference in C-weighted and A-weighted sound pressure levels can be a predictor of annoyance. Leventhall states that if ($L_{pC} - L_{pA}$) is greater than 20 dB there is “a potential for a low frequency noise problem.” He further states that ($L_{pC} - L_{pA}$) cannot be a predictor of annoyance but is a simple indicator that further analysis may be needed. This is due in part to the fact that the low frequency noise may be inaudible even if ($L_{pC} - L_{pA}$) is greater than 20 dB.

3 LITERATURE REVIEW

The authors performed an extensive literature search of over 100 scientific papers, technical reports and summary reports on low frequency sound and infrasound—hearing, effects, measurement, and criteria. The following paragraphs briefly summarize the findings from some of these papers and reports.

3.1 Leventhall

Leventhall⁴ presents an excellent study on low frequency noise from all sources and its effects. The report presents criteria in place at that time and includes data relating cause and effects. Leventhall¹⁷ reviewed data and allegations on alleged problems from low frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines, and concluded the following: “It has been shown that there is insignificant infrasound from wind turbines and that there is normally little low frequency noise.” “Turbulent air inflow conditions cause enhanced levels of low frequency noise, which may be disturbing, but the overriding noise from wind turbines is the fluctuating audible swish, mistakenly referred to

Table 9—Japan Ministry of Environment Guidance for evaluating complaints of low frequency noise: Reference one-third octave band sound pressure level values for complaints of mental and physical discomfort.

Location	One-Third Octave Band Center Frequency, Hz									
	10	12.5	16	20	25	31.5	40	50	63	80
Indoor L_{eq} , dB	92	88	83	76	70	64	57	52	47	41
Noise Reduction *, dB	8	7	8	8	8	11	13	14	15	12
Equivalent Outdoor L_{eq} , dB	100	95	91	84	78	75	70	66	62	53

* from Hubbard¹⁰ windows closed condition

as “infrasound” or “low frequency noise”. “Infrasound from wind turbines is below the audible threshold and of no consequence”. Other studies have shown that wind turbine generated infrasound levels are below threshold of perception and threshold of feeling and body reaction.

3.2 DELTA

The Danish Energy Authority project on “low frequency noise from large wind turbines” comprises a series of investigations in the effort to give increased knowledge on low frequency noise from wind turbines¹⁸. One of the conclusions of the study is that wind turbines do not emit audible infrasound, with levels that are “far below the hearing threshold.” Audible low frequency sound may occur both indoors and outdoors, “but the levels in general are close to the hearing and/or masking level.” “In general the noise in the critical band up to 100 Hz is below both thresholds”. The final report notes that for road traffic noise (in the vicinity of roads) the low frequency noise levels are higher [than wind turbine] both indoors and outdoors.

3.3 Hayes McKenzie Partnership

Hayes McKenzie Partnership Ltd performed a study for the UK Department of Trade & Industry (DTI) to investigate complaints of low frequency noise that came from three of the five farms with complaints out of 126 wind farms in the UK¹⁴. The study concluded that:

- Infrasound associated with modern wind turbines is not a source which will result in noise levels that are audible or which may be injurious to the health of a wind farm neighbor.
- Low frequency noise was measureable on a few occasions, but below DEFRA criteria. Wind turbine noise may result in indoor noise levels

within a home that is just above the threshold of audibility; however, it was lower than that of local road traffic noise.

- The common cause of the complaints was not associated with low frequency noise but the occasional audible modulation of aerodynamic noise, especially at night.
- The UK Department of Trade and Industry, which is now the UK Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR), summarized the Hayes McKenzie report: “The report concluded that there is no evidence of health effects arising from infrasound or low frequency noise generated by wind turbines.”¹⁹.

3.4 Howe

Howe performed extensive studies on wind turbines and infrasound and concluded that infrasound was not an issue for modern wind turbine installations—“while infrasound can be generated by wind turbines, it is concluded that infrasound is not of concern to the health of residences located nearby.”²⁰. Since then Gastmeier and Howe²¹ investigated an additional situation involving the alleged “perception of infrasound by individual.” In this additional case, the measured indoor infrasound was at least 30 dB below the audibility threshold given by Ref. 7 as presented in Fig. 1.

3.5 Branco

Branco and other Portuguese researchers have studied possible physiological affects associated with high amplitude low frequency noise and have labeled these alleged effects as “Vibroacoustic Disease” (VAD)²². “Vibroacoustic disease (VAD) is a whole-body, systemic pathology, characterized by the abnormal proliferation of extra-cellular matrices, and caused by excessive exposure to low frequency noise.”

Hayes^{23,24} concluded that levels from wind farms are not likely to cause VAD after comparing noise levels from alleged VAD cases to noise levels from wind turbines in homes of complainers. Noise levels in aircraft in which VAD has been hypothesized are considerably higher than wind turbine noise levels. Hayes also concluded that it is “unlikely that symptoms will result through induced internal vibration from incident wind farm noise.”²³ Other studies have found no VAD indicators in environmental sound that have been alleged by VAD proponents²⁵.

