

## INFRASOUND FROM WIND TURBINES – FACT, FICTION OR DECEPTION

Geoff Leventhall

Noise and Vibration Consultant, 150 Craddocks Avenue Ashtead Surrey KT21 1NL UK, geoff@activenoise.co.uk

### ABSTRACT

Infrasound is discussed in terms of what it actually is, how the media has dealt with it and what those with limited knowledge say about it. The perception of infrasound occurs at levels higher than the levels produced by wind turbines and there is now agreement amongst acousticians that infrasound from wind turbines is not a problem. Statements on infrasound from objectors are considered and it is shown how these may have caused avoidable distress to residents near wind turbines and also diverted attention from the main noise source, which is the repeating sound of the blades interacting with the tower. This is the noise which requires attention, both to reduce it and to develop optimum assessment methods

### RÉSUMÉ

L'infrason est discuté en termes de ce qu'il est réellement, son traitement dans les médias et par ceux avec des connaissances limitée à son sujet. La perception de l'infrason est qu'il existe à des niveaux plus hauts que ceux produits par des éoliennes, mais il y a maintenant accord parmi les acousticiens que l'infrason des éoliennes n'est pas un problème. Des rapports sur l'infrason par des protestataires sont considérés et on montre comment ceux-ci ont pu causer de la détresse évitable aux résidents près des éoliennes et également divertir l'attention de la source principale de bruit: le son répétitif de l'interaction des lames avec la tour. C'est ce bruit qui exige de l'attention, pour le réduire et pour développer des méthodes optimales d'évaluation.

## 1. INFRASOUND

A definition of infrasound is: Acoustic oscillations whose frequency is below the low frequency limit of audible sound (about 16Hz). (IEC 1994)

This definition is incorrect, as sound remains audible at frequencies well below 16Hz. For example, measurements of hearing threshold have been made down to 4Hz for exposure in an acoustic chamber (Watanabe and Møller 1990b) and down to 1.5 Hz for earphone listening (Yeowart, Bryan et al. 1967)

The limit of 16Hz, or more commonly considered as 20Hz, arises from the lower frequency limit of the standardized equal loudness hearing contours measured in units of phons, which is a difficult measurement at low frequencies, not from the lower limit of hearing.

## 2. THE AUDIBILITY OF INFRASOUND

Hearing sensation does not suddenly cease at 20Hz when the frequency is reduced from 21Hz to 19Hz, but continues from 20Hz down to very low frequencies of several Hertz. It is not possible to define an inaudible infrasound range and an audible audio range as separate regions, unless the infrasound range is limited to naturally occurring infrasound of very low frequencies. The range from about 10Hz to 100Hz can be

considered as the low frequency region, with possible extensions by an octave at each end of this range, giving 5Hz to 200Hz. There is a very fuzzy boundary between infrasound and low frequency noise, which often causes confusion.

Hearing thresholds in the infrasonic and low frequency region are shown in Fig 1. The solid line above 20Hz is the low frequency end of the ISO standard threshold (ISO:226 2003). The dashed curve, 4Hz to 125Hz, is from Watanabe and Møller (Watanabe and Møller 1990b). There is good correspondence between the two threshold measurements in the overlap region.

The slope of the hearing threshold reduces below about 15Hz from approximately 20dB/octave above 15 Hz to about 12dB/octave below. (Yeowart, Bryan et al. 1967). The common assumption that "infrasound" is inaudible is incorrect, arising from an unfortunate choice of descriptor. "Real" infrasound, at levels and frequencies below audibility are largely natural phenomena, although human activities, such as explosions, also produce infrasound. Microphone arrays for the detection of airborne infrasound are a component of the monitoring for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

The median hearing threshold is not a simple delineation between "Can hear - Can't hear", but the threshold is rather variable between individuals, depending on their genetics, prior noise exposure and age (ISO7029 2000). The standard deviation of threshold measurements is typically about 6dB.




Figure 1. Infrasonic and low frequency threshold

Therefore, it is most unlikely that anyone will be able to hear sound at any frequency which is more than, say, 20dB below its median threshold.

The false concept that infrasound is inaudible, when coupled with the many common misconceptions about its subjective effects, has spawned concerns, particularly expressed in popular publications, which are best described as mythology, rather than fact.

