

YASS VALLEY WIND FARM
Addendum for reports Rp001 R01 2008237SY and Rp002 2008237SY
Rp 001 R08 2013109SY

14 April 2014



Project: **YASS VALLEY WIND FARM**

Prepared for: **Epuron Pty Ltd
Level 11, 75 Miller Street
North Sydney NSW 2060**

Attention: **Andrew Wilson**

Report No.: **Rp 001 R08 2013109SY**

Disclaimer

Reports produced by Marshall Day Acoustics Pty Ltd are prepared based on the Client's objective and are based on a specific scope, conditions and limitations, as agreed between Marshall Day Acoustics and the Client. Information and/or report(s) prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics may not be suitable for uses other than the original intended objective. No parties other than the Client should use any information and/or report(s) without first conferring with Marshall Day Acoustics.

Copyright

The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Marshall Day Acoustics Pty Ltd. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Marshall Day Acoustics constitutes an infringement of copyright. Information shall not be assigned to a third party without prior consent.

Document control

Status:	Rev:	Comments	Date:	Author:	Reviewer:
Draft		Issued for client review	26 June	B Martin	D Griffin
Issue	1		22 July	B Martin	C Delaire
Issue	2		26 July	B Martin	D Griffin
Issue	3		26 July	B Martin	
Issue	4	Draft	13 November 2013	B Martin	D Griffin
Issue	5		20 November 2013	B Martin	J Adcock
Issue	6		21 November 2013	B Martin	
Issue	7		8 April 2014	B Martin	J Adcock
Issue	8	Additional construction information	14 April 2014	B Martin	J Adcock

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	4
2.0	SITE DESCRIPTION	6
2.1	Proposed wind farm layout	6
2.2	Tonality.....	9
3.0	NOISE ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES.....	10
4.0	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	10
5.0	RELEVANT RECEIVER ASSESSMENT.....	10
6.0	NOISE LEVEL PREDICTIONS.....	13
6.1	Cumulative Effect of Other Wind Farm Developments.....	14
6.2	Transformer Noise Levels	17
7.0	SITE CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT	18
7.1	Construction Site Noise Limits.....	18
7.2	Description of construction activities	19
APPENDIX A	GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY	
APPENDIX B	RECEIVER LOCATION CHANGES	
APPENDIX C	TURBINE COORDINATES	
APPENDIX D	TURBINE SOUND POWER LEVELS	
APPENDIX E	ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES	
APPENDIX F	ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION	
APPENDIX G	24HR NOISE CRITERIA REFERENCED TO HUB HEIGHT WIND SPEEDS	
APPENDIX H	NOISE LEVEL CRITERIA FOR RELEVANT RECEIVERS	
APPENDIX I	NOISE CRITERIA FOR DAYTIME AND NIGHT-TIME PERIODS	
APPENDIX J	PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS AT INTEGER WIND SPEEDS FOR ALL RECEIVERS	
APPENDIX K	CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT NSW WIND FARM PLANNING GUIDELINES	
APPENDIX L	NOISE CONTOUR MAPS	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Epuron Pty Ltd is developing a preferred Project Report for the Yass Valley Wind Farm which is currently on exhibition. The project comprises the originally proposed Coppabella Wind Farm and Marilba Wind Farm, with amendments to turbine layouts and transmission infrastructure.

We understand that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) has specified the following noise information be included in the preferred Project Report:

- *The noise impact assessment is to be updated to include “worst case” noise predictions of the revised turbine layout (construction and operational) for all identified receivers. This is to be inclusive of the approved Conroy’s Gap wind farm turbines.*
- *Identify the relevant receivers where the noise criteria will be exceeded with all turbines within the revised layout operating at maximum output (and at what wind speed this would occur).*
- *The noise impact assessment is to be updated to include construction noise predictions for all receivers in proximity of the revised transmission line route.*
- *The noise impact assessment is to include a revised “worst case” noise contour map inclusive of all identified receivers (on A3 size paper)*
- *The response is to have regard to the draft Wind Farm Planning Guidelines, and in particular the assessment of low frequency noise.*

This document has been prepared as an addendum to the two previous reports for the development, *Rp 001 R01 2008237SY Coppabella Hills Noise Impact Assessment* dated 9 September 2009 and *Rp002 2008237SY Marilba Hills Noise Impact Assessment* dated 22 April 2009. These two previous assessments are herein referred to collectively as the “2009 assessment”.

The main sections of this addendum shadow the document structure of the 2009 assessment. Subheadings have been included as required and renumbered for this document. Key changes to the 2009 assessment are outlined in each of the relevant sections below. Where there are no significant changes, the section has been left blank.

A key item of this addendum is consideration of the *Draft NSW Planning Guidelines: Wind Farms* (the draft NSW guidelines). In particular, the following tasks are documented:

- Reanalysis of the background noise data with hub-height wind speed data (in lieu of the 10m height data referenced in the 2009 assessment)
- Determination of noise limits for separate daytime and night-time periods.
- Prediction of low-frequency noise levels, supplemented by qualitative text concerning tonality and amplitude modulation
- Cumulative operational wind farm noise assessment based on limits applicable to the combined noise of all sites, in contrast the individual contribution of neighbouring sites as specified under the South Australia EPA's *Environmental Noise Guidelines: Wind Farms 2003* (2003 SA Guidelines) referenced in the 2009 assessment

In relation to the draft NSW guidelines, we note that this addendum primarily considers the analysis and assessment methodologies suggested in the draft NSW guidelines, based on the original baseline noise data collected for the 2009 assessment.

A glossary of the acoustic terminology used in this report is provided in Appendix A.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The Yass Valley Wind Farm is proposed to be located approximately 15km west of Yass and south of the township of Binalong in New South Wales. For the 2009 assessment, two separate schemes were assessed, Marilba Hills which consisted of 66 turbines and Coppabella Hills which consisted of 86 turbines. For the revised assessment, the two schemes have been merged to create the Yass Valley Wind Farm project and a total 147 turbines are proposed for the development.

Epuron have identified 148 receiver locations around the site of the proposed wind farm. The total number of receiver locations differs from that presented in the 2009 assessment. Additionally, revised coordinates have been provided for some receivers. We have been advised by Epuron that the changes in receiver information are due to:

- improved accuracy when capturing the receiver location
- identification of new receivers
- removal of redundant assessment positions.

Please refer to Appendix B for a list of identified receivers including a summary of the receiver changes from the 2009 to the current assessment. The receiver list also includes receiver locations surrounding Conroy's Gap Wind Farm.

2.1 Proposed wind farm layout

As part of the detailed design process, the total number and location of turbines have changed since the 2009 assessment. As per the 2009 assessment, two turbines options are considered for the revised assessment, namely the Repower MM92 and the Vesta V90 turbines. Sound power level information used for the calculations has been taken from the reports referenced in Table 1 and supersedes the information provided for the 2009 assessment.

Table 1: Turbine test report references

Turbine type	Reference document
MM92	Windtest report reference <i>Excerpt from the acoustic test report SE06010N1B1 about the wind turbine type Repower MM92 at St Michaelisdonn/ Germany</i>
V90	DELTA Test Report reference <i>AV 148/09 DANAK 100/2699 Rev. 2 revised 10 December 2009</i>

Table 2 provides a summary of the turbine specifications. Please refer to Appendix C for a full list of the turbine coordinates.

Table 2: WTG manufacturer specifications

	Turbine 1	Turbine 2
Make	REPower	Vestas
Model	MM92 2.05MW	V90 3MW
Rotor Diameter (m)	92.5	90
Hub Height (m)	80	80
Orientation	Upwind	Upwind
Rotor speed (rpm)	7.8 - 15.0	8.6-18.4
Cut-in Wind Speed (hub height, m/s)	3	3.5
Rated Wind Speed (hub height, m/s)	13	≈15
Cut-out Wind Speed (hub height, m/s)	25	25
Maximum Sound Power L_{WA} (10m AGL dB)	104.2 (at 8m/s)	107.1 (at 10m/s)
Tonality audibility ($\Delta L_{a,k}$)	Maximum value of -2.96	Maximum value of -1.7

Table 3 below presents the reported trend of sound power levels vs wind speed, referenced to hub height wind speeds (m/s). To obtain the turbine sound power levels referenced to hub height wind speeds, the 10m AGL wind speeds from the test reports have been extrapolated using the standard roughness value of $z_0=0.05$.

Table 3: Sound power levels vs wind speed for the candidate turbine models

L_{AW} (dB)										
Extrapolated Integer hub height wind speed (m/s)	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Vesta V90*	98.8	101.1	103.2	105	106.1	106.6	106.6	106.4	106.7	107.1
Repower MM92*	-	-	102.5	103.6	104.2	104.2	103.8	103.1	-	-

* Measured test sound power levels + uncertainty

The relationship between A-weighted sound power levels and integer hub height wind speeds for the candidate turbines is presented in Figure 1 below.




Figure 1: Hub height sound power level profiles (V90 and MM92)

Tabular octave band values for each turbine type are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Reference A-weighted octave band sound power levels for the candidate turbines

L_{WA} (dB)	Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)								Overall
	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
Vesta V90	95.4	94.0	96.6	99.3	101.4	101.1	96.6	86.3	107.1
Repower MM92	84.3	92.5	98.1	99.8	97.8	92.1	85.4	82.2	104.2

These octave band levels are also illustrated in Figure 2.

The spectra presented in Table 4 and Figure 2 have been scaled to the highest reported sound power level for each turbine as detailed in Table 3 above.




Figure 2: Turbine Spectral Values

Further details on relevant sound power level data can be found in Appendix D.

2.2 Tonality

Tonal audibility ($\Delta L_{a,k}$) will typically decrease with increasing distances from a turbine due to geometric divergence and atmospheric absorption effects.

A tonality assessment undertaken in accordance with IEC61400-11 *Wind Turbine Generator Systems – Part 11: Acoustic Noise Measurement Techniques* (IEC61400-11) for the Repower MM92 and Vesta V90 turbines is provided in the documents outlined in Table 1.

These reports provide tonal audibility ($\Delta L_{a,k}$) for the most prevalent tone at each integer wind speed in the range 6-9 m/s at 10m AGL for each proposed turbine type. The largest reported values for $\Delta L_{a,k}$ for measurements made close to the turbine at a distance of approximately 150m, are -2.96 dB and -1.7dB for the REpower and Vestas turbines respectively, as detailed in Table 2 above.

3.0 NOISE ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

In addition to the core assessment documents detailed in the 2009 assessment, this addendum also considers the following guidance documents:

- *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (ICNG) published by the Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC) (July 2009)
- *Draft NSW Planning Guidelines: Wind Farms* (draft NSW guidelines) published by the NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure (December 2011)

Discussion of these documents is provided in Appendix E.

4.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Please refer to Appendix F for a detailed description and justification of the prediction methodology used for this assessment.

The 2003 SA Guidelines propose a 5dB penalty for characteristics of turbine operation that may be deemed as annoying, such as tonality.

One means of determining tonality is in accordance with IEC61400-11 *Wind Turbine Generator Systems – Part 11: Acoustic Noise Measurement Techniques* (IEC61400-11). As detailed in Section 2.1, the maximum reported tone audibility ($\Delta L_{a,k}$) is less than 0dB. Version 3.0 of the IEC61400-11 test standard, published in 2012, states that a “tone is audible if the tonal audibility is above 0dB”.

It is therefore considered that a tonal correction need not apply for any of the assessed wind speeds.

5.0 RELEVANT RECEIVER ASSESSMENT

Using the assessment methodology presented in the 2009 assessment along with the changes outlined in Section 4.0 and Appendix F, we have determined relevant receivers that are located within the 35dB L_{Aeq} predicted noise contour. The revised set of relevant receivers is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Relevant receivers (MGA GDA94 Zone 55)

Location	Easting	Northing	Distance to closest turbine (km)	Representative background monitoring location	Base criteria	Relevant receiver for 2009 assessment?
C02 *	636019	6153226	1.7	C02	45	Yes
C03 *	637337	6151337	1.4	C03	45	Yes
C04 *	641145	6150582	2.3	C04	45	Yes
C25 *	650905	6151073	0.7	C26	45	No
C26 *	650347	6153681	1.5	C26	45	Yes
C27 *	651322	6154526	1.1	C26	45	No
C55 *	636410	6151623	1.7	-	45	No

Location	Easting	Northing	Distance to closest turbine (km)	Representative background monitoring location	Base criteria	Relevant receiver for 2009 assessment?
C56 *	637828	6151304	1.4	-	45	No
C68 *	651108	6154402	1.3	-	45	No
C74	639283	6160379	3.2	C74	35	No
G11	661209	6147630	1.7	G12	35	No
G12 *	660201	6149381	1.8	G12	45	Yes
G13 *	660057	6151077	2.0	G14	45	No
G14	659607	6150702	1.4	G14	35	Yes
G15 *	655374	6149637	1.2	G15	45	Yes
G16	655016	6147518	1.1	G30	35	No
G31 *	651691	6149344	1.5	M18	45	No
G38 *	659982	6150849	1.8	-	45	No
M08	660245	6151580	2.4	G14	35	No
M18 *	652314	6149832	0.9	M18	45	No
M20	658743	6154508	1.9	M04	35	No
M21 *	651854	6155574	1.4	C26	45	No
M32 *	652110	6146643	1.9	-	45	No
M41 *	651736	6155517	1.4	-	45	No
M42	653648	6155444	1.2	M42	35	No
M48 *	655766	6149602	1.5	-	45	No

* Involved receiver

A number of receivers were not included in the 2009 assessment and therefore do not have a corresponding representative background monitoring location. For these receivers, predicted noise levels are compared to the base criteria (as defined in Table 5) to assess compliance.

The background noise data collected for the 2009 assessment has been reanalysed using wind speeds referenced to hub height. The use of hub height referenced wind speeds is consistent with the Draft NSW guidelines.

For receiver C74 and M42, data collected in 2013 has been used to determine noise criteria. These receivers were not identified as part of the 2009 assessment. Given their proximity to proposed turbine locations, noise monitoring has been conducted at these locations by Epuron. Please refer to Appendix G for further details on the monitoring surveys carried out at C74 and M42.

Figure 3 presents an overview of the resulting 24 hour noise criteria for all receivers.




Figure 3: Hub height noise criteria

We note the derived criteria for receivers C05, C42, G14, G15 and G30 are noticeably higher than other receivers. These receivers are generally located close to a major highway or local road and therefore it is likely the elevated background noise levels are due to noise from traffic movements. The elevated background noise level experienced at the receivers is reflected in the derived noise criteria. The applicable noise criteria for each identified relevant receiver has been tabulated and presented in Appendix H.

