

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC
FOR ENERGY FACILITY PERMITS OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A
345-KV TRANSMISSION LINE IN DEUEL COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE
DEUEL HARVEST NORTH WIND FARM**

SD PUC DOCKET NO. _____

**PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL HANKARD
ON BEHALF OF DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC**

November 30, 2018

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

Q. Please state your name, employer, and business address.

A. My name is Mike Hankard. I am the president and principal of Hankard Environmental, Inc. (“Hankard Environmental”). My business address is 211 East Verona Avenue, Verona, Wisconsin 53593.

Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.

A. I have been measuring, analyzing, researching, and reporting on environmental noise levels for 27 years. My focus over the last eight years has been noise from utility-scale wind turbines, but I also have extensive experience with noise from mining operations, industrial plants, roadways, rail lines, commercial developments, and a host of other sources. I have worked on projects across the United States, as well as internationally, and have been principally responsible for noise measurements, analysis, and control on over 500 projects. I have interacted with a wide cross-section of project participants, including the public, local and state agencies, owners, operators, designers, and planners. I have a B.S. in electrical engineering from the University of Maine with a specialization in acoustics. I am a full member of the Institute of Noise Control Engineering and a member of the Acoustical Society of America. My statement of qualifications is attached as Exhibit 1.

Q. Expand on your professional expertise regarding sound from wind turbines, and how it is relevant to these proceedings.

A. I have conducted some of the most in-depth noise measurement studies of operating wind turbines in the United States. This experience has allowed me to spend many nights at residences located within wind farms listening to and measuring turbine noise and has given me a first-hand understanding of the characteristics of wind turbine noise emissions. In addition, I have spent hundreds of hours reviewing measured noise levels, listening to audio recordings, and have developed time- and frequency-based methods for

30 separating wind turbine noise from that of wind in the trees, traffic, and
31 insects/frogs. I used the results of my real-world studies to validate the accuracy
32 of the noise model I employed to predict noise emissions from the Deuel Harvest
33 North Wind Farm. Thus, the model of wind turbine noise emissions I use is
34 accurate and is calibrated to predict the maximum wind turbine noise level over a
35 one-hour period that is expected to occur at each turbine. Finally, I have
36 participated in public and agency hearings regarding wind turbines at which the
37 full spectrum of wind turbine noise issues was debated. This includes audible
38 noise, low frequency noise, and infrasound. In preparation for these
39 proceedings, I have read major research papers on these subjects published by
40 acoustical consultants, government agencies, university researchers, and health
41 professionals.

42 **II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

43 **Q. What is your role with respect to the Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm**
44 **Project (“Project”)?**

45 A. Hankard Environmental was retained to conduct noise modeling for the Project. I
46 conducted acoustic modeling of the Project’s proposed layout and prepared an
47 associated Pre-Construction Wind Turbine Noise Analysis (“Noise Analysis”),
48 which is provided in Appendix D of the Project’s Facility Permit Application
49 (“Application”).

50 **Q. What is the purpose of your Direct Testimony?**

51 A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the methodology and results of the
52 acoustic modeling Hankard Environmental conducted for the Project. In addition,
53 I will discuss how the modeling demonstrates that the Project will comply with
54 applicable acoustic regulations.

55 **Q. What exhibits are attached to your Direct Testimony?**

56 A. The following exhibits are attached to my Direct Testimony:

- 57 • Exhibit 1: Statement of Qualifications

58 **Q. Please identify the sections of the Application that you are sponsoring for**
59 **the record.**

60 A. I am sponsoring the following portions of the Application:

- 61 • Section 15.3: Sound
- 62 • Appendix D: Pre-Construction Wind Turbine Noise Analysis

63
64 **III. WIND TURBINE SOUND AND APPLICABLE STANDARDS**

65 **Q. Please provide an overview of the sound that may be generated by modern**
66 **utility-scale wind turbines, such as those that will be used by the Project.**

67 A. Wind turbines generate noise by means of two general mechanisms. First, noise
68 is produced at the nacelle by mechanical equipment such as gearboxes, drive
69 motors, and pumps. Second, “aerodynamic noise” is produced by the blades
70 passing through the air. When turbines are operating near or at full power, it is
71 the latter that is most important at residences located near the Project.
72 Aerodynamic noise is produced by a number of mechanisms; primary among
73 these is trailing edge noise (noise produced at the trailing edge of the blade,
74 particularly on the down stroke) and noise from tip vortices. The amount of noise
75 produced is dependent on the tip speed of the blade, the design of the blade,
76 blade angles during operation, and atmospheric conditions.