A report reviewing low frequency noise (Leventhall, Benton et al. 2003) is available on the internet.

**High levels at very low frequencies:** These may result in aural pain, which is not a hearing sensation, but arises from displacements of the middle ear system beyond its comfortable limits. Persons with both hearing ability and hearing loss, and with normal middle ears, exhibit aural pain at a similar stimulus level, which is at about 165dB at 2Hz, reducing to 145dB at 20Hz. Static pressure produces pain at 175 -180dB, whilst eardrum rupture occurs at 185 -190dB (von Gierke and Nixon 1976). A pressure of  $5 \times 10^4$  Pa, which is about half atmospheric pressure, falls in the 185 -190dB range. A child on a swing experiences infrasound at a level of around 110dB and frequency 0.5Hz, depending on the suspended length and the change in height during the swing.

**Natural infrasound:** We are enveloped in naturally occurring infrasound, which is in the range from about 0.01 Hz to 2Hz and is at inaudible levels. The lower limit of one cycle in a hundred seconds separates infrasound, as a propagating wave, from all but the fastest fluctuations in barometric pressure. There are many natural sources of infrasound, including meteors, volcanic eruptions, ocean waves, wind and any effect which leads to slow oscillations of the air. Man made sources include explosions, large combustion processes, slow speed fans and machinery. Much natural infrasound is lower

in frequency than 1 Hz and below the hearing threshold. (Berdard and George 2000). Our evolution has been in the presence of natural infrasound.

**Alternative receptors:** The question arises of whether there is a hierarchy of receptors, of which the ear is the most sensitive except at the lower frequencies, when other receptors may come into prominence. Several vibration and contact detectors reside in the skin, covering different frequency ranges (Johnson 2001). The Pacinian corpuscles are the most sensitive, with a threshold displacement of about 0.002mm in the region of 200Hz. Their sensitivity into lower frequencies reduces at approximately 50dB per decade from the maximum sensitivity.

The threshold displacement of 0.002mm at 200Hz is similar to the particle displacement in air of a 200Hz sound wave of 94dB (1 Pa ) pressure. Since the particle displacement in a sound wave of fixed pressure doubles as the frequency is halved (20dB per decade) inaudible sound waves will not excite these subcutaneous receptors.

There is no reliable evidence that infrasound at levels below its hearing threshold has an adverse effect on the body (Berglund and Lindvall 1995). A recent French study of wind turbine noise confirms that infrasound from wind turbines is not a problem. (Chouard 2006)

**Body vibrations:** It is known that high levels of low frequency noise excite body vibrations (Leventhall, Benton et al. 2003). The most prominent body response is a chest resonance vibration in the region of 50Hz to 80Hz, occurring at levels above about 80dB, which are audible in this frequency range. The low frequency perception thresholds of normal hearing and profoundly deaf subjects have also been investigated (Yamada, Ikuji et al. 1983), when it was shown that the profoundly deaf subjects perceived noise through their body

only at levels which were in excess of normal thresholds. The threshold of sensation of the deaf subjects was 40-50dB above the hearing threshold of those with normal hearing up to a frequency of 63Hz and greater at higher frequencies. For example about 100dB greater at 1 kHz, at which level perception was by the subjects' residual hearing. Deaf subjects experienced chest vibration in the same frequency range as normal hearing subjects.

The much repeated statement that "infrasound can be felt but not heard" is not supported by these measurements. The erroneous thought processes which led to this confusion are possibly:

Infrasound causes body vibrations - (correct at very high levels)

But infrasound is inaudible - (not correct at very high levels)

Therefore infrasound can be felt but not heard - (not correct)

neglecting that the levels to produce body vibrations are well above the hearing threshold. But, as will be shown later, infrasound is not a problem for modern wind turbines.

**The dimensions of noise:** Noise is multidimensional. A one dimensional view of noise is the A - weighting, which considers only levels and neglects frequencies. Another one-dimensional view is to consider only frequencies and neglect levels. Developing the dimensions further, two dimensions include both frequency and level (the spectrum), three dimensions adds in the time variations of the noise, whilst higher dimensions include subjective response.