Further details for the revised data analysis are presented in Appendix G. Consideration of the daytime and night-time limits and an overview of the resulting noise limits are discussed in Appendix I.

Where there is no proxy location for the receiver, a base noise limit has been assumed when assessing compliance of predicted noise levels.

6.0 NOISE LEVEL PREDICTIONS

Wind farm noise levels have been calculated in accordance with ISO9613-2:1996 *Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 2: General method of calculation* and the Joule Report recommendations as discussed in Section 4.0. The predicted noise level at each of the relevant receivers is presented in Table 6 for the V90 and MM92 turbines.

Noise levels in environmental assessment work are typically reported to the nearest integer to reflect the practical use of measurement and prediction data. In the case of wind farm layout design however, significant layout modifications may only give rise to fractional changes in the predicted noise level. This is a result of the relatively large number of sources influencing the total predicted noise level, as well as the typical separating distances between the turbine locations and surrounding assessment positions. It is therefore necessary to consider the predicted noise levels at a finer resolution than can be perceived or measured in practice. It is for this reason that the levels presented below are reported to one decimal place

The levels presented in Table 6 are based on the highest reported sound power level (plus uncertainty tolerance) for each turbine model using the prediction methodology as detailed in Appendix F. For the MM92 turbine the highest sound power level occurs at a hub height reference wind speed of 10m/s. For the V90 turbine the highest sound power level occurs at a hub height reference wind speed of 15m/s.

Table 6: Highest predicted levels for relevant receivers (L_{Aeq}) in dB

	MM92 ¹	Compliance at all wind speeds?	V90 ²	Compliance at all wind speeds?
C02*	37.8	✓	39.7	✓
C03*	37.1	✓	39.3	✓
C04*	35.7	✓	37.9	✓
C25*	39.9	✓	42.2	✓
C26*	35.8	✓	38.2	✓
C27*	37.1	✓	39.3	✓
C55*	35.8	✓	38.1	✓
C56*	37.8	✓	40.1	✓
C68*	36.5	✓	39.1	✓
C74	<35	✓	35.2	✓
G11	<35	✓	37.2	✓
G12*	37.0	✓	38.9	✓
G13*	35.1	✓	37.4	✓
G14	37.3	✓	39.3	✓
G15*	40.2	✓	42.3	✓

	MM92 ¹	Compliance at all wind speeds?	V90 ²	Compliance at all wind speeds?
G16	39.5	✓	41.7	✓
G31*	37.4	✓	39.6	✓
G38*	35.8	✓	38.1	✓
M08	<35	✓	36.2	✓
M18*	41.0	✓	43.1	✓
M20	<35	✓	35.2	✓
M21*	35.2	✓	37.1	✓
M32*	<35	✓	36.0	✓
M41*	<35	✓	37.5	✓
M42	35.1	✓	36.3	✓
M48*	39.5	✓	41.3	✓

¹ Predicted level for hub height wind speed 10m/s

² Predicted level for hub height wind speed 15m/s

* Involved receiver

The predicted noise levels comply with the relevant noise criteria for all relevant receivers for the MM92 and V90 turbine types. For details on the predicted noise levels for all receivers, please refer to Appendix J.

Appendix K provides further informative comparison of the predicted noise levels with the noise limits for the daytime and night-time periods (derived with regard to the NSW draft guidelines).

Please refer to Appendix L for indicative noise contour maps for the modelled scenarios.

6.1 Cumulative Effect of Other Wind Farm Developments

Cumulative noise impacts have been considered for the consented Conroy's Gap Wind Farm.

Conroy's Gap Wind Farm comprises 18 Repower MM92 turbines and is located directly south of the eastern section of the proposed Yass Valley Wind Farm. Operational noise from the Conroy's Gap Wind Farm has been modelled using sound power level information for the MM92 turbine provided in Section 2.1. Please refer to Appendix C for the coordinates of the turbines.

As noted previously, the receiver list presented in Appendix B includes the receivers surrounding Conroy's Gap Wind Farm. Predicted noise levels for receivers are detailed below where the inclusion of the Conroy's Gap turbines:

- Results in the overall noise level being greater than 35dB L_{Aeq} and
- Changes the overall predicted noise level at the receiver

We have identified 7 receivers comprised of 5 involved receivers and 2 non-involved receivers which meet criteria a) and b) above.

The cumulative predicted noise levels for the Yass Valley Wind Farm and consented Conroy's Gap Wind Farm for the involved receivers are presented in Table 7.

The levels presented are based on the highest reported sound power level (plus uncertainty tolerance) for each turbine model using the prediction methodology as detailed in Appendix F. For the case of the MM92 turbine being installed at both farms, the highest sound power level occurs at the hub height referenced wind speed of 10m/s. For the case of the V90 being installed at the Yass Valley Wind Farm with the MM92 installed at Conroy's Gap, the highest sound power levels occur at hub height reference wind speeds of 15m/s and 10m/s respectively¹.

Table 7: Cumulative predicted noise levels (L_{Aeq}) in dB for involved receivers

Receiver	Conroy's Gap	Yass noise level		Cumulative noise level (Yass + Conroy's Gap)		Base line criteria	Comply?
		MM92 ¹	V90 ²	MM92 ¹	V90 ³		
Conroy's Gap relevant receivers							
G10*	40.2	29.4	31.6	40.5	40.7	45	✓
G60*	35.5	26.7	29.4	36.1	36.5	45	✓
Yass Valley relevant receiver (if noise level has increased with Conroy's Gap included)							
G12*	24.2	37	38.9	37.2	39.1	45	✓
G13*	21.2	35.1	37.4	35.3	37.5	45	✓
M32*	23.0	<35	36	34.2	36.2	45	✓

¹ Predicted level for hub height wind speed 10m/s

² Predicted level for hub height wind speed 15m/s

³ Predicted level using maximum sound power level for MM92 turbine (which occurs at hub height wind speed of 10m/s) and V90 turbine (which occurs at hub height wind speed of 15m/s)

* Involved receiver with Yass Valley Wind Farm

As the cumulative predicted noise levels for the involved receivers are below the base line criteria of 45dB L_{Aeq} , we can confirm the cumulative predicted noise levels across all wind speeds are less than applicable noise criteria.

¹ As the maximum sound power levels for the two candidate turbines in this case occur at different wind speeds, the cumulative noise levels presented are considered to be conservative.

The cumulative predicted noise levels for relevant wind speeds for the non-involved receivers along with the relevant criteria are presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Cumulative predicted noise levels (L_{Aeq}) in dB for non-involved receivers

Receiver	Yass turbine	Cumulative noise level (Yass + Conroy's Gap)											
		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
G11	MM92	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.5	34.6	35.2	35.2	34.8	34.1	NA	NA
	V90	30.3	30.3	30.3	32.1	33.8	35.6	36.6	37.1	37.0	36.8	36.8	37.2
	Background	31.1	32.0	33.0	34.1	35.2	36.4	37.5	38.6	39.8	40.8	41.8	42.7
	<i>Criteria</i>	36.1	37.0	38.0	39.1	40.2	41.4	42.5	43.6	44.8	45.8	46.8	47.7
	Compliance?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
G16	MM92	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.0	39.1	39.7	39.7	39.3	38.6	NA	NA
	V90	34.2	34.2	34.2	36.2	38.0	39.8	40.9	41.3	41.3	41.1	41.3	41.7
	Background	35.2	35.8	36.3	36.7	37.1	37.6	38.1	38.8	39.5	40.5	41.6	43.0
	<i>Criteria</i>	40.2	40.8	41.3	41.7	42.1	42.6	43.1	43.8	44.5	45.5	46.6	48.0
	Compliance?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 8 shows the cumulative predicted noise levels are below the criteria at all relevant wind speeds for receivers G11 and G16.

Based on the above assessments of the cumulative noise levels from both Conroy's Gap and Yass Valley Wind Farms, the predicted noise levels are below the relevant criteria at all assessed receivers.

6.2 Transformer Noise Levels

The layout for the substations proposed for the 2009 assessment has been revised. There are two substation layout options proposed for the Yass Valley Wind Farm:

- **Option A** – Two substations, one with a 200MVA transformer and one with a 300 MVA transformer; or
- **Option B** – One substation with a 500MVA transformer

The transformer sound power levels presented in Table 9 have been estimated from Figure ZA1 – Sound Power levels from *AS/NZS60076.10:2009 Power transformers Part 10: Determination of sound levels*.

Table 9: Transformer locations and estimated sound power levels

Coordinates (MGA94 Zone 55)					
Option	Reference name	Easting	Northing	Size (MVA)	L _{WA} (dB)
A	COP_300	642116	6154068	300	101
A	MRL_200	652183	6151546	200	98
B	COP_500	649622	6149216	500	104

Noise levels have been predicted for the Option A and Option B configuration to the dwellings closest to the substations. It is noted that transformers commonly display tonality at 100Hz, therefore a penalty of +5dB has been applied to the predicted results. Predicted noise levels, adjusted for tonality in accordance with Table 4.1 of the *NSW Industrial Noise Policy, January 2000* (NSW INP), are detailed in Table 10. Noise criteria have been developed in accordance with the NSW INP (please refer to 2009 assessment for further information).

Table 10: Predicted transformer noise levels (L_{Aeq}) in dB

Dwelling	Distance to closest substation (km)	Closest transformer?	Predicted noise level (dB L _{Aeq})		Night-time RBL ¹ (dB L _{A90})	INP intrusiveness criteria (RBL +5dB)	Comply?
			Option A	Option B			
C04	3.6	COP_300	<10	<10	36	41	✓
C25	1.4	MRL_200	19	18	30	35	✓
C67	0.8	COP_500	<10	31	30	35	✓

¹ RBL is the rating background noise level as defined in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy

The predicted levels summarised in Table 10 indicate the noise levels from the closest substations will be below the NSW INP intrusiveness criteria.

7.0 SITE CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The potential impact from construction noise has been revisited for the present assessment. Specifically, noise levels at additional receivers have been presented to account for the worst case receivers, being those locations nearest to the proposed turbines sites and the revised transmission line layout.

We note the information in this section is considered to be supplementary to the construction noise assessment provided in the 2009 assessment. The information regarding construction noise levels provided in the 2009 assessment is still generally valid.

7.1 Construction Site Noise Limits

As detailed in Appendix E, it is considered that the NSW Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) is the most appropriate document for the assessment of construction noise at this site.

The ICNG specifies a variety of criteria for noise emissions, which are based principally on hours of work and specific land use of the impacted receivers. Typically, for residential receivers, the ICNG refers to noise management levels which are referenced against existing background noise levels. The recommended management noise levels vary, depending on land use and whether construction occurs within or outside of the recommended standard hours.

The ICNG defines the recommended standard construction hours as:

- Monday to Friday: 7am to 6pm
- Saturday: 8am to 1pm
- Sunday and public holidays: no construction work

We understand construction is likely to occur within the recommended standard construction hours and our assessment is undertaken on this basis.

For construction during standard hours, there are two defined management levels. The predicted noise levels from construction activities are compared to the management levels to assist with determining the level of assessment required during the construction process. The management levels are outlined in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Management noise levels for construction during standard hours

Receiver category	Management level $L_{Aeq(15mins)}$	Definition
Noise affected	RBL + 10dB	Where predicted levels are above the RBL + 10dB there may be some community reaction to noise
Highly noise affected	75dB	Where predicted levels are above 75dB L_{Aeq} there may be strong community reaction to noise

The ICNG management levels refer to the rating background level (RBL), which is defined in the INP. The RBL provides a single-figure background noise level which is determined based on the background noise levels measured at a noise sensitive receiver. Where the RBL is found to be less than 30dB L_{A90} , it is set to 30dB L_{A90} .

Background noise levels for the INP defined daytime period have been determined in accordance with the procedure detailed in Table 3.1 *Methods for determining background noise* of the NSW INP.

Table 14 below, summarises the daytime RBL for each receiver. Where there is no background noise monitoring data to determine a site specific RBL value, the minimum value of 30dB L_{A90} has been used.

For an assessment in line with the ICNG, the assessment requirements are determined by the receiver locations where predicted noise levels are expected to be highest. The construction noise predictions, assessments and recommendations presented here in account for all potentially affected receiver locations by considering those receivers nearest to the proposed turbines and transmission line.

7.2 Description of construction activities

The construction of the wind farm will include four key activities which are listed in approximate chronological order with the typical duration of each stage (per turbine) provided in brackets:

1. Access road construction (4 days)
2. Turbine foundation construction (3 days per turbine)
3. Cable trench digging to accommodate underground cabling (3 days)
4. Wind turbine assembly and erection (3 days per turbine)

This sequence of construction activities is generally followed at each individual turbine site and therefore for the site as a whole. There may however be some overlap of different construction stages in some cases. For example it is possible that turbine assembly could be occurring at one turbine site while foundation construction is underway at another turbine site. These overlaps are only expected to occur for short periods due to the short duration of each stage. As part of the assessment, we have considered the scenario of the four activities listed above occurring simultaneously at a single turbine site to conservatively predict the noise levels at receivers. Collectively, the four activities listed above are referred to as “Turbine construction activities”.

Additionally, the detailed coordination of site activities and their precise duration are not known at this stage as a detailed construction plan has not yet been developed. Accordingly, the information presented in this section should be regarded as preliminary only.

Transmission line construction is also required on the site. Figure 4 shows the proposed route for the line.




Figure 4: Proposed transmission line path

Throughout the construction phase of the project, it is proposed that two concrete batching plants may be located on the site at the locations of the proposed transformers COP_300 and MRL_200 (discussed in Section 6.2).

To provide context for the potential noise from of construction activities, we have calculated the distance where the predicted noise level due to construction activities could potentially be above the noise management levels defined in Table 11.

The highly noise affected management level of 75dB L_{Aeq} is not expected to be exceeded beyond 100m and there are no receivers with this range. Table 12 summaries the calculated distances where the noise levels would potentially be above the minimum ICNG noise affected management level of 40dB L_{Aeq} .

Predictions are based on the calculation method set out in ISO9613-2:1996. Calculations are based on commonly adopted geometric divergence of noise in addition to a range of factors including:

- The magnitude of the noise source expressed in terms of sound power level
- The distance between the source and receiver
- The ground effect, defined by porosity of the ground between the source and receiver (50% soft ground assumed)
- Attenuation due to atmospheric absorption.

We note attenuation due to shielding by intervening terrain has not been included for these calculations. This is considered to be a conservative approach.