3.6 French National Academy of Medicine

In 2006, the French National Academy of Medicine recommended²⁶ “*as a precaution* construction should be suspended for wind turbines with a capacity exceeding 2.5 MW located within 1500 m of homes.” [emphasis added] However, this precaution is not because of definitive health issues but because:

- Sound levels one km from some wind turbine installations “occasionally exceed allowable limits” for France (note that the allowable limits are long term averages).
- French prediction tools for assessment did not take into account sound levels created with wind speeds greater than 5 m/s.
- Wind turbine noise has been compared to aircraft noise (even though the sound levels of wind turbine noise are significantly lower), and exposure to high level aircraft noise “involves neurobiological reactions associated with an increased frequency of hypertension and cardiovascular illness. Unfortunately, no such study has been done near wind turbines.”²⁷

In March 2008, the French Agency for Environmental and Occupational Health Safety (AFSSET) published a report on “the health impacts of noise generated by wind turbines”, commissioned by the Ministries of Health and Environment in June 2006 following the report of the French National Academy of Medicine in March 2006²⁸. The AFSSET study recommends that one does not define a fixed minimum distance between wind farms and homes, but rather to model the acoustic impact of the project on a case-by-case basis. One of the conclusions of the AFSSET report is: “The analysis of available data shows: The absence of identified direct health consequences concerning the auditory effects or specific effects usually associated with exposure to low frequencies at high level.” (“L’analyse des données disponibles met en évidence: L’absence de conséquences sanitaires directes recensées en ce qui concerne les effets auditifs, ou les effets spécifiques généralement attachés à l’exposition à des basses fréquences à niveau élevé.”).

4 FIELD PROGRAM

Two types of utility-scale wind turbines were studied for this field program. These two turbines are among the most commonly used in the NextEra fleet: General Electric (GE) 1.5sle (1.5 MW), and Siemens SWT-2.3-93 (2.3 MW).

Sound levels for these wind turbine generators (WTGs) vary as a function of wind speed from cut-in wind speed to maximum sound level. Cut-in wind speed for the GE 1.5sle wind turbine is 3.5 m/s while the Siemens wind turbine has a cut-in wind speed of 4 m/s. Maximum reference sound power levels for the GE 1.5sle and Siemens 2.3-93 are approximately 104 dB and 105 dB respectively as provided by the manufacturer. These sound power levels are reached at electrical output levels of approximately 924 kW and 1767 kW for the GE and Siemens units, respectively. Under higher wind speeds, the sound levels from the wind turbines do not increase although electrical power output does continue to increase up to the rated power of each wind turbine (1500 kW and 2300 kW respectively).

Each wind turbine manufacturer has an uncertainty factor “K” of 2 dB to guarantee the turbine’s sound power level. (K accounts for both measurement variations and production variation²⁹.) The results presented later in this paper include sound power values which have added the manufacturer’s K value to the reference values, that is, 2 dB above the expected reference levels for the measured wind conditions and power output.

Real-world data were collected from operating wind turbines to compare to the low frequency noise guidelines and criteria discussed previously in Sec. 2. These data sets consisted of outdoor measurements at various reference distances, and concurrent indoor/outdoor measurements at residences within the wind farm.

NextEra provided access to the Horse Hollow Wind Farm in Taylor and Nolan Counties, Texas in November 2008 to collect data on the GE 1.5sle and Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbines. The portion of the wind farm used for testing is relatively flat with no significant terrain. The land around the wind turbines is rural and primarily used for agriculture and cattle grazing. The siting of the sound level measurement locations was chosen to minimize local noise sources except the wind turbines and the wind itself. Hub height for these wind turbines is 80 meters above ground level (AGL).

Two of the authors collected sound level and wind speed data over the course of one week under a variety of operational conditions. Weather conditions were dry the entire week with ground level winds ranging from calm to 12.5 m/s (28 mph) over a 1-minute average. In order to minimize confounding factors, the data collection tried to focus on periods of maximum sound levels from

the wind turbines (moderate to high hub height winds) and light to moderate ground level winds.

Ground level (2 meters AGL) wind speed and direction were measured continuously at one representative location. Wind speeds near hub height were also measured continuously using the permanent meteorological towers maintained by the wind farm.

A series of simultaneous interior and exterior sound level measurements were made at four houses owned by participating landowners within the wind farm. Two sets were made of the GE WTGs, and two sets were made of the Siemens WTGs. Data were collected with both windows open and windows closed. Due to the necessity of coordinating with the homeowners in advance, and reasonable restrictions on time of day to enter their homes, the interior/exterior measurement data sets do not always represent ideal conditions. However, enough data were collected to compare to the criteria and draw conclusions on low frequency noise.

Sound level measurements were also made simultaneously at two reference distances from a string of wind turbines under a variety of wind conditions. Using the manufacturer's sound power level data, calculations of the sound pressure levels as a function of distance in flat terrain were made to aid in deciding where to collect data in the field. Based on this analysis, two distances from the nearest wind turbine were selected—305 meters (1,000 feet) and 457 meters (1,500 feet)—and were then used where possible during the field program. Distances much larger than 457 meters (1,500 feet) were not practical since an adjacent turbine string could then be closer and affect the measurements, or would put the measurements beyond the boundaries of the wind farm property owners. Brief background sound level measurements were conducted several times during the program whereby the Horse Hollow Wind Farm operators were able to shutdown the nearby WTGs for a brief (20 minutes) period. This was done in real time using cell phone communication.

