
APPENDIX C
PIC Information

March 22, 2010
Public Information Centre

Sign-In Sheet



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
21	Tony Ferraro		
22	June M. Connell		
23	Ch. Lawrence		
24	L. KELLY		
25	F. HAN		
26	Don Easter		
27	ALAN AVERY		
28	B. Selus		
29	STAN FEQUON		
30	Ken Wright		
31	Carol Labelle		
32	Margie Labelle		
33	Cathy Ely		
34	Wade Brown		
35	Chris Ely		
36	William M. Lettier		
37	SOPHIE JONES		
38	PETER JONES		
39	Lois Walker		
40			



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
1	SIANA PARRILL		
2	Bud Wilson		
3	Bill Clate		
4	Heck Wood		
5	Kyla Jansen		
6	Leah Bowesma		
7	Martina White		
8	Perry Kowalace		
9	R. Rickard		
10	M. Moffatt		
11	Edmund Hagan		
12	Ed. Hen		
13	WILSON ATUONIE		
14	Cherif Omiké Atuonie		
15	Elisabeth Mall		
16	Bruce Keefe		
17	Chaplene Macdonald		
18	KUSS Bond		
19			
20			



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
1	Ellen + Dawn Leonard		
2	Larry Stearn		
3	Alex McQuinn		
4	Fred Roy		
5	John Lacey		
6	John Lacey		
7	Frank Best		
8	Perry Best		
9	Roger Wilson		
10	Don Abbott		
11	Godfrey Cranston		
12	A. Hall		
13	Mark Anderson		
14	BRIAN BRADAMS		
15	Rose Marie Martin		
16	Ron Tester		
17	Michelle		
18	Doug Hone		
19	Brad Wilkin		
20			

C. ARBITRARY
C. SHIMMER TOWER
100.7 FM THE ISLAND



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	
21	J.H. Turner	
22	Chris Bell	
23	Emily Weber	
24	Lynnda Lee	
25	William Lee	
26	Lee Spang	
27	Michael Spang	
28	V. Mazzoni	
29	Bruce & Carol	
30	Dean & Darlene L.	
31	W. Kochler	
32	G. Green	
33	Brid Bond	
34	John Streethead	
35	Doeg Waksinić	
36	Sharon McFarlane	
37	Lane McFarlane	
38	Barb Lawrence	
39	Mae + Jac. Dakin	
40		



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
1	Craig & KT Timmermans		
2	M. Gauthier		
3	Kyle Keltner		
4	Howard Cohen		
5	P. Salanki		
6	Wayne Coley		
7	Abie Hughes		
8	Paul Higgins		
9	Bruce in Rod		
10	Petra Will		
11	Guy NIELSEN		
12	Maia Nielson		
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			



NORTHLAND POWER


**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
1	Lizyone Cook		
2	John W. Gys		
3	Harold Simon		
4	Mel Madaleno		
5	Mel Madaleno		
6	Dennis		
7	David		
8	Jim Stringer		
9	Ernest Lewis		
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			



NORTHLAND POWER

**McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Project
Public Information Centre
March 22, 2010
Sign-in Sheet**

	Name (please print)	Address	E-mail Address
1	Patti Beaudry		
2	Chris Beaudry		
3	RAYMOND BEAUDRY		
4	Carol Deppard		
5	Carl Anault		
6	Kerrena Delsien		
7	Dill Studzieny		
8	Alexander Mc Gillivray		
9	in Sound		
10			
11	M. Sater		
12	W. J. Wankem		
13	Sid & Mary Coen		
14	Ken Lippold		
15	K. Bingham		
16	AWI WILKIN		
17	Patti WILKIN		
18	GORD BICKELL		
19			
20			

Handout Materials



Welcome to the
McLean's Mountain Wind
Farm Project

Public Information Centre

Municipality of NEMI/Traditional Territory of
Manitoulin First Nations

March 22, 2010

7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.

Welcome to our Public Information Centre

- **The purpose of this information centre is to:**
 - ✓ Introduce Northland Power as the project proponent
 - ✓ Provide an update on the project
 - ✓ Listen to you
 - ✓ Respond to your questions
- **We welcome an open and courteous dialogue with you regarding the project**



Project Update

- **The project has been in the planning stages for over 7 years – the first PIC was held in 2004**
- **An Environmental Screening Report was completed (July 2009) as part of the former Environmental Assessment process**
- **Some changes made to project layout to accommodate the provincial setback requirements**
- **The proposed project now subject to Ontario Regulation 359/09 – Renewable Energy Approval under the *Green Energy Act***
 - ✓ Draft REA package was released for 60 day public review in January 2010
 - ✓ Final REA package to be submitted to MOE in April 2010



Ontario Regulation 359/09 Renewable Energy Approval

- **Renewable Energy Approval process replaces the previous process that required several separate approvals including the *Environmental Assessment Act, Planning Act and Environmental Protection Act***
- **The Renewable Energy Approval requires:**
 - ✓ Meeting specific turbine setbacks (minimum distances from noise receptors, roads, water bodies, etc)
 - ✓ Comprehensive consultation requirements
 - ✓ Technical study reports



About Northland Power

- ✓ **Canadian owned company based in Ontario**
- ✓ **Has been active in the development and operation of electrical generation facilities in Northern Ontario for 20 years**
- ✓ **Construction of a 54 MW wind farm on Miller Mountain and a 127.5 MW wind farm in St. Ulric, both projects in the Gaspé Peninsula of Quebec**
- ✓ **2,000 MW of other opportunities across Canada in early stages of development**



Project Description

- **Construction of approximately 43 1.8 MW wind turbines**
- **Total generation capacity of about 77 MW of electricity.**
- **Wind farm infrastructure to include:**
 - ✓ A115 kV Electrical transmission line to connect the project to the provincial grid at Goat Island (with underwater crossing of North Channel)
 - ✓ Substation (to step up the electric output from 34 kV to 115 kV)
 - ✓ Wind turbine access roads
 - ✓ Overhead and underground electrical collection system
 - ✓ Temporary staging areas for the erection of wind turbines
 - ✓ Meteorological towers (4) already installed and operating
- **Project studies covered an area of over 20,000 acres – leased lands cover an area of about 6,500 acres**
- **The Project will require about 50 acres of land for the turbines plus about 150 acres for access roads**
- **First Nation lands, including the ceremonial lands of Sheguiandah First Nation, are not included**
- **Unopened road allowances adjacent to First Nation lands are not included**

Project Communications & Consultation

- **Northland Power has conducted communications and consultation activities with:**
 - ✓ Provincial agencies
 - ✓ Local landowners
 - ✓ NEMI
 - ✓ Local interest groups
- **Northland Power has engaged in communications and conversations with individual aboriginal people and communities that have an interest in the project**
- **Northland Power is committed to continuing its consultation activities as the project moves from the planning stage to implementation**
- **There will be additional public review and comment opportunities during the MOE review and approval process**

Proposed Wind Turbine

- **A Vestas machine model V-90**
- **Rated at 1.8 MW**
- **Gearbox turbine**
- **Three (3) blade up wind horizontal axis**
- **Tubular steel tower with a rotor diameter of 90 meters**
- **Blade Length 45 meters**
- **Pitch control – optimizes power generation**
- **Computer controlled microprocessor-based monitoring and control of all turbine functions**
- **Lighting in accordance with Transport Canada regulations**
- **Typical life span – over 20 years**



Local Economic Benefits

Construction Employment Opportunities

- ✓ Project will require an investment of about \$220 million
- ✓ Northland Power will endeavor maximize the dollars that are spent in the community
- ✓ About 140 people employed during the construction phase
- ✓ The project construction contractor is required to hire union labour
- ✓ Non-union employment positions will also be available
- ✓ Northland Power will hold a future job fair in the community
- ✓ Economic opportunities for local suppliers, hotels, restaurants and other service providers



Local Economic Benefits

- **20-year Operational Phase:**
 - ✓ 7 -10 full time employees (operators, technicians, mechanics)
 - ✓ Sub-contractor services (e.g. road maintenance)
 - ✓ Local maintenance and spare parts centre
- **Tax Revenue:**
 - ✓ Approximately \$100K/year - based on the generator capacity and provincial tax formula
 - ✓ Generated through construction permits and approvals
 - ✓ Additional annual funding for betterment of the Municipality
 - ✓ 20-year project cash-flow
- **Annual community fund for local projects**

Birds and Bats

Birds

- Bird field surveys June 2004 and October 2009, covering all seasons
- Significant impacts are not expected
- Additional pre-construction surveys are planned for June 2010 as per MNR request
- Mitigation measures will include no vegetation clearing during breeding season (May 9th –July 23rd) and buffering of sensitive natural features



Bats

- Pre-construction bat surveys were conducted during July and September of 2008 and August of 2009
- Based on the monitoring results, the proposed project is located in an area of relatively low bat activity
- 2 years of post-construction bat mortality monitoring will occur



Mitigation Measures

Key Mitigation Measures

- **Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was developed for all phases of the proposed project:**
 - ✓ Protect environmentally sensitive areas
 - ✓ Respect required setbacks from natural and sensitive features
 - ✓ Sediment and erosion control measures, such as silt fencing and revegetation to be used during construction
 - ✓ Water crossings to be constructed when dry as much as possible
Watercourse crossings in accordance with DFO and MNR practices
 - ✓ Mitigate and/or replace impacted fish habitat



Key monitoring activities:

- ✓ Site rehabilitation measures will be monitored
- ✓ Post-construction surveys will include mortality monitoring and breeding surveys to assess displacement of sensitive open country and forest species
- ✓ Environment Canada and MNR to be consulted for further mitigative actions



Visual Simulation

Visual Simulation - McLean's Mt - Site 2



Prepared By:



Location of Visual Simulation:	Southwest Corner of North Chanel Dr and Boozeneck Rd
Coordinates (UTM NAD 83, Zone 17N):	427256, 5092108
Direction of View (With respect to North):	198.5
Closest Visible Turbine ID:	1
Distance:	2870m

Visual Simulation



Visual Simulation - McLean's Mt - Site 5



Visual Simulation



Original Photo



Wireframe

Prepared By:





Location of Visual Simulation:

Town Line at Bass Lake

Coordinates (UTM NAD 83, Zone 17N):	425321, 5083014
Direction of View (With respect to North):	337.0
Closest Visible Turbine ID:	30
Distance:	1950m

Visual Simulation

Visual Simulation - McLean's Mt - Site 6



Prepared By:



Location of Visual Simulation: Hwy 6 at Municipal Dump Entrance

Coordinates (UTM NAD 83, Zone 17N):	429518, 5088517
Direction of View (With respect to North):	223.0
Closest Visible Turbine ID:	9
Distance:	2570m

Noise Levels

- **MOE noise restriction limit of 40 dBA will be met for all recognized noise receptors**
- **The wind turbine layout has been designed to meet MOE noise guidelines, as outlined in the *“Interpretations for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators”***
- **Sound modelling assumes receptors to be downwind of all surrounding turbines**

Health Effects of Noise

- NPI is aware of the community's health concerns
- There are reports of residents expressing “annoyance” by other operating wind turbines
- The December 2009 “Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects, An Expert Panel Review”, concludes:
 - *“There is nothing unique about sounds and vibrations emitted by wind turbines”*
 - *The body of accumulated knowledge about sound and health is substantial*
 - *The body of accumulated knowledge provides no evidence that the audible or sub-audible sounds emitted by wind turbines have any direct adverse physiological effects”*

Health Effects of Noise

- Ontario's Chief Medical Officer of Health, Dr. Arlene King, stated in an October 2009 memorandum to Medical Officers of Health and Environmental Health Directors throughout Ontario:
 - *"... there is no scientific evidence, to date, to demonstrate a causal association between wind turbine noise and adverse health effects."*
- Chatham-Kent's Acting Medical Officer of Health, Dr. David Colby:
 - *"In summary, as long as the MOE Guidelines for location criteria of wind farms are followed, it is my opinion that there will be negligible adverse health impacts on Chatham-Kent citizens. Although opposition to wind farms on aesthetic grounds is a legitimate point of view, opposition to wind farms on the basis of potential adverse health consequences is not justified by the evidence."*
- The Province has committed to establish a research chair in Renewable Energy Technologies & Health

Property Values

- NPI has consulted with Ms. Dale Godfrey, a “Realtor of Record” for the Godfrey Group Inc. regarding property values near the Prince Wind Farm in the community of Goulais River north of Sault Ste. Marie
- Ms Godfrey indicated that:


“It has not affected the value of any properties that I am aware of, and I sell a lot of the real estate in the Goulais area.

As a matter of fact, I sold 200 acres of vacant land directly under the turbines, on Thielman Road, and the buyers are planning on building a new home on the property, and have no concern about the wind farm.”



Property Values

- A just released property value study for the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, which is home to a large number of wind turbines was conducted by two independent consultants both of whom are certified property value appraisers:
 - ✓ In the study area, where wind farms were clearly visible, there was no empirical evidence to indicate that rural residential properties realized lower sale prices than similar residential properties within the same area that were outside of the viewshed of a wind turbine.
 - ✓ No statistical inference to demonstrate that wind farms negatively affect residential market values in Chatham-Kent was apparent in this analysis. Furthermore, this study did not find any consistent evidence from the analyzed data that such a negative correlation exists. During the course of gathering data, there were no unusual quantities of rural residential properties listed for sale in the study area.



NPI Commitments

- **To keep the community informed of its future project activities through local media**
- **To develop the project in a manner that will minimize impacts on the environment – the Environmental Management Plan will be followed**
- **To conduct 2 year post construction avian surveys and respond/mitigate if necessary**
- **Respond to reported concerns regarding the operation of the facility**
- **To follow the Project Decommissioning Plan at time of project decommissioning**

Next Steps

- **Northland Power intends to submit the wind farm layout as presented to the MOE for approval**
- **Renewable Energy Approval application to be submitted to the MOE in April**
- **Obtain a contract for the sale of electricity with the Ontario Power Authority through the Province's Feed-In-Tariff program.**
- **Conduct Stage II Archaeological Assessment for select portions of the project area prior to construction**
- **Construction could start as early as August 2010 – pending Provincial approvals and permits**



Thank You!

- **We would like to hear from you! Your input is important to us.**
- **For your input to be considered as part of the approval application to the MOE, please provide your comments by April 29, 2010.**

**If you have any questions or comments,
please fill out a questionnaire or contact:**

Rick Martin, Project Manager

Northland Power Inc. Little Current Office

McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Office

P.O. Box 73

Little Current ON, P0P 1K0

Tel: (705)271-5358 cell

(705)368-0303 Manitoulin Island Office

E-mail: ***rickmartin@northlandpower.ca***




McLean's Mountain Wind Farm REA Constraints

Legend


- Turbine
- Residence
- Substation
- Building
- Unknown Large Stick Nest
- Secondary Roads
- Highway
- Proposed Transmission Line (115kv)
- Watercourse
- Lots
- ANSI
- Pit or Quarry
- Waterbody
- Wetland
- Woodlots

REA Constraints

- 30m Watercourse Setback
- 120m River/Stream Setback
- 55m Non Participating Lot Setback
- 55m Road Setback
- 120m Wetlands Setback*
- 120m Life Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) Setback
- 550m Noise Receptor Setback




















Notes:
 The wind farm layout is draft and subject to revision based on input received from government agencies, Aboriginal communities, landowners and the public.
 * All wetlands are assumed to be Provincially Significant




McLean's Mountain Wind Farm Turbine Locations


Legend

-  Turbine
-  Residence
-  Substation
-  Building
-  Feeder Lines
-  Access Roads
-  Upgraded Roads
-  Secondary Roads
-  Highway
-  Proposed Transmission Line (115kv)
-  Watercourse
-  Lots
-  Pit or Quarry
-  Waterbody
-  Wetland
-  Woodlots



Notes:
 The wind farm layout is draft and subject to revision based on input received from government agencies, Aboriginal communities, landowners and the public.
 * All wetlands are assumed to be Provincially Significant





Responding to Concerns about Wind Energy

Prepared by:

**The Canadian Wind Energy Association
(CanWEA)**

January 2009



canwea

CANADIAN WIND
ENERGY ASSOCIATION

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE
DE L'ÉNERGIE ÉOLIENNE

Addressing concerns about wind energy

- **The wind industry takes these very seriously:**
 - It is natural that people will ask questions about a technology that is relatively new to the social and political landscape
 - The industry welcomes an open discussion on wind and we encourage the public to get the facts on wind
 - As an industry, our responsibility is to provide answers to any questions raised on the basis of factual, independent, peer-reviewed knowledge
 - During the discussion, it is very important to distinguish between:
 - Peer-reviewed studies that are subject to rigorous review and criticism through a formal process involving experts in relevant fields, and;
 - Speculation that represents one or more individuals' *opinions*
 - The former holds more weight than the latter

Addressing concerns around wind

- **About this presentation:**
 - Provides answers to some common questions and concerns raised about wind energy (one issue per slide)
 - Provides references for further reading on each issue (see reference section at end)
- **Other useful resources:**
 - Detailed “CanWEA Papers” addressing areas of particular concern: a) Sound from Wind Turbines, and b) Wind and Human Health
 - CanWEA website:
 - www.canwea.ca
 - CanWEA Fact Sheets:
 - canwea.com/wind-energy/windfacts_e.php
 - CanWEA Case Studies on wind projects across Canada:
 - www.canwea.ca/municipalities/municipalities_casestudies_e.php

Addressing concerns around wind

- **The issues:**

- Sound from wind turbines
- Wind turbines and human health
- Impacts on birds
- Impacts on bats
- Impacts on property values
- Impacts on agricultural practices
- Visual effects
- Safety
- Interference with radar and telecommunications
- Turbine lighting
- Shadow flicker
- Stray voltage
- The reliability of wind-generated electricity
- Emission reductions from wind energy
- The economics of wind energy

Sound from wind turbines

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Turbines emit a horrendous noise that makes it impossible to live anywhere near them”
- **What we know:**
 - Wind turbines do produce sound (“swoosh” of blades)
 - Actual sound level is influenced by many factors including the type of turbine, wind speed and surrounding topography
 - Sound is often masked by surrounding environment (e.g. rustling leaves)
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - All projects must meet regulatory requirements for sound
 - CanWEA Best Practices based on acceptable sound outside dwelling: 40 dBA at 4 m/s rising to 53 dBA at 11 m/s
 - Acceptable separation distances for sound are generally 300 to 600 m; at these distances, sound from the wind turbines is similar to a whisper
 - Encourage those with concerns to visit an actual wind farm: “Hearing is believing”

Wind turbines and human health

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines can have a negative impact on human health”
- **What we know:**
 - Wind turbines do not produce infrasound at a level that is detectable by humans or that has been shown to have any impacts on health
 - Tens of thousands of people in North America live and work in proximity to wind turbines – very few have claimed that their health has been negatively impacted
 - All peer-reviewed scientific literature has found no evidence linking wind turbines to human health concerns
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Insist that debate considers peer-reviewed evidence rather than assertions that do not have a valid scientific foundation
 - Refer to independent, peer-reviewed studies by experts who specialize in low frequency sound and related human health impacts

Impacts on birds

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines are a major threat to local and migratory birds”
- **What we know:**
 - Wind turbines can potentially have impacts on birds through collisions and habitat disruption – average is < 2 bird kills per year per turbine
 - Impact is much less than that of buildings, house cats or the climatic changes that are impacting many bird habitats
 - For these reasons, the National Audubon Society has stated that it “strongly supports wind power as a clean alternative energy source that reduces the threat of global warming”
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - The key is proper windfarm siting and understanding avian behaviour
 - All wind farms have to undergo an environmental assessment (at the provincial and, in some cases, federal levels) - these ensure that any potential impacts are minimised

Impacts on bats

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines are a major threat to bats”
- **What we know:**
 - Wind industry sponsored a recent study that looked into high number of observed migratory bat fatalities at one windfarm in Alberta
 - This study indicated that bats may suffer from *barotrauma* when flying through low pressure areas in a wind turbine’s wake
 - Higher than normal number of fatalities have been seen at two windfarms in North America – elsewhere, bat fatalities are very low
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Mitigation strategies can greatly reduce impacts – one study showed a 52% reduction in bat fatalities when the cut-in wind speed of the turbines was increased
 - Wind industry a part of the Bat and Wind Energy Cooperative that is pursuing research on bat behaviour and mitigation techniques