Table 12: Estimate of distance where construction noise levels are above ICNG management levels

Receiver status	Management level	Turbine construction	Batching plant	Transmission line construction
Noise affected	40dB L _{Aeq} *	within 2km	within 800m	within 1.25km

*Minimum RBL level of 30dB L_{Aeq} has been used to determine the noise affected management level

The actual noise levels experienced at a receiver will be dependent on the distance between the source and receiver, the intervening terrain as well as how long different items of equipment will be operating. The predictions are based on atmospheric conditions which favour sound propagation, such as a wind from the source to the receiver, or a mild thermal inversion; the noise levels under other conditions are expected to be significantly lower than predicted. The information presented in Table 12 can be considered to be conservative distance estimates defined for the purpose of identifying locations where noise levels could potentially be higher than the management levels in the ICNG. In practice, noise levels at these distances are likely to be lower than the management noise levels, on account of factors including terrain screening, wind direction effects and variations in construction activity.

More detailed calculations which include attenuation due to intervening terrain have been undertaken for nine (9) properties that represent the receiver locations where the noise levels are expected to be highest due to their proximity to the proposed construction activities. The predicted noise levels at these selected receiver locations are based on a 15-minute assessment period, which is in line with the assessment period outlined within the ICNG and INP. Noise levels have been predicted with software package SoundPLAN version 7.2 using ISO9613-2 prediction methodology.

Table 13 below provides a summary of the distance between the assessed receivers and the major construction noise sources. Receivers C25, C27, G15, G16, M18 and M42 represent the receivers closest to turbines. Receiver C67 and M13 represent the receivers closest to the power line construction. Receiver C25 also represents the receiver closest to the batching plant. In addition, receiver M48 has been included as it has been identified as a receiver where intervening terrain is not providing any significant screening from construction activities and therefore predicted noise levels are in line with some receivers that are located closer to the noise sources.

Table 13: Distance between assessed receivers and construction sources

Location	Closest turbine	Distance to closest turbine (km)	Distance to closest batching plant (km)	Distance to closest power line (km)
C25*	108	0.7	1.4	0.7
C27*	111	1.1	3.1	3.1
C67	74	3.3	4.2	0.8
G15*	93	1.2	3.8	3.7
G16	96	1.1	5.0	4.0
M13*	95	3.6	5.8	0.5
M18*	84	0.9	1.8	1.2
M42	114	1.2	4.2	4.2
M48*	93	1.5	4.1	4.1

* Involved landowner

Table 14 summarises the predicted noise levels at each receiver location for each construction stage as well as the cumulative noise level assuming all construction activities were occurring at the same time in a 15 minute period. The noise level is shown in bold where the predicted level is greater than the management level. The cumulative noise levels present an expected worst-case scenario, as it is unlikely that all six activities will occur at the closest turbine site simultaneously.

Table 14: Predicted construction noise level (L_{Aeq}) at assessed receiver locations

Location	Management level (RBL+ 10 dB)	Access Road Construction	Turbine Foundation Construction	Cable Trench Digging	WTG Assembly	Batching plant	Transmission line construction	Cumulative level	Noise affected receiver?	Highly noise affected receiver?
C25*	40	45-50	45-50	40-45	30-35	30-35	45-50	50-55	✓	×
C27*	40	40-45	40-45	35-40	25-30	15-20	25-30	40-45	✓	×
C67	40	25-30	25-30	20-25	15-20	15-20	40-45	40-45	✓	×
G15*	44	40-45	40-45	35-40	30-35	15-20	25-30	45-50	✓	×
G16	44	40-45	40-45	40-45	30-35	10-15	25-30	45-50	✓	×
M13*	40	25-30	25-30	25-30	15-20	<10	45-50	45-50	✓	×
M18*	40	35-40	35-40	30-35	20-25	25-30	40-45	45-50	✓	×
M42	40	35-40	35-40	35-40	25-30	10-15	20-25	40-45	✓	×
M48*	40	40-45	40-45	35-40	25-30	15-20	25-30	40-45	✓	×

* Involved landowner

The predicted noise levels provided in Table 14 show eight of the nine assessed receivers would be considered to be noise affected for some of the construction stages. Based on the

worst-case scenario assuming all construction stages occur simultaneously, all nine receivers would be considered noise affected receivers. No receivers would be considered highly noise affected.

The preliminary calculations indicate there is the potential for noise levels greater than the minimum management level of 40dB L_{Aeq} at receivers for the following construction stages:

- Access road construction
- Cable trench digging
- Transmission line construction
- Turbine foundation construction

The predictions indicated that the minimum management level of 40dB L_{Aeq} is not expected to be exceeded at any receivers as a result of concrete batching activities or for the wind turbine assembly stage.

The predicted noise levels provided in Table 14 present the highest expected noise levels for a given construction stage. For example, with regards to turbine foundation construction, there will be an initial period where noise levels are high while excavation is being undertaken followed by less noisy activities such as concrete pouring. While turbine foundation construction is noted to occur for approximately 3 days per turbine, the highest emission activities which result in noise levels above the minimum noise management level will only occur for a limited portion of this period, and only during normal hours and days of construction.

The ICNG recommends that where receivers are noise affected:

- The proponent should apply all feasible and reasonable work practices to meet the noise affected management level (RBL + 10dB) and;
- The proponent should also inform all potentially impacted residents of the nature of works to be carried out, the expected noise levels and duration, as well as contact details. The setback distances provided in Table 12 can be used as a guide to determine which receivers should be notified for each stage of construction.

The construction activities and equipment considered in this study are representative of the types of work associated with construction of a wind farm. Actual noise levels in practice will depend on the specific working methods and equipment selected to construct the project. In light of the above findings with respect to the management levels, we recommend that a construction noise management plan is developed when a construction contractor has been engaged for the project, and working methods and equipment selections are sufficiently well defined. The purpose of the construction management plan would be to define the best practicable working methods to be adopted for the control of construction noise, and the types of matters to be addressed in the construction noise management plan include:

- Revised noise level predictions for key construction stages and key receptor locations and determine the extent of noise affected receivers.
- Proposed scheduling of construction activities to minimise the noise impact, including confirmation of regular working days and hours, the timing of any noisier activities
- Selection of equipment with lower overall sound power levels

- Installing broadband/white noise reversing alarms on relevant equipment
- Investigation of the use of local screens or positioning of equipment to utilise screening provided by intervening terrain
- Key noise considerations to be included as part of the induction of site workers
- Procedures for notifying residences of particular activities, such as an essential out of hours work (e.g. turbine erection or deliveries)
- Procedures on how to deal with noise complaints
- Details of noise monitoring procedures and the circumstances in which monitoring may be undertaken

We understand the predicted traffic generated as part of the wind farm project is expected to be very similar to the scenarios presented in the 2009 assessment. Therefore, the assessment of noise relating to traffic movements on the site presented in the 2009 assessment is still valid. See the 2009 assessment for further details.

APPENDIX A GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

dB Decibel. The unit of sound level.

Frequency Sound can occur over a range of frequencies extending from the very low, such as the rumble of thunder, up to the very high such as the crash of cymbals. Sound is generally described over the frequency range from 63Hz to 4000Hz (4kHz). This is roughly equal to the range of frequencies on a piano.

dBA A-weighted decibel. The A-weighting approximates the response of the human ear

Lw (or SWL) Sound Power Level. The level of total sound power radiated by a sound source.

Noise is often not steady. Traffic noise, music noise and the barking of dogs are all examples of noises that vary over time. When such noises are measured, the noise level can be expressed as an average level, or as a statistical measure, such as the level exceeded for 90% of the time.

L_{A90} The noise level exceeded for 90% of the measurement period, measured in dBA. This is commonly referred to as the background noise level.

L_{Aeq} The equivalent continuous sound level. This is commonly referred to as the average noise level and is measured in dBA.

L_{Aeq} (t) The equivalent continuous (time-averaged) A-weighted sound level. This is commonly referred to as the average noise level.

The suffix "t" represents the time period to which the noise level relates, e.g. (8 h) would represent a period of 8 hours, (15 min) would represent a period of 15 minutes and (2200-0700) would represent a measurement time between 10 pm and 7 am.

APPENDIX B RECEIVER LOCATION CHANGES

As discussed in Section 5.0, there have been a number of receiver location changes since the 2009 assessment. Table B1 below provides a glossary of the terminology used to explain the 2013 receiver status and Table B2 gives the receiver coordinates for the current assessment.

Table B1: Receiver status glossary

Status	Description
No change	For the stated receiver ID, there has been no change in the easting or northing coordinate between the 2009 and the current assessment
New location	For the stated receiver ID, the easting or northing coordinate has changed between the 2009 and the current assessment. This is due to improved accuracy when capturing receiver locations.
Relabelled	Improved accuracy when capturing receiver locations has identified that a previous receiver is no longer identified as a dwelling and as such the label has been reused by the proponent or a redundant receiver position has been identified.
New receiver	There is no corresponding receiver ID location for the 2009 assessment

Table B2: Receiver location summary (MGA GDA94, Zone 55)

ID	Current Easting	Current Northing	Status	2009 assigned label*	Change in easting	Change in northing
C01	634542	6152998	No change			
C02	636019	6153226	New location		9.07	-5.35
C03	637337	6151337	New location		-16.48	66.91
C04	641145	6150582	New location		-3.9	-9.7
C05	644196	6148247	No change			
C06	645148	6147453	No change			
C07	631744	6154014	No change			
C08	645794	6147060	New location		11.14	-30.02
C09	630849	6153136	No change			
C10	632778	6150353	No change			
C12	634100	6149266	New location		-14.07	1.53
C13	634466	6150956	No change			
C22	641632	6147823	No change			
C25	650905	6151073	No change			
C26	650347	6153681	No change			
C27	651322	6154526	No change			
C28	648493	6156983	No change			
C28a	648498	6156870	New receiver			

ID	Current Easting	Current Northing	Status	2009 assigned label*	Change in easting	Change in northing
C29	645491	6156830	No change			
C30	643944	6159581	No change			
C33	644012	6160671	No change			
C34	643485	6160766	No change			
C35	639487	6159590	New location		-152.56	-25.54
C37	635366	6159643	New location		-91.46	-14.74
C38	632048	6157837	No change			
C39	631508	6158555	No change			
C41	646816	6146818	New location		-6.18	-20.65
C42	649156	6147589	New location		10.91	12.37
C46a	649054	6147292	New receiver			
C47	649752	6146654	No change			
C48	649388	6146699	No change			
C52	649584	6157888	No change			
C53	635285	6160772	New receiver			
C55	636410	6151623	New receiver			
C56	637828	6151304	New receiver			
C58	642782	6147349	New receiver			
C59	643544	6145985	New receiver			
C60	645430	6146811	New receiver			
C61	648066	6145891	New receiver			
C62	649389	6147137	New receiver			
C63	649566	6146693	New receiver			
C64	649625	6146616	New receiver			
C65	649666	6146568	New receiver			
C66	649801	6146592	New receiver			
C67	649305	6148446	New receiver			
C68	651108	6154402	New receiver			
C69	652031	6157308	New receiver			
C71	645410	6156831	New receiver			
C72	648197	6144474	New receiver			
C73	631318	6154627	New receiver			
C74	639283	6160379	New receiver			
C75	643338	6147618	New receiver			
C76	638649	6148574	New receiver			
C76a	639065	6148250	New receiver			

ID	Current Easting	Current Northing	Status	2009 assigned label*	Change in easting	Change in northing
C77	649502	6147085	New receiver			
E20	635355	6148215	New receiver			
G01	656955	6140691	New location		-0.28	-0.33
G02	655830	6142160	New location		-0.09	0.23
G02a	656066	6141866	New location		-0.48	0.11
G03	654913	6142552	New location		0.36	-0.13
G04	658616	6142092	New location		-0.09	-0.2
G05	660294	6142075	New location		0.45	0.02
G06	661339	6142115	New location		-0.19	0.16
G07	659736	6143497	New location		-0.37	0.11
G08	659548	6143435	New location		0.04	0.47
G09	660108	6143295	New location		0.14	-0.43
G10	657463	6144500	No change			
G11	661209	6147630	No change			
G12	660201	6149381	No change			
G13	660057	6151077	New receiver			
G14	659607	6150702	New location		58.7	43.02
G15	655374	6149637	No change			
G16	655016	6147518	New location		-11.29	24.48
G18	662442	6150000	No change			
G19	662998	6149342	New location		66.11	-55.43
G20	661622	6145660	No change			
G23	661185	6144412	No change			
G24	660294	6144222	No change			
G26	654589	6142433	New location		0.15	0.43
G27	654255	6139595	New location		-103.39	16.5
G28	653616	6137305	New receiver			
G29	654670	6144842	New location		-19.59	167.41
G30	639014	6147881	Relabelled	C20		
G31	651691	6149344	New location		-3.18	-10.26
G32	638449	6147803	New receiver			
G36	662352	6150964	No change			
G38	659982	6150849	Relabelled	G13		
G39	662856	6150456	Relabelled	G35		
G40	662318	6147348	New receiver			
G41	662876	6146549	New receiver			

ID	Current Easting	Current Northing	Status	2009 assigned label*	Change in easting	Change in northing
G42	658194	6138495	New location		-0.84	3.95
G43	656466	6137655	New location		-2.99	3.41
G44	662582	6145905	New receiver			
G45	655427	6136235	Relabelled	G44		
G46	654615	6142308	New receiver			
G47	658778	6136871	Relabelled	G32		
G53	662637	6135668	New receiver			
G54	654307	6142203	New receiver			
G55	663370	6146057	New receiver			
G56	664478	6146720	New receiver			
G57	662900	6146056	New receiver			
G58	662725	6145918	New receiver			
G59	659823	6143216	New receiver			
G60	659368	6143377	New receiver			
G61	663768	6144604	New receiver			
H30	640134	6147863	New receiver			
K52	647463	6143653	New receiver			
M01	658885	6154626	No change			
M02	658967	6154884	No change			
M03	658590	6154878	No change			
M04	658548	6154933	New location		-9.35	-11.27
M05	661995	6152897	No change			
M06	661362	6152923	No change			
M07	662307	6152429	No change			
M08	660245	6151580	No change			
M09	650243	6146581	New location		24.83	13.12
M13	650548	6145967	No change			
M18	652314	6149832	New location		-19.04	-44.06
M20	658743	6154508	No change			
M21	651854	6155574	No change			
M22	654105	6156790	No change			
M24	658623	6154599	New receiver			
M25	650051	6146376	New receiver			
M26	649993	6146306	New receiver			
M27	650120	6146322	New receiver			
M28	650095	6146256	New receiver			