All the sound level measurements described above were attended. One series of unattended overnight measurements was made at two locations for approximately 15 hours to capture a larger data set. One measurement was set up approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) from a GE 1.5sle WTG and the other was set up approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) from a Siemens WTG. The location was chosen based on the current wind direction forecast so that the sound level equipment would be downwind for the majority of the monitoring period. By doing this, the program was able to capture periods of strong hub-height winds and moderate to low ground-level winds.

All sound levels were measured using two Norsonic Model Nor140 precision sound analyzers, equipped

with a Norsonic-1209 Type 1 Preamplifier, a Norsonic-1225 half-inch microphone and a 7-inch Aco-Pacific untreated foam windscreen Model WS7. The instrumentation meets the "Type 1—Precision" requirements set forth in American National Standards Institute (ANSI) S1.4 for acoustical measuring devices³⁰. The microphone was tripod-mounted at a height of 1.5 meters (five feet) above ground. The measurements included simultaneous collection of broadband (A-weighted) and one-third-octave band data (3.15 hertz to 20,000 hertz bands). Sound level data were primarily logged in 10-minute intervals to be consistent with the wind farm's Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition (SCADA) system which provides electrical power output (kW) in 10-minute increments. A few sound level measurements were logged using 20-minute intervals for use in determining home transmission loss values. The meters were calibrated and certified as accurate to standards set by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. These calibrations were conducted by an independent laboratory within the past 12 months. Ground level wind speed and direction were measured with a HOBO H21-002 micro weather station (Onset Computer Corporation). The wind data were sampled every three seconds and logged every one minute.

5 RESULTS AND COMPARISON TO CRITERIA

Results from the field program are organized by wind turbine type. For each wind turbine type, results are presented per location type (outdoor or indoor) with respect to applicable criteria. Results are presented for 305 meters (1,000) feet from the nearest wind turbine. Data were also collected at 457 meters (1,500 feet) from the nearest wind turbine which showed lower sound levels. Therefore, wind turbines that met the criteria at 305 meters also met it at 457 meters. Data were collected under both high turbine output and moderate turbine output conditions (defined as sound power levels 2 or 3 dB less than the maximum sound power levels), and low ground-level wind speeds. The sound level data under the moderate conditions were equivalent to or lower than the high turbine output scenarios, thus confirming the conclusions from the high output cases. None of the operational sound level data were corrected for background noise. A-weighted sound power levels presented in this section (used to describe turbine operation) were estimated from the actual measured power output (kW) of the wind turbines and the sound power levels as a function of wind speed plus an uncertainty factor K of 2 dB.

Outdoor measurements are compared to criteria for audibility, for UK DEFRA disturbance using equivalent outdoor levels, for rattle and annoyance criteria as

Table 10—Summary of operational parameters—*Siemens SWT-2.3-93 (Outdoor)*.

Parameter	Sample #34	Sample #39
Distance to nearest WTG	305 meters	305 meters
Time of day	22:00-22:10	22:50-23:00
WTG power output	1,847 kW	1,608 kW
A-weighted sound power level*	107 dB	106.8 dB
Measured wind speed @ 2 m	3.3 m/s	3.4 m/s
L_{Aeq}	49.4 dB	49.6 dB
L_{A90}	48.4 dB	48.6 dB
L_{Ceq}	63.5 dB	63.2 dB

* Includes K, uncertainty factor of 2 dB

contained in ANSI S12.9/Part 4, for evaluating complaints of rattling using Japan Ministry of Environment guidance, and for perceptible vibration using equivalent outdoor levels from ANSI/ASA S12.2. Indoor measurements are compared to criteria for audibility, for UK DEFRA disturbance, for evaluating complaints of mental and physical discomfort using Japan Ministry of Environment guidance, and for suitability of bedrooms, hospitals and schools and perceptible vibration from ANSI/ASA S12.2.

5.1 Siemens SWT-2.3-93

5.1.1 Outdoor measurements—Siemens SWT-2.3-93

Sound levels during six 10-minute periods of high wind turbine output and relatively low ground wind speed (which minimized effects of wind noise) were measured outdoors approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) from the closest Siemens WTG. This site was actually part of a string of 15 WTGs, four of which were within 610 meters

(2,000 feet) of the monitoring location. Representative sound level data from two 10-minute periods are presented herein and include contributions from all wind turbines as measured by the recording equipment. One data set is representative of time periods with low frequency sound level values near the maximum measured and the other data set is representative of the mean. The standard deviations for the low frequency one-third octave band levels for the six measurement periods were between 0.2–0.7 dB. The key operational and meteorological parameters during these two measurement periods are listed in Table 10.

Figure 2 plots the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The results show that infrasound is inaudible to even the most sensitive people 305 meters (1,000 feet) from these wind turbines (more than 20 dB below the median thresholds of hearing). Low frequency sound above 40 Hz may be audible depending on background sound levels.

Figure 3 plots the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The low frequency sound was “steady” according to DEFRA procedures, and the results show that all outdoor equivalent DEFRA disturbance criteria are met.