Property Values

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines will reduce the value of nearby homes”
- **What we know:**
 - Comprehensive study by Renewable Energy Policy Project (REPP) looked at results of property value impacts of many wind farms across the United States. It concluded that there was *“no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms [...] for the great majority of projects the property values actually rose more quickly in the view shed than they did in the comparable community. Moreover, values increased faster in the view shed after the projects came online than they did before.”*
 - In some cases, local impacts of increased tourism and economic stimulus from windfarms can actually drive up property values
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - CanWEA undertaking a project of similar scope looking at Canadian installations

Impacts on agricultural practices

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines interfere with crop dusters and otherwise disrupt how farmers use their land”
- **What we know:**
 - Turbines occupy less than 4% of the land, leaving the rest for traditional uses (growing crops, raising cattle etc.)
 - Income from turbines helps support farmers – this is why wind is supported by several agriculture federations in the U.S. and Canada
 - Crop dusters are able to operate in and around wind farms with little difficulty, as has been demonstrated at several Canadian windfarms
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Encourage wind developers to act proactively with farmers and crop dusters to facilitate crop dusting when and where appropriate
 - Provide case studies that show how windfarms serve to diversify and boost landowner incomes

Visual impacts

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines will be a blight on the landscape”
- **What we know:**
 - “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder” – this is an aesthetic issue
 - Early consultation and engagement are key – concerns are often tied to concerns around other issues (e.g. sound, property value etc.)
 - There are many tools available to assist a developer and community in designing a wind farm to minimize visual impacts, and preserve viewscapes of importance to the community
 - Surveys show that community acceptance of windfarms actually increases once the windfarm has been built
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Encourage early and frequent consultations between developers and communities using tools to assist visualisation
 - Encourage those with concerns to visit existing windfarms and talk with leaders in those communities

Safety

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Turbines represent a hazard due to ice shedding and blade loss”
- **What we know:**
 - When ice builds up on a blade, the efficiency of the blade drops considerably – the turbine’s control system detects this and shuts down the turbine until the ice melts or drops to the base of the turbine
 - Some accidents have occurred with older turbines when proper maintenance procedures were not followed
 - It is extremely rare for a blade (or fragment) to be shed from a turbine
 - If a blade does fail (most often from a lightning strike), it is designed to remain attached while the turbine shuts down
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Ensure that proper maintenance procedures are carried out on the turbines at regular intervals (blade inspection, system checks)
 - CanWEA recommends setbacks from roads and public access areas of blade length + 10 metres

Interference with radar and telecom

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind turbines interfere with radar systems and television reception”
- **What we know:**
 - In certain circumstances, wind turbines can negatively affect radio, telecom, radar or seismoacoustic systems within a certain distance
 - Must consult at an early stage with relevant authorities to ensure that any potential impacts are either avoided or mitigated
 - Experience in Europe and U.S. has shown that wind turbines can easily and safely coexist with all types of radar and radio installations
 - Very few documented cases of interference with television or telephones
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - CanWEA and the Radio Advisory Board of Canada (RABC) issued guidelines to help determine early in the process if a potential site may interfere with any of these installations
 - Mitigation measures can be effective if interference occurs

Turbine Lighting

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “There will be lots of lights on the turbines, blinking incessantly and ruining the view”
- **What we know:**
 - As with all tall structures, turbines must be properly lit according to Transport Canada standards
 - Lighting has to a) provide sufficient warning to pilots, b) not attract birds, c) not hinder night sky viewing and d) not be a visual nuisance
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - CanWEA worked with Transport Canada and others - pilots association, Canadian Wildlife Service, skywatcher groups - to develop standard that addressed wide range of concerns
 - Result was CAR 621.19 Standard that requires red flashing lights spaced at least every 900 metres on turbines around the perimeter of the windfarm
 - System ensures pilot safety, minimal bird impacts and minimal impacts on stargazers, while remaining unobtrusive for communities

Shadow Flicker

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “The sun flashing through the rotating blades will act like a strobe light and cause a disturbance in nearby houses”
- **What we know:**
 - Turbines rotate at 16-18 revolutions per minute so flashes only occur once per second for a three-blade turbine – it is not a “strobe light”
 - Effect occurs only when a) sun is low enough, b) the turbine shadow falls on a residence, and c) it is not cloudy
 - Easily modeled as part of the wind farm siting process
 - No evidence that this has any health impact on humans or animals
 - No guidelines currently in place in Canada, but common practice follows German model that allows for 30 hours of incidence per year under real conditions
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Promote awareness of issue and encourage consultations between promoters and adjacent landowners

Stray voltage

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Stray voltage from the windfarm will affect my equipment & appliances and adversely impact my livestock”
- **What we know:**
 - Most cases of “stray voltage” occur when there is either:
 - **Improper grounding of on-site equipment (in which case it is an issue with on-site wiring) or;**
 - **A change in current patterns on the distribution line, from generation or load, that exposes a preexisting condition (in which case it is an issue with the distribution utility, not with the generator or load)**
 - The turbines are therefore not the root of the problem, but if they are visible they may be mistaken as the reason that the problem occurs
 - Turbines must fully comply with utility requirements to ensure that the electricity they supply is compliant with grid standards
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Requires on-site inspection for grounding problems, or examination of power quality issues with distribution utility

Reliability

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind energy is an intermittent energy source that we cannot count on as part of a reliable electricity system”
- **What we know:**
 - Wide geographic dispersal of wind farms, along with good wind forecasting, smoothes fluctuations and makes it easier to integrate wind
 - In most cases, variations in the wind-generated supply are smaller than those in the demand for electricity
 - Wind works well as part of an integrated electricity grid, particularly if it has substantial hydroelectric generation
 - Wind farms must adhere to strict “grid codes” that ensure they contribute to overall grid stability and reliability
 - Consensus: we can integrate at least 20% without significant impacts
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Work with utilities on grid codes and wind integration techniques
 - Sharing utility experience and knowledge gained from grid integration studies in Canada and the U.S.

Emission reductions from wind

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind requires an equal amount of fossil fuel backup power so it doesn’t do anything to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions”
- **What we know:**
 - Wind has been shown to provide reliable power with small ancillary service requirements (i.e. “backup power” sources including spinning reserve and regulation reserve)
 - Presence of wind on the grid means that utilities can avoid use of “marginal generation” sources such as gas or coal
 - The GHG emissions incurred in construction of a turbine are offset after only 6 months of the turbine’s operation
 - The International Energy Agency concluded in 2008 that a “huge investment “in wind energy would be required over the next 10 to 20 years to meet the IPCC’s call for a 50 percent GHG reduction by 2050
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Key is to understanding how electricity systems operate and how wind “backs out” need for thermal generation

Economics

- **What concerns are raised:**
 - “Wind energy is much more expensive than other generation sources”
 - “Wind energy receives undue subsidies from government”
- **What we know:**
 - Current prices range from 8 to 11 cents / kWh for large wind projects - already cost-competitive with some conventional generation sources
 - Costs of environmental and health impacts of conventional technologies are not factored into price – this results in an uneven playing field
 - Incentives for wind (e.g. ecoEnergy) help to level the playing field as markets for environmental attributes (e.g. carbon markets) emerge
 - Other economic benefits linked to long-term cost trends (wind costs are decreasing) and cost certainty (a wind project’s generation costs do not fluctuate with changes in fuel prices)
- **How we address these concerns:**
 - Encourage putting a value on wind’s environmental attributes (e.g. generation of offset credits)
 - Providing info on current wind project pricing

Summary

- **Concerns (and misperceptions) are inevitable**
 - Relatively new technology to the landscape
 - In absence of facts, misperceptions grow easily
- **Debate on wind is a good thing**
 - Need to base decisions on solid, peer-reviewed facts
 - In many cases, the real concern is hidden (e.g. visual impact concerns often stem from worries around property value)
 - Open communications can resolve many issues
- **Concerns often linked to “getting used to wind”**
 - Familiarity breeds comfort – surveys attest to this fact
- **Industry’s responsibility**
 - CanWEA and members working to establish sound basis for debate, and create effective communications tools

References

- **Audible sound**

- “Wind Turbines and Sound: Review and Best Practice Guidelines”, HGC Engineering, February 2007 - http://www.canwea.ca/Environmental_Issues.cfm
- CanWEA Fact Sheet: “Visual and sound - The sights and sounds of wind” http://www.canwea.ca/Fact_Sheets_eng.cfm
- For detailed information, see *CanWEA Paper: Addressing concerns about sound*

References

- **Wind turbines and human health**

- “Infrasound from Wind Turbines – Fact, Fiction or Deception?”
Geoff Leventhall, Vol. 34 No.2 (2006) Canadian Acoustics
www.wind.appstate.edu/reports/06-06Leventhall-Infras-WT-CanAcoustics2.pdf
- “Health impact of wind turbines”, Municipality of Chatham-Kent Health Unit. <http://www.chatham-kent.ca/NR/rdonlyres/CA6E8804-D6FF-42A5-B93B-5229FA127875/7046/5a.pdf>
- “*Research into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise*”, University of Salford, UK, July 2007
http://usir.salford.ac.uk/1554/1/Salford_Uni_Report_Turbine_Sound.pdf
- For a complete list of references: see *CanWEA Paper: Addressing concerns about wind turbines and health*

References

- **Impacts on birds and bats**

- “Wind Turbines and Birds: A Guidance Document for Environmental Assessment - Final Document and Recommended Protocols for Monitoring Impacts of Wind Turbines on Birds”, Canadian Wildlife Service,
http://www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/publications/eval/index_e.cfm
- “Minimal effects of wind turbines on the distribution of farmland birds”, Claire Devereaux et al, Journal of Applied Ecology, 2008
<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/press.office/press.release/content.phtml?ref=1222791170>
- CanWEA Fact Sheet: Wildlife: Birds, bats and wind energy
http://www.canwea.ca/Fact_Sheets_eng.cfm

References

- **Property Values:**

- “The Impact of Wind Facilities on Residential Property Values: What We Know And What We Don’t Know”, *Preliminary Results*. Ben Hoen & Ryan Wiser, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory www.energywv.org/101408HoenWiser.pdf
- “The Effect Of Wind Development On Local Property Values“ Renewable Energy Policy Project, May 2003 - http://www.crest.org/articles/static/1/binaries/wind_online_final.pdf

- **Safety:**

- “Recommendations for Risk Assessments of Ice Throw and Blade Failure in Ontario”, Garrad Hassan, May 2007 [http://canwea.com/images/uploads/File/GH-RiskAssessment-38079or01a\(1\).pdf](http://canwea.com/images/uploads/File/GH-RiskAssessment-38079or01a(1).pdf)

References

- **Interference with telecommunications**

- “Technical Information on the Assessment of the Potential Impact of Wind Turbines on Radio Communication, Radar and Seismoacoustic Systems”, Radio Advisory Board of Canada (RABC) and CanWEA, April 2007

http://www.canwea.ca/Standards_and_Technical.cfm

- **Lighting**

- “Obstruction Marking and Lighting Standards”, Standard CAR 621.19, Transport Canada , Chapter 12: Wind Turbines and Wind Turbine Farms. Contact Eduard Alf : eduard.alf@tc.gc.ca

- **Shadow flicker**

- Overview of shadow flicker and relevant standards:

<http://www.windpower.org/en/tour/env/shadow/index.htm>

References

- **Reliability:**

- "Utility Wind Integration and Operating Impact State of the Art," IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, Vol. 22, No. 3, August 2007, <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy07osti/41329.pdf>
- Analysis of the Impacts of Large-Scale Wind Generation on the Ontario Electricity System, April 2005; http://www.uwig.org/IESO_Study_final_document1.pdf
- For a listing of utility wind integration studies prepared by the Utility Wind Interest Group (UWIG): <http://www.uwig.org/opimpactsdocs.html>
- See CanWEA WindVision 2025 Backgrounder: Section 8 - *Wind Energy is a Reliable Source of Energy* canwea.com/images/uploads/File/Windvision_backgrounder_e.pdf

References

- **Emission reductions:**

- See CanWEA WindVision 2025 Backgrounder: Section 3 - *Wind Energy and Climate Change*

canwea.com/images/uploads/File/Windvision_backgrounder_e.pdf

- **Economics:**

- See CanWEA WindVision 2025 Backgrounder: Section 2 - *Wind Energy is Cost-Competitive*

canwea.com/images/uploads/File/Windvision_backgrounder_e.pdf

Wind Turbine Sound and Health Effects An Expert Panel Review

Prepared by (in alphabetical order):

W. David Colby, M.D.

Robert Dobie, M.D.

Geoff Leventhall, Ph.D.

David M. Lipscomb, Ph.D.

Robert J. McCunney, M.D.

Michael T. Seilo, Ph.D.

Bo Søndergaard, M.Sc.

Prepared for:

American Wind Energy Association

and

Canadian Wind Energy Association

December 2009

Contents

Section	Page
Executive Summary	ES-1
1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Expert Panelists.....	1-1
1.2 Report Terminology	1-2
2 Methodology	2-1
2.1 Formation of Expert Panel	2-1
2.2 Review of Literature Directly Related to Wind Turbines	2-1
2.3 Review of Potential Environmental Exposures.....	2-1
3 Overview and Discussion	3-1
3.1 Wind Turbine Operation and Human Auditory Response to Sound.....	3-1
3.1.1 Overview	3-1
3.1.2 The Human Ear and Sound	3-2
3.1.3 Sound Produced by Wind Turbines	3-3
3.1.4 Sound Measurement and Audiometric Testing.....	3-5
3.2 Sound Exposure from Wind Turbine Operation	3-6
3.2.1 Infrasound and Low-Frequency Sound	3-6
3.2.2 Vibration.....	3-9
3.2.3 Vestibular System.....	3-11
3.3 Potential Adverse Effects of Exposure to Sound	3-12
3.3.1 Speech Interference	3-12
3.3.2 Noise-Induced Hearing Loss	3-13
3.3.3 Task Interference	3-13
3.3.4 Annoyance.....	3-13
3.3.5 Sleep Disturbance.....	3-13
3.3.6 Other Adverse Health Effects of Sound	3-13
3.3.7 Potential Health Effects of Vibration Exposure	3-14
3.4 Peer-Reviewed Literature Focusing on Wind Turbines, Low-Frequency Sound, and Infrasound	3-15
3.4.1 Evaluation of Annoyance and Dose-Response Relationship of Wind Turbine Sound	3-15
3.4.2 Annoyance.....	3-16
3.4.3 Low-Frequency Sound and Infrasound	3-17
4 Results	4-1
4.1 Infrasound, Low-Frequency Sound, and Annoyance	4-1
4.1.1 Infrasound and Low-Frequency Sound	4-2
4.1.2 Annoyance.....	4-2
4.1.3 Other Aspects of Annoyance	4-3
4.1.4 Nocebo Effect	4-4

Section	Page
4.1.5 Somatoform Disorders	4-4
4.2 Infrasound, Low-frequency Sound and Disease	4-5
4.2.1 Vibroacoustic Disease.....	4-5
4.2.2 High-Frequency Exposure.....	4-6
4.2.3 Residential Exposure: A Case Series	4-6
4.2.4 Critique.....	4-7
4.3 Wind Turbine Syndrome	4-8
4.3.1 Evaluation of Infrasound on the Vestibular System	4-8
4.3.2 Evaluation of Infrasound on Internal organs.....	4-9
4.4 Visceral Vibratory Vestibular Disturbance	4-10
4.4.1 Hypothesis	4-10
4.4.2 Critique.....	4-11
4.5 Interpreting Studies and Reports.....	4-11
4.6 Standards for Siting Wind Turbines.....	4-13
4.6.1 Introduction	4-13
4.6.2 Noise Regulations and Ordinances	4-13
4.6.3 Wind Turbine Siting Guidelines.....	4-13
5 Conclusions.....	5-1
6 References	6-1

Appendices

A	Fundamentals of Sound
B	The Human Ear
C	Measuring Sound
D	Propagation of Sound
E	Expert Panel Members

Tables

1-1	Definitions of Acoustical Terms.....	1-2
3-1	Typical Sound Pressure Levels Measured in the Environment and Industry	3-2
3-2	Hearing Thresholds in the Infrasonic and Low Frequency Range	3-7

Figures

3-1	Sound Produced by Wind Turbine Flow.....	3-4
3-2	Hearing Contours for Equal Loudness Level (ISO:226, 2003)	3-9
3-3	Comparison of Excitation of an Object by Vibration and by Sound.....	3-10
C-1	Weighting Networks	C-2

Acronyms and Abbreviations

μPa	microPascal
ACOEM	American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AWEA	American Wind Energy Association
ASHA	American Speech-Language-Hearing Association
CanWEA	Canadian Wind Energy Association
dB	decibel
dBA	decibel (on an A-weighted scale)
DNL	day-night-level
DSM-IV-TR	<i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition</i>
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FFT	Fast Fourier Transform
GI	gastrointestinal
HPA	Health Protection Agency
Hz	Hertz
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
ICD-10	International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision
IEC	International Engineering Consortium
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
Km	kilometer
kW	kilowatt
L_{eq}	equivalent level
LPALF	large pressure amplitude and low frequency
m/s	meters per second
m/s^2	meters per second squared
NIESH	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
NIHL	noise-induced hearing loss
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
N/m^2	Newtons per square meter
NRC	National Research Council
NTP	National Toxicology Program
ONAC	Office of Noise Abatement and Control
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pa	Pascal
UK	United Kingdom
VAD	vibroacoustic disease
VVVD	vibratory vestibular disturbance
VEMP	vestibular evoked myogenic potential response
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive Summary

People have been harnessing the power of the wind for more than 5,000 years. Initially used widely for farm irrigation and millworks, today's modern wind turbines produce electricity in more than 70 countries. As of the end of 2008, there were approximately 120,800 megawatts of wind energy capacity installed around the world (Global Wind Energy Council, 2009).

Wind energy enjoys considerable public support, but it also has its detractors, who have publicized their concerns that the sounds emitted from wind turbines cause adverse health consequences.

In response to those concerns, the American and Canadian Wind Energy Associations (AWEA and CanWEA) established a scientific advisory panel in early 2009 to conduct a review of current literature available on the issue of perceived health effects of wind turbines. This multidisciplinary panel is comprised of medical doctors, audiologists, and acoustical professionals from the United States, Canada, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. The objective of the panel was to provide an authoritative reference document for legislators, regulators, and anyone who wants to make sense of the conflicting information about wind turbine sound.

The panel undertook extensive review, analysis, and discussion of the large body of peer-reviewed literature on sound and health effects in general, and on sound produced by wind turbines. Each panel member contributed a unique expertise in audiology, acoustics, otolaryngology, occupational/ environmental medicine, or public health. With a diversity of perspectives represented, the panel assessed the plausible biological effects of exposure to wind turbine sound.

Following review, analysis, and discussion of current knowledge, the panel reached consensus on the following conclusions:

- There is no evidence that the audible or sub-audible sounds emitted by wind turbines have any direct adverse physiological effects.
- The ground-borne vibrations from wind turbines are too weak to be detected by, or to affect, humans.
- The sounds emitted by wind turbines are not unique. There is no reason to believe, based on the levels and frequencies of the sounds and the panel's experience with sound exposures in occupational settings, that the sounds from wind turbines could plausibly have direct adverse health consequences.

SECTION 1

Introduction

The mission of the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) is to promote the growth of wind power through advocacy, communication, and education. Similarly, the mission of the Canadian Wind Energy Association (CanWEA) is to promote the responsible and sustainable growth of wind power in Canada. Both organizations wish to take a proactive role in ensuring that wind energy projects are good neighbors to the communities that have embraced wind energy.

Together AWEA and CanWEA proposed to a number of independent groups that they examine the scientific validity of recent reports on the adverse health effects of wind turbine proximity. Such reports have raised public concern about wind turbine exposure. In the absence of declared commitment to such an effort from independent groups, the wind industry decided to be proactive and address the issue itself. In 2009, AWEA and CanWEA commissioned this report. They asked the authors to examine published scientific literature on possible adverse health effects resulting from exposure to wind turbines.

The objective of this report is to address health concerns associated with sounds from industrial-scale wind turbines. Inevitably, a report funded by an industry association will be subject to charges of bias and conflicts of interest. AWEA and CanWEA have minimized bias and conflicts of interest to the greatest possible extent through selection of a distinguished panel of independent experts in acoustics, audiology, medicine, and public health. This report is the result of their efforts.

