

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response																												
<p>Fire Services Department (13) in FSD/PG 8/7596/97 III 21 June 2001</p>	<p>The proposed use of noise barriers/enclosure as noise mitigation is acceptable-in-principle subject to the following conditions :</p> <p>a) Emergency Vehicular access to any areas/buildings on both sides of a road shall not be obstructed; and</p> <p>b) Operation of the hydrant shall not be impeded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In a fire-fighting operation, the fire appliance will first proceed to a position close to the fire hydrant and obtain water from the fire hydrant through hoses connecting the fire hydrant and the fire appliance and then provide water for fire-fighting through hoses connecting the fire appliance and the hand branches at the scene of fire. The segregation between the carriageway and the pavement will definitely obstruct the use of fire hydrant during fire fighting operation. - In addition a minimum all round clearance of 1.5m should be maintained for the hydrant outlets and its ground valve at all times. <p>Apart from the above, EVA provisions to the following areas/buildings are not satisfactory:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="472 715 1359 1385"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Drawing No.</th> <th>Areas/Buildings</th> <th>Irregularities/Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>2293/TP/104 22936/TP/107 22936/TP/108</td> <td>School Village in Area 1L3</td> <td>Lack of EVA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>22936/TP/110</td> <td>Area 3A3</td> <td>Lack of EVA for building on the 10m podium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>22936/TP/111</td> <td>Area 4B1</td> <td>Lack of EVA for some buildings</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>22936/TP/113</td> <td>Area 3N1</td> <td>Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m & 15m podiums</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>22936/TP/113</td> <td>Area 3M1</td> <td>Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m podium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>22936/TP/114</td> <td>Area 4D1</td> <td>Lack of EVA for buildings on the 10m & 15m podium</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Drawing No.	Areas/Buildings	Irregularities/Comments	1.	2293/TP/104 22936/TP/107 22936/TP/108	School Village in Area 1L3	Lack of EVA	2.	22936/TP/110	Area 3A3	Lack of EVA for building on the 10m podium	3.	22936/TP/111	Area 4B1	Lack of EVA for some buildings	4.	22936/TP/113	Area 3N1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m & 15m podiums	5.	22936/TP/113	Area 3M1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m podium	6.	22936/TP/114	Area 4D1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 10m & 15m podium	<p>The requirements area noted and the conditions will be inserted into the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>6m has been allowed around and between all school buildings to allow for provision of EVA. Please note that the school village will be rearranged to conform with the latest layout of the stadium.</p> <p>The words EVA on podium apply to the whole of site 3A3. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.</p> <p>There is no podium on this site.</p> <p>5m podium: EVA access from within the site at-grade. 15m podium: EVA access from pedestrianised street.</p> <p>EVA access from within the site at-grade.</p> <p>10m podium: EVA access from Metro Park. 15m podium: EVA access from pedestrianised street. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.</p>
	Drawing No.	Areas/Buildings	Irregularities/Comments																											
1.	2293/TP/104 22936/TP/107 22936/TP/108	School Village in Area 1L3	Lack of EVA																											
2.	22936/TP/110	Area 3A3	Lack of EVA for building on the 10m podium																											
3.	22936/TP/111	Area 4B1	Lack of EVA for some buildings																											
4.	22936/TP/113	Area 3N1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m & 15m podiums																											
5.	22936/TP/113	Area 3M1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 5m podium																											
6.	22936/TP/114	Area 4D1	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 10m & 15m podium																											

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments			Response	
Fire Services Department (13) in FSD/PG 8/7596/97 III 21 June 2001	7.	22936/TP/115	Areas 4G1 & 4SI	Lack of EVA for buildings on the 15m podium	4G1: 15m podium: EVA access from along pedestrianised street. Others: at-grade from within the site. 4S1: 15m podium: EVA access from along pedestrianised street and local open space. Others: at-grade from within the site. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.
	8.	22936/TP/115	Area 4H1	Lack of EVA	EVA access from the pedestrianised street and at-grade from within the site. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.