77 **Q. Please provide an overview of how humans perceive sound, and how**
78 **perceived levels are measured.**

79 A. The human ear is sensitive primarily to the level (loudness) of a noise (sound),
80 but also to its pitch (frequency). Sound consists of small changes in air pressure
81 that our ears detect. The human ear is capable of detecting an incredibly large
82 range of sound pressure changes, from about 20 micropascals (the “threshold of
83 human hearing”) to about 20 pascals (the “threshold of pain”). The frequency of
84 a sound is the rate at which it fluctuates in time, expressed in Hertz (“Hz”), or
85 wave cycles per second.

86 The compressive decibel scale is used to make the numbers more manageable
87 for discussion. Sound is quantified using the decibel (“dB”), which can be
88 weighted and expressed in different ways. The most common weighting scale
89 used in environmental noise analysis and regulation is the A-weighted decibel
90 (“dBA”). This weighting mechanism emulates the human ear’s varying sensitivity
91 to the frequency of sound. The human ear is much less sensitive to low
92 frequencies, most sensitive to about 1,000 hertz (“Hz”), and not very sensitive to
93 high frequencies. The A-weighted level represents the sum of the energy across
94 the entire “audible frequency spectrum” (20 to 20,000 Hz), weighted by frequency
95 as the human ear would do. This incorporates the frequencies where wind
96 turbines produce most of their sound (250 to 1,250 Hz). This is a common range
97 for other sources as well, including transportation, industrial, and agricultural
98 equipment. Turbines do not emit much high frequency noise, and that which is
99 emitted is attenuated by the atmosphere before it reaches even the closest
100 residences.

101 Sounds in the environment vary with time, and the two sound level metrics that
102 are commonly reported in community noise monitoring are:

- 103 • L90, which is the sound level in dBA exceeded 90 percent of the time
104 during a measurement period. The L90 is close to the lowest sound level
105 observed. It is essentially the same as the “residual” sound level, which is
106 the sound level observed when there are no obvious nearby intermittent
107 noise sources.
- 108 • Leq, the equivalent level, is the level of a hypothetical steady sound that
109 would have the same energy (i.e., the same time-averaged mean square
110 sound pressure) as the actual fluctuating sound observed. The equivalent
111 level is designated Leq and is commonly A weighted. The equivalent level
112 represents the time average of the fluctuating sound pressure, but
113 because sound is represented on a logarithmic scale and the averaging is
114 done with time-averaged mean square sound pressure values, the Leq is
115 mostly determined by occasional loud noises.

116 A-weighting is the most appropriate weighting network here because it most
117 closely approximates how the human ear responds to sound at various
118 frequencies (in the 20 to 20,000 Hz range). The A-weighting network is the
119 accepted scale used for community sound level measurements. Further, the
120 applicable noise limit for comparison is A-weighted.

121 **Q. How does the sound from wind turbines fit within the range of sound**
122 **audible to humans?**

123 A. Sound pressure levels at the base of a modern utility-scale wind turbine are
124 typically between 55 and 60 dBA. For comparison, typical conversational speech
125 between two people standing three feet apart is between 55 and 65 dBA, so one
126 could hold a conversation at the base of a wind turbine. As sound spreads from
127 a turbine, the sound level diminishes.

128 **Q. Are you aware of any federal or state sound level regulations for wind**
129 **energy conversion facilities located in South Dakota?**

130 A. No. There are no federal noise regulations that apply to this Project. Also, it is
131 my understanding that the State of South Dakota does not have statutes or rules
132 governing sound level requirements for wind energy conversion facilities.

133 **Q. Has Deuel County established sound level requirements for wind energy**
134 **facilities?**

135 A. Yes. The Deuel County Zoning Ordinance provides that the noise level from
136 wind energy systems “shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-Weighted Sound
137 pressure at the perimeter of existing residences, for non-participating
138 residences.” This is the only numerical noise limit applicable to wind energy
139 systems in Deuel County, South Dakota.

140 **IV. ACOUSTIC ANALYSIS**

141 **Q. What was the purpose of the acoustic modeling and analysis discussed in**
142 **the Noise Analysis?**

143 A. The purpose of the Noise Analysis was to conservatively model the sound level
144 to be produced by the Project and determine through analysis whether the noise
145 generated by the Project will comply with the applicable noise standard in Deuel
146 County, which establishes a maximum dBA level. To ensure compliance with
147 that requirement, my modeling was designed to assess the maximum sound
148 level that could be generated by each turbine in any given hour (one-hour Leq).
149 Consistent with these goals, the Noise Analysis describes the results of an
150 acoustic modeling analysis we conducted, which demonstrates that Project
151 sound levels will meet Deuel County's 45 dBA noise standard at the perimeter of
152 existing, non-participating residences.