1.1 Expert Panelists

The experts listed below were asked to investigate and analyze existing literature and publish their findings in this report; their current positions and/or qualifications for inclusion are also provided.

- W. David Colby, M.D.: Chatham-Kent Medical Officer of Health (Acting); Associate Professor, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Western Ontario
- Robert Dobie, M.D.: Clinical Professor, University of Texas, San Antonio; Clinical Professor, University of California, Davis
- Geoff Leventhall, Ph.D.: Consultant in Noise Vibration and Acoustics, UK
- David M. Lipscomb, Ph.D.: President, Correct Service, Inc.
- Robert J. McCunney, M.D.: Research Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Department of Biological Engineering; Staff Physician, Massachusetts General Hospital Pulmonary Division; Harvard Medical School
- Michael T. Seilo, Ph.D.: Professor of Audiology, Western Washington University

- Bo Søndergaard, M.Sc. (Physics): Senior Consultant, Danish Electronics Light and Acoustics (DELTA)

Mark Bastasch, an acoustical engineer with the consulting firm of CH2M HILL, acted as technical advisor to the panel.

1.2 Report Terminology

Certain terms are used frequently throughout this report. Table 1-1 defines these terms. An understanding of the distinction between “sound” and “noise” may be particularly useful to the reader.

TABLE 1-1
Definitions of Acoustical Terms

Term	Definitions
Sound	Describes wave-like variations in air pressure that occur at frequencies that can stimulate receptors in the inner ear and, if sufficiently powerful, be appreciated at a conscious level.
Noise	Implies the presence of sound but also implies a response to sound: noise is often defined as unwanted sound.
Ambient noise level	The composite of noise from all sources near and far. The normal or existing level of environmental noise at a given location.
Decibel (dB)	A unit describing the amplitude of sound, equal to 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the measured pressure to the reference pressure, which is 20 micropascals (μPa).
A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA)	The sound pressure level in decibels as measured on a sound level meter using the A-weighted filter network. The A-weighted filter de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound in a manner similar to the frequency response of the human ear and correlates well with subjective reactions to noise.
Hertz (Hz)	A unit of measurement of frequency; the number of cycles per second of a periodic waveform.
Infrasound	According to the International Electrotechnical Commission's (IEC's) IEC 1994, infrasound is: Acoustic oscillations whose frequency is below the low-frequency limit of audible sound (about 16 Hz). However this definition is incomplete as infrasound at high enough levels is audible at frequencies below 16 Hz. (IEC (1994): 60050-801:1994 International Electrotechnical Vocabulary - Chapter 801: Acoustics and electroacoustics).
Low-frequency sound	Sound in the frequency range that overlaps the higher infrasound frequencies and the lower audible frequencies, and is typically considered as 10 Hz to 200 Hz, but is not closely defined.

Source: HPA, 2009.

Methodology

Three steps form the basis for this report: formation of an expert panel, review of literature directly related to wind turbines, and review of potential environmental exposures.

2.1 Formation of Expert Panel

The American and Canadian wind energy associations, AWEA and CanWEA, assembled a distinguished panel of independent experts to address concerns that the sounds emitted from wind turbines cause adverse health consequences.

The objective of the panel was to provide an authoritative reference document for the use of legislators, regulators, and people simply wanting to make sense of the conflicting information about wind turbine sound.

The panel represented expertise in audiology, acoustics, otolaryngology, occupational/environmental medicine, and public health. A series of conference calls were held among panel members to discuss literature and key health concerns that have been raised about wind turbines. The calls were followed by the development of a draft that was reviewed by other panel members. Throughout the follow-up period, literature was critically addressed.

2.2 Review of Literature Directly Related to Wind Turbines

The panel conducted a search of Pub Med under the heading “Wind Turbines and Health Effects” to research and address peer-reviewed literature. In addition, the panel conducted a search on “vibroacoustic disease.” The reference section identifies the peer and non-peer reviewed sources that were consulted by the panel.

2.3 Review of Potential Environmental Exposures

The panel conducted a review of potential environmental exposures associated with wind turbine operations, with a focus on low frequency sound, infrasound, and vibration.

SECTION 3

Overview and Discussion

This section summarizes the results of the review and analysis conducted by the expert panel and responds to a number of key questions:

- How do wind turbine operations affect human auditory response?
- How do we determine the loudness and frequency of sound and its effects on the human ear?
- How do wind turbines produce sound?
- How is sound measured and tested?
- What is vibration?
- What type of exposure to wind turbines is more likely to be perceived by humans (low frequency sound, infrasound or vibration)?
- Can sounds in the low frequency range, most notably the infrasonic range, adversely affect human health? Even when such levels are below the average person's ability to hear them?
- How does the human vestibular system respond to sound?
- What are the potential adverse effects and health implications of sound exposure?
- What does scientific literature say about wind turbines, low frequency sound, and infrasound?

3.1 Wind Turbine Operation and Human Auditory Response to Sound

3.1.1 Overview

The normal operation of a wind turbine produces sound and vibration, arousing concern about potential health implications. This section addresses the fundamental principles associated with sound and vibration, sound measurement, and potential adverse health implications. Sound from a wind turbine arises from its mechanical operation and the turning of the blades.

3.1.2 The Human Ear and Sound

The human ear is capable of perceiving a wide range of sounds, from the high-pitched sounds of a bird song to the low-pitched sound of a bass guitar. Sounds are perceived based on their loudness (i.e., volume or sound pressure level) or pitch (i.e., tonal or frequency content). The standard unit of measure for sound pressure levels is the decibel (dB). The standard unit used to describe the tonal or frequency content is the Hertz (Hz), measured in cycles per second) – Appendix A provides more information on the fundamentals of sound. Customarily, the young, non-pathological ear can perceive sounds ranging from 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz. Appendix B provides more information on the human ear.

Frequencies below 20 Hz are commonly called “infrasound,” although the boundary between infrasound and low frequency sound is not rigid. Infrasound, at certain frequencies and at high levels, can be audible to some people. Low frequency sound is customarily referred to as that between 10 Hz and 200 Hz, but any definition is arbitrary to some degree. Low frequency sound is the subject of concern to some with respect to potential health implications.

TABLE 3-1
TYPICAL SOUND PRESSURE LEVELS MEASURED IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND
INDUSTRY

Noise Source At a Given Distance	A-Weighted Sound Level in Decibels	Qualitative Description
Carrier deck jet operation	140	
	130	Pain threshold
Jet takeoff (200 feet)	120	
Auto horn (3 feet)	110	Maximum vocal effort
Jet takeoff (1000 feet)	100	
Shout (0.5 feet)		
N.Y. subway station	90	Very annoying
Heavy truck (50 feet)		Hearing damage (8-hour, continuous exposure)
Pneumatic drill (50 feet)	80	Annoying
Freight train (50 feet)	70 to 80	
Freeway traffic (50 feet)		
	70	Intrusive (Telephone use difficult)
Air conditioning unit (20 feet)	60	
Light auto traffic (50 feet)	50	Quiet
Living room	40	
Bedroom		
Library	30	Very quiet
Soft whisper (5 feet)		
Broadcasting/Recording studio	20	
	10	Just audible

Adapted from Table E, “Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts”, NY DEC, February 2001.

Table 3-1 shows sound pressure levels associated with common activities. Typically, environmental and occupational sound pressure levels are measured in decibels on an A-weighted scale (dBA). The A-weighted scale de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequency components of the sound in a manner similar to the frequency response of the human ear. For comparison, the sound from a wind turbine at distances between 1,000 and 2,000 feet is generally within 40 to 50 dBA.

Section 3.2 discusses the effects of exposure to wind turbine sound. Section 3.3 describes the potential adverse effects of sound exposure as well as the health implications.

3.1.3 Sound Produced by Wind Turbines


Wind turbine sound originates from either a mechanical or aerodynamic generation mechanism. Mechanical sound originates from the gearbox and control mechanisms. Standard noise control techniques typically are used to reduce mechanical sound. Mechanical noise is not typically the dominant source of noise from modern wind turbines (except for an occasional gear tone).

The aerodynamic noise is present at all frequencies, from the infrasound range over low frequency sound to the normal audible range and is the dominant source. The aerodynamic noise is generated by several mechanisms as is described below. The aerodynamic noise tends to be modulated in the mid frequency range, approximately 500 to 1,000 Hz.

Aerodynamic sound is produced by the rotation of the turbine blades through the air. A turbine blade shape is that of an airfoil. An airfoil is simply a structure with a shape that produces a lift force when air passes over it. Originally developed for aircraft, airfoil shapes have been adapted to provide the turning force for wind turbines by employing a shape which causes the air to travel more rapidly over the top of the airfoil than below it. The designs optimize efficiency by minimizing turbulence, which produces drag and noise. An aerodynamically efficient blade is a quiet one.

The aerodynamic sound from wind turbines is caused by the interaction of the turbine blade with the turbulence produced both adjacent to it (turbulent boundary layer) and in its near wake (see Figure 3-1) (Brooks et al., 1989). Turbulence depends on how fast the blade is moving through the air. A 100-meter-diameter blade, rotating once every three seconds, has a tip velocity of just over 100 meters per second. However, the speed reduces at positions closer to the centre of rotation (the wind turbine hub). The main determinants of the turbulence are the speed of the blade and the shape and dimensions of its cross-section.

FIGURE 3-1
Sound Produced by Wind Turbine Flow



The following conclusions have been derived from the flow conditions shown in Figure 3-1 (Brooks et al., 1989):

- At high velocities for a given blade, turbulent boundary layers develop over much of the airfoil. Sound is produced when the turbulent boundary layer passes over the trailing edge.
- At lower velocities, mainly laminar boundary layers develop, leading to vortex shedding at the trailing edge.

Other factors in the production of aerodynamic sound include the following:

- When the angle of attack is not zero—in other words, the blade is tilted into the wind—flow separation can occur on the suction side near to the trailing edge, producing sound.
- At high angles of attack, large-scale separation may occur in a stall condition, leading to radiation of low frequency sound.
- A blunt trailing edge leads to vortex shedding and additional sound.
- The tip vortex contains highly turbulent flow.

Each of the above factors may contribute to wind turbine sound production. Measurements of the location of the sound source in wind turbines indicate that the dominant sound is produced along the blade—nearer to the tip end than to the hub. Reduction of turbulence sound can be facilitated through airfoil shape and by good maintenance. For example, surface irregularities resulting from damage or to accretion of additional material, may increase the sound.

Aerodynamic sound has been shown to be generated at higher levels during the downward motion of the blade (i.e., the three o'clock position). This results in a rise in level of approximately once per second for a typical three-bladed turbine. This periodic rise in level is also referred to as amplitude modulation, and as described above for a typical wind turbine, the modulation frequency is 1 Hz (once per second). In other words, the sound level rises and falls about once per second. The origin of this amplitude modulation is not fully understood. It was previously assumed that the modulation was caused when the blade went past the tower (given the tower disturbed the airflow), but it is now thought to be related to the difference in wind speed between the top and bottom of the rotation of a blade and directivity of the aerodynamic noise (Oerlemans and Schepers, 2009).

In other words, the result of aerodynamic modulation is a perceivable fluctuation in the sound level of approximately once per second. The frequency content of this fluctuating sound is typically between 500 Hz and 1,000 Hz, but can occur at higher and lower frequencies. That is, the sound pressure levels between approximately 500 and 1,000 Hz will rise and fall approximately once per second. It should be noted, however, that the magnitude of the amplitude modulation that is observed when standing beneath a tower does not always occur at greater separation distances. A study in the United Kingdom (UK) also showed that only four out of about 130 wind farms had a problem with aerodynamic modulation and three of these have been solved (Moorhouse et al., 2007).

In addition to the sound levels generated by the turbines, environmental factors affect the levels received at more distant locations. For example, warm air near the ground causes the turbine sound to curve upwards, away from the ground, which results in reduced sound levels, while warm air in a temperature inversion may cause the sound to curve down to the earth resulting in increased sound levels. Wind may also cause the sound level to be greater downwind of the turbine – that is, if the wind is blowing from the source towards a receiver – or lower, if the wind is blowing from the receiver to the source. Most modeling techniques, when properly implemented, account for moderate inversions and downwind conditions. Attenuation (reduction) of sound can also be influenced by barriers, ground surface conditions, shrubbery and trees, among other things.

Predictions of the sound level at varying distances from the turbine are based on turbine sound power levels. These turbine sound power levels are determined through standardized measurement methods.

3.1.4 Sound Measurement and Audiometric Testing

A sound level meter is a standard tool used in the measurement of sound pressure levels. As described in Section 3.1.2, the standard unit of sound pressure level (i.e., volume) is dB and the standard unit used to describe the pitch or frequency is Hz (cycles per second). A sound level meter may use the A-weighting filter to adjust certain frequency ranges (those that humans detect poorly), resulting in a reading in dBA (decibels, A-weighted). Appendix C provides more information on the measurement of sound. The pitch or frequencies (sometimes referred to as sound level spectrum) can be quantified using a sound level meter that includes a frequency analyzer. Octave band, one-third octave band, and narrow band (such as Fast Fourier Transform, or FFT) are three common types of frequency analyzers.

Consider, for example, a routine audiometric test (hearing test) in which a person sits in a booth and wears headphones, through which sounds are transmitted to evaluate hearing. Outside the booth, a technician turns a dial which yields certain frequencies (for example, 125 Hz, a low-pitched sound, or 4,000 Hz, a high-pitched sound) and then the technician raises the volume of each frequency until the person recognizes the sound of each tone. This is a standard approach used to measure thresholds for many reasons, including noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL). As the technician raises the volume of the designated frequency, the sound level (in dB) is noted. People who need more than 25 dB at more than one frequency to hear the sound (ie loudness of the tone) are considered to have an abnormal test.

The effects of prolonged, high-level sound exposure on hearing have been determined through audiometric tests of workers in certain occupations. The studies have been published in major medical journals and subjected to the peer review process (see, for example, McCunney and Meyer, 2007). Studies of workers have also served as the scientific basis for regulations on noise in industry that are overseen by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). Workers in noise-intensive industries have been evaluated for NIHL and certain industries are known to be associated with high noise levels, such as aviation, construction, and areas of manufacturing such as canning. Multiyear worker studies suggest that prolonged exposure to high noise levels can adversely affect hearing. The levels considered sufficiently high to cause hearing loss are considerably higher than one could experience in the vicinity of wind turbines. For example, prolonged, unprotected high exposure to noise at levels greater than 90 dBA is a risk for hearing loss in occupational settings such that OSHA established this level for hearing protection. Sound levels from wind turbines do not approach these levels (50 dBA at a distance of 1,500 feet would be a conservative estimate for today's turbines). Although the issue of NIHL has rarely been raised in opposition to wind farms, it is important to note that the risk of NIHL is directly dependent on the intensity (sound level) and duration of noise exposure and therefore it is reasonable to conclude that there is no risk of NIHL from wind turbine sound. Such a conclusion is based on studies of workers exposed to noise and among whom risk of NIHL is not apparent at levels less than 75 dBA.

3.2 Sound Exposure from Wind Turbine Operation

This section addresses the questions of (1) whether sounds in the low frequency range, most notably the infrasonic range, adversely affect human health, and whether they do so even when such levels are below the average person's ability to hear them; (2) what we are referring to when we talk about vibration; and (3) how the human vestibular system responds to sound and disturbance.

3.2.1 Infrasound and Low-Frequency Sound

Infrasound and low frequency sound are addressed in some detail to offer perspective on publicized hypotheses that sound from a wind turbine may damage health even if the noise levels are below those associated with noise-induced hearing loss in industry. For example, it has been proposed that sounds that contain low frequency noise, most notably within the infrasonic level, can adversely affect health even when the levels are below the average person's ability to detect or hear them (Alves-Pereira and Branco, 2007b).

Comprehensive reviews of infrasound and its sources and measurement have been published (Berglund and Lindvall, 1995; Leventhall et al., 2003). Table 3-2 shows the sound pressure level, in decibels, of the corresponding frequency of infrasound and low frequency sound necessary for the sound to be heard by the average person (Leventhall et al., 2003).

TABLE 3-2
Hearing Thresholds in the Infrasonic and Low Frequency Range

Frequency (Hz)	4	8	10	16	20	25	40	50	80	100	125	160	200
Sound pressure level (dB)	107	100	97	88	79	69	51	44	32	27	22	18	14

NOTE:

Average hearing thresholds (for young healthy people) in the infrasound (4 to 20 Hz) and low frequency region (10 to 200 Hz).

Source: Leventhall et al., 2003

As Table 3-2 indicates, at low frequencies, a much higher level sound is necessary for a sound to be heard in comparison to higher frequencies. For example, at 10 Hz, the sound must be at 97 dB to be audible. If this level occurred at the mid to high frequencies, which the ear detects effectively, it would be roughly equivalent to standing without hearing protection directly next to a power saw. Decibel for decibel, the low frequencies are much more difficult to detect than the high frequencies, as shown in the hearing threshold levels of Table 3-2.

Table 3-2 also shows that even sounds as low as 4 Hz can be heard if the levels are high enough (107 dB). However, levels from wind turbines at 4 Hz are more likely to be around 70 dB or lower, and therefore inaudible. Studies conducted to assess wind turbine noise have shown that wind turbine sound at typical distances does not exceed the hearing threshold and will not be audible below about 50 Hz (Hayes 2006b; Kamperman and James, 2008). The hearing threshold level at 50 Hz is 44 dB, as shown in Table 3-2. Recent work on evaluating a large number of noise sources between 10 Hz and 160 Hz suggests that wind turbine noise heard indoors at typical separation distances is modest on the scale of low frequency sound sources (Pedersen, 2008). The low levels of infrasound and low frequency sound from wind turbine operations have been confirmed by others (Jakobsen, 2004; van den Berg, 2004).


The low frequency sound associated with wind turbines has attracted attention recently since the A-weighting scale that is used for occupational and environmental regulatory compliance does not work well with sounds that have prominently low frequency components. Most environmental low frequency sound problems are caused by discrete tones (pitch or tones that are significantly higher in level (volume) than the neighboring frequencies); from, for example, an engine or compressor, not by continuous broadband sound. The high frequency sounds are assessed by the A-weighted measurement and, given their shorter wavelengths, are controlled more readily. Low frequency sounds may be irritating to some people and, in fact, some low frequency sound complaints prove impossible to resolve (Leventhall et al., 2003). This observation leads to a perception that there is something special, sinister, and harmful about low frequency sound. To the contrary, most external sound when heard indoors is biased towards low frequencies due to the efficient building attenuation of higher frequencies. One may recognize this when noise

from a neighbor's stereo is heard within their home – the bass notes are more pronounced than the higher frequency sounds. Any unwanted sound, whether high frequency or low frequency, can be irritating and stressful to some people.

Differences in how a low frequency sound and high frequency sound are perceived are well documented. Figure 3-2 shows that lower-frequency sounds typically need to be at a high sound pressure level (dB) to be heard. Figure 3-2 also demonstrates that as the frequency lowers, the audible range is compressed leading to a more rapid rise in loudness as the level changes in the lower frequencies. At 1,000 Hz, the whole range covers about 100 dB change in sound pressure level, while at 20 Hz the same range of loudness covers about 50 dB (note the contours displayed in Figure 3-2 are in terms of phons, a measure of equal loudness; for additional explanation on phons, the reader is referred to <http://www.sfu.ca/sonic-studio/handbook/Phon.html> [Truax, 1999]). As the annoyance of a given sound increases as loudness increases, there is also a more rapid growth of annoyance at low frequencies. However, there is no evidence for direct physiological effects from either infrasound or low frequency sound at the levels generated from wind turbines, indoors or outside. Effects may result from the sounds being audible, but these are similar to the effects from other audible sounds.

Low frequency sound and infrasound are further addressed in Section 3.3, Potential Adverse Effects of Exposure to Sound.

FIGURE 3-2
Hearing Contours for Equal Loudness Level (International Standards Organization, 2003)



3.2.2 Vibration

Vibration, assumed to result from inaudible low frequency sounds, has been postulated to have a potential adverse effect on health. This section defines vibration, describes how it is measured, and cites studies that have addressed the risk of vibration on health.

Vibration refers to the way in which energy travels through solid material, whether steel, concrete in a bridge, the earth, the wall of a house or the human body. Vibration is distinguished from sound, which is energy flowing through gases (like air) or liquids (like water).