Figure 4 compares the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions to the Japan Ministry of Environment levels for evaluating complaints on rattle. The rattle criteria is met at all frequencies except at 5 Hz where the mean value is 1 dB (standard deviation of 0.4 dB) higher than the Japanese evaluation value. When one considers that the 5 Hz sound level is 3 dB lower than the observed threshold of rattle, one concludes that the Japanese criteria are met.

The measured outdoor sound levels also meet the outdoor equivalent Japan Ministry of Environment




Fig. 2—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to audibility criteria.




Fig. 3—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to outdoor equivalent DEFRA criteria.

criteria for evaluating complaints of mental and physical discomfort. This comparison is not presented in a figure since these criteria are generally less stringent than the DEFRA criteria.

Figure 5 plots the 16, 31.5, 63, and 125 Hz octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The results show that all outdoor equivalent ANSI/ASA S12.2 perceptible vibration criteria are met. In addition, the results show that all outdoor equivalent ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency NC-25 and NC-30 criteria for bedrooms are met. The low frequency sound levels are below the ANSI S12.9 Part 4 thresholds for the beginning of rattles (16, 31.5, 63 Hz total less than 70 dB). The 31.5 and 63 Hz sound levels are below the level of 65 dB identified for minimal annoyance in ANSI S12.9 Part 4,

and the 16 Hz sound level is within 1.5 dB of this level, which is an insignificant increase since the levels were not rapidly fluctuating.

5.1.2 Indoor measurements—Siemens SWT-2.3-93

Simultaneous outdoor and indoor measurements were made at two residences at different locations within the wind farm to determine indoor audibility of low frequency noise from Siemens WTGs. In each house a 10-minute measurement was made in a room facing the wind turbines with a window both open and closed. Results from the testing at one of the homes are not presented due to the very high ground level winds




Fig. 4—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to Japan Ministry of Environment rattle criteria.




Fig. 5—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to ANSI criteria.

(~9 m/s) which dominated the sound environment. The remaining residence is designated Home “A” and was approximately 323 meters (1,060 feet) from the closest Siemens WTG. The home was near a string of multiple WTGs, four of which were within 610 meters (2,000 feet) of the house. The sound level data presented herein include contributions from all wind turbines as measured by the recording equipment. The key operational and meteorological parameters during these measurements are listed in Table 11.

The room in Home “A” where interior measurements were made had the following characteristics: approximately 3.6 meters wide (12 feet) by 4.9 meters long (16 feet), no furniture, carpeted flooring, two relatively new double-hung windows (no storm windows), sheetrock interior walls, and clapboard exterior walls. The sound level meter was located in the center of the room.

Figure 6 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “A”. The results show that infrasound is inaudible to even the most sensitive people approximately 1,000 feet from these wind turbines with

the windows open or closed (more than 20 dB below the median thresholds of hearing). Low frequency sound at or above 50 Hz may be audible depending on background sound levels.

Figure 7 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “A”. The low frequency sound was “steady” according to DEFRA procedures under the window open condition, and the results show that all indoor DEFRA disturbance criteria are met.

Although not shown in Fig. 7, the one-third octave band levels meet the Japan Ministry of Environment criteria for evaluating complaints of mental and physical discomfort since in the frequency range of the Japan criteria both samples meet the more stringent DEFRA criteria for “non-steady” sounds, which is more stringent than the Japan criteria.

Figure 8 plots the indoor 16 Hz to 125 Hz octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “A”. The results show the ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency criteria for perceptible vibration were easily met for both windows open and closed scenarios. The ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency NC-25 and NC-30 criteria for bedrooms, classrooms and hospitals were met, the spectrum was balanced, and the criteria for moderately perceptible vibrations in light-weight walls and ceilings were also met.

Table 11—Summary of operational parameters—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 (Indoor).

Parameter	Home “A” (closed/open)
Distance to nearest WTG	323 meters
Time of day	07:39-07:49/07:51-08:01
WTG power output	1,884 kW/1564 kW
A-weighted sound power level*	107 dB/106.7 dB
Measured wind speed @ 2 m	3.2 m/s/3.7 m/s
L_{Aeq}	33.8 dB/38.1 dB
L_{A90}	28.1 dB/36.8 dB
L_{Ceq}	54.7 dB/57.1 dB

* Includes K, uncertainty factor of 2 dB

5.2 GE 1.5sle

5.2.1 Outdoor measurements—GE 1.5sle

Sound level data during twelve 10-minute periods of high wind turbine output and relatively low ground wind speed (which minimized effects of wind noise) were measured outdoors approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) from the closest GE 1.5sle WTG. This site was actually part of a string of more than 30 WTGs, four of which were within 610 meters (2,000 feet) of the




Fig. 6—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine indoor sound levels at 323 meters compared to audibility criteria (Home “A”).

monitoring location. Representative sound level data from two 10-minute periods are presented herein and include contributions from all wind turbines as measured by the recording equipment. One data set is representative of time periods with low frequency sound level values near the maximum and the other data set is representative of the mean. The standard deviations for the low frequency one-third octave band levels for the twelve measurement periods were between 0.3–1.9 dB with the largest variation in the 10–16 Hz bands and the lowest at 160 Hz. The key operational and meteorological parameters for these two measurement periods are listed in Table 12.