Many lay people take the one dimensional view of infrasound, which is based on frequency alone. They express concern at the presence of any infrasound, irrespective of its level. This is a significant failure of understanding.

**Public Perceptions:** The Public has been misled by the media about infrasound, resulting in needless fears and anxieties, which possibly arise from confusion of the work on subjective effects, which has been carried out at high, audible levels with the popular mindset that infrasound is inaudible. There have also been misunderstandings fostered in publications and popular science books, considered later.

Early work on low frequency noise and its subjective effects was stimulated by the American space program. Launch vehicles produce high noise levels with maximum energy in the low frequency region. Furthermore, as the vehicle accelerates, the crew compartment is subjected to boundary layer turbulence noise for about two minutes after lift-off. Experiments were carried out in low frequency noise chambers on short term subjective tolerance to bands of noise at very high levels of 140 to 150dB, in the frequency range up to 100Hz (Mohr, Cole et al. 1965). It was concluded that the subjects, who were experienced in noise exposure and who were wearing ear protection, could tolerate both broadband and discrete frequency noise in the range

1 Hz to 100Hz at sound pressure levels up to 150dB. Later work suggests that, for 24 hour exposure, levels of 120 - 130dB are tolerable below 20Hz. These limits were set to prevent direct physiological damage, not for comfort. (Mohr, Cole et al. 1965; Westin 1975; von Gierke and Nixon 1976).

The American work did not attract media attention, but in the late 1960's two papers from France led to much publicity and speculative exaggerations. (Gavreau, Condat et al. 1966; Gavreau 1968). Although both papers carry "infrasound" in their titles, there is very little on frequencies below 20Hz (Leventhall 2005). Some rather casual and irresponsible experiments of the "try it and see" variety were carried out on exposure of the laboratory staff, primarily using high intensity pneumatic sources at frequencies mainly at the upper end of the low frequency range, or above. For example, 196Hz at 160dB sound level and 340Hz at 155dB sound level. A high intensity whistle at 2600Hz is also included in the "infrasound" papers.

*Infrasounds are not difficult to study but they are potentially harmful. For example one of my colleagues, R Levavasseur, who designed a powerful emitter known as the 'Levavasseur whistle' is now a victim of his own inventiveness. One of his larger whistles emitting at 2600Hz had an acoustic power of 1 kW. ... This proved sufficient to make him a lifelong invalid. (Gavreau 1968)*

Of course, 2600Hz is not infrasound, but the misleading implication is that infrasound caused injury to Levavasseur. A point source of sound of power 1 kW will produce a sound level of about 140dB at 1 m, which is a very undesirable exposure at 2600Hz.

Referring to the exposure of 160dB at 196Hz:

*...after the test we became aware of a painful 'resonance' within our bodies - everything inside us seemed to vibrate when we spoke or moved. What had happened was that this sound at 160 decibels..... acting directly on the body produced intense friction between internal organs, resulting in severe irritation of the nerve endings. Presumably if the test had lasted longer than five minutes, internal haemorrhage would have occurred. (Gavreau 1968)*

96 Hz is not infrasound, but the unpleasant effects at 160dB are described in a paper which is said to be about "Infrasound". Internal haemorrhage is often quoted as an effect of exposure to infrasound. Exposure levels were not given for frequencies of 37Hz and 7Hz, although the 7Hz caused subjective disturbance and vibrations of the laboratory walls. Unfortunately, these papers by Gavreau were seized upon by the press and presented to claim that infrasound was dangerous. For example "The silent killer all around us", London Evening News, 25 May 1974. When work by other investigators detected moderate levels of infrasound in, for example, road vehicles, the press was delighted, leading to "The silent sound menaces drivers" - Daily Mirror, 19 October 1969.

“Danger in unheard car sounds” The Observer, 21 April 1974.

The most deplorable example, in a book which claimed to have checked its sources, was in “Supernature” by Lyall Watson (Coronet 1973). In this it is claimed that the technician who gave one of Gavreau’s high power infrasound sources its trial run “fell down dead on the spot” and that two infrasonic generators “focused on a point even five miles away produce a resonance that can knock a building down as effectively as a major earthquake”.