As higher frequency vibrations attenuate rapidly, it is low frequencies which are of potential concern to human health. When vibration is detected through the feet or through the seat, the focus of interest is the vibration of the surface with which one is in contact – for example, when travelling in a vehicle.


Vibration is often measured by the acceleration of the surface in meters per second, squared (m/s^2), although other related units are used. Vibration can also be expressed in decibels, where the reference excitation level used in buildings is often $10^{-5}m/s^2$ and the vibration level is $20\log(A/10^{-5})$ dB, where A is the acceleration level in m/s^2 .

The threshold of perception of vibration by humans is approximately $0.01 m/s^2$. If a frequency of excitation (vibration) corresponds with a resonant frequency of a system, then

excitation at the resonant frequency is greater than at other frequencies. However, excitation by sound is not the same as excitation by mechanical excitation applied at, say, the feet.

Figure 3-3 shows an object excited by point mechanical vibration and by sound. The object contains a resiliently suspended system. For example, if the object was the body, the suspended system might be the viscera (internal organs of the body). The left hand of the figure can be interpreted as the body vibrated by input to the feet. The vibration of the viscera will be maximum at the resonant frequency¹ of the suspended system, which, for viscera, is about 4 Hz. When excitation is by long wavelength low frequency sound waves, as shown at the right of the figure, not only is the force acting on the body much smaller than for vibration input, but, as the wavelength is much greater than the dimensions of the body, it is acting around the body in a compressive manner so that there is no resultant force on the suspended system and it does not vibrate or resonate.

FIGURE 3-3
Comparison of Excitation of an Object by Vibration and by Sound



Unfortunately, this lack of effect has not been addressed by those who have suggested the mechanical vibration response of the body instead of the acoustic response as a potential health consequence. This oversight has led to inaccurate conclusions. For example, Dr. Nina Pierpont bases one of her key hypotheses for the cause of “wind turbine syndrome” on such an egregious error (Pierpont, 2009, pre-publication draft). Although not a recognized medical diagnosis, “wind turbine syndrome” has been raised as a concern for proposed projects—refer to Section 4.3 for more information.

Vibration of the body by sound at one of its resonant frequencies occurs only at very high sound levels and is not a factor in the perception of wind turbine noise. As will be discussed

¹ A common example of resonance is pushing a child on a swing in which energy is given to the swing to maximize its oscillation.

below, the sound levels associated with wind turbines do not affect the vestibular or other balance systems.

3.2.3 Vestibular System

The vestibular system of the body plays a major role in maintaining a person's sense of balance and the stabilization of visual images. The vestibular system responds to pressure changes (sound pressure, i.e., decibels) at various frequencies. At high levels of exposure to low frequency sound, nausea and changes in respiration and blood pressure may occur. Studies have shown, however, that for these effects to occur, considerably high noise levels (greater than 140 dB, similar in sound level of a jet aircraft heard 80 feet away) are necessary (Berglund et al., 1996).

Head vibration resulting from low frequency sound has been suggested as a possible cause of a variety of symptoms that some hypothesize as being associated with wind turbines. In order to properly assess this hypothesis, this section addresses the human vestibular system. The "vestibular system" comprises the sense organs in the vestibular labyrinth, in which there are five tiny sensory organs: three semicircular canals that detect head rotation and two chalk-crystal-studded organs called otoliths (literally "ear-stones") that detect tilt and linear motion of the head. All five organs contain hair cells, like those in the cochlea, that convert motion into nerve impulses traveling to the brain in the vestibular nerve.

These organs evolved millions of years before the middle ear. Fish, for example, have no middle ear or cochlea but have a vestibular labyrinth nearly identical to ours (Baloh and Honrubia, 1979). The vestibular organs are specialized for stimulation by head position and movement, not by airborne sound. Each vestibular organ is firmly attached to the skull, to enable them to respond to the slightest head movement. In contrast, the hair cells in the cochlea are not directly attached to the skull; they do not normally respond to head movement, but to movements of the inner ear fluids.

The otolith organs help fish hear low frequency sounds; even in primates, these organs will respond to head vibration (i.e., bone-conducted sound) at frequencies up to 500 Hz (Fernandez and Goldberg, 1976). These vibratory responses of the vestibular system can be elicited by *airborne* sounds, however, only when they are at a much higher level than normal hearing thresholds² (and much higher than levels associated with wind turbine exposure). Thus, they do not help us hear but appear to be vestiges of our evolutionary past.

The vestibular nerve sends information about head position and movement to centers in the brain that also receive input from the eyes and from stretch receptors in the neck, trunk, and

² Young et al. (1977) found that neurons coming from the vestibular labyrinth of monkeys responded to head vibration at frequencies of 200-400 Hz, and at levels as low as 70 to 80 dB below gravitational force. However, these neurons could not respond to airborne sound at the same frequencies until levels exceeded 76 dB sound pressure level (SPL), which is at least 40 dB higher than the normal threshold of human hearing in this frequency range. Human eye movements respond to 100 Hz head vibration at levels 15 dB below audible levels (Todd et al., 2008a). This does not mean that the vestibular labyrinth is more sensitive than the cochlea to airborne sound, because the impedance-matching function of the middle ear allows the cochlea to respond to sounds that are 50-60 dB less intense than those necessary to cause detectable head vibration. Indeed, the same authors (Todd et al., 2008b) found that for airborne sound, responses from the cochlea could always be elicited by sounds that were below the threshold for vestibular responses. Similarly, Welgampola et al. (2003) found that thresholds for vestibular evoked myogenic potential response (VEMP) were higher than hearing thresholds and stated: "the difference between hearing thresholds and VEMP thresholds is much greater for air conducted sounds than for bone vibration." In other words, the vestigial vestibular response to sound is relatively sensitive to bone conduction, which involves vibration of the whole head, and much less sensitive to air conduction.

legs (these stretch receptors tell which muscles are contracted and which joints are flexed, and provide the “proprioceptive” sense of the body’s position and orientation in space). The brain integrates vestibular, visual, and proprioceptive inputs into a comprehensive analysis of the position and movement of the head and body, essential for the sense of balance, avoidance of falls, and keeping the eyes focused on relevant targets, even during movement.

Perception of the body’s position in space may also rely in part on input from receptors in abdominal organs (which can shift back and forth as the body tilts) and from pressure receptors in large blood vessels (blood pools in the legs when standing, then shifts back to the trunk when lying down). These “somatic graviceptors” (Mittelstaedt, 1996) could be activated by whole-body movement and possibly by structure-borne vibration, or by the blast of a powerful near explosion, but, as described in Section 4.3.2, it is unlikely that intra-abdominal and intra-thoracic organs and blood vessels could detect airborne sound like that created by wind turbines.

Trauma, toxins, age-related degeneration, and various ear diseases can cause disorders of the vestibular labyrinth. A labyrinth not functioning properly can cause a person to feel unsteady or even to fall. Since the semicircular canals of the ear normally detect head rotation (such as shaking the head to indicate “no”), one of the consequences of a dysfunctional canal is that a person may feel a “spinning” sensation. This reaction is described as vertigo, from the Latin word to turn. In normal conversation, words like vertigo and dizziness can be used in ambiguous ways and thus make careful interpretation of potential health claims problematic. “Dizzy,” for example, may mean true vertigo or unsteadiness, both of which may be symptoms of inner ear disease. A person who describes being “dizzy” may actually be experiencing light-headedness, a fainting sensation, blurred vision, disorientation, or almost any other difficult-to-describe sensation in the head. The word “dizziness” can represent different sensations to each person, with a variety of causes. This can make the proper interpretation of research studies in which dizziness is evaluated a challenge to interpret.

Proper diagnostic testing to evaluate dizziness can reduce errors in misclassifying disease. The vestibular labyrinth, for example, can be tested for postural stability. Information from the semicircular canals is fed to the eye muscles to allow us to keep our eyes focused on a target; when the head moves; this “vestibulo-ocular reflex” is easily tested and can be impaired in vestibular disorders (Baloh and Honrubia, 1979).

3.3 Potential Adverse Effects of Exposure to Sound

Adverse effects of sound are directly dependent on the sound level; higher frequency sounds present a greater risk of an adverse effect than lower levels (see Table 3-2). Speech interference, hearing loss, and task interference occur at high sound levels. Softer sounds may be annoying or cause sleep disturbance in some people. At normal separation distances, wind turbines do not produce sound at levels that cause speech interference, but some people may find these sounds to be annoying.

3.3.1 Speech Interference

It is common knowledge that conversation can be difficult in a noisy restaurant; the louder the background noise, the louder we talk and the harder it is to communicate. Average

levels of casual conversation at 1 meter (arm's length) are typically 50 to 60 dBA. People raise their voices – slightly and unconsciously at first – when ambient levels exceed 50 to 55 dBA, in order to keep speech levels slightly above background noise levels. Communication at arm's length requires conscious extra effort when levels exceed about 75 dBA. Above ambient levels of 80 to 85 dBA, people need to shout or get closer to converse (Pearsons et al., 1977; Webster, 1978). Levels below 45 dBA can be considered irrelevant with respect to speech interference.

3.3.2 Noise-Induced Hearing Loss

Very brief and intense sounds (above 130 dBA, such as in explosions) can cause instant cochlear damage and permanent hearing loss, but most occupational NIHL results from prolonged exposure to high noise levels between 90 and 105 dBA (McCunney and Meyer 2007). Regulatory (OSHA, 1983) and advisory (NIOSH, 1998) authorities in the U.S. concur that risk of NIHL begins at about 85 dBA, for an 8-hour day, over a 40-year career. Levels below 75 dBA do not pose a risk of NIHL. Thus, the sound levels associated with wind turbine operations would not cause NIHL because they are not high enough.

3.3.3 Task Interference

Suter (1991) reviewed the effects of noise on performance and behavior. Simple tasks may be unaffected even at levels well above 100 dBA, while more complex tasks can be disrupted by intermittent noise as low as 75 dBA. Speech sounds are usually more disruptive than nonspeech sounds. Levels below 70 dBA do not result in task interference.

3.3.4 Annoyance

Annoyance as a possible “effect” of wind turbine operations is discussed in detail in later sections of this report (Sections 3.4 and 4.1). In summary, annoyance is a subjective response that varies among people to many types of sounds. It is important to note that although annoyance may be a frustrating experience for people, it is not considered an adverse health effect or disease of any kind. Certain everyday sounds, such as a dripping faucet – barely audible – can be annoying. Annoyance cannot be predicted easily with a sound level meter. Noise from airports, road traffic, and other sources (including wind turbines) may annoy some people, and, as described in Section 4.1, the louder the noise, the more people may become annoyed.

3.3.5 Sleep Disturbance

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) document titled *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety* (1974) recommends that indoor day-night-level (DNL) not exceed 45 dBA. DNL is a 24-hour average that gives 10 dB extra weight to sounds occurring between 10p.m. and 7 a.m., on the assumption that during these sleep hours, levels above 35 dBA indoors may be disruptive.

3.3.6 Other Adverse Health Effects of Sound

At extremely high sound levels, such as those associated with explosions, the resulting sound pressure can injure any air-containing organ: not only the middle ear (eardrum

perforations are common) but also the lungs and intestines (Sasser et al., 2006). At the other extreme, any sound that is chronically annoying, including very soft sounds, may, for some people, create chronic stress, which can in turn lead to other health problems. On the other hand, many people become accustomed to regular exposure to noise or other potential stressors, and are no longer annoyed. The hypothesis that chronic noise exposure might lead to chronic health problems such as hypertension and heart disease has been the subject of hundreds of contradictory studies of highly variable quality, which will not be reviewed in this document. Other authors have reviewed this literature, and some of their conclusions are quoted below:

“It appears not likely that noise in industry can be a direct cause of general health problems..., except that the noise can create conditions of psychological stress...which can in turn cause physiological stress reactions...” (Kryter, 1980)

“Epidemiological evidence on noise exposure, blood pressure, and ischemic heart disease is still limited.” (Babisch, 2004), and “contradictory’ (Babisch, 1998), but “there is some evidence...of an increased risk in subjects who live in noisy areas with outdoor noise levels of greater than 65 - 70 dBA.” (Babisch, 2000)

“The present state of the art does not permit any definite conclusion to be drawn about the risk of hypertension.” (van Dijk, Ettema, and Zielhuis, 1987)

“At this point, the relationship between noise induced hearing loss and hypertension must be considered as possible but lacking sufficient evidence to draw causal associations.” (McCunney and Meyer, 2007)

3.3.7 Potential Health Effects of Vibration Exposure

People may experience vibration when some part of the body is in direct contact with a vibrating object. One example would be holding a chainsaw or pneumatic hammer in the hands. Another would be sitting in a bus, truck, or on heavy equipment such as a bulldozer. Chronic use of vibrating tools can cause “hand-arm vibration syndrome,” a vascular insufficiency condition characterized by numbness and tingling of the fingers, cold intolerance, “white-finger” attacks, and eventually even loss of fingers due to inadequate blood supply. OSHA does not set limits for vibration exposure, but the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) (2006) recommends that 8-hour workday exposures to hand-arm vibration (5 to 1400 Hz, summed over three orthogonal axes of movement) not exceed acceleration values of 2.5 m/s².

Excessive whole-body vibration is clearly linked to low back pain (Wilder, Wasserman, and Wasserman, 2002) and may contribute to gastrointestinal and urinary disorders, although these associations are not well established. ANSI (1979) recommends 8-hour limits for whole-body vibration of 0.3 m/s², for the body’s most sensitive frequency range of 4 to 8 Hz. This is about 30 times more intense than the weakest vibration that people can detect (0.01 m/s²).

Airborne sound can cause detectable body vibration, but this occurs only at very high levels – usually above sound pressure levels of 100 dB (unweighted) (Smith, 2002; Takahashi et al., 2005; Yamada et al., 1983). There is no scientific evidence to suggest that modern wind turbines cause perceptible vibration in homes or that there is an associated health risk.

3.4 Peer-Reviewed Literature Focusing on Wind Turbines, Low-Frequency Sound, and Infrasound

This section addresses the scientific review of the literature that has evaluated wind turbines, the annoyance effect, low frequency sound, and infrasound.

3.4.1 Evaluation of Annoyance and Dose-Response Relationship of Wind Turbine Sound

To date, three studies in Europe have specifically evaluated potential health effects of people living in proximity to wind turbines (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2009). These studies have been primarily in Sweden and the Netherlands. Customarily, an eligible group of people are selected for possible participation in the study based on their location with respect to a wind turbine. Control groups have not been included in any of these reports.

In an article published in August 2009, investigators reported the results of their evaluation of 725 people in the Netherlands, who lived in the vicinity of wind turbines (Pedersen et al., 2009). The potential study population consisted of approximately 70,000 people living within 2.5 kilometers of a wind turbine at selected sites in the Netherlands. The objective of the study was to (1) assess the relationship between wind turbine sound levels at dwellings and the probability of noise annoyance, taking into account possible moderating factors, and (2) explore the possibility of generalizing a dose response relationship for wind turbine noise by comparing the results of the study with previous studies in Sweden.

Noise impact was quantified based on the relationship between the sound level (dose) and response with the latter measured as the proportion of people annoyed or highly annoyed by sound. Prior to this study, dose response curves had been modeled for wind turbines. Previous studies have noted different degrees of relationships between wind turbine sound levels and annoyance (Wolsink et al., 1993; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2007).

Subjective responses were obtained through a survey. The calculation of the sound levels (dose) in Sweden and the Netherlands were similar. A dose response relationship was observed between calculated A-weighted sound pressure levels and annoyance. Sounds from wind turbines were found to be more annoying than several other environmental sources at comparable sound levels. A strong correlation was also noted between noise annoyance and negative opinion of the impact of wind turbines on the landscape, a finding in earlier studies as well. The dominant quality of the sound was a swishing, the quality previously found to be the most annoying type.

The authors concluded that this study could be used for calculating a dose response curve for wind turbine sound and annoyance. The study results suggest that wind turbine sound is easily perceived and, compared with sound from other sources, is annoying to a small percentage of people (5 percent at 35 to 40 dBA).

In this study, the proportion of people who reported being annoyed by wind turbine noise was similar to merged data from two previous Swedish studies (Pederson and Persson

Waye, 2004; Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2007). About 5 percent of respondents were annoyed at noise levels between 35 to 40 dBA and 18 percent at 40 to 45 dBA.

Pedersen et al. also reported significant dose responses between wind turbine sound and self-reported annoyance (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004). High exposed individuals responded more (78 percent) than low exposed individuals (60 percent), which suggests that bias could have played a role in the final results.

An analysis of two cross-sectional socio-acoustic studies – one that addressed flat landscapes in mainly rural settings (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004) and another in different terrains (complex or flat) and different levels of urbanization (rural or suburban) (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2007) – was performed (Pedersen, 2008). Approximately 10 percent of over 1000 people surveyed via a questionnaire reported being very annoyed at sound levels of 40 dB and greater. Attitude toward the visual impact of the wind turbines had the same effect on annoyance. Response to wind turbine noise was significantly related to exposure expressed as A-weighted sound pressure levels dB. Among those who could hear wind turbine sound, annoyance with wind turbine noise was highly correlated to the sound characteristics: swishing, whistling, resounding and pulsating/throbbing (Pedersen, 2008).

A similar study in Sweden evaluated 754 people living near one of seven sites where wind turbine power was greater than 500 kilowatt (kW) (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2007). Annoyance was correlated with sound level and also with negative attitude toward the visual impact of the wind turbines. Note that none of these studies included a control group. Earlier field studies performed among people living in the vicinity of wind turbines showed a correlation between sound pressure level and noise annoyance; however, annoyance was also influenced by visual factors and attitudes toward the impact of the wind turbines on the landscape. Noise annoyance was noted at lower sound pressure levels than annoyance from traffic noise. Although some people may be affected by annoyance, there is no scientific evidence that noise at levels created by wind turbines could cause health problems (Pedersen and Högskolan, 2003).

3.4.2 Annoyance

A feeling described as “annoyance” can be associated with acoustic factors such as wind turbine noise. There is considerable variability, however, in how people become “annoyed” by environmental factors such as road construction and aviation noise, among others (Leventhall, 2004). Annoyance is clearly a subjective effect that will vary among people and circumstances. In extreme cases, sleep disturbance may occur. Wind speed at the hub height of a wind turbine at night may be up to twice as high as during the day and may lead to annoyance from the amplitude modulated sound of the wind turbine (van den Berg, 2003). However, in a study of 16 sites in 3 European countries, only a weak correlation was noted between sound pressure level and noise annoyance from wind turbines (Pedersen and Högskolan, 2003).

In a detailed comparison of the role of noise sensitivity in response to environmental noise around international airports in Sydney, London, and Amsterdam, it was shown that noise sensitivity increases one’s perception of annoyance independently of the level of noise exposure (van Kamp et al., 2004).

In a Swedish study, 84 out of 1,095 people living in the vicinity of a wind turbine in 12 geographical areas reported being fairly or very annoyed by wind turbines (Pedersen, 2008). It is important to note that no differences were reported among people who were “annoyed” in contrast to those who were not annoyed with respect to hearing impairment, diabetes, or cardiovascular disease. An earlier study in Sweden showed that the proportion of people “annoyed” by wind turbine sound is higher than for other sources of environmental noise at the same decibel level (Pedersen and Persson Waye, 2004).

3.4.3 Low-Frequency Sound and Infrasound

No scientific studies have specifically evaluated health effects from exposure to low frequency sound from wind turbines. Natural sources of low frequency sound include wind, rivers, and waterfalls in both audible and non-audible frequencies. Other sources include road traffic, aircraft, and industrial machinery. The most common source of infrasound is vehicular (National Toxicology Program, 2001).

Infrasound at a frequency of 20 Hz (the upper limit of infrasound) is not detectable at levels lower than 79 dB (Leventhall et al., 2003). Infrasound at 145 dB at 20 Hz and at 165 dB at 2 Hz can stimulate the auditory system and cause severe pain (Leventhall, 2006). These noise levels are substantially higher than any noise generated by wind turbines. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved the use of infrasound for therapeutic massage at 70 dB in the 8 to 14 Hz range (National Toxicology Program, 2001). In light of the FDA approval for this type of therapeutic use of infrasound, it is reasonable to conclude that exposure to infrasound in the 70 dB range is safe. According to a report of the National Research Council (NRC), low frequency sound is a concern for older wind turbines but not the modern type (National Research Council, 2007).