	9.	22936/TP/115 22936/TP/120	Area 4J1	Lack of EVA	EVA access from the pedestrianised street and at-grade from within the site. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.
	10.	22936/TP/120	Area 5A1	Lack of EVA	EVA access from the pedestrianised street and at-grade from within the site. EVA annotation will be added to the layout plan issued in the Final Report.
Marine Department/Planning & Development (33) in PA/S 909/2/41(87) 23 June 2001	No comment.			Noted.	
Education Department (28) in ED(BS) 61/3911/51 XIV 22 June 2001	No comment.			Noted.	
Architectural Services Department/CA/CMB ASD 10/9520/UAD/SEK 22 June 2001	<p>As far as refers to our own area of concern we would have only one observation and request for amendment/inclusion, based on our experience and attendance on the HyD ACABAS Committee.</p> <p>The Report Monitoring and Audit Manual includes recommendations for the design of Noise Barriers under 'Landscape and visual Mitigation Measures' page A-22. The locations of NSRs vary considerably in relation to highway noise sources, with the consequence that heights and profiles of Noise Barriers can also vary considerably and without relationship to the visual form of the highway or to the structure of the highway. We would suggest and request the following addition to the bullet list of Noise Barrier design principles:</p>			Noted.	

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Architectural Services Department/CA/CMB ASD 10/9520/UAD/SEK 22 June 2001</p>	<p>“Visual junctions between noise barriers of different height requirements should not be handled by abrupt changes of level but by inclined panel profiles at a slope of between 10 to 15 degrees and never greater than 210 degrees; commencement of such changes of level must be coordinated with major structural elements. Similar design attention should be given to changes of differing cantilever barrier profiles, so that such changes are perceived visually as gradual changes.’</p> <p>We have already raised our concerns about the impacts [operations conflicts/visual intrusion/possible noise and odour] of the culvert desilting success ramps upon the parks and public open spaces.</p>	<p>Noted and will be inserted accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Transport Department/Planning Division TP 182/111/2 21 June 2001</p>	<p>Para. 3.9.1.3 – Since it is not possible to impose any constraints on the nearby developments for any choice of the shuttle system, it is suggested that the Consultants should amend this paragraph to clearly state that the noise mitigation measures as recommended in this EIA report would be adequate to bring the noise impacts arising from the LRT/Trolley Bus systems to acceptable levels. The Consultants should explain, as mentioned in paragraph 3.9.2, that even if other mode of shuttle service is adopted, the mitigation measures should still be adequate because a conservative methodology was assumed in assessing the noise impacts from the Trolley Bus system.</p> <p>Para. 3.10.22 – As the vehicle ferry pier is mostly used by dangerous good vehicles, I suggest adding “Dangerous Good” before the “Vehicle Ferry Pier” for the heading of paragraph 3.10.22 and in the 1st and 6th line of paragraph 3.10.22.1. Table 3.36 indicates 2 proposed locations of DGVFP, both at 6C10. The Consultants should include/make reference to the plan for the locations of the two DGVFP.</p>	<p>Noted and the following sentence will be appended to S.3.9.1.3: “Having said that, preliminary noise impact assessment of the shuttle system have been carried out. Mitigation measures where necessary have also been recommended in this study based on the conservative approach discussed in the following sections.”</p> <p>Noted and text will be revised. The two rows in Table 3.36 refers to the waiting areas and the berthing area of the DGVFP. Text will be revised to avoid confusion.</p>
<p>Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department AF EA 040/01 22 June 2001</p>	<p>General We have raised the issue of potential impact on corals in the western part of Junk Bay (Li/Gaiger). Although the Junk Bay area is outside the assessment area of this EIA, we opine that it is necessary to address this issue in order to avoid potential criticism from ACE, green groups or public. In fact, it would be quite difficult for readers of the EIA to understand why coral communities quite far away at Green Island and Lamma Island was included in the assessment while those much closer at Junk Bay was not. As such, we propose additional text be added to paragraph 10.4.2.15 (see detailed comment below).</p> <p>Specific <u>10.3.1.4, first sentence</u> It is not entirely correct to state that the nearest natural coast is at Green Island. Small strips of natural coastline are located at both sides of Lei Yue Mun channel. I suggest to amend the first sentence to read "The closest natural coast of considerable length within the assessment area is located in Green Island."