ID	Current Easting	Current Northing	Status	2009 assigned label*	Change in easting	Change in northing
M29	650134	6146219	New receiver			
M30	650156	6146155	New receiver			
M31	650227	6146088	New receiver			
M32	652110	6146643	New receiver			
M33	662430	6152891	New receiver			
M34	658644	6155236	New receiver			
M35	658445	6155225	New receiver			
M36	658630	6155598	New receiver			
M37	658208	6155434	New receiver			
M38	658294	6155812	New receiver			
M39	657388	6155956	New receiver			
M40	654760	6157037	New receiver			
M41	651736	6155517	New receiver			
M42	653648	6155444	New receiver			
M43	650710	6159059	New receiver			
M44	652027	6160045	New receiver			
M44a	651766	6159729	New receiver			
M44b	651827	6159558	New receiver			
M46	660983	6152974	New receiver			
M48	655766	6149602	New receiver			
M81	651222	6136844	New receiver			
M92	651370	6135593	New receiver			

*Where different from 2009 assessment

APPENDIX C TURBINE COORDINATES

Table C1: Yass Valley Wind Farm Turbine Coordinates (MGA GDA94, Zone 55)

Turbine ID	Easting	Northing	Turbine ID	Easting	Northing
1	641,135	6,156,615	30	640,070	6,154,676
2	642,183	6,155,309	31	640,038	6,155,010
3	641,934	6,155,584	32	639,618	6,154,648
4	641,683	6,155,973	33	639,464	6,153,582
5	641,228	6,156,306	34	638,607	6,154,188
6	644,704	6,153,528	35	638,391	6,153,940
7	643,949	6,154,128	36	639,022	6,154,556
8	643,690	6,154,400	37	638,704	6,154,914
9	642,410	6,155,033	38	639,088	6,155,044
10	642,697	6,154,767	39	638,176	6,153,691
11	644,507	6,153,820	40	637,724	6,153,002
12	645,386	6,153,102	41	637,724	6,152,676
13	645,920	6,153,005	42	637,890	6,153,483
14	645,844	6,152,689	43	638,123	6,153,103
15	643,186	6,154,579	44	637,501	6,153,978
16	640,374	6,156,085	45	637,821	6,154,164
17	640,731	6,155,502	46	638,091	6,154,423
18	640,494	6,155,780	47	639,088	6,152,412
19	641,174	6,155,340	48	639,374	6,152,965
20	642,992	6,152,607	49	639,508	6,153,251
21	642,127	6,153,127	50	639,733	6,152,377
22	642,273	6,152,772	51	639,315	6,152,655
23	641,835	6,152,804	52	637,982	6,155,133
24	640,458	6,154,180	53	637,955	6,154,807
25	639,997	6,154,114	54	637,553	6,154,697
26	640,620	6,153,560	55	637,558	6,155,411
27	641,397	6,153,772	56	638,860	6,155,385
28	641,085	6,153,590	57	638,692	6,155,728
29	641,753	6,154,245	58	638,239	6,155,953

Turbine ID	Easting	Northing	Turbine ID	Easting	Northing
59	638,546	6,156,147	86	653,296	6,150,233
60	637,143	6,155,777	87	653,274	6,150,848
61	636,904	6,155,521	88	653,192	6,150,541
62	636,707	6,155,235	89	653,780	6,148,628
63	636,604	6,154,848	90	654,147	6,148,953
64	637,973	6,156,390	91	654,115	6,150,552
65	638,118	6,156,671	92	653,718	6,149,738
66	638,884	6,156,320	93	654,280	6,149,247
67	639,241	6,156,706	94	654,247	6,150,108
68	638,060	6,157,008	95	653,887	6,147,211
69	635,163	6,156,152	96	653,864	6,147,510
70	635,491	6,156,697	97	653,912	6,147,888
71	635,449	6,156,374	98	653,867	6,148,186
72	635,867	6,156,842	99	654,114	6,149,534
73	646,131	6,150,401	100	657,779	6,152,902
74	646,521	6,150,162	101	657,711	6,152,609
75	645,789	6,149,787	102	657,513	6,152,339
76	646,174	6,149,496	103	657,608	6,151,700
77	645,814	6,149,346	104	657,688	6,151,403
78	644,751	6,150,491	105	657,457	6,151,129
79	644,471	6,150,212	106	657,822	6,150,824
80	644,204	6,150,650	107*	650,962	6,152,365
81	643,496	6,151,799	108*	651,069	6,151,739
82	643,622	6,152,119	109*	650,984	6,152,044
83	653,720	6,150,014	110	653,972	6,153,876
84	653,194	6,149,608	111	652,405	6,154,318
85	653,260	6,149,921	112	653,843	6,154,217

Turbine ID	Easting	Northing	Turbine ID	Easting	Northing
114	653,391	6,154,324	132	658,027	6,149,117
115	652,514	6,153,210	133	658,117	6,149,707
116	653,431	6,154,025	134	658,264	6,149,275
117	653,839	6,151,769	135	658,102	6,148,798
118	653,821	6,152,082	136	658,275	6,150,211
119	654,059	6,153,012	137	658,094	6,148,517
120	653,830	6,152,394	138	658,049	6,148,242
121	653,872	6,152,719	139	658,435	6,147,613
122	652,364	6,153,913	140	658,581	6,147,858
123	656,466	6,152,373	141	658,136	6,147,895
124	656,362	6,152,085	142	659,406	6,147,513
125	656,577	6,151,809	143	659,500	6,147,766
126	636,929	6,157,657	144	659,241	6,146,899
127	637,065	6,157,311	145	658,870	6,146,506
128	637,560	6,157,324	146	658,957	6,147,198
129	637,674	6,157,619	147	658,828	6,147,521
130	635,896	6,156,000	148	658,963	6,146,742
131	658,270	6,149,928			

*We note turbines 107, 108 and 109 have been removed since the completion of the noise modelling for this assessment. The predicted noise levels at some receivers may decrease due the removal of the 3 turbines however the magnitude of this decrease has not been quantified as part of this study.

Table C2 summarises the turbine coordinates for the Conroy's Gap Wind Farm.

Table C2: Conroy's Gap Wind Farm Turbine Coordinates

Turbine ID	Easting	Northing
CG 1	657799	6146676
CG 2	657750	6146446
CG 3	657825	6146181
CG 4	658201	6146049
CG 5	658046	6145858
CG 6	658525	6145724
CG 7	658125	6145513
CG 8	658127	6145276
CG 9	658245	6145036
CG 10	658386	6144811
CG 11	657799	6143205
CG 12	657776	6142954
CG 13	657225	6142566
CG 14	657150	6142126
CG 15	658451	6140700
CG 16	658501	6140303
CG 17	658400	6140025
CG 18	658599	6139325

APPENDIX D TURBINE SOUND POWER LEVELS

Table D1 presents the measured plus uncertainty sound power levels for the V90 and MM92 turbines.

Table D1: Turbine sound power levels *

L_{AW} (dB)							
Wind speed (m/s) 10m AGL standardised	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Vesta V90	98.4	101.6	104.5	106.1	106.7	106.4	107.1
Repower MM92	-	-	103	104.1	104.2	103.5	-

**Based on measured plus uncertainty levels*

Table D2 summarises the octave band data as presented in the test reports for the V90 and MM92 turbine.

Table D2: Reference A-weighted octave band sound power levels for the candidate turbines

L_{WA} (dB)	Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)								Overall
	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000	
Vesta V90	94.2	92.8	95.4	98.1	100.2	99.9	95.4	85.1	105.9
Repower MM92	83.2	91.4	97	98.7	96.7	91	84.3	81.1	103.1

APPENDIX E ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES

E1 Construction Noise Guidelines

Construction noise guidelines were discussed in section 3.3 of the 2009 assessments.

The initial assessment was conducted in line with the Environmental Noise Control Manual (ENCM). Since the 2009 assessment, the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) was published by the DECC (July 2009).

We have provided a summary of the criterion from the two documents in this section.

Environmental Noise Control Manual (ENCM) summary

The ENCM recommends different criteria for different construction periods. While the construction duration associated with the proposed development is estimated to take 12 – 24 months in total, due to the size of the wind farm site intensive work will be located in any one location for a short period of time. Therefore we consider the criteria for between 4 and 26 weeks of construction to be appropriate for this assessment. The ENCM recommend for construction periods longer than 4 weeks and not exceeding 26 weeks, the noise emissions from construction should not exceed the $RBL + 10dB L_{A10}$.

Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) summary

The ICNG does not specify criteria for noise emissions, it instead refers to managements levels and in contrast to the ENCM, the construction period does not affect the recommended management levels.

The ICNG outlines two management noise levels.

Where construction occurs during the recommended standard hours (Monday to Friday 7am to 6pm and Saturday from 8am to 1pm), a receiver is considered a:

- “noise affected” receiver where the predicted noise level is greater than $RBL + 10dB L_{Aeq}$
- “highly noise affected” receiver where the predicted noise level is greater than $75dB L_{Aeq}$.

Different management processes are recommended depending on whether a receiver is considered a “noise affected” receiver or a “highly noise affected” receiver.

Proposed criteria

The criterion recommended by the ENCM is similar to the management level for “noise affected” receivers specified in the ICNG. As the ICNG is the current NSW guideline and the specified noise management levels are similar to the criteria used for the 2009 assessment, we consider the ICNG to be an appropriate guideline for the revised assessment.

E2 Draft NSW Guideline – Wind farms

The NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure released the draft *NSW Planning Guidelines: Wind Farms* (the *draft NSW guidelines*) in December 2011 to enable public consultation on a proposed regulatory framework for the development of wind farms in NSW. No final guidelines have been published, however as required by the DGR, the noise assessment has taken account of the proposed noise criteria contained in the draft NSW guidelines.

Appendix B of the draft NSW guidelines outlines a proposed noise assessment methodology for wind farms. The proposed methodology includes draft noise criteria for receivers not involved with the project and details of relevant noise prediction, background monitoring and compliance monitoring requirements. The noise criteria are:

For a new wind farm development the predicted (L_{eq} 10 minute), adjusted for any excessive levels of tonality, amplitude modulation or low frequency, but including all other normal wind farm characteristics, should not exceed:

35dB(A) or the background noise (L_{90}) by more than 5dB(A), whichever is greater, at all relevant receivers not associated with the wind farm, for wind speed from cut-in to rated power of the WTG at each integer wind speed in between. The noise criteria must be established on the basis of separate daytime (7am to 10pm) and night-time (10pm to 7am) periods.

Appendix B of the draft NSW guidelines also provides a discussion of the basis for these criteria and notes the following:

To ensure that the amenity of an area is not compromised, criteria have been set to restrict noise generated by wind turbines to 5dB(A) below the lowest acceptable noise criteria for a suburban or rural amenity (which is 40dB(A) at night) unless the area experiences background noise levels higher than the average 30dB(A) in which case the noise criteria can be up to 5dB(A) above the L_{90} background noise level. These criteria apply to all periods of the day regardless of whether the acceptable amenity is higher during the day or night.

The minimum noise limit derived according to the proposed criteria in the draft NSW guidelines is 35dB L_{Aeq} irrespective of the measured background noise level.

The draft NSW guidelines refer to negotiated agreements between wind farm proponents and owners of private land suitable for hosting wind turbines. In this context, the draft NSW guidelines specifically clarify that the proposed criteria are intended to minimise the impact on the amenity on neighbouring properties that do not have an agreement with the wind farm proponent. Whilst the draft NSW guidelines do not specifically define criteria applicable to involved land owners, it is implicit from this advice that the draft criteria provided for non-involved receivers should not be applied to involved receivers.

The draft NSW guidelines note that the proposed criteria for A-weighted noise levels have been specifically developed in recognition of the fundamental characteristics of the noise associated with a correctly functioning wind farm. In instances where the noise of a wind farm contains excessive levels of specific noise characteristics, the draft NSW guidelines propose relevant procedures in its section titled *Data analysis* within Appendix B.

Importantly, the procedures documented for these characteristics are documented as data analysis requirements which implicitly relate to post-construction compliance studies. However, Section 1.3(a) of the draft NSW guidelines detail planning assessment requirements for specific situations where a wind farm proposal seeks to place turbines within 2km of existing residences. In these instances, the draft NSW guidelines indicate that the application should include the following where written consent has not been obtained from residences within 2km:

predicted levels of noise at any houses within the 2km zone (including low frequency noise)

Section 1.3(a) of the draft NSW guidelines does not detail specific information requirements for low frequency noise. However, the proposed data analysis procedures of Appendix B suggest a threshold for external noise levels to trigger a detailed assessment of low frequency noise, stating the following:

If it is shown that the C-weighted noise (measured from 20Hz upwards) from a wind farm (excluding any wind induced or extraneous C-weighted noise) is repeatedly greater than 65dB(C) during the daytime or 60dB(C) during the night-time a more detailed low frequency noise assessment should be undertaken.

Whilst the proposed trigger for detailed low frequency noise assessments is stated to apply to the measured noise levels of an operational wind farm, the proposed draft criteria provide a guide to the type of information required in specific situations where a proposed wind farm includes turbine positions within 2km of dwellings.

Preliminary low frequency noise predictions have been conducted and the results are summarised in Appendix K.

The draft NSW guidelines do permit the use of the L_{A90} parameter for compliance measurements, but importantly, specifies that an addition of 1.5dB must be applied to these values to yield an equivalent noise level L_{Aeq} (effectively a form of average noise level) for comparison with the noise criteria.

APPENDIX F ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION

Noise levels from the proposed Yass Valley Wind Farm have been predicted using the implementation of ISO9613-2:1996 with SoundPLAN version 7.2.

The ISO 9613-2:1996 method has been used with input parameters specifically chosen for the purpose of modelling wind farm noise, taking account of a range of national and international research publications. These publications include a comprehensive 1998 study⁵ (commonly cited as the Joule Report) part funded by the European Commission which found the ISO 9613 model provides a robust representation of upper noise levels which may occur in practice as well as other documents including international research publications and measurement studies conducted by Marshall Day Acoustics. ISO 9613 is also directly referenced in the South Australian Environment Protection Authority 2009 wind farm noise guidelines, draft NSW Guidelines, AS4959:2010 *Acoustics – Measurement, prediction and assessment of noise from wind turbine generators* and NZS6808:2010 *Acoustics – Wind farm noise*.

The standard specifies an engineering method for calculating noise at a known distance from a variety of sources under meteorological conditions favourable to sound propagation. The standard defines favourable conditions as downwind propagation where the source blows from the source to the receiver within an angle of +/-45 degrees from a line connecting the source to the receiver, at wind speeds between approximately 1m/s and 5m/s, measured at a height of 3m to 11m above the ground. Equivalently, the method accounts for average propagation under a well-developed moderate ground based thermal inversion. In this respect, it is noted that at the wind speeds relevant to noise emissions from wind turbines, atmospheric conditions do not favour the development of thermal inversions throughout the propagation path from the source to the receiver.