Figure 9 plots the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The results show that infrasound is inaudible to even the most

sensitive people 305 meters (1,000 feet) from these wind turbines (more than 20 dB below the median thresholds of hearing). Low frequency sound at and above 31.5–40 Hz may be audible depending on background sound levels.

Figure 10 plots the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The low frequency sound was “steady” according to DEFRA procedures, and the results show the low frequency sound meet or are within 1 dB of outdoor equivalent DEFRA disturbance criteria.

Figure 11 compares the one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions to the Japan Ministry of Environment levels for evaluating complaints on rattle. The rattle criteria is met at all




Fig. 7—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine indoor sound levels at 323 meters compared to DEFRA criteria (Home “A”).




Fig. 8—Siemens SWT-2.3-93 wind turbine indoor sound levels at 323 meters compared to ANSI 12.2 criteria for perceptible vibrations and NC-25 (Home “A”).

frequencies; at 5 Hz the mean value is 70 dB (standard deviation=0.9 dB), while the two presented measure-

Table 12—Summary of operational parameters—GE 1.5sle (Outdoor).

Parameter	Sample #46	Sample #51
Distance to nearest WTG	305 meters	305 meters
Time of day	23:10-23:20	00:00-00:10
WTG power output	1,293 kW	1,109 kW
A-weighted sound power level*	106 dB	106 dB
Measured wind speed @ 2 m	4.1 m/s	3.3 m/s
L_{Aeq}	50.2 dB	50.7 dB
L_{A90}	49.2 dB	49.7 dB
L_{Ceq}	62.5 dB	62.8 dB

* Includes K, uncertainty factor of 2 dB

ments are approximately 1 dB higher, an insignificant increase. When one considers that the 5 Hz sound level is 3 dB lower than the observed threshold of rattle, one concludes that the Japanese criteria are met.

The measured outdoor sound levels also meet the outdoor equivalent Japan Ministry of Environment criteria for evaluating complaints of mental and physical discomfort. This comparison is not presented in a figure since these criteria are generally less stringent than the DEFRA criteria.

Figure 12 plots the 16, 31.5, 63 and 125 Hz octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for both samples of high output conditions. The results show that all outdoor equivalent ANSI/ASA S12.2 perceptible vibration criteria are met. The results show that all outdoor equivalent ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency NC-25 and NC-30 criteria for




Fig. 9—GE 1.5sle wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to audibility criteria.




Fig. 10—GE 1.5sle wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to outdoor equivalent DEFRA criteria.

bedrooms are met. The low frequency sound levels are below the ANSI S12.9 Part 4 thresholds for the beginning of rattles (16, 31.5, 63 Hz total less than 70 dB). The 16, 31.5, 63 Hz sound levels are below the level of 65 dB identified for minimal annoyance in ANSI S12.9 Part 4.

5.2.2 Indoor measurements—GE 1.5sle

Simultaneous outdoor and indoor measurements were made at two residences at different locations within the wind farm to determine indoor audibility of low frequency noise from GE 1.5sle WTGs. In each house, measurements were made in a room facing the wind turbines, and were made with a window both open and closed. These residences are designated Homes “B” and “C” and were approximately

305 meters (1,000 feet) from the closest GE WTG. Operational conditions were maximum turbine noise and high ground winds at Home “B”, and within 1.5 dB of maximum turbine noise and high ground level winds at Home “C”. Home “B” was near a string of multiple WTGs, four of which were within 610 meters (2,000 feet) of the house, while Home “C” was at the end of a string of WTGs, two of which were within 610 meters of the house. The sound level data presented herein include contributions from all wind turbines as measured by the recording equipment. The key operational and meteorological parameters during these measurements are listed in Table 13.

The room in Home “B” where interior measurements were made had the following characteristics:




Fig. 11—GE 1.5sle wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to Japan Ministry of Environment rattle criteria.




Fig. 12—GE 1.5sle wind turbine outdoor sound levels at 305 meters compared to ANSI criteria.

approximately 3.0 meters wide (10 feet) by 3.6 meters long (12 feet), bedroom furniture, carpeted flooring, two relatively new double-hung windows (no storm windows), paneling on the interior walls, and bricked exterior walls. The sound level meter was located just off-center in the room. The room in Home “C” where interior measurements were made had the following characteristics: approximately 2.4 meters wide (8 feet) by 3.6 meters long (12 feet), bathroom fixtures, linoleum flooring, one old casement window (no storm window), paneling on the interior walls, and wooden exterior walls. The sound level meter was located in the center of the room.

Figure 13 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “B”, and Fig. 14 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels for Home “C”. The results show that infrasound is inaudible to even the most sensitive people at around 305 meters (1,000 feet) from these wind turbines with the windows open or closed (more than 20 dB below the median thresholds of hearing). Low frequency sound at and above 63 Hz may be audible depending on background sound levels.

Figure 15 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “B”, and Fig. 16 plots the indoor one-third octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “C”. The results show the DEFRA disturbance criteria were met for steady and non-steady low frequency sounds.