Results

This section discusses the results of the analysis presented in Section 3. Potential effects from infrasound, low frequency sound, and the fluctuating aerodynamic “swish” from turbine blades are examined. Proposed hypotheses between wind turbine sound and physiological effects in the form of vibroacoustic disease, “wind turbine syndrome,” and visceral vibratory vestibular disturbance are discussed.

4.1 Infrasound, Low-Frequency Sound, and Annoyance

Sound levels from wind turbines pose no risk of hearing loss or any other nonauditory effect. In fact, a recent review concluded that “Occupational noise-induced hearing damage does not occur below levels of 85 dBA.” (Ising and Kruppa, 2004) The levels of sound associated with wind turbine operations are considerably lower than industry levels associated with noise induced hearing loss.

However, some people attribute certain health problems to wind turbine exposure. To make sense of these assertions, one must consider not only the sound but the complex factors that may lead to the perception of “annoyance.” Most health complaints regarding wind turbines have centered on sound as the cause. There are two types of sounds from wind turbines: mechanical sound, which originates from the gearbox and control mechanisms, and the more dominant aerodynamical sound, which is present at all frequencies from the infrasound range over low frequency sound to the normal audible range.

Infrasound from natural sources (for example, ocean waves and wind) surrounds us and is below the audible threshold. The infrasound emitted from wind turbines is at a level of 50 to 70 dB, sometimes higher, but well below the audible threshold. There is a consensus among acoustic experts that the infrasound from wind turbines is of no consequence to health. One particular problem with many of these assertions about infrasound is that is that the term is often misused when the concerning sound is actually low frequency sound, not infrasound.

Under many conditions, low frequency sound below about 40 Hz cannot be distinguished from environmental background sound from the wind itself. Perceptible (meaning above both the background sound and the hearing threshold), low frequency sound can be produced by wind turbines under conditions of unusually turbulent wind conditions, but the actual sound level depends on the distance of the listener from the turbine, as the sound attenuates (falls off) with distance. The higher the frequency, the greater the sound attenuates with distance – Appendix D provides more information on the propagation of sound. The low frequency sound emitted by spinning wind turbines could possibly be annoying to some when winds are unusually turbulent, but there is no evidence that this level of sound could be harmful to health. If so, city dwelling would be impossible due to the similar levels of ambient sound levels normally present in urban environments. Nevertheless, a small number of people find city sound levels stressful.

It is not usually the low frequency nonfluctuating sound component, however, that provokes complaints about wind turbine sound. The fluctuating aerodynamic sound (swish) in the 500 to 1,000 Hz range occurs from the wind turbine blades disturbing the air, modulated as the blades rotate which changes the sound dispersion characteristics in an audible manner. This fluctuating aerodynamic sound is the cause of most sound complaints regarding wind turbines, as it is harder to become accustomed to fluctuating sound than to sound that does not fluctuate. However, this fluctuation does not always occur and a UK study showed that it had been a problem in only four out of 130 UK wind farms, and had been resolved in three of those (Moorhouse et al., 2007).

4.1.1 Infrasound and Low-Frequency Sound

Infrasound occurs at frequencies less than 20 Hz. At low and inaudible levels, infrasound has been suggested as a cause of “wind turbine syndrome” and vibroacoustic disease (VAD)—refer to Section 4.2.1 for more information on VAD. For infrasound to be heard, high sound levels are necessary (see Section 3, Table 3-2). There is little risk of short term acute exposure to high levels of infrasound. In experiments related to the Apollo space program, subjects were exposed to between 120 and 140 dB without known harmful effects. High level infrasound is less harmful than the same high levels of sound in the normal audible frequency range.

High levels of low frequency sound can excite body vibrations (Leventhall, 2003). Early attention to low frequency sound was directed to the U.S. space program, studies from which suggested that 24-hour exposures to 120 to 130 dB are tolerable below 20 Hz, the upper limit of infrasound. Modern wind turbines produce sound that is assessed as infrasound at typical levels of 50 to 70 dB, below the hearing threshold at those frequencies (Jakobsen, 2004). Jakobsen concluded that infrasound from wind turbines does not present a health concern. Fluctuations of wind turbine sound, most notably the swish-swish sounds, are in the frequency range of 500 to 1,000 Hz, which is neither low frequency sound nor infrasound. The predominant sound from wind turbines, however, is often mischaracterized as infrasound and low frequency sound. Levels of infrasound near modern-scale wind farms are in general not perceptible to people. In the human body, the beat of the heart is at 1 to 2 Hz. Higher-frequency heart sounds measured externally to the body are in the low frequency range (27 to 35 dB at 20 to 40 Hz), although the strongest frequency is that of the heartbeat (Sakai, Feigen, and Luisada, 1971). Lung sounds, measured externally to the body are in the range of 5 to 35 dB at 150 to 600 Hz (Fiz et al., 2008). Schust (2004) has given a comprehensive review of the effects of high level low frequency sound, up to 100 Hz.

4.1.2 Annoyance

Annoyance is a broad topic on which volumes have been written. Annoyance can be caused by constant amplitude and amplitude modulated sounds containing rumble (Bradley, 1994).

As the level of sound rises, an increasing number of those who hear it may become distressed, until eventually nearly everybody is affected, although to different degrees. This is a clear and easily understood process. However, what is not so clearly understood is that when the level of the sound reduces, so that very few people are troubled by it, there remain a small number who may be adversely affected. This occurs at all frequencies, although there seems to be more subjective variability at the lower frequencies. The effect of low

frequency sound on annoyance has recently been reviewed (Leventhall, 2004). The standard deviation of the hearing threshold is approximately 6 dB at low frequencies (Kurakata and Mizunami, 2008), so that about 2.5 percent of the population will have 12 dB more sensitive hearing than the average person. However, hearing sensitivity alone does not appear to be the deciding factor with respect to annoyance. For example, the same type of sound may elicit different reactions among people: one person might say “Yes, I can hear the sound, but it does not bother me,” while another may say, “The sound is impossible, it is ruining my life.” There is no evidence of harmful effects from the low levels of sound from wind turbines, as experienced by people in their homes. Studies have shown that peoples’ attitudes toward wind turbines may affect the level of annoyance that they report (Pedersen et al., 2009).

Some authors emphasize the psychological effects of sounds (Kalveram, 2000; Kalveram et al., 1999). In an evaluation of 25 people exposed to five different wind turbine sounds at 40 dB, ratings of “annoyance” were different among different types of wind turbine noise (Persson Waye and Öhrström, 2002).

None of the psycho-acoustic parameters could explain the difference in annoyance responses. Another study of more than 2,000 people suggested that personality traits play a role in the perception of annoyance to environmental issues such as sound (Persson et al., 2007). Annoyance originates from acoustical signals that are not compatible with, or that disturb, psychological functions, in particular, disturbance of current activities. Kalveram et al. (1999) suggest that the main function of noise annoyance is as a warning that fitness may be affected but that it causes little or no physiological effect. Protracted annoyance, however, may undermine coping and progress to stress related effects. It appears that this is the main mechanism for effects on the health of a small number of people from prolonged exposure to low levels of noise.

The main health effect of noise stress is disturbed sleep, which may lead to other consequences. Work with low frequencies has shown that an audible low frequency sound does not normally become objectionable until it is 10 to 15 dB above hearing threshold (Inukai et al., 2000; Yamada, 1980). An exception is when a listener has developed hostility to the noise source, so that annoyance commences at a lower level.

There is no evidence that sound at the levels from wind turbines as heard in residences will cause direct physiological effects. A small number of sensitive people, however, may be stressed by the sound and suffer sleep disturbances.

4.1.3 Other Aspects of Annoyance

Some people have concluded that they have health problems caused directly by wind turbines. In order to make sense of these complaints, we must consider not only the sound, but the complex factors culminating in annoyance.

There is a large body of medical literature on stress and psychoacoustics. Three factors that may be pertinent to a short discussion of wind turbine annoyance effects are the nocebo effect, sensory integration dysfunction and somatoform disorders.

4.1.4 Nocebo Effect

The nocebo effect is an adverse outcome, a worsening of mental or physical health, based on fear or belief in adverse effects. This is the opposite of the well known placebo effect, where belief in positive effects of an intervention may produce positive results (Spiegel, 1997). Several factors appear to be associated with the nocebo phenomenon: expectations of adverse effects; conditioning from prior experiences; certain psychological characteristics such as anxiety, depression and the tendency to somatize (express psychological factors as physical symptoms; see below), and situational and contextual factors. A large range of reactions include hypervagotonia, manifested by idioventricular heart rhythm (a slow heart rate of 20 to 50 beats per minute resulting from an intrinsic pacemaker within the ventricles which takes over when normal sinoatrial node regulation is lost), drowsiness, nausea, fatigue, insomnia, headache, weakness, dizziness, gastrointestinal (GI) complaints and difficulty concentrating (Sadock and Sadock, 2005, p.2425). This array of symptoms is similar to the so-called “wind turbine syndrome” coined by Pierpont (2009, pre-publication draft). Yet these are all common symptoms in the general population and no evidence has been presented that such symptoms are more common in persons living near wind turbines. Nevertheless, the large volume of media coverage devoted to alleged adverse health effects of wind turbines understandably creates an anticipatory fear in some that they will experience adverse effects from wind turbines. Every person is suggestible to some degree. The resulting stress, fear, and hypervigilance may exacerbate or even create problems which would not otherwise exist. In this way, anti-wind farm activists may be creating with their publicity some of the problems that they describe.

4.1.5 Somatoform Disorders

There are seven somatoform disorders in the Fourth Edition of *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV-TR) (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Somatoform disorders are physical symptoms which reflect psychological states rather than arising from physical causes. One common somatoform disorder, Conversion Disorder, is the unconscious expression of stress and anxiety as one or more physical symptoms (Escobar and Canino, 1989). Common conversion symptoms are sensations of tingling or discomfort, fatigue, poorly localized abdominal pain, headaches, back or neck pain, weakness, loss of balance, hearing and visual abnormalities. The symptoms are not feigned and must be present for at least six months according to DSM-IV-TR and two years according to the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision (ICD-10) (WHO, 1993). ICD-10 specifies the symptoms as belonging to four groups: (1) Gastrointestinal (abdominal pain, nausea, bloating/gas/, bad taste in mouth/excessive tongue coating, vomiting/regurgitation, frequent/loose bowel movements); (2) Cardiovascular (breathlessness without exertion, chest pains); (3) Genitourinary (frequency or dysuria, unpleasant genital sensations, vaginal discharge), and (4) Skin and Pain (blotchiness or discoloration of the skin, pain in the limbs, extremities or joints, paresthesias). ICD-10 specifies that at least six symptoms must be present in two or more groups.

One feature of somatoform disorders is *somatosensory amplification*, a process in which a person learns to feel body sensations more acutely and may misinterpret the significance of those sensations by equating them with illness (Barsky, 1979). *Sensory integration dysfunction*

describes abnormal sensitivity to any or all sensory stimuli (sound, touch, light, smell, and taste). There is controversy among researchers and clinicians as to whether sensory integration problems exist as an independent entity or as components of a pervasive developmental disorder (Sadock and Sadock, 2005, p. 3135), but their presence can lead to overestimation of the likelihood of being ill (Sadock and Sadock, 2005, p. 1803). Sensory integration dysfunction as such is not listed in the DSM-IV-TR or in the ICD-10.

Day-to-day stressors and adverse life events provide multiple stimuli to which people respond, and that response is often somatic due to catecholamines and activation of the autonomic nervous system. This stress response can become conditioned as memory. There is some evidence that poor coping mechanisms (anger impulsivity, hostility, isolation, lack of confiding in others) are linked to physiological reactivity, which is associated with somatic sensation and amplification (Sadock and Sadock, 2005, p. 1806).

In summary, the similarities of common human stress responses and conversion symptoms to those described as “wind turbine syndrome” are striking. An annoyance factor to wind turbine sounds undoubtedly exists, to which there is a great deal of individual variability. Stress has multiple causes and is additive. Associated stress from annoyance, exacerbated by the rhetoric, fears, and negative publicity generated by the wind turbine controversy, may contribute to the reported symptoms described by some people living near rural wind turbines.

4.2 Infrasound, Low-frequency Sound and Disease

Some reports have suggested a link between low frequency sound from wind turbines and certain adverse health effects. A careful review of these reports, however, leads a critical reviewer to question the validity of the claims for a number of reasons, most notably (1) the level of sound exposure associated with the putative health effects, (2) the lack of diagnostic specificity associated with the health effects reported, and (3) the lack of a control group in the analysis.

4.2.1 Vibroacoustic Disease

Vibroacoustic disease (VAD) in the context of exposure of aircraft engine technicians to sound was defined by Portuguese researchers as a whole-body, multi-system entity, caused by chronic exposure to large pressure amplitude and low frequency (LPALF) sound (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007a; Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007b; Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007c; Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007d). VAD, the primary feature of which is thickening of cardiovascular structures, such as cardiac muscle and blood vessels, was first noted among airplane technicians, military pilots, and disc jockeys (Maschke, 2004; Castelo Branco, 1999). Workers had been exposed to high levels for more than 10 years. There are no epidemiological studies that have evaluated risk of VAD from exposure to infrasound. The likelihood of such a risk, however, is remote in light of the much lower vibration levels in the body itself. Studies of workers with substantially higher exposure levels have not indicated a risk of VAD. VAD has been described as leading from initial respiratory infections, through pericardial thickening to severe and life-threatening illness such as stroke, myocardial infarction, and risk of malignancy (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007a).

4.2.2 High-Frequency Exposure

All of the exposures of subjects for whom the VAD concept was developed, were dominated by higher frequency sounds, a critical point since the frequency range claimed for VAD-inducing sound is much wider than the frequency range of exposures experienced by the aircraft technicians who were diagnosed with VAD (Castelo Branco, 1999). Originally, proponents of the VAD concept had proposed a “greater than 90 dB” criterion for VAD. However, now some claim that VAD will result from exposure to almost any level of infrasound and low frequency sound at any frequency below 500 Hz. This assertion is an extraordinary extrapolation given that the concept of VAD developed from observations that a technician, working around military aircraft on the ground, with engines operating, displayed disorientation (Castelo Branco, 1999). Sound levels near aircraft were very high. In an evaluation of typical engine spectra of carrier based combat aircraft operating on the ground, the spectra peaked at frequencies above 100 Hz with sound levels from 120 to 135 dB close to the aircraft (Smith, 2002). The levels drop considerably, however, into the low frequency region.

There is an enormous decibel difference between the sound exposure of aircraft technicians and the sound exposure of people who live near wind turbines. Animal experiments indicated that exposure levels necessary to cause VAD were 13 weeks of continuous exposure to approximately 100 dB of low frequency sound (Mendes et al., 2007). The exposure levels were at least 50 to 60 dB higher than wind turbine levels in the same frequency region (Hayes, 2006a).

4.2.3 Residential Exposure: A Case Series

Extrapolation of results from sound levels greater than 90 dB and at predominantly higher frequencies (greater than 100 Hz) to a risk of VAD from inaudible wind turbine sound levels of 40 to 50 dB in the infrasound region, is a new hypothesis. One investigator, for example, has claimed that wind turbines in residential areas produce acoustical environments that can lead to the development of VAD in nearby home-dwellers (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007a).

This claim is based on comparison of only two infrasound exposures. The first is for a family which has experienced a range of health problems and which also complained of disturbances from low frequency sound. The second is for a family which lived near four wind turbines, about which they have become anxious (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007a; Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007b).

The first family (Family F), was exposed to low levels of infrasound consisting of about 50 dB at 8 Hz and 10 Hz from a grain terminal about 3 kilometers (km) away and additional sources of low frequency sound, including a nearer railway line and road. The second family (Family R) lives in a rural area and was described as exposed to infrasound levels of about 55 dB to 60 dB at 8 Hz to 16 Hz. These exposures are well below the hearing threshold and not uncommon in urban areas. Neither the frequency nor volume of the sound exposures experienced by Families F or R are unusual. Exposure to infrasound (< 20 Hz) did not exceed 50 dB.

4.2.3.1 Family F—Exposure to Low Levels of Infrasound

Family F has a long history of poor health and a 10-year-old boy was diagnosed with VAD due to exposure to infrasound from the grain terminal (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007a; Castelo Branco et al., 2004). However, the infrasound levels are well below hearing threshold and are typical of urban infrasound, which occurs widely and to which many people are exposed.

According to the authors, the main effect of VAD was demonstrated by the 10-year-old boy in the family, as pericardial thickening.³ However, the boy has a history of poor health of unknown etiology (Castelo Branco et al., 2004). Castelo Branco (1999) has defined pericardial thickening as an indicator of VAD and assumes that the presence of pericardial thickening in the boy from Family F must be an effect of VAD, caused by exposure to the low-level, low frequency sound from the grain terminal. This assumption excludes other possible causes of pericardial thickening, including viral infection, tuberculosis, irradiation, hemodialysis, neoplasia with pericardial infiltration, bacterial, fungal, or parasitic infections, inflammation after myocardial infarction, asbestosis, and autoimmune diseases. The authors did not exclude these other possible causes of pericardial thickening.

4.2.3.2 Family R—Proximity to Turbines and Anxiety

Family R, living close to the wind turbines, has low frequency sound exposure similar to that of Family F. The family does not have symptoms of VAD, but it was claimed that “Family R. will also develop VAD should they choose to remain in their home.” (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007b). In light of the absence of literature of cohort and case control studies, this bold statement seems to be unsubstantiated by available scientific literature.

4.2.4 Critique

It appears that Families F and R were self-selected complainants. Conclusions derived by Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco (2007b) have been based only on the poor health and the sound exposure of Family F, using this single exposure as a measure of potential harmful effects for others. There has been no attempt at an epidemiological study.

Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco claim that exposure at home is more significant than exposure at work because of the longer periods of exposure (Alves-Pereira and Castelo Branco, 2007e). Because an approximate 50 dB difference occurs between the exposure from wind turbines and the exposure that induced VAD (Hayes, 2006a), it will take 10^5 years (100,000 years) for the wind turbine dose to equal that of one year of the higher level sound.

Among published scientific literature, this description of the two families is known as a case series, which are of virtually no value in understanding potential *causal associations* between exposure to a potential hazard (i.e., low frequency sound) and a potential health effect (i.e., vibroacoustic disease). Case reports have value but primarily in generating hypotheses to test in other studies such as large groups of people or in case control studies. The latter type of study can systematically evaluate people with pericardial thickening who live near wind turbines in comparison to people with pericardial thickening who do not live

³ Pericardial thickening is unusual thickening of the protective sac (pericardium) which surrounds the heart. For example, see <http://www.emedicine.com/radio/topic191.htm>.

near wind turbines. Case reports need to be confirmed in larger studies, most notably cohort studies and case-control studies, before definitive cause and effect assertions can be drawn. The reports of the two families do not provide persuasive scientific evidence of a link between wind turbine sound and pericardial thickening.

Wind turbines produce low levels of infrasound and low frequency sound, yet there is no credible scientific evidence that these levels are harmful. If the human body is affected by low, sub-threshold sound levels, a unique and not yet discovered receptor mechanism of extraordinary sensitivity to sound is necessary – a mechanism which can distinguish between the normal, relatively high-level “sound” inherent in the human body⁴ and excitation by external, low-level sound. Essential epidemiological studies of the potential effects of exposure at low sound levels at low frequencies have not been conducted. Until the fuzziness is clarified, and a receptor mechanism revealed, no reliance can be placed on the case reports that the low levels of infrasound and low frequency sound are a cause of vibroacoustic disease.⁵

The attribution of dangerous properties to low levels of infrasound continues unproven, as it has been for the past 40 years. No foundation has been demonstrated for the new hypothesis that exposure to sub-threshold, low levels of infrasound will lead to vibroacoustic disease. Indeed, human evolution has occurred in the presence of natural infrasound.

4.3 Wind Turbine Syndrome

“Wind turbine syndrome” as promoted by Pierpont (2009, pre-publication draft) appears to be based on the following two hypotheses:

1. Low levels of airborne infrasound from wind turbines, at 1 to 2 Hz, directly affect the vestibular system.
2. Low levels of airborne infrasound from wind turbines at 4 to 8 Hz enter the lungs via the mouth and then vibrate the diaphragm, which transmits vibration to the viscera, or internal organs of the body.