To calculate far-field noise levels according to the ISO 9613, the noise emissions of each turbine are firstly characterised in the form of octave band frequency levels. A series of octave band attenuation factors are then calculated for a range of effects including:

- Geometric divergence
- Air absorption
- Reflecting obstacles
- Screening
- Vegetation
- Ground reflections

The octave band attenuation factors are then applied to the noise emission data to determine the corresponding octave band and total calculated noise level at receiver locations.

Calculating the attenuation factors for each effect requires a relevant description of the environment into which the sound propagation such as the physical dimensions of the environment, atmospheric conditions and the characteristics of the ground between the source and the receiver.

⁵ Bass, Bullmore and Sloth - Development of a wind farm noise propagation prediction model; Contract JOR3-CT95-0051, Final Report, January 1996 to May 1998.

Wind farm noise propagation has been the subject of considerable research in recent years. These studies have provided support for the reliability of engineering methods such as ISO 9613 when a certain set of input parameters are chosen in combination. Specifically, the studies to date tend to support that the assignment of a ground absorption factor of $G=0.5$ for the source, middle and receiver ground regions between a wind farm and a calculation point tends to provide a reliable representation of the upper noise levels expected in practice, when modelled in combination with other key assumptions; specifically all turbines operating at identical wind speeds, emitting sound levels equal to the test measured levels plus a margin for uncertainty (or guaranteed values), at a temperature of 10 degrees and relative humidity of 70% to 80%, with specific adjustments for screening and ground effects as a result of the ground terrain profile.

In support of the use of ISO 9613 and the choice of $G=0.5$ as an appropriate ground characterisation, the following references are noted:

- A factor of $G=0.5$ is frequently applied in Australia for general environmental noise modelling purposes as a way of accounting for the potential mix of ground porosity which may occur in regions of dry/compacted soils or in regions where persistent damp conditions may be relevant
- NZS6808:2010 refers to ISO 9613 as an appropriate prediction methodology for wind farm noise, and notes that soft ground conditions should be characterised by a ground factor of $G=0.5$
- A range of comparative measurement and prediction studies^{6,7,8} for wind farms in which Marshall Day Acoustics' staff have been involved in have provided further support for the use of ISO 9613 and $G=0.5$ as an appropriate representation of typical upper noise levels expected to occur in practice.

The key findings of these studies demonstrated the suitability of the ISO 9613 method to predict the propagation of wind turbine noise for:

- the types of noise source heights associated with a modern wind farm, extending the scope of application of the method beyond the 30m maximum source heights considered in the original ISO 9613;
 - the types of environments in which wind farms are typically developed, and the range of atmospheric conditions and wind speeds typically observed around wind farm sites.
- Importantly, this supports the extended scope of application to wind speeds in excess of 5m/s.

In addition to the choice of ground absorption factor referred to above, the ISO 9613 standard has also been used with due regard to the recommended adjustments for terrain presented in the Joule Report. The following adjustments have been made:

- In instances where the ground terrain provides marginal or partial acoustic screening, the barrier effect should be limited to not more than 2dB

⁶ Bullmore, Adcock, Jiggins & Cand – *Wind Farm Noise Predictions: The Risks of Conservatism*; Presented at the Second International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise in Lyon, France September 2007

⁷ Bullmore, Adcock, Jiggins & Cand – *Wind Farm Noise Predictions and Comparisons with Measurements*; Presented at the Third International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise in Aalborg, Denmark June 2009

⁸ Delaire, Griffin, & Walsh – *Comparison of predicted wind farm noise emission and measured post-construction noise levels at the Portland Wind Energy Project in Victoria, Australia*; Presented at the Fourth International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise in Rome, April 2011

- Barrier attenuation calculated based on the screening expected for the source located at the tip height of the turbine
- In instances where the ground falls away significantly between the source and receiver, such as valleys, an adjustment of 3dB should be added to the calculated sound pressure level. A terrain profile in which the ground falls away significantly is defined as one where the mean sound propagation height is at least 50% greater than would occur over flat ground

These methodologies are also supported by the UK Institute of Acoustics document *A Good Practice Guide to the application of ESTU-R-97 for the Assessment and Rating of Wind Turbine Noise*.



APPENDIX G 24HR NOISE CRITERIA REFERENCED TO HUB HEIGHT WIND SPEEDS

G1 Noise criteria from 2009 noise monitoring

For the 2009 assessment, background noise data was referenced to 10m AGL wind speeds. For the current assessment, the measured background noise levels from the 2009 monitoring have been re-referenced to hub height wind speeds and regression trends have been reassessed.

As a result of this revised analysis, the correlation coefficients and regression curves for each monitoring location have been recalculated. In general, the correlation coefficient for the data sets has decreased since the 2009 assessment. A decrease in correlation coefficients is not unusual when changing the wind speed reference height from 10m AGL to hub height AGL.


As noted above the SA Guidelines 2003 require that where the local wind speed at the monitoring site was greater than 5m/s and/or rainfall occurred the associated measured noise levels must be excluded from the analysis. The revised analysis has identified additional periods at some monitoring locations which have been removed due to likely rain or local wind speed effects. Removing these data points has also had a minor effect on the correlation coefficients for some data sets.



(04.07.2008 - 19.07.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.57



Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C02 - July 2008





(04.07.2008 - 19.07.2008)

Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C02 - July 2008








(04.07.2008 - 18.07.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.11

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C05 - July 2008



(04.07.2008 - 18.07.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C05 - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 04.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.5



Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C07 - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 04.08.2008)

Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C07 - July 2008






(04.07.2008 - 19.07.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.33



Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C29 - July 2008



(04.07.2008 - 19.07.2008)

Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C29 - July 2008






(22.07.2008 - 03.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.23

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C35 - July 2008



(22.07.2008 - 03.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C35 - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 02.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.4

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C38 - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 02.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C38 - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 02.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.61

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C38a - July 2008



(21.07.2008 - 02.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C38a - July 2008



(22.07.2008 - 03.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.43

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House C42 - July 2008



(22.07.2008 - 03.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House C42 - July 2008



(05.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.68

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House G12 - August 2008



(05.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House G12 - August 2008



(05.08.2008 - 14.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.5



Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House G14 - August 2008



(05.08.2008 - 14.08.2008)

Background noise levels vs wind speeds House G14 - August 2008






(06.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.55

Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House G30 - August 2008



(06.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)


Background noise levels vs wind speeds House G30 - August 2008



(05.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)


Correlation Coefficient = 0.68



Background noise levels and wind speeds vs time House M04 - August 2008



(05.08.2008 - 17.08.2008)

Background noise levels vs wind speeds House M04 - August 2008





G2 Noise criteria for receiver M42

A new receiver, M42, was identified for the current assessment. As the predicted noise levels for receiver M42 were above the minimum criteria of 35dB L_{Aeq} , noise monitoring was conducted on-site by Epuron in accordance with the 2003 SA Guidelines to determine background dependant limits. We understand local monitoring of meteorological conditions was not undertaken during the survey period.

Noise monitoring was conducted for two periods, the first from the 17 April to 26 April 2013 and then from 30 May to 12 June 2013 using a Type 2 Rion NL42 noise logger.

Epuron have stated the monitoring location was positioned 1.2m above the ground at least 5m from any reflecting surface. Figure G1 shows the monitoring location.



Figure G1: M42 monitoring location

Table G1 provides details of the monitoring location and the number of data points used to generate the regression curve for the site.

Table G1: Details of monitoring location

Location	Easting [#]	Northing [#]	Data points analysed
M42	653700	6155468	1999*

[#] MGA94 Zone 55

* Total data set of 3257 points

As no local measurements of meteorological conditions were undertaken, the weather information from the closest Bureau of Meteorology station at Bowning AWS was reviewed to assist with determining whether the meteorological conditions were acceptable during the noise monitoring. Only one reading per day was available from this weather station. Epuron has reviewed the

available rain fall information and advised on the noise data to be excluded when determining the noise criteria for the site.

With regard to the data to be excluded from the analysis, Epuron have provided the following statement:

Concurrent rainfall data was attained by the proponent from the Bureau of Meteorology using the closest weather station with available data. On days where daily rainfall greater than 0.2mm were detected concurrent background noise data that was deemed likely to be affected and removed from the analysis.

The measured rainfall data from the Bowning AWS weather station for the periods of monitoring is provided Figure G2 below.






Figure G2: Rainfall data from Bowning AWS weather station for duration of monitoring period

Marshall Day was not involved in the noise monitoring or determining which data to exclude for the analysis. Noise data has been excluded based on Epuron's advice, and then processed to generate the regression curves for the data set. The reliability of the data is the responsibility of Epuron.



G3 Noise criteria for receiver C74

A new receiver, C74, was identified for the current assessment. As the predicted noise levels for receiver C74 were above the minimum criteria of 35dB L_{Aeq} , noise monitoring was conducted on-site by Epuron in accordance with the 2003 SA Guidelines to determine background dependant limits. We understand local monitoring of meteorological conditions was not undertaken during the survey period.

Noise monitoring was conducted from the 5 September to 25 October 2013 using a Type 2 Rion NL42 noise logger.

Epuron have stated the monitoring location was positioned 1.2m above the ground at least 5m from any reflecting surface. Figure G3 and Figure G4 show the monitoring location.



Figure G3: C74 monitoring location



Figure G4: C74 monitoring location

Table G2 provides details of the monitoring location and the number of data points used to generate the regression curve for the site.

Table G2: Details of monitoring location

Location	Easting [#]	Northing [#]	Data points analysed
C74	639313	6160325	5585*

[#] MGA94 Zone 55

* Total data set of 7190 points

As no local measurements of meteorological conditions were undertaken, the weather information from the closest Bureau of Meteorology station at Murrumburrah Old Post Office was reviewed to assist with determining whether the meteorological conditions were acceptable during the noise monitoring. Only one reading per day was available from this weather station. Epuron has reviewed the available rain fall information and advised on the noise data to be excluded when determining the noise criteria for the site.

With regard to the data to be excluded from the analysis, Epuron have provided the following statement:

Concurrent rainfall data was attained by the proponent from the Bureau of Meteorology using the closest weather station with available data. On days where daily rainfall greater than 0.2mm were detected concurrent background noise data that was deemed likely to be affected and removed from the analysis.

The measured rainfall data from the Murrumburrah Old Post Office weather station for the periods of monitoring is provided Figure G5 below.






Figure G5: Rainfall data from Murrumburrah Old Post Office weather station for duration of monitoring period

Marshall Day was not involved in the noise monitoring or determining which data to exclude for the analysis. Noise data has been excluded based on Epuron's advice, and then processed to generate the regression curves for the data set. The reliability of the data is the responsibility of Epuron.



APPENDIX H NOISE LEVEL CRITERIA FOR RELEVANT RECEIVERS

Table H1 presents the noise criteria for all relevant receivers. Where a receiver is not presented, the minimum limit of 35dB L_{Aeq} has been assumed for all wind speeds.

Table H1: Noise criteria for relevant receivers for hub height wind speeds

Receiver ID	Representative background monitoring location	Base criteria	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
C02*	C02	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C03*	C03	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C04*	C04	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C25*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C26*	C26	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C27*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C55*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C56*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C68*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
C74	C74	35	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.9	37.6	39.3	40.9	42.5	43.8	44.9
G11	G12	35	36.1	37.0	38.0	39.1	40.2	41.4	42.5	43.6	44.7	45.8	46.8	47.7
G12*	G12	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.8	46.8	47.7
G13*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
G14	G14	35	46.0	47.2	48.2	49.0	49.7	50.4	50.9	51.4	52.0	52.6	53.2	54.1
G15*	G15	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.4	45.8	46.0	46.4	46.7	47.3	47.9	48.4
G16	G30	35	40.2	40.8	41.3	41.7	42.1	42.6	43.1	43.8	44.5	45.5	46.6	48.0
G31*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
G38*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
M08	G14	35	46.0	47.2	48.2	49.0	49.7	50.4	50.9	51.4	52.0	52.6	53.2	54.1
M18*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
M20	M04	35	35.9	36.6	37.7	39.0	40.5	42.1	43.8	45.5	47.1	48.5	49.8	50.9
M21*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
M32*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
M41*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
M42	M42	35	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.8	37.8	39.9	42.1	44.2	46.0
M48*	-	45	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0

APPENDIX I NOISE CRITERIA FOR DAYTIME AND NIGHT-TIME PERIODS

I1 Daytime period (0700 to 2200 hours)

The background noise data collected for the 2009 assessment and data collected in 2013 for receivers M42 and C74 has been reanalysed to look at the daytime period only, which is stated to be between 7am and 10pm. Please refer to Figure H1 for an overview of the potential daytime criteria.




Figure H1: Noise criteria based on daytime data only

I2 Night-time period (2200 to 0700 hours)

The background noise data collected for the 2009 assessment and data collected in 2013 for receivers M42 and C74 has been reanalysed to look at the night-time period only, which is stated to be between 10pm and 7am. Please refer to Figure H2 for an overview of the potential night-time criteria.

We note for most receivers there is only a limited data set available for the night-time period and the data covers a limited range of wind speeds. The criteria presented below are for information only.




Figure H2: Noise criteria based on night-time data only

APPENDIX J PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS AT INTEGER WIND SPEEDS FOR ALL RECEIVERS

Table I1 summarises the predicted noise levels for all receivers at hub height integer wind speeds using the MM92 turbines. Relevant receivers for the current assessment are highlighted using italic text. The relevant receivers for the 2009 assessment are shown using bold text. As per the requirements of the 2003 SA Guidelines, we have predicted the noise levels to rated power, which we understand occurs at the hub height wind speed of 13m/s.