These fictitious statements are, of course, totally incorrect but are clear contributors to some of the unfounded concerns which the public feels about infrasound. One can detect a transition from Gavreau and his colleague feeling ill after exposure to the high level of 196Hz to “fell down dead on the spot” and a further transition from laboratory walls vibrating to “can knock a building down”, transitions which resulted from repeated media exaggerations over a period of five or six years.

The misunderstanding between infrasound and low frequency noise continues to the present day. A newspaper article on low frequency noise from wind turbines (Miller 24 January 2004) , opens with:

Onshore wind farms are a health hazard to people living near them because of the low-frequency noise that they emit, according to new medical studies. A French translation of this article for use by objectors’ groups opens with:

*De nouvelles etudes medicales indiquent que les eoliennes terrestres representent un risque pour la sante des gens habitant a proximite, a cause d'emission d'infrasons.*

The translation of low frequency noise into infrasons continues through the article. This is not a trivial misrepresentation because, following on from Gavreau, infrasound

has been connected with many misfortunes, being blamed for problems for which some other explanation had not yet been found e.g., brain tumours, cot deaths of babies, road accidents.

Infrasound, and its companion low frequency noise, now occupy a special position in the national psyche of a number of countries, where they lie in wait for an activating trigger to re-generate concerns of effects on health. Earlier triggers have been defence establishments and gas pipelines. A current trigger is wind turbines.

### 3 INFRASOUND AND LOW FREQUENCY NOISE FROM WIND TURBINES

Early designs of downwind turbines produced pressure pulses at about once per second, which were high enough to cause vibrations in lightweight buildings nearby. (Shepherd and Hubbard 1991). A series of pulses occurring at one per second analyses into a harmonic series in the infrasound region, which is the origin of the link between wind turbines and infrasound. One could discuss whether the Fourier time-frequency duality is misleading on this point, since it was the effects of peaks of the pulses which caused the building vibration, not a continuous infrasonic wave. Similar vibration would have occurred with a faster stream of pulses, with the limiting condition that the pulse repetition rate was lower than the period of the vibration.

Modern up-wind turbines produce pulses which also analyse as infrasound, but at low levels, typically 50 to 70dB, well below the hearing threshold. Infrasound can be neglected in the assessment of the noise of modern wind turbines (Jakobsen 2004)

Fig 2 shows the infrasonic and low frequency noise at 65m from a 1.5MW wind turbine on a windy day. The fol-




Figure 2. Spectrum of a modern upwind wind turbine - Upper trace Wind Turbine Noise. Lower trace Background noise.

lowing should be noted.

- The fall off below about 5Hz is an instrument effect. The background noise actually increases down to the frequencies of atmospheric pressure variations .
- Frequencies below 40Hz cannot be distinguished from background noise due to wind.
- The wind turbine noise and background noise separate above about 40Hz and both rise above the median hearing threshold.
- The measurements were taken at 65m. Levels are likely to be about 15dB lower at normal separation distances

On the occasions, such as unusually turbulent inflow conditions, when low frequency noise is produced by wind turbines, it may not be perceived as a noise, but rather as an unidentified adverse component in the environment, which disappears if the turbines stop, or if the inflow conditions change. This is because we are not accustomed to listening to low levels of broad band low frequency noise and, initially, do not always recognise it as a “noise”, but more as a “disturbance” in the environment. An analogy is with air-conditioning rumble noise, which is noticed when it stops.

**What Objectors Say** Objectors have eagerly grasped the media hype on infrasound and low frequency noise and used it to engender concerns about wind turbine developments. In this they have, possibly, done a disservice to the communities they were established to help, through raising false concerns and diverting attention from more important aspects of the development. Two examples are as follows.

In the UK there is an Advertising Standards Authority(ASA), to which deceptive adverts can be referred for assessment. An objectors’ group (Ochils Environmental Protection Group) issued a leaflet “FACTS ABOUT WIND POWER”. containing a number of assertions including:

... wind turbines still create noise pollution, notably ‘in-

fra sound’ - inaudible frequencies which nevertheless cause stress-related illness ...”

In their Judgment (April 02, 2004), the ASA concluded that the objectors had not produced evidence to substantiate their claim.