153 **Q. Could you provide an overview of the methodology used in conducting the**
154 **acoustic modeling analysis for the Project?**

155 A. The modeling utilized conservative assumptions and was conducted in
156 accordance with the international standard (ISO 9613-2), which is used for
157 propagating outdoor sound levels from specific sources. There are several
158 parameters in the ISO 9613-2 method, including the locations of the noise
159 sources and receivers, noise source level and frequency characteristics, terrain
160 and ground type, and atmospheric propagation conditions. Specifically, ISO
161 9613-2 assumes downwind sound propagation between every source and every
162 receiver; consequently, all wind directions are taken into account. This is a
163 conservative method because, in the model, each receiver is downwind of every
164 source, a scenario that cannot physically occur. While the modeling did not
165 include the turbine manufacturers' uncertainty factor, the modeling did apply a
166 conservative ground factor of 0.0, which represents completely reflective ground
167 material such as pavement or flat water, and results in a higher level of sound
168 reaching a receptor. Actual ground conditions could at times be 0.0 when the
169 ground is completely frozen, but would generally be closer to 0.5 when the

170 ground is covered with new snow or crops, or when the ground is bare and
171 unfrozen. These assumptions were made to maintain the inherent
172 conservativeness of the model and to estimate the worst-case modeled sound
173 levels.

174 Modeling was completed for both the GE 2.82-127 and GE 2.3-116 turbine
175 models. The layout analyzed includes 111 units of GE 2.82-127 wind turbines
176 and 13 units of GE 2.3-116 wind turbines, all fitted with Low Noise Trailing Edge
177 (“LNTE”) blades. Note that 12 of the GE 2.82-127 wind turbines included in the
178 noise analysis are alternates.

179 Sound levels from the Project were calculated for each of the 122 non-
180 participating and 109 participating residences (receptors) located within 2 miles
181 of any turbine or main transformer. In accordance with ISO 9613-2, each
182 receptor’s height was set to 1.5 meters (5 feet) above the ground.

183 Further discussion of the methodology used is provided in the Noise Analysis
184 (Appendix D of the Application).

185 **Q. Could you summarize the results of the analysis?**

186 A. Noise levels from the Project are predicted to be less than 45 dBA at all non-
187 participating residences within 2 miles of the Project turbines and main
188 transformers. At non-participating residences within the study area, noise levels
189 range from 24 dBA to 44.9 dBA, with an average of 36 dBA. At participating
190 residences, noise levels range from 28 dBA to 49.8 dBA. Thus, the results show
191 the Project will comply with the Deuel County noise requirement.

192 **Q. Are you aware of any post-construction noise studies for other wind farms
193 that support the accuracy and conservativeness of the pre-construction
194 noise modeling you conducted for the Project?**

195 A. Yes. The noise level modeling method employed on this Project has been
196 validated by many acoustical consultants, including Hankard Environmental.
197 Hankard Environmental has conducted numerous wind turbine noise level

198 compliance surveys, and routinely compares the results of these measurements
199 with corresponding predicted levels using the same methods employed on this
200 Project. The noise modeling method used in the Noise Analysis has been
201 demonstrated by Hankard Environmental and other acoustical consultants to
202 over-predict measured turbine only maximum one-hour Leq levels by at least 1
203 dBA. Comparatively, my predicted maximum one-hour Leq levels would be 3
204 dBA higher than an actual long-term average Leq level.

205 **Q. How confident are you that actual noise levels will not be louder?**

206 A. I am highly confident of this because I have routinely compared the results of my
207 measurements of noise emissions from operating wind farms to models of those
208 projects that I constructed using the same modeling methods employed here.
209 Hankard Environmental has conducted many noise level measurement surveys
210 at operating wind farms. We focus our analysis on those times when all nearby
211 turbines were operating at full capacity, noise from other sources was at a
212 minimum, and atmospheric conditions were conducive to sound propagation
213 (mainly at night). We find that the maximum measured turbine noise levels are
214 less than our predicted levels.

215 **V. CONCLUSION**

216 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

217 A. Yes.

218 Dated this 30th day of November, 2018.

219

220

221



222 Mike Hankard

223

224

225 65213321.2