Although not shown in Figs. 15 and 16, the one-third octave band levels meet the Japan Ministry of Environment criteria for evaluating complaints of mental and physical discomfort since both samples meet the more stringent DEFRA criteria for “non-steady” sounds, which is more stringent than the Japan criteria.

Figure 17 plots the indoor 16 Hz to 125 Hz octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “B”, and Fig. 18 plots the indoor 16 Hz to 125 Hz octave band sound levels (L_{eq}) for Home “C”. The results show the ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency criteria for perceptible vibration were met for both windows open and closed scenarios. The ANSI/ASA S12.2 low frequency NC-25 and NC-30 criteria for bedrooms, classrooms and hospitals were met,

Table 13—Summary of operational parameters—GE 1.5sle (Indoor).

Parameter	Home “B” (closed/open)	Home “C” (closed/open)
Distance to nearest WTG	290 meters	312 meters
Time of day	09:29-09:39/09:40-09:50	11:49-11:59/12:00-12:10
WTG power output	1,017 kW/896 kW	651 kW/632 kW
A-weighted sound power level	106 dB/105.8 dB	104.7 dB/104.6 dB
Measured wind speed @ 2 m	6.2 m/s/6.8 m/s	6.4 m/s/5.9 m/s
L_{Aeq}	27.1 dB/36.0 dB	33.6 dB/39.8 dB
L_{A90}	23.5 dB/33.7 dB	27.6 dB/34.2 dB
L_{Ceq}	47.1 dB/54.4 dB	50.6 dB/55.1 dB

* Includes K, uncertainty factor of 2 dB




Fig. 13—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 290 meters compared to audibility criteria (Home “B”).

the spectrum was balanced, and the criteria for moderately perceptible vibrations in light-weight walls and ceilings were also met.

5.3 Noise Reduction from Outdoor to Indoor

Simultaneous outdoor and indoor measurements made at the three residences within the Horse Hollow Wind Farm discussed above, were used to determine noise reductions of the homes for comparison to that used in the determination of equivalent outdoor criteria for indoor criteria, such as ANSI/ASA S12.2 and DEFRA. Indoor measurements were made with windows open and closed. Tables 11 and 13 list the conditions of measurement for these houses.

Figures 19 and 20 present the measured one-third octave band noise reduction for the three homes with windows closed and open, respectively. Also presented in these same figures are the one-third octave noise reductions discussed in the Appendix of this paper to obtain equivalent outdoor criteria for the indoor DEFRA criteria as well as the equivalent outdoor criteria for the Japanese mental and physical discomfort indoor criteria. It can be seen that for the window closed condition in Fig. 19, the measured noise reductions for all houses were greater than that used in our analysis for determining the equivalent outdoor criteria for the Japanese mental and physical discomfort indoor criteria. For the open window case in Fig. 20, which




Fig. 14—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 312 meters compared to audibility criteria (Home “C”).




Fig. 15—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 290 meters compared to DEFRA criteria (Home “B”).

was used in our analysis for obtaining the equivalent outdoor DEFRA criteria, the average of the three homes has a greater noise reduction than assumed in the Appendix and all houses at all frequencies have higher values with one minor exception. Only Home “A” at 25 Hz had a lower noise reduction (3 dB), and this difference is not critical since the measured indoor sounds at 25 Hz at each of these home was significantly lower than the indoor DEFRA criteria and the indoor Japanese criteria. Furthermore, the outdoor measurements for both Siemens and GE wind turbines at 305 meters (1,000 feet) under high output/high noise levels met the equivalent outdoor DEFRA criteria at 25 Hz.

Table 14 presents the measured octave band noise reduction for the three homes with windows closed and open, respectively. Also presented in Table 14 are the

octave band noise reductions used in Table 2 of this paper to obtain equivalent outdoor criteria for the indoor ANSI/ASA S12.2 criteria for perceptible vibration and for NC-25 and NC-30. It can be seen that for the window closed condition, the measured noise reductions for all houses were greater than that used in our analysis. For the open window case, the average of the three homes has a greater noise reduction than the values from Table A1, and all houses at all frequencies have higher values with one minor exception. Only Home “A” at 31 Hz (which contains the 25 Hz one-third octave band) had a lower noise reduction (3 dB), and this difference is not critical since the measured indoor sounds at 31 Hz at each of these homes was significantly lower than the indoor ANSI/ASA S12.2 criteria. Furthermore, the outdoor measurements for both Siemens and GE wind




Fig. 16—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 312 meters compared to DEFRA criteria (Home “C”).




Fig. 17—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 290 meters compared to ANSI 12.2 criteria for perceptible vibrations and NC-25 (Home “B”).

turbines at 305 meters (1,000 feet) under high output/high noise levels met the equivalent outdoor ANSI/ASA S12.2 criteria at 31 Hz.