In the USA, a high profile objector (Nina Pierpont of Malone NY) placed an advertisement in a local paper, consisting entirely of selected quotations from a previously published technical paper by van den Berg (Van den Berg 2004). However the comment “[i.e. infrasonic]”, as shown in Fig 3, was added in the first line of the first quotation in a manner which might mislead naive readers into believing that it was part of the original.

The van den Berg paper was based on A-weighted measurements and had no connection with infrasound. So, not only is the advertisement displaying the advertiser’s self deception, but this has also been propagated to others who have read it. To mistakenly connect the noise to infrasound, which has unpleasant associations is, however, a way to gather support . (When a person has adopted a particular mindset, new information is processed to support that mindset. We all do this.)

It takes little technical knowledge to be aware that a modulated high frequency wave does not contain the modulation components. For example, an amplitude modulated radio wave contains the carrier wave and sidebands, which are close in frequency to the carrier. The fluctuations of wind turbine noise (swish – swish) are a very low frequency modulation of the aerodynamic noise, which is typically in the region of 500 - 1000Hz. The modulation occurs from a change in radiation characteristics as the blade passes the tower, but the modulating frequencies do not have an independent and separate existence.

The comment, [ i.e. infrasonic], added into Fig 3 gives incorrect information. Claims of infrasound are irrelevant and possibly harmful, should they lead to unnecessary fears.

PAID ADVERTISEMENT

## Wind Turbines & Infrasound: What the latest research says

**“At night the wind turbines cause a low pitched thumping [i.e., infrasonic] sound superimposed on a broadband ‘noisy’ sound, the ‘thumps’ occurring at the rate at which blades pass a turbine tower.... The number and severity of noise complaints near the wind park are at least in part explained by the two main findings of this study: actual sound levels are considerably higher than predicted, and wind turbines can produce sound with an impulsive character.”**

**-- Professor Frits G.P. van den Berg, University of Groningen, the Netherlands, November 2004 (see excerpts from research articles, below)**

Figure 3 Part of an advertisement placed by an objector in the Malone (NY) Telegram, 25th February 2005.

It has been shown that fear of a noise source, for example that aircraft might crash, increases the extra annoyance of a person with a high fear of a crash by up to 19dB DNL equivalent, compared with a person who has no fear (Miedema and Vos 1999).

Fear of a source is not the same as fear of the noise itself, but it is understandable that those who fear the effects of a noise upon their health will be less tolerant of the noise than those who do not fear it. We can only speculate upon the harm which objectors might have done by, for example, taking a one dimensional view of infrasound and publicising the subjective effects of high levels of both infrasound and low frequency noise in a manner which implies that the effects may also be caused by the low levels produced by wind turbines.

#### 4 WIND TURBINE NOISE

It has been shown above that there is insignificant infrasound from wind turbines and that there is normally little low frequency noise. Turbulent air inflow conditions cause enhanced levels of low frequency noise, which may be disturbing, but the overriding noise from wind turbines is the fluctuating audible swish, mistakenly referred to as "infrasound" or "low frequency noise". Objectors uninformed and mistaken use of these terms (as in Fig 3), which have acquired a number of anxiety-producing connotations, has led to unnecessary fears and to unnecessary costs, such as for re-measuring what was already known, in order to assuage complaints.

Attention should be focused on the audio frequency fluctuating swish, which some people may well find to be very disturbing and stressful, depending on its level. The usual equivalent level measurements and analyses are incomplete, as these measurements are taken over a time period which is much longer than the fluctuation period and information on the fluctuations is lost. A time varying sound is more annoying than a steady sound of the same average level and this is accounted for by reducing the permitted level of wind turbine noise. However, more work is required to ensure that the optimum levels have been set.

#### 5 CONCLUSIONS

- Infrasound from wind turbines is below the audible threshold and of no consequence.
- Low frequency noise is normally not a problem, except under conditions of unusually turbulent inflow air.
- The problem noise from wind turbines is the fluctuating swish. This may be mistakenly referred to as infrasound by those with a limited knowledge of acoustics, but it is entirely in the normal audio range and is typically 500Hz to 1000Hz. It is difficult to have a useful discourse with objectors whilst they continue to use acoustical terms incorrectly. This is unfortunate, as there are wind turbine installations which may have noise problems.
- It is the swish noise on which attention should be focused, in order to reduce it and to obtain a proper estimate of its

effects. It will then be the responsibility of legislators to fix the criterion levels, However, although the needs of sensitive persons may influence decisions, limits are not normally set to satisfy the most sensitive.

