Some Locations, Sources, and/or Reports that have (are recommending, or are considering) 1± Mile (1500± m) Setbacks from Wind Turbines

1. 15,000 m (9.3 miles) range of infrasound problems (from this 2018 Finnish report).
2. 10,000 m (6.2 miles) exclusion zone recommended (p 90 of this Scottish report).
3. 10,000 m called for by a prominent physician (with many references: 2011).
4. 6,440 m (4.0 miles) to a residence – Darlington, Indiana (2018)
5. 5,000 m (3.1 miles). This French study concluded “wind turbines must not be sited less than 5 km from all habitation, because of infrasound risks.” (2004)
6. 5,000 m - Dr. Robyn Phipps, New Zealand conducted a survey and wrote a detailed report concluding “wind turbine noise may well extend more than 5 km.” (2007)
7. 5,000 m - Professional engineer discusses infrasound problems (2016).
8. 4,800 m (3.0 miles) from residences – Divide, North Dakota (2017).
9. 4,000 m (2.5 miles) 1 mile per MW: Rutland (VT) Regional Planning (2015)
10. 3,220 m (2.0 miles) to properly address infrasound. This is found in an outstanding study done by the town of Heath, Massachusetts (2013)
11. 3,220 m to a rural home – Walworth County, South Dakota (2017)
12. 3,220 m to a rural home – Umatilla County, Oregon (2011)
13. 3,220 m - Coconino County, Arizona (see this report page 29: 2011)
14. 3,000 m (1.9 miles) for turbines taller than 150 m – Wiltshire, UK (2012)
15. 3,000 m recommended as setback by German doctors (2016)
16. 2,600 m (1.6 miles) going from 2000 m: examining increasing the recommended distance between wind turbines and the nearest town or village: Scotland (2013)
17. 2,414 m (1.5 miles) Board of Health recommendation – Madison, Iowa (2019)
18. 2,414 m Board of Health recommendation – Chautauqua County, NY (2019)
19. 2,414 m from property lines – Caratunk, Maine (2011)
20. 2,414 m – Moscow, Maine (2011)
21. 2,414 m – Peru Maine (see this report page 29: 2012)
22. 2,414 m recommendation of Dr. Amanda Harry (British physician) (2007)
23. 2,253 m (1.4 miles) from people’s homes - (Lincolnshire, UK: 2012)
24. 2,100 m buffer zone from property lines in Industry, Maine (2013)
25. 2,100 m for 3MW turbines - recommended in Denmark (2011)
26. 2,010 m (1.25 miles) – from property lines in Woodstock, Maine (2013)
27. 2,000 m (1.24 miles) – Poland’s National Institute of Public Health (2016)
28. 2,000 m – Retexo (a wind energy consultant) advisory (2014)
29. 2,000 m – by Director of Finland’s Ministry of Health (2014)
30. 2,000 m – by Dr. Hazel Lynn, who has extensively studied this issue (2014)
31. 2,000 m – by Dr. Robert Thorne’s study (2014)
32. 2,000 m – “Bad Science Behind Wind Noise Guidelines” study (2013)
33. 2,000 m from a home in the Haut-Saint-Laurent, in the Montérégie, Quebec (2013)
34. 2,000 m restriction: Cambridgeshire, UK (2013)
35. 2,000 m away from housing in Scotland (2013)
36. 2,000 m to habitations & 5000 m from agglomerations – Victoria, Australia (2011)
37. 2,000 m from existing homes proposed in New South Wales, Australia (2011)
38. 2,000 m advised by Noise & Health Journal study: “setback distances need to be greater than 2000 m in hilly terrain”. (2011)
39. 2,000 m turbine setback bill debated by British House of Lords (2011)
40. 2,000 m setback affirmed by Scotland Government Official (2009)
41. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Freedom, Maine (2012)
42. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Buckfield, Maine (2010)
43. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height [est 500’]) - Montville, Maine (2010)
44. 1,900 m distance scientific study found that residents “expressed annoyance” (2003)
45. 1,900 m Poland adopts 10x as national standard (2016)
46. 1,900 m Bavarian law (10x height & 600 feet in height) (2014)
47. 1,900 m for a 600 foot turbine (10x height) - The little Isle of Anglesey, UK (2012)
48. 1,770 m Fayette County, Pennsylvania (2008)
49. 1,740 m average of numerous communities found in this excellent study (2013)
50. 1,609 m (1.0 mile) from property lines - Lancaster County, NE (2019)
51. 1,609 m from property lines - Craven County, NC (2018)
52. 1,609 m from property lines - Richland, NY (2018)
53. 1,609 m from properties - Buffalo Township, ND (2017)
54. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Letcher Township, SD (2016)
55. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Whiting, Maine (2016)
56. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Fort Fairfield, Maine (2015)
57. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Carteret County, NC (2014)
58. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Mason County, KY (2014)
59. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Sumner, Maine (2013)
60. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Frankfort, Maine (2011)
61. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Unity, Maine (2011)
62. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Eddington, Maine (2011)
63. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - Dixmont, Maine (2011?)
64. 1,609 m from the nearest existing residence, etc - Madison County, Idaho (2011)
65. 1,609 m buffer recommended - Acoustical Society of America (2010)
66. 1,609 m from inhabited structures - Trempealeau County, Wisc. (2007)
67. 1,609 m (1 to 1.5 mile) - UK Noise Association (2006)
68. 1,524 m from non-participating property lines - Town of Newport, NC (2014)
69. 1,500-2,000 m recommended by this European Human Rights study (2012)
70. 1,500 m in an environment characterized by a 35 DB ambient noise level Germany
71. 1,500 m “Weight of expert opinion is that this is the health limit” study (2015)
72. 1,500 m larger buffer zones needed in Wales (2012)
73. 1,500 m sleep expert warns of effects of wind turbines (2012)
75. 1,500 m recommended by French National Academy of Medicine (2006)
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