6 CONCLUSION

Sound levels from Siemens SWT 2.93-93 and GE 1.5sle wind turbines under maximum noise conditions at a distance more than 305 meters (1,000 feet) from the nearest residence meet the low frequency and infra-sound standards and criteria published by several independent agencies and organizations. At this distance the wind farms:

- meet ANSI/ASA S12.2 indoor levels for low frequency sound for bedrooms, classrooms and hospitals;
- meet ANSI/ASA S12.2 indoor levels for moderately perceptible vibrations in light-weight walls and ceilings;
- meet ANSI/ASA S12.2 criteria for balanced spectrum from low frequency sounds;
- meet ANSI S12.9/Part 4 thresholds for annoyance from low frequency sound and beginning of rattles;
- meet UK DEFRA disturbance based guidelines for low frequency sound;
- meet Japan Ministry of Environment Guidance for evaluating complaints of rattling from low frequency noise;
- meet Japan Ministry of Environment Guidance for evaluating complaints of mental and physi-




Fig. 18—GE 1.5sle wind turbine indoor sound levels at 312 meters compared to ANSI 12.2 criteria for perceptible vibrations and NC-25 (Home “C”).




Fig. 19—One-third octave band interior noise reduction—Windows closed.




Fig. 20—One-third octave band interior noise reduction—Windows open.

- cal discomfort from low frequency noise; have no audible infrasound to the most sensitive listeners; and
- might have slightly audible low frequency noise at frequencies at 50 Hz and above depending on

other sources of low frequency noises in homes, such as refrigerators or external traffic or airplanes.

In accordance with the above findings, and in conjunction with our extensive literature search of

Table 14—Summary of octave band noise reduction—Interior measurements.

Home	Wind Turbine	Windows	16 Hz	31.5 Hz	63 Hz	125 Hz
A	Siemens SWT-2-3-93	Closed	5	6	16	14
A	Siemens SWT-2-3-93	Open	4	3	12	12
B	GE 1.5sle	Closed	20	22	22	27
B	GE 1.5sle	Open	13	17	18	21
C	GE 1.5sle	Closed	13	14	19	17
C	GE 1.5sle	Open	8	13	17	14
Table A1 Noise Reduction		Open	3	6	9	9

scientific papers and reports, there should be no adverse public health effects from infrasound or low frequency noise at distances greater than 305 meters (1,000 feet) from the wind turbine types measured: GE 1.5sle and Siemens SWT 2.3-93.

7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgement is made to NextEra Energy Resources, LLC (“NextEra”), formerly FPL Energy, for providing financial support for the study, allowing access to the wind farm, and supplying critical operational data. Epsilon determined all means, methods, and the testing protocol without interference or direction from NextEra. No limitations were placed on Epsilon by NextEra with respect to the testing protocol or upon the analysis methods; the conclusions are those of the authors.

8 APPENDIX: HOME NOISE REDUCTION USED TO DETERMINE EQUIVALENT OUTDOOR SOUND PRESSURE LEVEL CRITERIA BASED ON INDOOR CRITERIA

Since indoor measurements are not always possible, for comparison to outdoor sound levels the indoor criteria from ANSI/ASA S12.2 should be adjusted. Outdoor to indoor low frequency noise reductions have been reported by Sutherland for aircraft and highway noise for open and closed windows⁹ and by Hubbard and Shepherd for aircraft and wind turbine noise for closed windows¹⁰. Table A1 presents the average low frequency octave band noise reductions from outdoor to indoors from these two papers for open and closed windows. Sutherland only reported values down to 63 Hz; whereas Hubbard and Shepherd presented values to less than 10 Hz. The closed window conditions of Ref. 10 were used to estimate noise reductions less than 63 Hz by applying the difference between values for open and closed windows from Ref. 9 data at 63 Hz. It should be noted that the attenuation for wind turbines in Ref. 10 is based on only three homes at two different wind farms, whereas the traffic and aircraft data are for many homes. The wind turbine open window values were determined from the wind turbine closed window values by subtracting the difference in values between windows closed and open obtained by Ref. 9.

To be conservative, we use the open window case instead of closed windows except for the adjustments to the Japanese guideline which specifically called for closed windows. To be further conservative, we use the wind turbine noise reduction data in Ref. 10 (adjusted to open windows). However, it should be noted that it is

possible for some homes to have some slight amplification at low frequencies with windows open due to possible room resonances.

The average one-third octave band noise reductions used to determine equivalent outdoor one-third octave band criteria were determined in a similar manner. The first row of Table A2 and Fig. 20 present the average one-third octave band noise reductions values for *windows open* that were used to determine the equivalent outdoor one-third octave band criteria levels in Table 7 from the indoor criteria. The second row of Table A2 and Fig. 19 presents the one-third octave band noise reductions for windows closed determined by Ref. 10 for homes exposed to wind turbine sounds—these higher closed window noise reduction values were only used to determine equivalent outdoor levels for determining the equivalent Japanese guidance one-third octave band sound pressure level values for dealing with complaints of mental and physical discomfort from environmental sounds.