#### 6 REFERENCES

- Bedard, A. J. and T. M. George (2000). "Atmospheric Infrasound." *Physics Today* 53 (3): 32 - 37.
- Berglund, B. and T. Lindvall (1995). "Community Noise." Centre for Sensory Research, Karolinska Institute.
- Chouard, C. H. (2006). "Le retentissement du fonctionnement des éoliennes sur la santé de l'homme." Report to National Academy of Medicine.
- Gavreau, V. (1968). "Infrasound." *Science Journal* Vol 4(No.1): 33-37.
- Gavreau, V., R. Condat, et al. (1966). "Infra-sons: generateur, detecteurs, proprietes physique, effets biologiques." *Acustica* 17(1): 1-10.
- IEC (1994). "60050-801:1994 International Electrotechnical Vocabulary - Chapter 801: Acoustics and electroacoustics."
- ISO7029 (2000). "Statistical distribution of hearing thresholds as a function of age."
- Jakobsen, J. (2004). "Infrasound emission from wind turbines." Proc 11th International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control, Maastricht August 2004: 147 to 156.
- Johnson, K. O. (2001). "The roles and functions of cutaneous mechanoreceptors." *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 11: 455-461.
- Leventhall, H. G. (2005). "How the "mythology" of infrasound and low frequency noise related to wind turbines might have developed." Proc Wind Turbine Noise 2005 INCE/Europe, Berlin September 2005.
- Leventhall, H. G., S. Benton, et al. (2003). "A review of published research on low frequency noise and its effects . Report for Defra." <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/noise/research/lowfrequency/pdf/lowfreqnoise.pdf>.
- Miedema, H. and H. Vos (1999). "Demographic and attitudinal factors that modify annoyance from transportation noise." *JASA* 105: 3336 - 3344.

---

*Note: Continued on Page 32*

# Award-winning *Innovation*

## Created for You

With over 60 years as pioneers within the world of sound and vibration, Brüel & Kjær presents its innovative, award-winning, 4th generation of hand-held instruments for sound and vibration measurement. Development of this latest generation – Type 2250 – was instigated and inspired entirely by the requirements of users participating in in-depth workshops around the world. The hardware has been designed to meet the specific ergonomic requirements of users, and the application software covers everything from environmental noise, troubleshooting, and occupational health, to quality control. The software packages can be licensed separately, so you can get what you need when you need it and won't get left behind if your requirements change. This way, the platform ensures the safety of your investment now and in the future. Created, built and made for you personally, you'll find it will make a difference to our work and all your measurement tasks.

## New Sound Recording Option

The Sound Recording Option works with all other software modules, and lets you record measurement signals in order to identify and document sound sources. Recordings are automatically attached to the measurement and kept with it, even after transfer of the data to a PC.

If you need more information please go to [www.type2250.com](http://www.type2250.com)



BA0782-11

HEADQUARTERS: DK-2850 Nærum · Denmark · Telephone: +45 45 80 05 00  
Fax: +45 45 80 14 05 · [www.bksv.com](http://www.bksv.com) · [info@bksv.com](mailto:info@bksv.com)

USA: 2815 Colonnades Court · Norcross, GA 30071  
Toll free (800) 332-2040 · [www.BKHome.com](http://www.BKHome.com) · [bkinfo@bksv.com](mailto:bkinfo@bksv.com)

Australia (+61) 2 9889-8888 · Austria (+43) 1 865 74 00 · Brazil (+55) 11 5188-8166  
Canada (+1) 514 695-8225 · China (+86) 10 680 29906 · Czech Republic (+420) 2 6702 1100  
Finland (+358) 9 521300 · France (+33) 1 69 90 71 00 · Germany (+49) 421 17 87 0  
Hong Kong (+852) 2548 7486 · Hungary (+36) 1 21 15 83 05 · Ireland (+353) 1 807 4083  
Italy (+39) 0257 68061 · Japan (+81) 3 5715 1612 · Korea (+82) 2 3473 0605  
Netherlands (+31) 318 55 9290 · Norway (+47) 66 77 1155 · Poland (+48) 22 816 75 56  
Portugal (+351) 21 4711 453 · Korea (+82) 2 3473 0605 · Singapore (+65) 377 4512  
Slovak Republic (+421) 25 443 0701 · Spain (+34) 91 659 0820 · Sweden (+46) 8 449 8600  
Switzerland (+41) 44 880 7035 · Taiwan (+886) 2 2502 7255 · United Kingdom (+44) 14 38 739 000  
USA (+1) 800 332 2040 · Local representatives and service organisations worldwide