</p>	<p>Noted and please see our response to comments below on S.10.4.2.15 for the additional text. Please note that since there is no published information of the coral communities available and it is also outside the assessment area, a very detailed description of the communities would not be given.</p> <p>Noted. The first sentence of 10.3.13 will be amended as follows: “The closest natural coast of considerable length within the assessment area is located in Green Island.”</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department AF EA 040/01 22 June 2001</p>	<p><u>10.3.1.28, second last sentence</u> According to Binnie(1995), the abundance of hard corals at Pak Kok is only "medium", not "high". Please amend. For your information, a more recent study conducted by Binnie in 1998 for CED (Coastal Ecology Study) gave a "low" abundance for hard corals at Pak Kok.</p> <p><u>10.4.2.15</u> Please insert additional text to state that coral communities have been found outside the assessment area at western part of Junk Bay, and then assess the potential impact on them due to water quality change during construction such as increase in suspended sediments or reduction in dissolved oxygen content. We consider using existing water quality modeling results and plots in section 4 should suffice for this purpose.</p> <p><u>10.6.1.1, second bullet</u> The permanent loss of low ecological value artificial vertical seawall is stated to be 3.6 km. The rest of the report such as 10.9.1.1 or 11.1.2 of the Executive Summary however quote a figure of 4 km. Please check this figure and ensure there is consistency throughout the report to avoid unnecessary confusion.</p>	<p>Noted. Text will be amended as follows: "At the southeastern end of the Western Buffer WCZ, five sites were surveyed during an extensive dive survey in Hong Kong waters (Binnie, 1995). Ap Lei Chau, Magazine Island, south Telegraph Bay and north Telegraph Bay were all assigned a <u>medium</u> conservation value in terms of the abundance and diversity of hard corals and soft corals. However,"</p> <p>Noted. The following text will be added to 10.4.2.15: <u>"Recently some hard coral colonies have been found on the western coast of Junk Bay during a few ongoing EIA studies in TKO area. It is noted that Junk Bay is outside the Assessment Area of the present study. As shown in Section 4 -Water Quality Impact of this report, the main tidal current, which goes through Victoria Harbour, would be the major agent to disperse the contaminants from the project area for this study. The main tidal current generally would not go into Junk Bay, and therefore would only have minor effect on marine water quality there. Results of water quality modeling also show that the marine water quality in Junk Bay would not change significantly even in 2003, i.e. the interim reclamation phase of the SEKD project. The suspended solid concentrations in marine water would be 2 to 5 mg/L in dry season and 5 to 10 mg/L in wet season, while the mean depth averaged D.O. would be 6 to 7 mg/L in dry season and 5 to 6 mg/L in wet season. The depth average D.O. in 2003 would still fulfill the WQO for Junk Bay WCZ which is only 4 mg/L. Impacts on hard corals from the present project would be much less significant than those from the several proposed projects in TKO (the EIAs of which are still underway) which are at much closer distance from the corals."</u></p> <p>The number should be 3.6 km. 4km was put in the summary as a round-off number. It will be changed to 3.6km to avoid confusion.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department AF EA 040/01 22 June 2001</p>	<p>10.9.1.1, line 7-8 Corals at Green Island are said to be the only sensitive receiver. 10.4.2.15 however states that the Indo-Pacific Humpbacked Dolphin, apart from the corals at Green Island, is also a sensitive receiver. In view of our proposed additional text to 10.4.2.15, and that this sensitive receiver issue is not an important point that must be placed in the summary section, I suggest to delete the whole sentence.</p> <p><i>Executive Summary</i> <u>11.1.2</u> Consistent with my comment on 10.9.1.1 of the main report, I suggest to delete the sentence on sensitive receiver (line 7-8).</p> <p><i>Executive Summary (Chinese)</i> <u>11.1.2</u> Proposed amendment to the English Executive Summary above requires consequential amendment to the Chinese version.</p>	<p>Noted. The whole sentence “Marine ecological sensitive receivers were identified as soft corals and gorgonians in Green Island.” will be deleted.</p> <p>Noted and the sentence will be deleted accordingly</p> <p>Noted and the corresponding sentence in Chinese version will be deleted accordingly.