The combined effect of these infrasound frequencies sends confusing information to the position and motion detectors of the body, which in turn leads to a range of disturbing symptoms.

4.3.1 Evaluation of Infrasound on the Vestibular System

Consider the first hypothesis. The support for this hypothesis is a report apparently misunderstood to mean that the vestibular system is more sensitive than the cochlea to low levels of both sound and vibration (Todd et al., 2008a). The Todd report is concerned with vibration input to the mastoid area of the skull, and the corresponding detection of these vibrations by the cochlea and vestibular system. The lowest frequency used was 100 Hz,

⁴ Body sounds are often used for diagnosis. For example see Gross, V., A. Dittmar, T. Penzel, F., Schüttler, and P. von Wichert.. (2000): "The Relationship between Normal Lung Sounds, Age, and Gender." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. Volume 162, Number 3: 905 - 909.

⁵ This statement should not be interpreted as a criticism of the work of the VAD Group with aircraft technicians at high noise levels.

considerably higher than the upper limit of the infrasound frequency (20 Hz). The report does not address air-conducted sound or infrasound, which according to Pierpont excites the vestibular system by airborne sound and by skull vibration. This source does not support Pierpont's hypothesis and does not demonstrate the points that she is trying to make.

There is no credible scientific evidence that low levels of wind turbine sound at 1 to 2 Hz will directly affect the vestibular system. In fact, it is likely that the sound will be lost in the natural infrasonic background sound of the body. The second hypothesis is equally unsupported with appropriate scientific investigations. The body is a noisy system at low frequencies. In addition to the beating heart at a frequency of 1 to 2 Hz, the body emits sounds from blood circulation, bowels, stomach, muscle contraction, and other internal sources. Body sounds can be detected externally to the body by the stethoscope.

4.3.2 Evaluation of Infrasound on Internal organs

It is well known that one source of sound may mask the effect of another similar source. If an external sound is detected within the body in the presence of internally generated sounds, the external sound must produce a greater effect in the body than the internal sounds. The skin is very reflective at higher frequencies, although the reflectivity reduces at lower frequencies (Katz, 2000). Investigations at very low frequencies show a reduction of about 30 dB from external to internal sound in the body of a sheep (Peters et al., 1993). These results suggest an attenuation (reduction) of low frequency sound by the body before the low frequency sound reaches the internal organs.

Low-level sounds from outside the body do not cause a high enough excitation within the body to exceed the internal body sounds. Pierpont refers to papers from Takahashi and colleagues on vibration excitation of the head by high levels of external sound (over 100 dB). However, these papers state that response of the head at frequencies below 20 Hz was not measurable due to the masking effect of internal body vibration (Takahashi et al., 2005; Takahashi et al., 1999). When measuring chest resonant vibration caused by external sounds, the internal vibration masks resonance for external sounds below 80 dB excitation level (Leventhall, 2006). Thus, the second hypothesis also fails.

To recruit subjects for her study, Pierpont sent out a general call for anybody believing their health had been adversely affected by wind turbines. She asked respondents to contact her for a telephone interview. The case series results for ten families (37 subjects) are presented in Pierpont (2009, pre-publication draft). Symptoms included sleep disturbance, headache, tinnitus, ear pressure, vertigo, nausea, visual blurring, tachycardia, irritability, concentration, memory, panic attacks, internal pulsation, and quivering. This type of study is known as a case series. A case series is of limited, if any, value in evaluating causal connections between an environmental exposure (in this case, sound) and a designated health effect (so called "wind turbine syndrome"). This particular case series is substantially limited by selection bias, in which people who already think that they have been affected by wind turbines "self select" to participate in the case series. This approach introduces a significant bias in the results, especially in the absence of a control group who do not live in proximity of a wind turbine. The results of this case series are at best hypothesis-generating activities that do not provide support for a causal link between wind turbine sound and so-called "wind turbine syndrome."

However, these so called “wind turbine syndrome” symptoms are not new and have been published previously in the context of “annoyance” to environmental sounds (Nagai et al., 1989; Møller and Lydolf, 2002; Mirowska and Mroz, 2000). The following symptoms are based on the experience of noise sufferers extending over a number of years: distraction, dizziness, eye strain, fatigue, feeling vibration, headache, insomnia, muscle spasm, nausea, nose bleeds, palpitations, pressure in the ears or head, skin burns, stress, and tension (Leventhall, 2002).

The symptoms are common in cases of extreme and persistent annoyance, leading to stress responses in the affected individual and may also result from severe tinnitus, when there is no external sound. The symptoms are exhibited by a small proportion of sensitive persons and may be alleviated by a course of psychotherapy, aimed at desensitization from the sound (Leventhall et al., 2008). The similarity between the symptoms of noise annoyance and those of “wind turbine syndrome” indicates that this “diagnosis” is not a pathophysiological effect, but is an example of the well-known stress effects of exposure to noise, as displayed by a small proportion of the population. These effects are familiar to environmental noise control officers and other “on the ground” professionals.

“Wind turbine syndrome,” not a recognized medical diagnosis, is essentially reflective of symptoms associated with noise annoyance and is an unnecessary and confusing addition to the vocabulary on noise. This syndrome is not a recognized diagnosis in the medical community. There are no unique symptoms or combinations of symptoms that would lead to a specific pattern of this hypothesized disorder. The collective symptoms in some people exposed to wind turbines are more likely associated with annoyance to low sound levels.

4.4 Visceral Vibratory Vestibular Disturbance

4.4.1 Hypothesis

In addition to case reports of symptoms reported by people who live near wind turbines, Pierpont has proposed a hypothesis that purports to explain how some of these symptoms arise: visceral vibratory vestibular disturbance (VVVD) (Pierpont, 2009, pre-publication draft). VVVD has been described as consisting of vibration associated with low frequencies that enters the body and causes a myriad of symptoms. Pierpont considers VVVD to be the most distinctive feature of a nonspecific set of symptoms that she describes as “wind turbine syndrome.” As the name VVVD implies, wind turbine sound in the 4 to 8 Hz spectral region is hypothesized to cause vibrations in abdominal viscera (e.g., intestines, liver, and kidneys) that in turn send neural signals to the part of the brain that normally receives information from the vestibular labyrinth. These signals hypothetically conflict with signals from the vestibular labyrinth and other sensory inputs (visual, proprioceptive), leading to unpleasant symptoms, including panic. Unpleasant symptoms (especially nausea) can certainly be caused by sensory conflict; this is how scientists explain motion sickness. However, this hypothesis of VVVD is implausible based on knowledge of sensory systems and the energy needed to stimulate them. Whether implausible or not, there are time-tested scientific methods available to evaluate the legitimacy of any hypothesis and at this stage, VVVD as proposed by Pierpont is an untested hypothesis. A case series of 10 families recruited to participate in a study based on certain symptoms would not be considered evidence of causality by research or policy institutions such as the International Agency for Research on

Cancer (IARC) or EPA. As noted earlier in this report, a case series of self-selected patients does not constitute evidence of a causal connection.

4.4.2 Critique

Receptors capable of sensing vibration are located predominantly in the skin and joints. A clinical neurological examination normally includes assessment of vibration sensitivity. It is highly unlikely, however, that airborne sound at comfortable levels could stimulate these receptors, because most of airborne sound energy is reflected away from the body.

Takahashi et al. (2005) used airborne sound to produce chest or abdominal vibration that exceeded ambient body levels. This vibration may or may not have been detectable by the subjects. Takahashi found that levels of 100 dB sound pressure level were required at 20 to 50 Hz (even higher levels would have been required at lower and higher frequencies). Sounds like this would be considered by most people to be very loud, and are well beyond the levels produced by wind turbines at residential distances. Comparison of the responses to low frequency airborne sound by normal hearing and profoundly deaf persons has shown that deaf subjects can detect sound transmitted through their body only when it is well above the normal hearing threshold (Yamada et al., 1983). For example, at 16 Hz, the deaf persons' average threshold was 128 dB sound pressure level, 40 dB higher than that of the hearing subjects. It has also been shown that, at higher frequencies, the body surface is very reflective of sound (Katz, 2000). Similarly, work on transmission of low frequency sound into the bodies of sheep has shown a loss of about 30 dB (Peters et al., 1993)

The visceral receptors invoked as a mechanism for VVVD have been shown to respond to static gravitational position changes, but not to vibration (that is why they are called graviceptors). If there were vibration-sensitive receptors in the abdominal viscera, they would be constantly barraged by low frequency body sounds such as pulsatile blood flow and bowel sounds, while external sounds would be attenuated by both the impedance mismatch and dissipation of energy in the overlying tissues. Finally, wind turbine sound at realistic distances possesses little, if any, acoustic energy, at 4 to 8 Hz.

It has been hypothesized that the vestibular labyrinth may be "abnormally stimulated" by wind turbine sound (Pierpont, 2009, pre-publication draft). As noted in earlier sections of this report, moderately loud airborne sound, at frequencies up to about 500 Hz, can indeed stimulate not only the cochlea (the hearing organ) but also the otolith organs. This is not abnormal, and there is no evidence in the medical literature that it is in any way unpleasant or harmful. In ordinary life, most of us are exposed for hours every day to sounds louder than those experienced at realistic distances from wind turbines, with no adverse effects. This assertion that the vestibular labyrinth is stimulated at levels below hearing threshold is based on a misunderstanding of research that used bone-conducted vibration rather than airborne sound. Indeed, those who wear bone conduction hearing aids experience constant stimulation of their vestibular systems, in addition to the cochlea, without adverse effects.

4.5 Interpreting Studies and Reports

In light of the unproven hypotheses that have been introduced as reflective of adverse health effects attributed to wind turbines, it can be instructive to review the type of research studies that can be used to determine definitive links between exposure to an environmental

hazard (in this case, sound and vibration emissions from wind turbines) and adverse health effects (the so-called “wind turbine syndrome”).

How do we know, for example, that cigarettes cause lung cancer and that excessive noise causes hearing loss? Almost always, the first indication that an exposure might be harmful comes from the informal observations of doctors who notice a possible correlation between an exposure and a disease, then communicate their findings to colleagues in case reports, or reports of groups of cases (*case series*). These initial observations are usually uncontrolled; that is, there is no comparison of the people who have both exposure and disease to control groups of people who are either non-exposed or disease-free. There is usually no way to be sure that the apparent association is statistically significant (as opposed to simple coincidence), or that there is a causal relationship between the exposure and the disease in question, without control subjects. For these reasons, case reports and case series cannot prove that an exposure is really harmful, but can only help to develop hypotheses that can then be tested in controlled studies (Levine et al., 1994; Genovese, 2004; McLaughlin, 2003).

Once suspicion of harm has been raised, controlled studies (case-control or cohort) are essential to determine whether or not a causal association is likely, and only after multiple independent-controlled studies show consistent results is the association likely to be broadly accepted (IARC, 2006).

Case-control studies compare people with the disease to people without the disease (ensuring as far as possible that the two groups are well-matched with respect to all other variables that might affect the chance of having the disease, such as age, sex, and other exposures known to cause the disease). If the disease group is found to be much more likely to have had the exposure in question, and if multiple types of error and bias can be excluded (Genovese, 2004), a causal link is likely. Multiple case-control studies were necessary before the link between smoking and lung cancer could be proved.

Cohort studies compare people with the exposure to well-matched control subjects who have not had that exposure. If the exposed group proves to be much more likely to have the disease, assuming error and bias can be excluded, a causal link is likely. After multiple cohort studies, it was clear that excessive noise exposure caused hearing loss (McCunney and Meyer, 2007).

In the case of wind turbine noise and its hypothetical relationships to “wind turbine syndrome” and vibroacoustic disease, the weakest type of evidence – case series – is available, from only a single investigator. These reports can do no more than suggest hypotheses for further research. Nevertheless, if additional and independent investigators begin to report adverse health effects in people exposed to wind turbine noise, in excess of those found in unexposed groups, and if some consistent syndrome or set of symptoms emerges, this advice could change. Thus, at this time, “wind turbine syndrome” and VVVD are unproven hypotheses (essentially unproven ideas) that have not been confirmed by appropriate research studies, most notably cohort and case control studies. However, the weakness of the basic hypotheses makes such studies unlikely to proceed.

4.6 Standards for Siting Wind Turbines

4.6.1 Introduction

While the use of large industrial-scale wind turbines is well established in Europe, the development of comparable wind energy facilities in North America is a more recent occurrence. The growth of wind and other renewable energy sources is expected to continue. Opponents of wind energy development argue that the height and setback regulations established in some jurisdictions are too lenient and that the noise limits which are applied to other sources of noise (either industrial or transportation) are not sufficient for wind turbines for a variety of reasons. Therefore, they are concerned that the health and well-being of some residents who live in the vicinity (or close proximity) of these facilities is threatened. Critics maintain that wind turbine noise may present more than an annoyance to nearby residents especially at night when ambient levels may be low. Consequently, there are those who advocate for a revision of the existing regulations for noise and setback pertaining to the siting of wind installations (Kamperman and James, 2009). Some have indicated their belief that setbacks of more than 1 mile may be necessary. While the primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the potential for adverse health effects rather than develop public policy, the panel does not find that setbacks of 1 mile are warranted.

4.6.2 Noise Regulations and Ordinances

In 1974, EPA published a report that examined the levels of environmental noise necessary to protect public health and welfare (EPA, 1974). Based on the analysis of available scientific data, EPA specified a range of day-night sound levels necessary to protect the public health and welfare from the effects of environmental noise, with a reasonable margin of safety. Rather than establishing standards or regulations, however, EPA simply identified noise levels below which the general public would not be placed at risk from any of the identified effects of noise. Each federal agency has developed its own noise criteria for sources for which they have jurisdiction (i.e., the Federal Aviation Administration regulates aircraft and airport noise, the Federal Highway Administration regulates highway noise, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulates interstate pipelines (Bastasch, 2005). State and local governments were provided guidance by EPA on how to develop their own noise regulations, but the establishment of appropriate limits was left to local authorities to determine given each community's differing values and land use priorities (EPA, 1975).

4.6.3 Wind Turbine Siting Guidelines

Establishing appropriate noise limits and setback distances for wind turbines has been a concern of many who are interested in wind energy. There are several approaches to regulating noise, from any source, including wind turbines. They can generally be classified as absolute or relative standards or a combination of absolute and relative standards. Absolute standards establish a fixed limit irrespective of existing noise levels. For wind turbines, a single absolute limit may be established regardless of wind speed (i.e., 50 dBA) or different limits may be established for various wind speeds (i.e., 40 dBA at 5 meters per second [m/s] and 45 dBA at 8 m/s). The Ontario Ministry of Environment (2008) wind turbine noise guidelines is an example of fixed limits for each integer wind speed between 4 and 10 meters per second. Relative standards limit the increase over existing levels and may

also establish either an absolute floor or ceiling beyond which the relative increase is not considered. That is, for example, if a relative increase of 10 dBA with a ceiling of 50 dBA is allowed and the existing level is 45 dBA, a level of 55 dBA would not be allowed. Similarly, if a floor of 40 dBA was established and the existing level is 25 dBA, 40 dBA rather than 35 dBA would be allowed. Fixed distance setbacks have also been discussed. Critics of this approach suggest that fixed setbacks do not take into account the number or size of the turbines nor do they consider other potential sources of noise within the project area. It is clear that like many other sources of noise, a uniform regulator approach for wind turbine noise has not been established either domestically or internationally.

A draft report titled *Environmental Noise and Health in the UK*, published for comment in 2009 by the Health Protection Agency (HPA) on behalf of an ad hoc expert group, provides insightful comments on the World Health Organization's noise guidelines (WHO, 1999). The HPA draft report can be viewed at the following address:

http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1246433634856

The HPA report states the following:

It is important to bear in mind that the WHO guideline values, like other WHO guidelines, are offered to policymakers as a contribution to policy development. They are not intended as standards in a formal sense but as a possible basis for the development of standards. By way of overall summary, the 1998 NPL report noted [a British report titled Health-Based Noise Assessment Methods – A Review and Feasibility Study (Porter et al., 1998) as quoted in HPA 2009]:

The WHO guidelines represent a consensus view of international expert opinion on the lowest noise levels below which the occurrence rates of particular effects can be assumed to be negligible. Exceedances of the WHO guideline values do not necessarily imply significant noise impact and indeed, it may be that significant impacts do not occur until much higher degrees of noise exposure are reached. The guidelines form a starting point for policy development. However, it will clearly be important to consider the costs and benefits of reducing noise levels and, as in other areas, this should inform the setting of objectives.

(From: HPA, 2009, p. 77)

The HPA report further states the following:

Surveys have shown that about half of the UK population lives in areas where daytime sound levels exceed those recommended in the WHO Community Noise Guidelines. About two-thirds of the population live in areas where the night-time guidelines recommended by WHO are exceeded. (p. 81)

That sleep can be affected by noise is common knowledge. Defining a dose-response curve that describes the relationship between exposure to noise and sleep disturbance has, however, proved surprisingly difficult. Laboratory studies and field studies have generated different results. In part this is due to habituation to noise which, in the field, is common in many people. (p. 82)

Our examination of the evidence relating to the effects of environmental noise on health has demonstrated that this is a rapidly developing area. Any single report will, therefore, need to be revised within a few years. We conclude and recommend that an

independent expert committee to address these issues on a long-term basis be established. (p. 82)

The statements cited above from the HPA and WHO documents address general environmental noise concerns rather than concerns focused solely on wind turbine noise.

Conclusions

Many countries have turned to wind energy as a key strategy to generate power in an environmentally clean manner. Wind energy enjoys considerable public support, but it has its detractors, who have publicized their concerns that the sounds emitted from wind turbines cause adverse health consequences.

The objective of the panel was to develop an authoritative reference document for the use of legislators, regulators, and citizens simply wanting to make sense of the conflicting information about wind turbine sound. To this end, the panel undertook extensive review, analysis, and discussion of the peer-reviewed literature on wind turbine sound and possible health effects. The varied professional backgrounds of panel members (audiology, acoustics, otolaryngology, occupational and environmental medicine, and public health) were highly advantageous in creating a diversity of informed perspectives. Participants were able to examine issues surrounding health effects and discuss plausible biological effects with considerable combined expertise.

Following review, analysis, and discussion, the panel reached agreement on three key points:

- There is nothing unique about the sounds and vibrations emitted by wind turbines.
- The body of accumulated knowledge about sound and health is substantial.
- The body of accumulated knowledge provides no evidence that the audible or subaudible sounds emitted by wind turbines have any direct adverse physiological effects.

The panel appreciated the complexities involved in the varied human reactions to sound, particularly sounds that modulate in intensity or frequency. Most complaints about wind turbine sound relate to the aerodynamic sound component (the swish sound) produced by the turbine blades. The sound levels are similar to the ambient noise levels in urban environments. A small minority of those exposed report annoyance and stress associated with noise perception.

This report summarizes a number of physical and psychological variables that may influence adverse reactions. In particular, the panel considered “wind turbine syndrome” and vibroacoustic disease, which have been claimed as causes of adverse health effects. The evidence indicates that “wind turbine syndrome” is based on misinterpretation of physiologic data and that the features of the so-called syndrome are merely a subset of annoyance reactions. The evidence for vibroacoustic disease (tissue inflammation and fibrosis associated with sound exposure) is extremely dubious at levels of sound associated with wind turbines.

The panel also considered the quality of epidemiologic evidence required to prove harm. In epidemiology, initial case reports and uncontrolled observations of disease associations

need to be confirmed through controlled studies with case-control or cohort methodology before they can be accepted as reflective of casual connections between wind turbine sound and health effects. In the area of wind turbine health effects, no case-control or cohort studies have been conducted as of this date. Accordingly, allegations of adverse health effects from wind turbines are as yet unproven. Panel members agree that the number and uncontrolled nature of existing case reports of adverse health effects alleged to be associated with wind turbines are insufficient to advocate for funding further studies.

In conclusion:

1. Sound from wind turbines does not pose a risk of hearing loss or any other adverse health effect in humans.
2. Subaudible, low frequency sound and infrasound from wind turbines do not present a risk to human health.
3. Some people may be annoyed at the presence of sound from wind turbines. Annoyance is not a pathological entity.
4. A major cause of concern about wind turbine sound is its fluctuating nature. Some may find this sound annoying, a reaction that depends primarily on personal characteristics as opposed to the intensity of the sound level.