Type 2250 – *Inspired by Users*

**Brüel & Kjær** 

Note: Continued from Page 30

Miller, C. (24 January 2004). "Wind farms 'make people sick who live up to a mile away'." Sunday Telegraph.

Mohr, G. C., J. N. Cole, et al. (1965). "Effects of low frequency and infrasonic noise on man." Aerospace Medicine 36(9): 817-824.

Shepherd, K. P. and H. H. Hubbard (1991). "Physical characteristics and perception of low frequency noise from wind turbines." Noise Control Eng 36(1): 5-15.

Van den Berg, G. P. (2004). "Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine sound." Jnl Sound Vibn: 955-970.

von Gierke, H. E. and C. Nixon (1976). Effects of intense

infrasound on man. In: Infrasound and Low Frequency Vibration. Editor: W Tempest. Academic Press.

Watanabe, T. and H. Møller (1990b). "Low frequency hearing thresholds in pressure field and free field." Jnl Low Freq Noise Vibn 9(3): 106-115.

Westin, J. B. (1975). "Infrasound: A short review of effects on man." Aviat Space Environ Med 46(9): 1135-40.

Yamada, S., M. Ikuji, et al. (1983). "Body sensations of low frequency noise of ordinary persons and profoundly deaf persons." Jnl Low Freq Noise Vibn 2(3): 32-36.

Yeowart, N. S., M. E. Bryan, et al. (1967). "The monaural MAP threshold of hearing at frequencies from 1.5 to 100c/s." J Sound Vibration 6: 335-342.

**West Caldwell Calibration Laboratories, Inc.**  
uncompromised calibration  
Web site: [www.wccl.com](http://www.wccl.com) E-mail: [info@wccl.com](mailto:info@wccl.com)

Head Office: 1575 State Route 96, Victor, NY 14564  
Phone: 585-586-3900 Fax: 585-586-4327

Branch Office: 220 Rutherford Rd. S. Suite 210, Brampton, ON L6W 3J6  
Phone: 905-595-1107 Fax: 905-595-1108

## A SINGLE SOURCE LABORATORY

for Calibration and Repair of Sound, Vibration, and Electronic Test Instrumentation

### SPECIALIZING IN:

- Accelerometers
- Field Calibrators
- Frequency Analyzers
- Microphones
- Audiometric Equipment
- Vibration Test Equipment
- Sound Level Meters
- Vibration Meters

### OUR AUTOMATED FACILITY ASSURES YOU OF:

Calibrations Traceable to N.I.S.T.

Certification: ISO 9001:2000

Accreditation: ISO/IEC 17025:2005

Compliance: ISO 10012-1, MIL-STD-45662A, ANSI/NCSL 2540-1-1994

Superior Workmanship

Complete Test Documentation

Quick Turnaround time:

- 48 Hour Calibration Service Available for an Additional Fee
- 5-10 Days Standard Turnaround

### OTHER SERVICES INCLUDE:

- Custom System Integration



### Authorized Calibration and Repair Center for

- Rion
- Ono-Sokki
- Scantek Inc.

### We service equipment manufactured by:

- ACO Pacific\*
- Brüel & Kjær\*
- CEL\*
- Dytran\*
- Endevco\*
- Fluke
- G.R.A.S.\*
- Hewlett-Packard
- Larson Davis\*
- Metrosonics\*
- Norsonic\*
- Norwegian Electric\*
- PCB\*
- Rion\*
- Simpson
- Syminex\*
- Quest
- and others

### FREE INITIAL OR NEXT CALIBRATIONS COMPLIMENTS FROM WCCL

Your cost of the instrument will be manufacturers list price.

\* We will be pleased to order any instrument for you from the manufacturers marked with an \*\*\*