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Water Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>General – the waste quality during the construction stage very much depends on the construction sequence, in particular the reclamation phasing and stormdrain diversion. The EIA report, being a standalone document, should include drawings showing the construction sequence, similar to those drawings 22936/IM/620 to 624, 611 to 615 and 630 to 633 presented in the report on Implementation and Costing Study, for easy reference.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3.13 – dispersion of pollutants relies on the discharge volume, not the current speed. Hence the SEKD, which will cause a reduction in the discharge volume, will not have a positive effect on the water quality condition in the harbour. The last sentence is not correct and should be deleted.</p> <p>Section 6.8 – to avoid water pollution problem during emergency overflow conditions, the overflow discharge location for all proposed pumping stations should be kept away from the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, • Marina, • The embayment created at the mouth of Tsui Ping Nullah by the eastern breakwater of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, • Existing and proposed seawater intakes. <p>This requirement should be included in the implementation schedule.</p> <p>Drawings 22936/EN/347 to 350 – the modelling results without storm overflow should be included on the same drawings to allow easy comparison and identification of the water quality impacts due to storm overflows.</p>	<p>The mentioned drawings will be included for easy reference.</p> <p>Noted and will be deleted.</p> <p>Noted and the requirement will be included in the implementation schedule.</p> <p>The modelling results without storm overflow will be included in the drawings.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Water Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Drawings 22936/EM/294 & 295 – the time series plots showing the modelling results at the marina, the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and embayment at the mouth of the Tsui Ping Nullah, due to emergency overflows from KTSTW and TKWsTW, should also be presented.</p> <p>EM&A Manual Section 4.1 – the EIA has already concluded that the release of heavy metals should not be a concern, except for zinc at KB1. This also applies to other contaminants such as TBT, PAH and PCB, which are of concern only when dredging is to be carried out in certain areas. The Consultants should, therefore, be more selective on recommending where and when should monitoring of these parameters be carried out to make sure the monitoring efforts are devoted to areas and parameters of the most concern. The need for monitoring of these parameters should also be reviewed periodically, say every three months.</p> <p>Section 4.4 – the Tung Lung Chau FCZ is about 9km away from the SEKD work site and the modelling results do not indicate any adverse impacts on this sensitive receiver. Based on part experience, however, fishermen could be very claim conscious about reclamation projects. For the project proponent’s own interest, it may be worthwhile to add one monitoring station at the Tung Lung Chau FCZ.</p> <p>Appendix A Implementation Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures Construction Phase Water Quality Mitigation Measures Nullah and Box Culvert Diversion a) change the first bullet point to “Nullah and box culvert diversion should be away from typhoon shelter, marina and temporary embayment created during construction state to minimise the water quality impacts to these sensitive receivers.</p> <p>Dredging and Filling a) the maximum dredging and filling rates, which have been demonstrated as environmentally acceptable in this EIA, should be specified as one of the mitigation. b) 3rd bullet point – should add “Site curtains should be placed at the opening left for marine accesses to prevent the spreading of the sediment plumes’ at the end. c) The mitigation of placing the foundation for seawall/breakwater, and the Earth Bund for Culvert P2, through the suction arm of a trailer suction dredger close to the seabed to minimise sediment losses should be specified.</p>	<p>The mentioned time series plots will be provided.</p> <p>Noted and more detailed recommendations will be provided in this section.</p> <p>In between the SEKD work site and the Tung Lung Chau FCZ, several water quality monitoring stations have been proposed to monitor the changes of water quality condition during reclamation. In case of deterioration of water quality due to reclamation, these nearest monitoring stations would first be affected. Indicative information will be provided from these stations during monitoring to alert the occurrence of unacceptable condition. In view of the long distance of the FCZ to the work site, it is considered not necessary to set a monitoring point at the Tung Lung Chau FCZ.