SECTION 6

References

- Alves-Pereira, M., and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007a. Public Health and Noise Exposure: The Importance of Low Frequency Noise. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2007 Conference*. Istanbul: Sponsored by the International Institute of Noise Control Engineering (I-INCE) and Organized by the Turkish Acoustical Society. August 28-31, 2007.
- Alves-Pereira, M., and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007b. In-Home Wind Turbine Noise is Conducive to Vibroacoustic Disease. *Proceedings of the Second International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise*. Lyon, France: September 20-21, 2007. INCE/Europe.
- Alves-Pereira, M., and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007c. The Scientific Arguments Against Vibroacoustic Disease. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2007 Conference*. Istanbul: Sponsored by the International Institute of Noise Control Engineering (I-INCE) and Organized by the Turkish Acoustical Society. August 28-31, 2007.
- Alves-Pereira, M., and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007d. Infrasound and Low Frequency Noise Dose Responses: Contributions. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2007 Conference*. Istanbul: Sponsored by the International Institute of Noise Control Engineering (I-INCE) and Organized by the Turkish Acoustical Society. August 28-31, 2007.
- Alves-Pereira, M., and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007e. Infrasound and low frequency noise dose responses: Contributions. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2007 Conference*, CD Rom. Istanbul: Sponsored by the International Institute of Noise Control Engineering (I-INCE) and Organized by the Turkish Acoustical Society. August 28-31, 2007.
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI). 2006. *Guide for the Measurement and Evaluation of Human Exposure to Vibration Transmitted to the Hand*, ANSI S2.70-2006. New York: Acoustical Society of America.
- American National Standards Institute (ANSI). 1979. *Guide for the Evaluation of Human Exposure to Whole-Body Vibration*, ANSI S3.18-1979. New York: Acoustical Society of America.
- American Psychiatric Association. 2000. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th Ed. Text rev. Washington DC.
- Babisch, W. 2004. Health Aspects of Extra-Aural Noise Research. *Noise & Health* 6(22): 69-81.
- Babisch, W. 2000. Traffic Noise and Cardiovascular Disease: Epidemiological Review and Synthesis. *Noise & Health* 2(8): 9-32.
- Babisch, W. 1998. Epidemiological Studies of the Cardiovascular Effects of Occupational Noise – A Critical Appraisal. *Noise & Health* 1(1): 24 – 39.
- Baloh, R.W. and V. Honrubia. 1979. *Clinical Neurophysiology of the Vestibular System*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: F. A. Davis Company.

- Barsky, A.J. 1979. Patients who amplify body symptoms. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 91: 63.
- Bastasch, M. 2005. Regulation of Wind Turbine Noise in the Western U.S. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise: Perspectives for Control*. Berlin. October 17-18, 2005. INCE/Europe.
- Berglund, B., P. Hassmen, and R. F. Job. 1996. Sources and effects of low frequency noise. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 99: 2985-3002
- Berglund, B. and T. Lindvall. 1995. Community Noise. *Archives of the Centre for Sensory Research, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm University Vol 2, Issue 1*.
- Brooks, Thomas F., D. Stuart Pope, and Michael A. Marcolini. 1989. Airfoil self-noise and prediction. L-16528; NAS 1.61:1218; NASA-RP-1218.
http://ntrs.nasa.gov/archive/nasa/casi.ntrs.nasa.gov/19890016302_1989016302.pdf
- Bradley, J. S. 1994. Annoyance Caused by Constant Amplitude and Amplitude Modulated Sounds Containing Rumble. *Noise Control Engineering Journal* 42: 203-208.
- Castelo Branco, N.A.A. 1999. The Clinical Stages of Vibroacoustic Disease. *Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine* 70 (3 II Suppl.): A32-A39.
- Castelo Branco, N.A.A., A. Araujo, J. Jonaz de Melo, and M. Alves-Pereira. 2004. Vibroacoustic Disease in a Ten Year Old Male. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2004 Conference*. Prague: Czech Acoustical Society and the International Institute of Noise Control Engineering
- Escobar, J, and G. Canino. 1989. Unexplained physical complaints: Psychopathology and epidemiological correlates. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 154 [Suppl 4]: 24.
- Fernandez, C., and J.M. Goldberg. 1976. Physiology of Peripheral Neurons Innervating Otolith Organs of the Squirrel Monkey. III: Response dynamics. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 39: 996.
- Fiz, J. A., J. Gnitecki, S.S. Kraman, H. Pasterkamp and G.R. Wodicka. 2008. Effect of Body Position on Lung Sounds in Healthy Young Men. *Chest* 133 (3): 729-736.
- Genovese E. 2004. Evidence-based medicine: What does it mean? Why do we care? In *Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines*, ed Glass LS, American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, OEM Press, Beverly Farms, MA.
- Global Wind Energy Council. 2009. Global Wind 2008 Report.
<http://www.gwec.net/fileadmin/documents/Publications/Global%20Wind%202008%20Report.pdf>.
- Gross, V., A. Dittmar, T. Penzel, F. Schüttler, and P. von Wichert. 2000. The Relationship Between Normal Lung Sounds, Age, and Gender. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. 162 (3): 905 - 909.
- Hayes, M. 2006a. Low Frequency and Infrasound Noise Emissions from Wind Farms and the Potential for Vibroacoustic Disease. *Proceedings of the 12th International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and Its Control*. Bristol: Journal of Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and its Control, INCE/Europe, and EAA.

- Hayes, M. 2006b. The Measurement of Low Frequency Noise at Three UK Wind Farms. URN No.: 06/1412
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.berr.gov.uk//whatwedo/energy/sources/renewables/explained/wind/onshore-offshore/page31267.html>.
- Health Protection Agency (HPA). 2009. *Environmental Noise and Health in the UK*. Dr. Andy Moorhouse, Ed.
http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1246433634856.
- IEC. 1994. 60050-801:1994 International Electrotechnical Vocabulary - Chapter 801: Acoustics and electroacoustics.
- International Agency for Research on Cancer. 2006. IARC monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risk to humans: Preamble. World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on Cancer: Lyon, France.
- Inukai, Y., N. Nakamura, and H. Taya. 2000. Unpleasantness and Acceptable Limits of Low Frequency Sound. *Journal of Low-frequency Noise and Vibration* 19: 135-140.
- Ising, H. and B. Kruppa. 2004. Health Effects Caused by Noise: Evidence in the Literature from the Past 25 Years. *Noise and Health* 6 (23): 5-13.
- International Standards Organization (ISO). 2003. ISO 226. Acoustics – Normal equal-loudness contours.
- Jakobsen, J. 2004. Infrasound Emission from Wind Turbines. *Proceedings of the 11th International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control*. Maastricht: MultiScience Publishing Company.
- Kalveram, K. T. 2000. How Acoustical Noise Can Cause Physiological and Psychological Reactions. *Proceedings of the 5th International Symposium of Transport Noise and Vibration*. St. Petersburg, Russia: East European Acoustical Society.
- Kalveram, K Th, Dassow, J & Vogt, J (1999) How information about the source influences noise annoyance. *Proceedings of the 137th meeting of the Acoustical Society of America*. Seattle, Washington: Acoustical Society of America.
- Kamperman G.W. and R. R. James. 2009. Guidelines for selecting wind turbine sites. *Sound and Vibration*: 8-12. July. <http://www.sandv.com/home.htm>.
- Kamperman, G. W. and R. R. James. 2008. Simple Guidelines for Siting Wind Turbines to Prevent Health Risks. *Proceedings NoiseCon 2008*. Dearborn, Michigan: Institute of Noise Control Engineering.
- Katz, B. 2000. Acoustic Absorption Coefficient of Human Hair and Skin within the Audible Frequency Range. *JASA* 108. pp. 2238-2242.
- Kryter K.D. 1980. Physiological Acoustics and Health. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 68: 10-14.

- Kurakata, K., and T. Mizunami. 2008. The statistical distribution of normal hearing thresholds for low frequency tones. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and Active Control* 27: 97-104.
- Leventhall, H.G. 2006. Somatic Responses to Low Frequency Noise. *Proceedings of the 12th International Meeting: Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control*. Bristol: Journal of Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and its Control, INCE/Europe, and EAA.
- Leventhall, H.G. 2004. Low Frequency Noise and Annoyance. *Noise and Health* 6 923: 59-72.
- Leventhall, H.G. 2002. 35 Years of Low Frequency Noise – Stephens Medal Lecture. *Proceedings of Institute of Acoustics*. Stratford, UK: Institute of Acoustics.
- Leventhall, H. G., S. Benton, and P. Pelmear. 2003. *A Review of Published Research on Low Frequency Noise and its Effects*.
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/noise/research/lowfrequency/pdf/lowfrequency.pdf>. Accessed 2003.
- Leventhall, H. G., S. Benton, and D. Robertson. 2008. Coping Strategies for Low Frequency Noise. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 27: 35-52.
- Levine M, Walter S, Lee H, Haines T, Holbrook Am Moyer V. 1994. How to use an article about harm. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 271: 1615-1619.
- Maschke C. 2004. Introduction to the special issue of low frequency noise. *Noise and Health* 6: 1-2.
- McCunney, R.J. and J. Meyer. 2007. Occupational Exposure to Noise. *Environmental and Occupational Medicine, 4th Edition*. W. M. Rom, ed. Baltimore: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins. pp. 1295-1238.
- McLaughlin J.K. 2003. Epidemiology and Biostatistics. McCunney R.J. (ed) *A Practical Approach to Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. Baltimore.
- Mendes, J., J. Martins dos Santos, P. Oliveira, J. da Fonseca, A. Aguas, and N.A.A. Castelo Branco. 2007. Low frequency noise effects on the periodontium of the Wistar rat - a light microscopy study. *European Journal of Anatomy* 11 (1): 27-30
- Mirowska, M., and E. Mroz. 2000. Effect of low frequency noise at low levels on human health in light of questionnaire investigation. *Proceedings of the Inter-Noise 2000 Conference*. 5: 2809 - 2812.
- Mittelstaedt, H. 1996. Somatic graviception. *Biological Psychology* 42: 53-74.
- Møller, H., and M. Lydolf. 2002. A questionnaire survey of complaints of infrasound and low frequency noise. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 21: 53-65.
- Moorhouse, A., M. Hayes, S. von Hunerbein, B. Piper, and M. Adams. 2007. Research into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise. *Report: Department of Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform*. www.berr.gov.uk/files/file40570.pdf.
- Nagai, N., M. Matsumoto, Y. Yamsumi, T. Shiraishi, K. Nishimura, K. Matsumoto, K. Myashita, and S. Takeda. 1989. Process and emergence of the effects of infrasonic

- and low frequency noise on inhabitants. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 8: 87-89.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). 1998. Criteria for a Recommended Standard: Occupational Noise Exposure. NIOSH, Cincinnati OH.
- National Research Council (NRC). 2007. Environmental Impacts of Wind-Energy Projects NRC, Washington, DC.
- National Toxicology Program (NTP). National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS). 2001. Infrasound: brief review of the toxicological literature. Prepared in part by Integrated Laboratory systems (NIEHS contract N01-E3 -65402 (Haneke K.E. and B.C. Carson, authors).
- New York Department of Environmental Conservation. 2001. Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impacts. Available at http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/noise2000.pdf.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). 1983. Occupational Noise Exposure: Hearing Conservation Amendment; Final Rule. Federal Register 48 (46): 9738-9784.
- Oerlemans, S. and G. Schepers. 2009. Prediction of wind turbine noise directivity and swish. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise*. Aalborg, Denmark. June 17-19, 2009. INCE/Europe.
- Ontario Ministry of Environment. 2008. Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms. Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Publications to Wind Power Generation Facilities. <http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/publications/4709e.pdf>
- Pearsons K.S., R.L. Bennett, and S. Fidell. 1977. Speech levels in various noise environments. Report No. EPA-600/1-77-025. Washington DC, Environmental Protection Agency, 1977.
- Pedersen, E., R. Bakker, J. Bouma, and F. van den Berg. 2009. Response to noise from modern wind farms in The Netherlands. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* August 126: 634-643
- Pedersen, and H. Högskolan. 2003. *Noise Annoyance from Wind Turbines*. Report 5308. Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.
- Pedersen, E. and K Persson Waye. 2008. Wind turbines-low level noise sources interfering with restoration. *Environmental Research Letters* 3: 1-5
- Pedersen, E. and K. Persson Waye. 2007. Wind turbine noise, annoyance and self-reported health and wellbeing in different living environments, *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 64: 480-486.
- Pedersen, E. and K. Persson Waye. 2004. Perception and annoyance due to wind turbine noise: A dose-response relationship, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 116: 3460-3470.

- Pedersen, E., L. R.-M. Hallberg, and K. Persson Waye. 2007. Living in the vicinity of wind turbines – A grounded theory study. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 4: 49–63.
- Pedersen, T. H. 2008. Low frequency noise from large Wind Turbines - A procedure for evaluation of the audibility for low frequency sound and a literature study. *DELTA Report EP- 06*.
- Persson Waye, K. 2004. Effects of low frequency noise on sleep. *Noise and Health* 6 (23): 87-91.
- Persson Waye, K. and E. Öhrström 2002. Psycho-acoustic characters of relevance for annoyance of wind turbine noise. *J. Sound & Vibration* 250 (1): 65-73.
- Persson R. M. Albin, J. Ardö, J. Björk, and K. Jakobsson. 2007. Trait anxiety and modeled exposure determinants of self reported annoyance to sound, air pollution and other environmental factors in the home. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 18: 179-191
- Peters, A. J. M., R.M. Abrams, K.J. Gerhardt, and S.K. Griffiths. 1993. Transmission of airborne sound from 50 to 20,000 Hz into the abdomen of sheep. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 12: 16-24.
- Pierpont, N. 2009, pre-publication draft. *Wind Turbine Syndrome: a report on a natural experiment*. <http://www.windturbinesyndrome.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/ms-ready-for-posting-on-wtscom-3-7-09.pdf>.
- Porter, N.D., I.H. Flindell, and B.F. Berry. 1998. Health-Based Noise Assessment Methods – A Review and Feasibility Study. NPL Report CMAM 16.
- Sadock, B. J., and V.A. Sadock, Eds. 2005. *Kaplan & Sadock's Comprehensive Textbook of Psychiatry*, 8th Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Sakai, A. L.P. Feigen and A.A. Luisada. 1971. Frequency distribution of the heart sounds in normal man. *Cardiovascular Research* 5 (3): 358-363.
- Sasser, S.M., R.W. Sattin, R.C. Hunt, and J. Krohmer. 2006. Blast lung injury. *Prehospital Emergency Care* 10: 165-72.
- Schust, M. 2004. Effects of low frequency noise up to 100 Hz. *Noise & Health* 6 (23): 73-85.
- Smith, S.D. 2002. Characterizing the effect of airborne vibration on human body vibration response. *Aviation, Space and Environmental Medicine* 73: 36 - 45.
- Spiegel, H. 1997. 1997. Nocebo: The power of suggestibility. *Preventive Medicine* 26: 616.
- Suter, AH. 1991. Noise and its Effects. Report to the Administrative Conference of the United States. <http://www.nonoise.org/library/suter/suter.htm>.
- Takahashi, Y., K. Kanada, Y. Yonekawa, and N. Harada. 2005. A study on the relationship between subjective unpleasantness and body surface vibrations induced by high-level low-frequency pure tones. *Industrial Health* 43: 580-587.
- Takahashi, Y., Y. Yonekawa, K. Kanada, and S. Maeda. 1999. A pilot study on human body vibration induced by low frequency noise. *Industrial Health* 37: 28-35.

- Todd, N., S.M. Rosengren, and J.G. Colebatch. 2008a. Tuning and sensitivity of the human vestibular system to low frequency vibration. *Neuroscience Letters* 444: 36-41.
- Todd, N.P., S.M. Rosengren, and J.G. Colebatch. 2008b. A source analysis of short-latency evoked potentials produced by air- and bone-conducted sound. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* 119: 1881-94.
- Truax, Barry, ed. 1999. *Handbook for Acoustic Ecology, Second Edition*. Originally published by the World Soundscape Project, Simon Fraser University, and ARC Publications, 1978
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1974. *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004, March 1974.
<http://www.nonoise.org/library/levels/levels.htm>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1975. Model Noise Control Ordinance.
<http://www.nonoise.org/epa/Roll16/roll16doc6.pdf>.
- van den Berg, G. P. 2004: Do Wind Turbines produce significant low frequency sound levels? *Proc 11th International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control, Maastricht August 2004*, 367-376.
- van den Berg, G. P. 2003. Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine noise. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*. <http://www.nowap.co.uk/docs/windnoise.pdf>.
- Van Dijk F.J.H., J.H. Ettema, and R.L. Zielhuis. 1987. Non-auditory effects of noise: VII. Evaluation, conclusions, and recommendations. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 59: 147 – 152.
- van Kamp , M. Haines, J. Hatfield, R.F. Job, S.A. Stanfield and R.K. Stellato. 2004. The role of noise sensitivity in the noise response relation: A comparison of three international airport studies. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 116: 3471-79.
- Webster, J.C. 1978. Speech interference aspects of noise. In *Noise and Audiology*, ed. Lipscomb DL, Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Wilder D.G., D.E. Wasserman, and J. Wasserman. 2002. Occupational vibration exposure. In *Physical and Biological Hazards of the Workplace*, ed. Wald PH, Stave GM. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Wolsink, M., M. Sprengers, A. Keuper, T.H. Pedersen, and C.A. Westra. 1993. Annoyance from wind turbine noise on sixteen sites in three countries. *Proceedings of the European Community Wind Energy Conference*. Lübeck, Travemünde. 273–276.
- World Health Organization (WHO). 1999. Guidelines for Community Noise (edited by B. Berglund, T. Lindvall, D. Schwela, K-T. Goh). The World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. ISBN: 9971: 9971-88-770-3
<http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/1999/a68672.pdf>.

- World Health Organization (WHO). 1993. International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, 10th Revision (ICD-10), *Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders*. Geneva.
- Yamada, S., 1980. Hearing of low frequency sound and influence on the body. Conference on Low Frequency Noise and Hearing. Aalborg, Denmark. 95-102. (Eds. H Møller and P Rubak).
- Yamada, S., M. Ikuji, S. Fujikata, T. Watanabe, and T. Kosaka. 1983. Body sensations of low frequency noise of ordinary persons and profoundly deaf persons. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise and Vibration* 2: 32-36.
- Young, E.D., C. Fernandez, and J.M. Goldberg. 1977. Responses of squirrel monkey vestibular neurons to audio-frequency sound and head vibration. *Acta Otolaryngol* 84: 352-60.

Additional References

- Alberts, D. 2006. Primer for Addressing Wind Turbine Noise.
<http://www.maine.gov/doc/mfs/windpower/pubs/pdf/AddressingWindTurbineNoise.pdf>.
- American National Standards Institute. 1996. *American National Standard Specification for Audiometers*, ANSI S3.6-1996. New York: Acoustical Society of America.
- Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit. 2008. The Health Impact of Wind Turbines: a Review of the Current White, Grey and Published Literature 2008. <http://www.wind-works.org/LargeTurbines/Health%20and%20Wind%20by%20C-K%20Health%20Unit.pdf>.
- Copes, R. and K. Rideout. Wind Turbines and Health: A Review of Evidence. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion 2009.
<http://www.oahpp.ca/Documents/Wind%20Turbines%20-%20Sept%2010%202009.pdf>.
- Draft New Zealand standard for wind turbine sound.
<http://shop.standards.co.nz/drafts/DZ6808-DZ6808Publiccommentdraft.pdf>.
- Hellwig, R. and Lampeter, R. 2009. Critiques on Kamperman and James paper on wind turbine noise. March. http://www.dekalbcounty.org/Planning/Exhibit_M.pdf.
- Stelling, K. and D. Phyt. 2009. Summary of recent research on adverse health effects of wind turbines. <http://windconcernsontario.files.wordpress.com/2009/08/adverse-health-effects-of-wind-turbines1.pdf>.
- Fox Business. 2009. Ontario citizen takes legal aim at government of Ontario's flagship Green Energy Act.
<http://www.foxbusiness.com/story/markets/industries/energy/ontario-citizen-takes-legal-aim-government-ontarios-flagship-green-energy-act/>.

