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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 résidants 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.
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 x 104 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. (Bedard 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 (Berghlund 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
levels of 140 to 150dB, in the frequency range up to 100Hz. 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.

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-
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 ‘infra 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.

---

**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 cause 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.
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Note: Continued on Page 36
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 your 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