Table J1: Predicted noise levels at integer hub height wind speeds for MM92 turbines

Receiver ID	8	9	10	11	12	13
C01	30.1	31.2	31.8	31.8	31.4	30.7
<i>C02</i>	<i>36.1</i>	<i>37.2</i>	<i>37.8</i>	<i>37.8</i>	<i>37.4</i>	<i>36.7</i>
<i>C03</i>	<i>35.4</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>36.0</i>
<i>C04</i>	<i>34.0</i>	<i>35.1</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>34.6</i>
C05	31.5	32.6	33.2	33.2	32.8	32.1
C06	30.2	31.3	31.9	31.9	31.5	30.8
C07	22.2	23.3	23.9	23.9	23.5	22.8
C08	29.0	30.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	29.6
C09	20.6	21.7	22.3	22.3	21.9	21.2
C10	22.8	23.9	24.5	24.5	24.1	23.4
C12	25.8	26.9	27.5	27.5	27.1	26.4
C13	28.2	29.3	29.9	29.9	29.5	28.8
C22	27.4	28.5	29.1	29.1	28.7	28.0
C25	38.2	39.3	39.9	39.9	39.5	38.8
C26	34.1	35.2	35.8	35.8	35.4	34.7
<i>C27</i>	<i>35.4</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>36.0</i>
<i>C28</i>	<i>27.2</i>	<i>28.3</i>	<i>28.9</i>	<i>28.9</i>	<i>28.5</i>	<i>27.8</i>
C28a	27.1	28.2	28.8	28.8	28.4	27.7
C29	30.4	31.5	32.1	32.1	31.7	31.0
C30	28.4	29.5	30.1	30.1	29.7	29.0
C33	26.4	27.5	28.1	28.1	27.7	27.0
C34	26.8	27.9	28.5	28.5	28.1	27.4
C35	30.5	31.6	32.2	32.2	31.8	31.1
C37	28.9	30.0	30.6	30.6	30.2	29.5
C38	26.4	27.5	28.1	28.1	27.7	27.0
C39	24.0	25.1	25.7	25.7	25.3	24.6
C41	28.3	29.4	30.0	30.0	29.6	28.9
C42	28.8	29.9	30.5	30.5	30.1	29.4

Receiver ID	8	9	10	11	12	13
C46a	27.8	28.9	29.5	29.5	29.1	28.4
C47	27.6	28.7	29.3	29.3	28.9	28.2
C48	27.3	28.4	29.0	29.0	28.6	27.9
C52	26.2	27.3	27.9	27.9	27.5	26.8
C53	28.3	29.4	30.0	30.0	29.6	28.9
C55	34.1	35.2	35.8	35.8	35.4	34.7
C56	36.1	37.2	37.8	37.8	37.4	36.7
C58	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
C59	26.7	27.8	28.4	28.4	28.0	27.3
C60	28.3	29.4	30.0	30.0	29.6	28.9
C61	26.3	27.4	28.0	28.0	27.6	26.9
C62	27.8	28.9	29.5	29.5	29.1	28.4
C63	27.8	28.9	29.5	29.5	29.1	28.4
C64	27.6	28.7	29.3	29.3	28.9	28.2
C65	27.8	28.9	29.5	29.5	29.1	28.4
C66	27.5	28.6	29.2	29.2	28.8	28.1
C67	29.7	30.8	31.4	31.4	31.0	30.3
C68	34.8	35.9	36.5	36.5	36.1	35.4
C69	28.0	29.1	29.7	29.7	29.3	28.6
C71	30.4	31.5	32.1	32.1	31.7	31.0
C72	24.0	25.1	25.7	25.7	25.3	24.6
C73	22.8	23.9	24.5	24.5	24.1	23.4
C74	30.4	31.5	32.1	32.1	31.7	31.0
C75	28.7	29.8	30.4	30.4	30.0	29.3
C76	27.9	29.0	29.6	29.6	29.2	28.5
C76a	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
C77	27.1	28.2	28.8	28.8	28.4	27.7
E20	25.7	26.8	27.4	27.4	27.0	26.3
G01	18.2	19.3	19.9	19.9	19.5	18.8
G02	22.3	23.4	24.0	24.0	23.6	22.9
G02a	22.3	23.4	24.0	24.0	23.6	22.9
G03	23.7	24.8	25.4	25.4	25.0	24.3
G04	21.5	22.6	23.2	23.2	22.8	22.1
G05	21.0	22.1	22.7	22.7	22.3	21.6
G06	18.7	19.8	20.4	20.4	20.0	19.3

Receiver ID	8	9	10	11	12	13
G07	25.3	26.4	27.0	27.0	26.6	25.9
G08	24.9	26.0	26.6	26.6	26.2	25.5
G09	24.3	25.4	26.0	26.0	25.6	24.9
G10	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
G11	32.9	34.0	34.6	34.6	34.2	33.5
G12	35.3	36.4	37.0	37.0	36.6	35.9
G13	33.4	34.5	35.1	35.1	34.7	34.0
G14	35.6	36.7	37.3	37.3	36.9	36.2
G15	38.5	39.6	40.2	40.2	39.8	39.1
G16	37.8	38.9	39.5	39.5	39.1	38.4
G18	28.1	29.2	29.8	29.8	29.4	28.7
G19	27.0	28.1	28.7	28.7	28.3	27.6
G20	28.7	29.8	30.4	30.4	30.0	29.3
G23	25.5	26.6	27.2	27.2	26.8	26.1
G24	25.3	26.4	27.0	27.0	26.6	25.9
G26	23.8	24.9	25.5	25.5	25.1	24.4
G27	18.0	19.1	19.7	19.7	19.3	18.6
G29	29.6	30.7	31.3	31.3	30.9	30.2
G30	27.3	28.4	29.0	29.0	28.6	27.9
G31	35.7	36.8	37.4	37.4	37.0	36.3
G32	27.2	28.3	28.9	28.9	28.5	27.8
G36	26.6	27.7	28.3	28.3	27.9	27.2
G38	34.1	35.2	35.8	35.8	35.4	34.7
G39	25.2	26.3	26.9	26.9	26.5	25.8
G40	29.2	30.3	30.9	30.9	30.5	29.8
G41	27.2	28.3	28.9	28.9	28.5	27.8
G42	13.2	14.3	14.9	14.9	14.5	13.8
G44	27.2	28.3	28.9	28.9	28.5	27.8
G46	23.4	24.5	25.1	25.1	24.7	24.0
G54	22.3	23.4	24.0	24.0	23.6	22.9
G55	24.0	25.1	25.7	25.7	25.3	24.6
G56	21.9	23.0	23.6	23.6	23.2	22.5
G57	26.1	27.2	27.8	27.8	27.4	26.7
G58	26.8	27.9	28.5	28.5	28.1	27.4
G59	24.5	25.6	26.2	26.2	25.8	25.1

Receiver ID	8	9	10	11	12	13
G60	25.0	26.1	26.7	26.7	26.3	25.6
G61	23.0	24.1	24.7	24.7	24.3	23.6
H30	27.2	28.3	28.9	28.9	28.5	27.8
K52	23.3	24.4	25.0	25.0	24.6	23.9
M01	30.0	31.1	31.7	31.7	31.3	30.6
M02	29.0	30.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	29.6
M03	30.0	31.1	31.7	31.7	31.3	30.6
M04	29.6	30.7	31.3	31.3	30.9	30.2
M05	26.5	27.6	28.2	28.2	27.8	27.1
M06	28.1	29.2	29.8	29.8	29.4	28.7
M07	25.7	26.8	27.4	27.4	27.0	26.3
M08	32.1	33.2	33.8	33.8	33.4	32.7
M09	27.5	28.6	29.2	29.2	28.8	28.1
M13	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
M18	39.3	40.4	41.0	41.0	40.6	39.9
M20	31.2	32.3	32.9	32.9	32.5	31.8
M21	33.5	34.6	35.2	35.2	34.8	34.1
M22	28.8	29.9	30.5	30.5	30.1	29.4
M24	31.0	32.1	32.7	32.7	32.3	31.6
M25	27.6	28.7	29.3	29.3	28.9	28.2
M26	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
M27	27.5	28.6	29.2	29.2	28.8	28.1
M28	27.6	28.7	29.3	29.3	28.9	28.2
M29	27.6	28.7	29.3	29.3	28.9	28.2
M30	27.4	28.5	29.1	29.1	28.7	28.0
M31	27.2	28.3	28.9	28.9	28.5	27.8
M32	32.1	33.2	33.8	33.8	33.4	32.7
M33	25.9	27.0	27.6	27.6	27.2	26.5
M34	27.9	29.0	29.6	29.6	29.2	28.5
M35	29.0	30.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	29.6
M36	27.7	28.8	29.4	29.4	29.0	28.3
M37	29.1	30.2	30.8	30.8	30.4	29.7
M38	27.1	28.2	28.8	28.8	28.4	27.7
M39	27.3	28.4	29.0	29.0	28.6	27.9
M40	28.0	29.1	29.7	29.7	29.3	28.6

Receiver ID	8	9	10	11	12	13
M41	33.2	34.3	34.9	34.9	34.5	33.8
M42	33.4	34.5	35.1	35.1	34.7	34.0
M43	23.6	24.7	25.3	25.3	24.9	24.2
M44	23.4	24.5	25.1	25.1	24.7	24.0
M44a	24.0	25.1	25.7	25.7	25.3	24.6
M44b	24.2	25.3	25.9	25.9	25.5	24.8
M46	29.0	30.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	29.6
M48	37.8	38.9	39.5	39.5	39.1	38.4

Table I2 summarises the predicted noise levels for all receivers at hub height integer wind speeds using the V90 turbines. Relevant receivers for the current assessment are highlighted using italic text. The relevant receivers for the 2009 assessment are shown using bold text. The 2003 SA Guidelines require noise levels to be predicted to rated power, which occurs at hub height wind speed of approximately 15m/s for the V90 turbine.

Table J2: Predicted noise levels at integer hub height wind speeds for V90 turbines

Receiver ID	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
C01	24.8	27.1	29.2	31.0	32.1	32.6	32.6	32.4	32.7	33.1
C02	31.4	33.7	35.8	37.6	38.7	39.2	39.2	39.0	39.3	39.7
C03	31.0	33.3	35.4	37.2	38.3	38.8	38.8	38.6	38.9	39.3
C04	29.6	31.9	34.0	35.8	36.9	37.4	37.4	37.2	37.5	37.9
C05	26.3	28.6	30.7	32.5	33.6	34.1	34.1	33.9	34.2	34.6
C06	25.7	28.0	30.1	31.9	33.0	33.5	33.5	33.3	33.6	34.0
C07	17.4	19.7	21.8	23.6	24.7	25.2	25.2	25.0	25.3	25.7
C08	24.5	26.8	28.9	30.7	31.8	32.3	32.3	32.1	32.4	32.8
C09	16.4	18.7	20.8	22.6	23.7	24.2	24.2	24.0	24.3	24.7
C10	18.4	20.7	22.8	24.6	25.7	26.2	26.2	26.0	26.3	26.7
C12	22.9	25.2	27.3	29.1	30.2	30.7	30.7	30.5	30.8	31.2
C13	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
C22	22.8	25.1	27.2	29.0	30.1	30.6	30.6	30.4	30.7	31.1
C25	33.9	36.2	38.3	40.1	41.2	41.7	41.7	41.5	41.8	42.2
C26	29.9	32.2	34.3	36.1	37.2	37.7	37.7	37.5	37.8	38.2
C27	31.0	33.3	35.4	37.2	38.3	38.8	38.8	38.6	38.9	39.3
C28	23.8	26.1	28.2	30.0	31.1	31.6	31.6	31.4	31.7	32.1
C28a	23.4	25.7	27.8	29.6	30.7	31.2	31.2	31.0	31.3	31.7
C29	26.2	28.5	30.6	32.4	33.5	34.0	34.0	33.8	34.1	34.5
C30	25.1	27.4	29.5	31.3	32.4	32.9	32.9	32.7	33.0	33.4
C33	23.4	25.7	27.8	29.6	30.7	31.2	31.2	31.0	31.3	31.7
C34	23.8	26.1	28.2	30.0	31.1	31.6	31.6	31.4	31.7	32.1
C35	25.5	27.8	29.9	31.7	32.8	33.3	33.3	33.1	33.4	33.8
C37	23.9	26.2	28.3	30.1	31.2	31.7	31.7	31.5	31.8	32.2
C38	22.3	24.6	26.7	28.5	29.6	30.1	30.1	29.9	30.2	30.6
C39	19.5	21.8	23.9	25.7	26.8	27.3	27.3	27.1	27.4	27.8
C41	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
C42	25.2	27.5	29.6	31.4	32.5	33.0	33.0	32.8	33.1	33.5
C46a	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
C47	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9

Receiver ID	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
C48	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
C52	23.4	25.7	27.8	29.6	30.7	31.2	31.2	31.0	31.3	31.7
C53	25.1	27.4	29.5	31.3	32.4	32.9	32.9	32.7	33.0	33.4
C55	29.8	32.1	34.2	36.0	37.1	37.6	37.6	37.4	37.7	38.1
C56	31.8	34.1	36.2	38.0	39.1	39.6	39.6	39.4	39.7	40.1
C58	23.3	25.6	27.7	29.5	30.6	31.1	31.1	30.9	31.2	31.6
C59	24.0	26.3	28.4	30.2	31.3	31.8	31.8	31.6	31.9	32.3
C60	23.9	26.2	28.3	30.1	31.2	31.7	31.7	31.5	31.8	32.2
C61	22.9	25.2	27.3	29.1	30.2	30.7	30.7	30.5	30.8	31.2
C62	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
C63	24.4	26.7	28.8	30.6	31.7	32.2	32.2	32.0	32.3	32.7
C64	24.0	26.3	28.4	30.2	31.3	31.8	31.8	31.6	31.9	32.3
C65	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
C66	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
C67	25.4	27.7	29.8	31.6	32.7	33.2	33.2	33.0	33.3	33.7
C68	30.8	33.1	35.2	37.0	38.1	38.6	38.6	38.4	38.7	39.1
C69	24.4	26.7	28.8	30.6	31.7	32.2	32.2	32.0	32.3	32.7
C71	26.2	28.5	30.6	32.4	33.5	34.0	34.0	33.8	34.1	34.5
C72	21.2	23.5	25.6	27.4	28.5	29.0	29.0	28.8	29.1	29.5
C73	18.1	20.4	22.5	24.3	25.4	25.9	25.9	25.7	26.0	26.4
C74	26.9	29.2	31.3	33.1	34.2	34.7	34.7	34.5	34.8	35.2
C75	23.7	26.0	28.1	29.9	31.0	31.5	31.5	31.3	31.6	32.0
C76	23.4	25.7	27.8	29.6	30.7	31.2	31.2	31.0	31.3	31.7
C76a	23.8	26.1	28.2	30.0	31.1	31.6	31.6	31.4	31.7	32.1
C77	22.3	24.6	26.7	28.5	29.6	30.1	30.1	29.9	30.2	30.6
E20	23.0	25.3	27.4	29.2	30.3	30.8	30.8	30.6	30.9	31.3
G01	14.6	16.9	19.0	20.8	21.9	22.4	22.4	22.2	22.5	22.9
G02	18.1	20.4	22.5	24.3	25.4	25.9	25.9	25.7	26.0	26.4
G02a	18.5	20.8	22.9	24.7	25.8	26.3	26.3	26.1	26.4	26.8
G03	20.3	22.6	24.7	26.5	27.6	28.1	28.1	27.9	28.2	28.6
G04	16.9	19.2	21.3	23.1	24.2	24.7	24.7	24.5	24.8	25.2
G05	16.6	18.9	21.0	22.8	23.9	24.4	24.4	24.2	24.5	24.9
G06	14.3	16.6	18.7	20.5	21.6	22.1	22.1	21.9	22.2	22.6
G07	21.3	23.6	25.7	27.5	28.6	29.1	29.1	28.9	29.2	29.6
G08	20.0	22.3	24.4	26.2	27.3	27.8	27.8	27.6	27.9	28.3