- Industrial Wind Action Group. 2009. Maine Osteopathic Association Resolution: Wind Energy and Public Health. <http://www.windaction.org/documents/23515>.
- Kamperman, G. and R. James. 2008. Why noise criteria are necessary for proper siting of wind turbines. <http://www.windturbinesyndrome.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/11/kamperman-and-james-9-pp.pdf>.
- Kamperman, G., and R. James. 2008. The how to guide to siting wind turbines to prevent health risks from sound. <http://www.savethebluffs.ca/archives/files/kamperman-james-8-26-08-report.pdf>.
- Klug, H. Noise from wind turbines – standards and noise reduction procedures. <http://www.sea-acustica.es/Sevilla02/envgen013.pdf>.
- Keith, S. E., D. S. Michaud, and S. H. P. Bly. 2008. A proposal for evaluating the potential health effects of wind turbine noise for projects under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. *Journal of Low Frequency Noise, Vibration and Active Control*, 27 (4):253-265.
- Ramakrishnan, R. 2007. Acoustic Consulting Report Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of the Environment: Wind Turbine Facilities Noise Issues. Aiolos Engineering Corporation. <https://ospace.scholarsportal.info/bitstream/1873/13073/1/283287.pdf>.
- Regan, B. and T.G. Casey. 2006. Wind Turbine Noise Primer, *Canadian Acoustics Journal* 34 (2).
- Rogers, A. and J. Manwell . Wright, S. 2002. Wind turbine acoustic noise. http://www.ceere.org/rerl/publications/whitepapers/Wind_Turbine_Acoustic_Noise_Rev2006.pdf/
- Soysai, H., and O. Soysai. Wind farm noise and regulations in the eastern United States. 2007. *Proceedings of the Second International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise*. Lyon, France: September 20-21, 2007. INCE/Europe.
- State of Rhode Island, Department of Environmental Management. 2009. *Terrestrial Wind Turbine Siting Report*. <http://www.dem.ri.gov/cleanrg/pdf/terrwind.pdf>.
- Ward, W.D, L.H. Royster, and J.D. Royster. 2003. Anatomy and Physiology of the Ear: Normal and Damaged Hearing. In *The Noise Manual*, Eds. Berger EH, Royster LH, Royster JD, Driscoll DP, Layne M. AIHA Press, Fairfax VA.
- Welgampola, M.S., S.M. Rosengren, G.M. Halmagyi, and J.G. Colebatch. 2003. Vestibular activation by bone conducted sound. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry* 74: 771-778.
- Wilder, D.G., D.E. Wasserman, and J. Wasserman. 2002. Occupational Vibration Exposure. In *Physical and Biological Hazards of the Workplace*, Ed. Wald PH, Stave GM. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- World Health Organization (WHO). 2009. Night Noise Guidelines for Europe. The World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. <http://www.euro.who.int/document/e92845.pdf>.

APPENDIX A

Fundamentals of Sound

Fundamentals of Sound

The following appendix provides additional background information on sound and how it is defined.

One atmospheric pressure is given by 100,000 pascals (Pa), where one pascal is one Newton per square meter (N/m^2), and a sound pressure of 94 dB re $20\mu\text{Pa}$ is given by 1 Pa (See later for decibels). The frequency of the fluctuations may be between 20 times a second (20 Hz), and up to 20,000 times a second (20,000 Hz) for the “audible” noise. Frequencies below 20 Hz are commonly called “infrasound,” although there is a very fuzzy boundary between infrasound and low frequency noise. Infrasound at high levels is audible. Low frequency noise might be from about 10 Hz to about 200 Hz.

In addition to frequency, the quantities which define a sound wave include:

- Pressure, P
- Wavelength, λ
- Velocity, $c = 340\text{m}/\text{s}$ approx, depending on temperature

The velocity and wavelength are related by: velocity = wavelength \times frequency,

Relating frequency and wavelength by velocity gives

Freq Hz	16	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000
Wavelength m	21	11	5.4	2.7	1.4	0.68	0.34	0.17	0.085

Low frequencies have long wavelengths. It is useful to develop an appreciation of frequencies and related wavelengths, since this helps an understanding of noise propagation and control.

Sound pressure in a wave is force per unit of area of the wave and has units of N/m^2 , which is abbreviated to Pa. The sound pressure fluctuates above and below atmospheric pressure by a very small amount.

The sound power is a characteristic of the source, and is its rate of production of energy, expressed in watts. The sound power is the fundamental property of the source, whilst the sound pressure at a measurement location depends on the transmission path from source to receiver. Most sound sources, including wind turbines, are specified in terms of their sound power. The sound power of a wind turbine is typically in the 100-105 dBA range, which is similar to that of a leaf blower. The sound power is used to predict propagation of the sound, where the source is assumed to be at the hub.

Sound Levels

The decibel is the logarithm of the ratio between two values of a quantity such as power, pressure or intensity, with a multiplying constant to give convenient numerical factors. Logarithms are useful for compressing a wide range of quantities into a smaller range. For example:

$$\begin{aligned}\log_{10}10 &= 1 \\ \log_{10}100 &= 2 \\ \log_{10}1000 &= 3\end{aligned}$$

The ratio of 1000:10 is compressed into a ratio of 3:1.

This approach is advantageous for handling sound levels, where the ratio of the highest to the lowest sound which we are likely to encounter is as high as 1,000,000 to 1. A useful development, many years ago, was to take the ratios with respect to the quietest sound which we can hear. This is the threshold of hearing at 1,000 Hz, which is 20 microPascals (μPa) ($2 \times 10^{-5} \text{Pa}$) of pressure for the average young healthy person. Sound powers in decibels are taken with respect to a reference level of 10^{-12} watts.

When the word “level” is added to the word for a physical quantity, decibel levels are implied, denoted by L_x , where x is the symbol for the quantity.

$$\text{Pressure level } L_p = 20 \log_{10} \left[\frac{P}{P_0} \right] \text{ dB}$$

where P is the measured pressure and P_0 is the reference pressure level of $2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Pa}$

A little calculation allows us to express the sound pressure level at a distance from a source of known sound power level as

$$\text{Sound pressure level, } L_P = L_w - 20 \log[r] - 11 \text{ dB}$$

Where L_p is the sound pressure level
 L_w is the sound power level of the source
 r is the distance from the source

This is the basic equation for spherical sound propagation. It is used in prediction of wind turbine sound but, in a real calculation, has many additions to it, to take into account the atmospheric, ground and topographic conditions. However, as a simple calculation, the sound level at a distance of 500m from a source of sound power 100 dBA is 35 dBA.

Equivalent level (L_{eq}): This is a steady level over a period of time, which has the same energy as that of the fluctuating level actually occurring during that time. A-weighted equivalent level, designated L_{Aeq} , is used for many legislative purposes, including for assessment of wind turbine sound.

Percentiles (LN)L These are a statistical measure of the fluctuations in overall noise level, that is, in the envelope of the noise, which is usually sampled a number of times per second, typically ten times. The most used percentiles are L_{90} and L_{10} . The L_{90} is the level exceeded for 90 percent of the time and represents a low level in the noise. It is often used to assess

background noise. The L10 is the level exceeded for 10 percent of the time and is a measure of the higher levels in a noise. Modern computing sound level meters give a range of percentiles. Note that the percentile is a statistical measure over a specified time interval.

Frequency Analysis

This gives more detail of the frequency components of a noise. Frequency analysis normally uses one of three approaches: octave band, one-third octave band or narrow band.

Narrow band analysis is most useful for complex tonal noises. It could be used, for example, to determine a fan tone frequency, to find the frequencies of vibration transmission from machinery or to detect system resonances. All analyses require an averaging over time, so that the detail of fluctuations in the noise is normally lost.

Criteria for assessment of noise are based on dBA, octave bands, or 1/3-octave band measurements. These measures clearly give increasingly detailed information about the noise.

APPENDIX B

The Human Ear

The Human Ear

Humans have ears with three general regions:

1. An *outer ear*, including an ear (auditory) canal
2. An air-containing *middle ear* that includes an eardrum and small bones called ossicles (three in mammals, one in other animals)
3. An *inner ear* that includes organs of hearing (in mammals, this is the organ of Corti in the cochlea) and balance (vestibular labyrinth)

Airborne sound passes thorough the ear canal, making the eardrum and ossicles vibrate, and this vibration then sets the fluids of the cochlea into motion. Specialized “hair cells” convert this fluid movement into nerve impulses that travel to the brain along the auditory nerve. The hair cells, nerve cells, and other cells in the cochlea can be damaged by excessive noise, trauma, toxins, ear diseases, and as part of the aging process. Damage to the cochlea causes “sensorineural hearing loss,” the most common type of hearing loss in the United States.

It is essential to understand the role of the middle ear, as well as the difference between air conduction and bone conduction. The middle ear performs the essential task of converting airborne sound into inner ear fluid movement, a process known as impedance matching (air is a low-impedance medium, meaning that its molecules move easily in response to sound pressure, while water is a high-impedance medium). Without impedance matching, over 99.9 percent of airborne sound energy is reflected away from the body. The middle ear enables animals living in air to hear very soft sounds that would otherwise be inaudible, but it is unnecessary for animals that live in water, because sound traveling in water passes easily into the body (which is mostly water). When a child has an ear infection, or an adult places earplugs in his ears, a “conductive hearing loss” dramatically reduces the transmission of airborne sound into the inner ear. People with conductive hearing loss can still hear sounds presented directly to the skull by “bone conduction.” This is how both humans and fishes hear underwater or when a vibrating tuning fork is applied to the head, but it requires much more acoustic energy than air conduction hearing.

APPENDIX C
Measuring Sound

Measuring Sound

A sound level meter is the standard way of measuring sound. Environmental sound is normally assessed by the A-weighting. Although hand-held instruments appear to be easy to use, lack of understanding of their operation and limitations, and the meaning of the varied measurements which they can give, may result in misleading readings.


The weighting network and electrical filters are an important part of the sound level meter, as they give an indication of the frequency components of the sound. The filters are as follows:

- A-weighting: on all meters
- C-weighting: on most meters
- Linear (Z-weighting): on many meters
- Octave filters: on some meters
- Third octave filters: on some meters
- Narrow band: on a few meters

Sound level meter weighting networks are shown in Figure C-1. Originally, the A-weighting was intended for low levels of noise. C-weighting was intended for higher levels of noise. The weighting networks were based on human hearing contours at low and high levels and it was hoped that their use would mimic the response of the ear. This concept, which did not work out in practice, has now been abandoned and A- and C-weighting are used at all levels. Linear weighting is used to detect low frequencies. A specialist G-weighting is used for infrasound below 20 Hz.

Figure C-1 shows that the A-weighting depresses the levels of the low frequencies, as the ear is less sensitive to these. There is general consensus that A-weighting is appropriate for estimation of the hazard of NIHL. With respect to other effects, such as annoyance, A-weighting is acceptable if there is largely middle and high frequency noise present, but if the noise is unusually high at low frequencies, or contains prominent low frequency tones, the A-weighting may not give a valid measure. Compared with other noise sources, wind turbine spectra, as heard indoors at typical separation distances, have less low frequency content than most other sources (Pedersen, 2008).

FIGURE C-1
Weighting Networks



APPENDIX D

Propagation of Sound

Propagation of Sound

The propagation of noise from wind turbines is determined by a number of factors, including:

- Geometrical spreading, given by $K = 20\log[r] - 11$ dB, at a distance r
- Molecular absorption. This is conversion of acoustic energy to heat and is frequency dependent
- Turbulent scattering from local variations in wind velocity and air temperature and is moderately frequency dependent
- Ground effects – reflection, topography and absorption are frequency dependent; their effects increasing as the frequency increases
- Near surface effects – temperature and wind gradients.

The sound pressure at a point, distant from source, is given by

$$L_P = L_W - K - D - A_A - A_G \quad (\text{dB})$$

In which:

L_P is the sound pressure at the receiving point

L_W is the sound power of the turbine in decibels re 10^{-12} watts

K is the geometrical spreading term, which is inherent in all sources

D is a directivity index, which takes non-uniform spreading into account

A_A is an atmospheric absorption and other near surface effects term

A_G is a ground absorption and other surface effects term

Near surface meteorological effects are complex, as wind and temperature gradients affect propagation through the air.

APPENDIX E

Expert Panel Members

Expert Panel Members

Members of the expert panel are listed below. Biographies of each member are provided following the list.

Expert Panel Members

W. David Colby, M.D.

Chatham-Kent Medical Officer of Health (Acting)
Associate Professor, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, University of Western Ontario

Robert Dobie, M.D.

Clinical Professor, University of Texas, San Antonio
Clinical Professor, University of California, Davis

Geoff Leventhall, Ph.D.

Consultant in Noise Vibration and Acoustics, UK

David M. Lipscomb, Ph.D.

President, Correct Service, Inc.

Robert J. McCunney, M.D.

Research Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Department of Biological Engineering,
Staff Physician, Massachusetts General Hospital Pulmonary Division; Harvard Medical School

Michael T. Seilo, Ph.D.

Professor of Audiology, Western Washington University

Bo Søndergaard, M.Sc. (Physics)

Senior Consultant, Danish Electronics Light and Acoustics (DELTA)

Technical Advisor

Mark Bastasch

Acoustical Engineer, CH2M HILL

Panel Member Biographies

W. David Colby, M.D.

W. David Colby M.Sc., M.D., FRCPC, is a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada in Medical Microbiology. Dr Colby is the Acting Medical Officer of Health in Chatham-Kent, Ontario and Associate Professor of Medicine, Microbiology/Immunology and Physiology/Pharmacology at the Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry at the University of Western Ontario. He received his M.D. from the University of Toronto and completed his residency at University Hospital, London, Ontario. While still a resident he was given a faculty appointment and later was appointed Chief of Microbiology and Consultant in Infectious Diseases at University Hospital. Dr Colby lectures extensively on antimicrobial chemotherapy, resistance and fungal infections in addition to a busy clinical practice in Travel Medicine and is a Coroner for the province of Ontario. He has received numerous awards for his teaching. Dr. Colby has a number of articles in peer-reviewed journals and is the author of the textbook *Optimizing Antimicrobial Therapy: A Pharmacometric Approach*. He is a Past President of the Canadian Association of Medical Microbiologists. On the basis of his expertise in Public Health, Dr Colby was asked by his municipality to assess the health impacts of wind turbines. The report, titled *The Health Impact of Wind Turbines: A Review of the Current White, Grey, and Published Literature* is widely cited internationally.

Robert Dobie, M.D.

Robert Dobie, M.D., is clinical professor of otolaryngology at both the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio and the University of California-Davis. He is also a partner in Dobie Associates, a consulting practice specializing in hearing and balance, hearing conservation, and ear disorders. The author of over 175 publications, his research interests include age-related and noise-induced hearing loss, as well as tinnitus and other inner ear disorders. He is past president of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology, past chair of the Hearing and Equilibrium Committee of the American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, and has served on the boards and councils of many other professional organizations and scholarly journals.

Geoff Leventhall, Ph.D.

Geoff is a UK-based noise and vibration consultant who works internationally. His academic and professional qualifications include Ph.D. in Acoustics, Fellow of the UK Institute of Physics, Honorary Fellow of the UK institute of Acoustics (of which he is a former President), Distinguished International Member of the USA Institute of Noise Control Engineering, Member of the Acoustical Society of America.

He was formerly an academic, during which time he supervised 30 research students to completion of their doctoral studies in acoustics. Much of his academic and consultancy work has been on problems of infrasound and low frequency noise and control of low frequency noise by active attenuation

He has been a member of a number of National and International committees on noise and acoustics and was recently a member of two committees producing reports on effects of noise on health: the UK Health Protection Agency Committee on the Health Effects of

Ultrasound and Infrasound and the UK Department of Health Committee on the Effects of Environmental Noise on Health.

David M. Lipscomb, Ph.D.

Dr. David M. Lipscomb received a Ph. D. in Hearing Science from the University of Washington (Seattle) in 1966. Dr. Lipscomb taught at the University of Tennessee for more than two decades in the Department of Audiology and Speech Pathology. While he was on the faculty, Dr. Lipscomb developed and directed the department's Noise Research Laboratory. During his tenure at Tennessee and after he moved to the Pacific Northwest in 1988, Dr. Lipscomb has served as a consultant to many entities including communities, governmental agencies, industries, and legal organizations.

Dr. Lipscomb has qualified in courts of law as an expert in Audiology since 1966. Currently, he investigates incidents to determine whether an acoustical warning signal provided warning to individuals in harms way, and, if so, at how many seconds before an incident. With his background in clinical and research audiology, he undertakes the evaluation of hearing impairment claims for industrial settings and product liability.

Dr. Lipscomb was a bioacoustical consultant to the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Noise Abatement and Control (ONAC) at the time the agency was responding to Congressional mandates contained in the Noise Control Act of 1972. He was one of the original authors of the Criteria Document produced by ONAC, and he served as a reviewer for the ONAC document titled *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*. Dr. Lipscomb's experience in writing and reviewing bioacoustical documentation has been particularly useful in his review of materials for AWEA regarding wind farm noise concerns.

Robert J. McCunney, M.D.

Robert J. McCunney, M.D., M.P.H., M.S., is board certified by the American Board of Preventive Medicine as a specialist in occupational and environmental medicine. Dr. McCunney is a staff physician at Massachusetts General Hospital's pulmonary division, where he evaluates and treats occupational and environmental illnesses, including lung disorders ranging from asbestosis to asthma to mold related health concerns, among others. He is also a clinical faculty member of Harvard Medical School and a research scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Department of Biological Engineering, where he participates in epidemiological research pertaining to occupational and environmental health hazards.

Dr. McCunney received his B.S. in chemical engineering from Drexel University, his M.S. in environmental health from the University of Minnesota, his M.D. from the Thomas Jefferson University Medical School and his M.P.H. from the Harvard School of Public Health. He completed training in internal medicine at Northwestern University Medical Center in Chicago. Dr. McCunney is past president of the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) and an accomplished author. He has edited numerous occupational and environmental medicine textbooks and over 80 published articles and book chapters. He is the Editor of all three editions of the text book, *A Practical Approach to Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, the most recent edition of which was published in 2003. Dr. McCunney received the Health Achievement Award from ACOEM in 2004.

Dr. McCunney has extensive experience in evaluating the effects of noise on hearing via reviewing audiometric tests. He has written book chapters on the topic and regularly lectures at the Harvard School of Public Health on "Noise and Health."

Michael T. Seilo, Ph.D.

Dr. Michael T. Seilo received his Ph.D. in Audiology from Ohio University in 1970. He is currently a professor of audiology in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington where he served as department chair for a total of more than twenty years. Dr. Seilo is clinically certified by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) in both audiology and speech-language pathology and is a long-time member of ASHA, the American Academy of Audiology, and the Washington Speech and Hearing Association.

For many years Dr. Seilo has taught courses in hearing conservation at both the graduate and undergraduate level. His special interest areas include speech perception and the impact of noise on human hearing sensitivity including tinnitus.

Dr. Seilo has consulted with industries on the prevention of NIHL and he has collaborated with other professionals in the assessment of hearing-loss related claims pertaining to noise.

Bo Søndergaard, M.Sc. (Physics)

Bo Søndergaard has more than 20 years of experience in consultancy in environmental noise measurements, predictions and assessment. The last 15 years with an emphasis on wind turbine noise. Mr. Søndergaard is the convenor of the MT11 work group under IEC TC88 working with revision of the measurement standard for wind turbines IEC 61400-11. He has also worked as project manager for the following research projects: Low Frequency Noise from Large Wind Turbines for the Danish Energy Authority, Noise and Energy optimization of Wind Farms, and Noise from Wind Turbines in Wake for Energinet.dk.

Technical Advisor Biography

Mark Bastasch

Mr. Bastasch is a registered acoustical engineer with CH2M HILL. Mr. Bastasch assisted AWEA and CanWEA in the establishment of the panel and provided technical assistance to the panel throughout the review process. Mr. Bastasch's acoustical experience includes preliminary siting studies, regulatory development and assessments, ambient noise measurements, industrial measurements for model development and compliance purposes, mitigation analysis, and modeling of industrial and transportation noise. His wind turbine experience includes some of the first major wind developments including the Stateline project, which when built in 2001 was the largest in the world. He also serves on the organizing committee of the biannual International Wind Turbine Noise Conference, first held in Berlin, Germany, in 2005.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the following person for suggestions and comments on the manuscript. The final responsibility for the content remains with the authors.

Richard K. Jennings, M.D. —Psychiatrist, Retired