9 REFERENCES

1. “American National Standard Criteria for Evaluating Room Noise”, American National Standards Institute ANSI/ASA S12.2-2008, Acoustical Society of America, (2008).
2. “American National Standard Quantities and Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sound—Part 4: Noise Assessment and Prediction of Long-term Community Response”, American National Standards Institute ANSI S12.9-2005/Part 4, Acoustical Society of America, (2005).
3. “International Electrotechnical Vocabulary—Chapter 801: Acoustics and Electroacoustics”, International Standard IEC 60050-801:1994, International Electrotechnical Commission, (1994).
4. Geoff Leventhall, “A Review of Published Research on Low Frequency Noise and its Effects”, Report for Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs, DEFRA, (2003).
5. H. Moeller and C. S. Pedersen, “Hearing at Low and Infrasonic Frequencies”, *Noise Health*, **6**(23), 37–57, (2004).
6. “Acoustics—Normal equal-loudness-level contours”, International Standard ISO 226:2003, International Organization for Standardization, (2003).
7. T. Watanabe and H. Moeller, “Low Frequency Hearing Thresholds in Pressure Field and in Free Field”, *Low Freq. Noise, Vibr., Act. Control*, **9**(3), 106–115, (1990).
8. “American National Standard Quantities and Procedures for Description and Measurement of Environmental Sound—Part 5: Sound Level Descriptors for Determination of Compatible Land Use”, American National Standards Institute ANSI/ASA S12.9-2007/Part 5, Acoustical Society of America, (2007).
9. L. C. Sutherland, “Indoor Noise Environments Due to Outdoor Noise Sources”, *Noise Control Eng. J.*, **11**(3), 124–137, (1978).
10. Harvey H. Hubbard and Kevin P. Shepherd, “Aeroacoustics of large wind turbines”, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, **89**(6), 2495–2508, (1991).
11. “Guidelines for Community Noise”, Edited by Birgitta Berglund, Thomas Lindvall and Dietrich H. Schwela, World Health Organization, (1999).
12. B. Berglund and T. Lindvall, “Community Noise”, Center for Sensory Research, (1995).
13. Andy Moorhouse, David Waddington and Mags Adams, “Proposed criteria for the assessment of low frequency noise disturbance”, UK Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Af-

- fairs, DEFRA NANR45 Project Report, University of Salford, (2005).
14. Hayes McKenzie Partnership Ltd, "The Measurement of Low Frequency Noise at Three UK Wind Farms", <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file31270.pdf>, UK Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) contract number: W/45/00656/00/00, London, UK, (2006).
 15. Japan Ministry of the Environment, "Handbook to Deal with Low Frequency Noise (2004)", Government of Japan, 2004, available from www.env.go.jp/air/aq/low_noise2004/.
 16. Kenji Kamigawara, "Community Responses to Low Frequency Noise and Administrative Actions in Japan", *InterNoise03*, (2003).
 17. Geoff Leventhall, "Infrasound from Wind Turbines—Fact, Fiction or Deception", *Can. Acoust.*, **34**(2), 29–36 (2006).
 18. Kaj Dam Madsen and Torben Holm Pedersen, "Low Frequency Noise from Large Wind Turbines. Final Report", DELTA, Horsholm, Denmark, EFP-06 Project prepared for Danish Energy Authority, report AV 1272/10, www.delta.dk, (2010).
 19. "Government statement regarding the findings of the Salford University report into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise", <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file40571.pdf>, (2007).
 20. Brian Howe, "Wind Turbines and Infrasound", Prepared for the Canadian Wind Energy Association by Howe Gastmeier Chapnik Limited (HGC Engineering), (2006).
 21. William J. Gastmeier and Brian Howe, "Recent Studies of Infrasound from Industrial Sources", *Can. Acoust.*, **36**(3), 58–59, (2008).
 22. N. A. A. Castelo Branco and M. Alves-Pereira, "Vibroacoustic Disease", *Noise Health*, **6**(23), 3–20, (2004).
 23. Malcolm Hayes, "Low Frequency and Infrasound Noise Immis-
sion from Wind Farms and the potential for Vibro-Acoustic disease", *Second International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise*, (2007).
 24. Malcolm Hayes, "Low Frequency and Infrasound Noise Immis-
sion from Wind Farms and the potential for Vibro-Acoustic disease", *Wind Farm Noise*, www.hayesmckenzie.co.uk, (2008).
 25. "Expert Review of the Vieques Heart Study Summary Report for the Vieques Heart Study Expert Panel Review", <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/news/viequesheartreport.html>, Prepared for The (U. S.) Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, (2001).
 26. "Le retentissement du fonctionnement des éoliennes sur la santé de l'homme" ("Repercussions of wind turbine operations on human health"), <http://ventdubocage.net/documentsoriginaux/sante/eoliennes.pdf>, (2006).
 27. Chantal Gueniot, "Wind Turbines: The Academy Cautious", *Panorama du Médecin*, (2006).
 28. "Impacts sanitaires du bruit généré par les éoliennes" ("The health impacts of noise generated by wind turbines"), Agence Française de sécurité Sanitaire de l'Environnement et du Travail (Agency for Environmental and Occupational Health Safety) (AFSSET), (2008). http://www.afsset.fr/upload/bibliotheque/978899576914371931356311364123/bruit_eoliennes_vdef.pdf.
 29. *Wind Turbines—Part 14: Declaration of apparent sound power level and tonality values*, International Standard IEC TS 61400-14:2005, International Electrotechnical Commission, (2005).
 30. *American National Standard Specification for Sound Level Meters*, American National Standards Institute ANSI S1.4-1983, (1983).