Receiver ID	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
G09	20.4	22.7	24.8	26.6	27.7	28.2	28.2	28.0	28.3	28.7
G10	23.3	25.6	27.7	29.5	30.6	31.1	31.1	30.9	31.2	31.6
G11	28.9	31.2	33.3	35.1	36.2	36.7	36.7	36.5	36.8	37.2
G12	30.6	32.9	35.0	36.8	37.9	38.4	38.4	38.2	38.5	38.9
G13	29.1	31.4	33.5	35.3	36.4	36.9	36.9	36.7	37.0	37.4
G14	31.0	33.3	35.4	37.2	38.3	38.8	38.8	38.6	38.9	39.3
G15	34.0	36.3	38.4	40.2	41.3	41.8	41.8	41.6	41.9	42.3
G16	33.4	35.7	37.8	39.6	40.7	41.2	41.2	41.0	41.3	41.7
G18	24.5	26.8	28.9	30.7	31.8	32.3	32.3	32.1	32.4	32.8
G19	23.4	25.7	27.8	29.6	30.7	31.2	31.2	31.0	31.3	31.7
G20	24.7	27.0	29.1	30.9	32.0	32.5	32.5	32.3	32.6	33.0
G23	21.2	23.5	25.6	27.4	28.5	29.0	29.0	28.8	29.1	29.5
G24	20.4	22.7	24.8	26.6	27.7	28.2	28.2	28.0	28.3	28.7
G26	20.5	22.8	24.9	26.7	27.8	28.3	28.3	28.1	28.4	28.8
G27	15.2	17.5	19.6	21.4	22.5	23.0	23.0	22.8	23.1	23.5
G29	25.5	27.8	29.9	31.7	32.8	33.3	33.3	33.1	33.4	33.8
G30	23.9	26.2	28.3	30.1	31.2	31.7	31.7	31.5	31.8	32.2
G31	31.3	33.6	35.7	37.5	38.6	39.1	39.1	38.9	39.2	39.6
G32	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
G36	21.9	24.2	26.3	28.1	29.2	29.7	29.7	29.5	29.8	30.2
G38	29.8	32.1	34.2	36.0	37.1	37.6	37.6	37.4	37.7	38.1
G39	20.2	22.5	24.6	26.4	27.5	28.0	28.0	27.8	28.1	28.5
G40	25.1	27.4	29.5	31.3	32.4	32.9	32.9	32.7	33.0	33.4
G41	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
G42	9.8	12.1	14.2	16.0	17.1	17.6	17.6	17.4	17.7	18.1
G44	23.5	25.8	27.9	29.7	30.8	31.3	31.3	31.1	31.4	31.8
G46	20.0	22.3	24.4	26.2	27.3	27.8	27.8	27.6	27.9	28.3
G54	17.9	20.2	22.3	24.1	25.2	25.7	25.7	25.5	25.8	26.2
G55	18.8	21.1	23.2	25.0	26.1	26.6	26.6	26.4	26.7	27.1
G56	16.9	19.2	21.3	23.1	24.2	24.7	24.7	24.5	24.8	25.2
G57	22.3	24.6	26.7	28.5	29.6	30.1	30.1	29.9	30.2	30.6
G58	23.2	25.5	27.6	29.4	30.5	31.0	31.0	30.8	31.1	31.5
G59	20.9	23.2	25.3	27.1	28.2	28.7	28.7	28.5	28.8	29.2
G60	21.1	23.4	25.5	27.3	28.4	28.9	28.9	28.7	29.0	29.4
G61	19.7	22.0	24.1	25.9	27.0	27.5	27.5	27.3	27.6	28.0

Receiver ID	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
H30	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
K52	21.3	23.6	25.7	27.5	28.6	29.1	29.1	28.9	29.2	29.6
M01	25.0	27.3	29.4	31.2	32.3	32.8	32.8	32.6	32.9	33.3
M02	24.3	26.6	28.7	30.5	31.6	32.1	32.1	31.9	32.2	32.6
M03	24.7	27.0	29.1	30.9	32.0	32.5	32.5	32.3	32.6	33.0
M04	24.4	26.7	28.8	30.6	31.7	32.2	32.2	32.0	32.3	32.7
M05	22.8	25.1	27.2	29.0	30.1	30.6	30.6	30.4	30.7	31.1
M06	24.4	26.7	28.8	30.6	31.7	32.2	32.2	32.0	32.3	32.7
M07	21.3	23.6	25.7	27.5	28.6	29.1	29.1	28.9	29.2	29.6
<i>M08</i>	<i>27.9</i>	<i>30.2</i>	<i>32.3</i>	<i>34.1</i>	<i>35.2</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>35.7</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>36.2</i>
M09	23.1	25.4	27.5	29.3	30.4	30.9	30.9	30.7	31.0	31.4
M13	24.1	26.4	28.5	30.3	31.4	31.9	31.9	31.7	32.0	32.4
M18	34.8	37.1	39.2	41.0	42.1	42.6	42.6	42.4	42.7	43.1
<i>M20</i>	<i>26.9</i>	<i>29.2</i>	<i>31.3</i>	<i>33.1</i>	<i>34.2</i>	<i>34.7</i>	<i>34.7</i>	<i>34.5</i>	<i>34.8</i>	<i>35.2</i>
<i>M21</i>	<i>28.8</i>	<i>31.1</i>	<i>33.2</i>	<i>35.0</i>	<i>36.1</i>	<i>36.6</i>	<i>36.6</i>	<i>36.4</i>	<i>36.7</i>	<i>37.1</i>
M22	24.3	26.6	28.7	30.5	31.6	32.1	32.1	31.9	32.2	32.6
M24	26.6	28.9	31.0	32.8	33.9	34.4	34.4	34.2	34.5	34.9
M25	23.5	25.8	27.9	29.7	30.8	31.3	31.3	31.1	31.4	31.8
M26	23.9	26.2	28.3	30.1	31.2	31.7	31.7	31.5	31.8	32.2
M27	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
M28	23.8	26.1	28.2	30.0	31.1	31.6	31.6	31.4	31.7	32.1
M29	23.7	26.0	28.1	29.9	31.0	31.5	31.5	31.3	31.6	32.0
M30	23.8	26.1	28.2	30.0	31.1	31.6	31.6	31.4	31.7	32.1
M31	23.2	25.5	27.6	29.4	30.5	31.0	31.0	30.8	31.1	31.5
<i>M32</i>	<i>27.7</i>	<i>30.0</i>	<i>32.1</i>	<i>33.9</i>	<i>35.0</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>35.6</i>	<i>36.0</i>
M33	22.5	24.8	26.9	28.7	29.8	30.3	30.3	30.1	30.4	30.8
M34	22.9	25.2	27.3	29.1	30.2	30.7	30.7	30.5	30.8	31.2
M35	24.5	26.8	28.9	30.7	31.8	32.3	32.3	32.1	32.4	32.8
M36	23.3	25.6	27.7	29.5	30.6	31.1	31.1	30.9	31.2	31.6
M37	24.8	27.1	29.2	31.0	32.1	32.6	32.6	32.4	32.7	33.1
M38	21.9	24.2	26.3	28.1	29.2	29.7	29.7	29.5	29.8	30.2
M39	22.7	25.0	27.1	28.9	30.0	30.5	30.5	30.3	30.6	31.0
M40	23.6	25.9	28.0	29.8	30.9	31.4	31.4	31.2	31.5	31.9
<i>M41</i>	<i>29.2</i>	<i>31.5</i>	<i>33.6</i>	<i>35.4</i>	<i>36.5</i>	<i>37.0</i>	<i>37.0</i>	<i>36.8</i>	<i>37.1</i>	<i>37.5</i>
<i>M42</i>	<i>28.0</i>	<i>30.3</i>	<i>32.4</i>	<i>34.2</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>35.8</i>	<i>35.6</i>	<i>35.9</i>	<i>36.3</i>

Receiver ID	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
M43	20.4	22.7	24.8	26.6	27.7	28.2	28.2	28.0	28.3	28.7
M44	21.5	23.8	25.9	27.7	28.8	29.3	29.3	29.1	29.4	29.8
M44a	22.1	24.4	26.5	28.3	29.4	29.9	29.9	29.7	30.0	30.4
M44b	22.0	24.3	26.4	28.2	29.3	29.8	29.8	29.6	29.9	30.3
M46	25.2	27.5	29.6	31.4	32.5	33.0	33.0	32.8	33.1	33.5
M48	33.0	35.3	37.4	39.2	40.3	40.8	40.8	40.6	40.9	41.3

APPENDIX K CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT NSW WIND FARM PLANNING GUIDELINES

The *Draft NSW Planning Guidelines – Wind Farms* were released in December 2011 (the draft NSW guidelines) by the DPI. As outlined in Section 1.0 the DPI has requested that this report addendum “have regard” to the draft NSW guidelines. The key differences between the draft NSW guidelines and the South Australian Wind Farm Guidelines 2003 are as follows:

- Noise criteria to be developed separately for the daytime period (7am to 10pm) and night-time period (10pm to 7am)
- Consideration and prediction of expected low frequency noise emissions
- Differences in compliance monitoring

A discussion of each of these aspects of an assessment is provided in pursuant sections. It is concurrently noted that the draft Guidelines are only considered in this assessment for information purposes.

With the exception of receivers C74 and M42, the baseline noise levels referenced in this assessment and addendum are sourced from surveys conducted in 2009, prior to the release of the draft NSW guidelines. Baseline noise levels have not been remeasured as part of this addendum.

K1 Informative analysis of night-time noise criteria

In general, the night-time criteria for a given receiver are lower than the 24 hour or daytime criteria, as shown in Appendix I.

To provide an indication of the potential affect of application of night-time noise criteria, predicted noise levels for all identified relevant receivers have been compared to night-time noise limits based on times of days as detailed in the draft NSW guidelines.

The analysis shows that one receiver, M42, may be affected by the application of night-time criteria. Figure K1 shows the predicted noise levels for receiver M42 and the 24hr and night-time criteria. Based on the 24hr criteria, the predicted noise levels achieve compliance at all integer wind speeds.




Figure K1: Predicted noise levels and criteria for receiver M42

When considering the night-time noise criteria, the predicted noise levels for the V90 turbine exceed the criteria by up to 0.6dB between 10 and 13m/s and the predicted levels for the MM92 turbines exceed the criteria by up to 0.1dB between 10 and 11m/s.

As stated above in section I2 of Appendix I, the night-time criteria is not deemed robust as the data set from which the criteria has been developed has a limited number of data points and the data covers a limited range of wind speeds.

K2 Amplitude modulation

Section 6.6 of the 2009 assessment notes that the 2003 SA Guidelines were developed with the inherent noise characteristics from turbines already taken into account. This includes aerodynamic noise from the blades passing through the air commonly referred to as “swish” or “swoosh”.

This characteristic of a fluctuation of sound level, with a degree of regularity or repetition, can also be referred to as amplitude modulation.

The draft NSW guidelines note that if a greater than normal or excessive degree of amplitude modulation is a repeated characteristic of sound from a wind turbine then a 5dB(A) penalty should be applied to predicted or measured levels of wind farm sound.

The draft NSW guidelines nominate a definition of amplitude modulation as a “*variation of greater than 4dB(A) at the blade passing frequency*”. However the guidelines do not offer any corresponding guidance on suitable prediction or measurement methods. For example, it is not clear whether the 4 decibel variation refers to the peak-to-trough difference in sound level, or the variation from the average.

At present we are not aware of any widely accepted methods of predicting either the occurrence or level of any excessive amplitude modulation from wind farms.

A limited number of methods are available for assessing excessive amplitude modulation once a wind farm is operational. An example of such a measurement method is documented in New Zealand Standard 6808:2010 *Acoustics – Wind farm noise* (NZS6808:2010). However, this method is described as interim and should be preceded by a subjective evaluation of the character of the noise to establish whether enhanced amplitude modulation is a noticeable feature. Comment CB3.2 notes the following regarding the interim method:

This method is considered to be an adequate interim test that has been used in New Zealand. It is envisaged that appropriate objective tests for modulation special audible characteristics will be developed in future to replace B3.2 [Interim method] or provide a more robust objective method than B3.2.

Additionally, a study⁹ released by Renewable UK in December 2013 presents the findings of a detailed research programme by an international consortium into atypical amplitude modulation of wind farm noise which, if present, could attract a special audible characteristics' penalty to compliance testing results. The study found that situations can arise where the modulation of the noise is sufficient to give rise to increased annoyance from wind farm noise, however the factors which give rise to the effect are complicated and cannot be predicted. An important outcome of the study is a new method proposed for objectively measuring and assessing atypical amplitude modulation during post-construction monitoring.

However, there remains limited evidence to currently confirm the presence of this type of effect¹⁰, largely due to the very limited numbers of sites internationally where the effect has been reported, and at the sites where it has been reported, the limited and very specific atmospheric conditions required to result in the reported effect. Though some recent work suggests amplitude modulation may be more prevalent than previously thought¹¹ we are not presently aware of any operational wind farms in Australia where excessive amplitude modulation has been identified.

Given the limited apparent extent of reporting of this issue in Australia, no adjustment to the predicted noise levels for the development has been made to account for the potential for excessive amplitude modulation at the site.

K3 Low Frequency Noise Levels

Discussion

Detailed guidance on proposed noise assessment methods is contained in Appendix B of the draft NSW guidelines, and does not explicitly indicate a requirement to predict low-frequency noise levels. The proposed methodology does however nominate a method of identifying the presence of low frequency special audible characteristics which may result in the application of a 5dB penalty to predicted or measured noise levels.

⁹ Wind Turbine Amplitude Modulation: Research to Improve Understanding as to its Cause and Effects (<http://tinyurl.com/RUK-OAM-Report> - 12.6MB)

¹⁰ Moorhouse, A., Hayes, M., von Hunerbein, S., Piper, B., & Adams, M. (2007). *NANR223 Research into aerodynamic modulation of wind turbine noise: Final report*. London: Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) UK.

¹¹ Stigwood, M., Large, S., & Stigwood, D. (2013). Audible amplitude modulation - Results of field measurements and investigations compared to psycho-acoustical assessment and theoretical research. Fifth International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise. Denver.

The Site Compatibility Certificate application referred to in Section 1.3 of the draft NSW guidelines makes reference to the prediction of low-frequency noise levels at dwellings within 2km where consent has not been obtained. Whilst specific details of the low frequency noise predictions that are required are not specified in Section 1.3, we anticipate that the intent of the draft NSW guidelines is that the prediction of C-weighted noise levels is required, in line with the advice provided in Appendix B of the draft NSW guidelines.

The C-weighting refers to the way in which the frequency content of the noise is adjusted to produce a total decibel value for the noise level. The most common form of assessment relies on the A-weighting which is intended to adjust noise frequencies in a way that results in a total noise level corresponding to general human perception of loudness. The A-weighting is however recognised as being less appropriate for noise levels characterised by significant or prominent low-frequency components (specifically, frequencies of noise lying below approximately 200Hz). Noise levels which are predicted or measured using the C-weighting are more sensitive to the influence of low-frequency noise, and are therefore often referred to as an indicative measure when evaluating low-frequency considerations. For a given noise source and character, the noise level measured using a C-weighting will be greater than measured using an A-weighting in most cases.

The draft NSW guidelines provide the following reference levels for low frequency noise (from 20Hz upwards):

- Day: 65dB L_{Ceq}
- Night: 60dB L_{Ceq}

It is important to note however that these reference levels are not proposed in the draft NSW Guidelines as compliance requirements, but instead represent the thresholds at which further detailed investigations are proposed.

Prediction method

Provision of C-weighted noise levels predictions requires:

- Turbine manufacturers' noise emission data at frequencies below the minimum range that is commonly available
- Prediction of noise levels at frequencies below the validated range of the methodologies referred to in the draft NSW guidelines - ISO 9613 and CONCAWE. Alternative methods are available for predicting noise at lower frequencies (notably the Danish method NORD 2000), however to our knowledge these methods are not routinely applied in Australia (for wind farm or other general applications) or other countries such as New Zealand or the United Kingdom (countries in which we are familiar with noise assessment legislation and practices).

In the absence of an international standard engineering prediction method specifically developed for the prediction of C-weighted noise levels, reference has been made to Danish Statutory Order No. 1284, dated 15 December 2011 (DSO 1284), which introduces low frequency noise requirements applicable to wind farms in Denmark, but also provides a methodology for predicting low frequency noise between 10-160Hz. The overall form of the methodology is comparable to ISO 9613, but suggests slightly higher fixed value ground reflection enhancements for frequencies below 160Hz.

In recognition of the DSO 1284 guidance, the C-weighted predictions presented herein have been developed on the basis of the ISO 9613 calculations, adjusted for the increased influence of ground reflections as suggested by DSO 1284.

The predictions are provided to address the information requirements proposed in the draft NSW guidelines. It is reemphasised however that ISO 9613 and other similar prediction methods are not specifically intended for this purpose and the predictions involve applying the ISO 9613 prediction methodology to frequencies outside the stated scope of the standard. The following items are noted:

- The ISO 9613 prediction method assumes an equal noise contribution from the reflected ground wave at 63Hz, and therefore applies no ground attenuation at this frequency irrespective of the selected ground absorption for the calculation. This effectively equates to a hard ground condition and therefore a hemi-spherical noise propagation pattern. In extending the application of ISO 9613 to C-weighted noise level calculations, frequencies below 63Hz are treated in a similar manner and therefore do not benefit from ground absorption
- The ISO 9613 calculation method includes an attenuation factor related to atmospheric absorption. At low frequencies, this absorption is negligible, and the corresponding calculated attenuation equates to less than 0.1dB

Based on the above considerations, the ISO 9613 calculation of C-weighted noise levels can only be regarded as indicative predictions. The uncertainty associated with the C-weighted predicted noise levels is expected to be similar to, or greater than, than the uncertainty associated with the C-weighted sound power of the turbines.

Predictions

Low frequency noise predictions have been based on the sound power level spectrum provided in Table K1 below.

Table K1: Reference A-weighted octave band sound power levels for the candidate turbines

L_{WA} (dB)	Octave Band Centre Frequency (Hz)									
	16	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000
Vestas V90	61.3	81.8	93.0	94.4	96.7	99.4	101.6	101.2	96.8	87.1
Repower MM92	56.6	78.6	84.3	92.5	98.1	99.8	97.8	92.1	85.4	82.2

Predicted noise levels are presented in Table K2 and are based on the octave band noise level measured test data for frequencies upwards of 20Hz and correspond to the wind speeds where the maximum predicted noise levels occurred. In the case of the MM92 candidate turbine, the available test data is limited to 50Hz and above. The influence of noise emissions between 20Hz and 50Hz has been estimated based on the test data for the V90 turbine with the value corrected so the overall A-weighted was that of the maximum sound power level.

Results are presented in Table K2 for each of the non-involved receiver locations where a wind turbine is proposed to be located within 2km. Additionally, Table K1 presents results for one (1) additional dwelling which is located greater than 2km from any proposed turbine but for which predicted noise levels exceed the 60dB L_{Ceq} reference level for the Vestas V90 turbine model.

Table K2: Maximum C-weighted predicted receiver noise levels L_{Ceq} dB

Location	MM92	Threshold exceeded?		V90	Threshold exceeded?	
		Daytime	Night-time		Daytime	Night-time
C01	56	No	No	61	No	Yes
G11	56	No	No	61	No	Yes
G14	58	No	No	63	No	Yes
G16	60	No	No	64	No	Yes
M20	55	No	No	60	No	No
M24	55	No	No	60	No	No
M42	58	No	No	63	No	Yes
M8*	56	No	No	61	No	Yes

* Dwelling located greater than 2 km from a wind turbine

For the MM92 turbine, the predicted C-weighted level is below both the daytime and night-time reference levels for all assessed non-involved receivers. For the V90 turbine, the predicted C-weighted levels are below the daytime reference level of 65dB L_{Ceq} at all assessed locations. Six of the assessed non-involved receivers exceed the night-time reference level of 60 dB L_{Ceq} .

Contingency strategies

As noted above, the C-weighted reference levels are not proposed in the draft NSW Guidelines as compliance requirements, but instead represent the thresholds at which further detailed investigations are proposed. Notwithstanding this, if a requirement to adhere to external low frequency noise criteria was introduced, and low-frequency noise reductions were required, the types of mitigation options available for the reduction of A-weighted noise levels could be similarly considered for the reduction of C-weighted noise levels. Such contingencies, which are discussed in Section 9 of the 2009 assessment, are noted here for information:

- Procurement contract: the procurement contract for the supply of turbines to the site will typically include specifications concerning the allowable total noise emissions from the turbine, and the permissible characteristics of the turbine and can include requirements extending into the low frequency noise region (for example, down to 20Hz). In the event that turbine emissions are found to exceed the contracted values, the supplier can be required to implement measures to reduce the noise to the contracted value. This can include measures to rectify manufacturing defects or appropriate control settings.

- Noise reduction management strategy: modern wind farms include control systems which enable the operation of the turbines to be varied according to environmental constraints. Specifically, variable pitch turbines as proposed for this site include control functions which enable the noise emissions of the turbines to be selectively controlled; by adjusting the pitch of blade, the noise emissions of the turbine can be reduced. In addition, where required, the turbines can be selectively shut down under relevant wind speeds and directions. These types of control measures can be used separately, or in combination, to achieve C-weighted noise reductions for predetermined wind speed ranges and directions.

The need for such measures would be dependent on the outcome of a future detailed design and procurement process, should the scheme be approved, and would be determined according to the emission characteristic of the final selected turbine. In particular, the adoption of control modes of operation for turbines (in lieu of selective/periodic shutdown) would involve verification of frequency characteristics of the control modes.

K4 Noise Predictions and Compliance Monitoring

Appendix F provides a discussion on the noise prediction methodology used to predict noise emission for this assessment. The method applied is that of *ISO 9613-2: 1996- Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 2: General method of calculation* (ISO9613 2:1996).

The draft NSW guidelines do not explicitly prescribe the noise prediction method to be used, but does refer to ISO 9613-2 and CONCAWE as two methods commonly used for wind farm noise predictions.

The selection of these methods has been justified on the basis of field studies comparing predictions and measurements. These comparisons are however based on compliance testing according to a specific methodology. That is, compliance measurements based on the L_{A90} parameter which is a measure the underlying constant noise present in given measurement period (in this case, a 10 minute sample measurement). The draft NSW guidelines do permit the use of the L_{A90} parameter for compliance measurements, but importantly, specifies that an addition of 1.5dB must be applied to these values to yield an equivalent noise level L_{Aeq} (effectively a form of average noise level) for comparison with the noise criteria.

Therefore, whilst the prediction method presented in this addendum conforms to the method presented in the draft NSW guidelines, and demonstrates compliance with the same noise criteria which apply under the draft NSW guidelines, the proposed compliance measurement method introduces a risk. This risk is directly related to the compliance values being increased by 1.5dB. At locations where the predicted noise level is close to the limit value the 1.5dB adjustment to the compliance measurements could result in a non-compliance.

An additional factor with respect to the predictions relates to micro-siting. Appendix B of the draft NSW guidelines states that:

Micro-siting of turbines up to 100m from each turbine's nominated location will generally be permitted. Noise levels at receivers must be based on the 'worst case' turbine layout / configuration having regard to any micro-siting.

The draft NSW guidelines do not prescribe how micro-siting should be accounted for. In general terms, a 100m change in the separating distance associated with wind farms is unlikely to give rise to a significant change in noise level; particularly given that it is unlikely that all turbines would shift 100m as part of micro-siting, and would also be unlikely to shift all in a single direction. However, in worst case terms, a theoretical shift of all turbines 100m in a single direction could give rise to an increase in noise level of approximately 0.5-1dB in some cases. In instances where the predicted noise levels are very close to the criteria, an increase of this order would be sufficient to result in a predicted noise level above the limit. We emphasise this is only a theoretical worst case, and is unlikely to transpire in practice, but may represent an avenue of challenge if the draft NSW guidelines were to be applied to the assessment.

APPENDIX L NOISE CONTOUR MAPS

As noted in Appendix F above, operational noise levels from the proposed Yass Valley Wind Farm have been predicted using the implementation of ISO9613-2:1996 in SoundPLAN version 7.2 with due consideration of recommendations from the Joule Report.

Assessing the Joule Report recommendations requires exporting ISO 9613-2:1996 predicted levels from SoundPLAN for post-processing. The post-processing involves consideration of each source-receiver pair and the intervening terrain between the source (wind turbine) and the receiver as well as consideration of the extent of barrier attenuation at each receiver.

The Joule Report corrected noise levels can be up to 5dB higher in some cases than the levels calculated according to ISO 9613-2:1996 alone. Please refer to Appendix F for details regarding the recommendations of the Joule Report.

It is not currently possible to directly apply Joule Report adjustments in the noise modelling software. The noise contour maps generated by SoundPLAN can therefore only relate to ISO 9613-2:1996 predicted levels and do not reflect the Joule Report adjustments.

In order for the contour maps included in this appendix to broadly agree with the predicted levels presented in this addendum, the calculations for the noise contours maps have been adjusted. The noise contour maps provided should therefore be considered as indicative only.

To enable the majority of receivers to be displayed in the correct noise contour band, the noise contour maps have been calculated using a ground attenuation factor of $G=0$ in lieu of the ground attenuation factor of $G = 0.5$ documented in other sections of this addendum. However, as the change in ground attenuation factor is an estimated correction, not all receivers on the attached contour maps are shown within the correct noise contour band. For information, receivers which are located in a different 5dB contour band are provided in Table L1 and Table L2 below. Where the Joule Report adjusted noise level for a receiver is lower than the noise level presented in the grid noise maps, the receiver is said to be located in a “higher contour” band. Where the Joule reported noise level for a receiver is higher than the noise level presented in the grid noise maps, the receiver is said to be located in a “lower contour” band.

Table L1: Receivers located in incorrect contour band for MM92 scenario

Location	
C25*	Higher contour
G11	Higher contour
G16	Higher contour
M08	Higher contour
M41*	Higher contour
M42	Lower contour

Table L2: Receivers located in incorrect contour band for V90 scenario

Location	
C56*	Lower contour
C74	Lower contour
M20	Lower contour

As discussed above, the noise contour maps provided should only be considered as indicative only. As such, the term 'representative noise levels' is used to describe the contours shown on the following figures. For the predicted noise level calculated in accordance with the recommendations of the Joule Report, please refer to Appendix J.

2013109SY Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 1

MM92 turbines

Yass Valley Wind Farm

11 November 2013


Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effect not applied

Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)

Noise level
(LAeq dB)



2013109SY Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 2

MM92 turbines

Yass Valley and Conroy's Gap Wind Farms

11 November 2013


Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effects not applied

Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)

Noise level
(LAeq dB)



2013109SY Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 3

V90 turbines

Yass Valley Wind Farm

11 November 2013



Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effect not applied

Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)

Noise level
(LAeq dB)



2013109SY Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 4

V90 turbines

Yass Valley and Conroy's Gap Wind Farms

11 November 2013


Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effect not applied


Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)

Noise level
(LAeq dB)



1a



2013109SY

Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 1a and 1b (enlarged view)

MM92 turbines

Yass Valley Wind Farm

11 November 2013

Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effects not applied


Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)


Noise level
(LAeq dB)



1b



2a



2013109SY

Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 2a and 2b (enlarged view)

MM92 turbines

Yass Valley and Conroy's Gap Wind Farms

11 November 2013

Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effects not applied


Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)


Noise level
(LAeq dB)



2b



3a



2013109SY Yass Valley Wind Farm

Map 3a and 3b (enlarged view)

V90 turbines

Yass Valley Wind Farm

11 November 2013

Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2

Joule effects not applied


Representative noise levels only

(100% hard ground used for calculations)


Noise level
(L_{Aeq} dB)



3b



4a



2013109SY
Yass Valley Wind Farm
 Map 4a and 4b (enlarged view)
 V90 turbines
 Yass Valley and Conroy's Gap Wind Farms
 11 November 2013

Predictions in accordance with ISO9613-2
 Joule effects not applied
 Representative noise levels only
 (100% hard ground used for calculations)

Noise level
 (LAeq dB)



4b