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Water Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>d) The last bullet point should be amended to 'silt curtains should be provided around dredging sites, except at the less contaminated areas including the eastern and western breakwaters of the new Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, to restrict the spreading of the sediment plumes.</p> <p>Kwun Tong Typhoon shelter and Marina The following bullet points should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormdrains should be diverted away from the typhoon shelter and the marina. • For the storm overflows into the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter the overflow weirs should be set at a level of 2.5m m.P.D or above. The overflow structure should be so designed to avoid, during dry weather condition, the overflow of the dry weather flows, which tends to form a thin surface layer on top of the seawater due to the lower density, into the typhoon shelter. <p>Emergency Overflows from KTSTW and TKWSTW The following bullet point should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the emergency overflow from KTSTW, a by-pass pipe should be provided to convey the emergency overflow along the new breakwater (eastern arm of KTTS) and to discharge at the end of the breakwater to allow quick dispersion of the sewage plume. • For the emergency overflow from TKWSTW, an emergency bypass along the proposed box culvert (outfall P1) plus a 150m submarine outfall should be provided to allow discharging into more open water. 	<p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>It is noted that both construction and operational air quality impacts were assessed in the EIA report. The modelling results indicate that with the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed SEKD will not pose unacceptable construction or operational phase air quality impacts. Hence, we agree that the EIA report documents have met the TM and SB requirements for the aspect of air quality impacts.</p> <p><u>EIA Report</u> Vehicular emissions impact Bearing in mind that the use of year 2031 traffic flow with year 2011 Fleet Average Emission Factors (FAEFs) is a conservative estimate of the impact without taking into account the improvement in the FAEFs between years 2011 and 2031. The consultants should indicate in the EIA report that requirements of the proposed mitigation measures of i) environmental setback of 230m from centre of the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) East Vent Building (EVB) at ARA 4A and, ii) increased the exhaust height of the northern vent shaft of T2 tunnel of 24m above ground are based on conservative estimate of the impact.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and the following sentence will be appended to S.2.3.3.11: "The use of year 2031 traffic flow with year 2011 Fleet Average Emission Factors is a conservative estimate of the impact without taking into account the improvement in the Fleet Average Emission Factors between year 2011 and 2031."</p> <p>The following sentence will be appended to S.2.4.2.9 and S.2.4.2.10: "The requirement of this mitigation measure is based on conservative estimate of the impact discussed in Section 2.3.3.11."</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>The pollution contours (Drgs 22936/EN322A & 322E) indicated that there are areas of predicted exceedances of 24-hr average NO₂ concentration at 1.5m above ground. The consultants have indicated in their response (May 2001) that representative and worst affected ASRS were selected for the impact assessment and the modelling results do not indicate AQO exceedances at the identified ASRs. However, it is noted that no assessment point at the proposed Open Space areas in SEKD were selected in the impact assessment. The consultants should confirm in the report if any sensitive uses at the proposed Open Space areas would be subject to predicted AQO exceedances. If affirmative, the consultants should propose appropriate mitigation measures such as only allowing non-sensitive use or amenity use at the predicted AQO exceedances areas of the Open Space areas. Such mitigation measures should also be specified in the Implementation Schedule (IS).</p> <p><u>Chimney emissions impact</u></p> <p>The impact of the proposed hospital at Area 5L in the present assessment is larger than that presented in March this year. The consultants should clarify if there is any change of the emission characteristics of the hospital's chimney.</p> <p>According to the modelling results in the EIA report, the hospital's chimney will pose the 1-hr average SO₂ levels exceeding AQO at assessment points 7240 & 7242 locating at the boundary of Area 5L but within AWO at the ASRs adjacent to the hospital. The acceptable impact at the ASRs adjacent to the hospital should be reflected in the texts addressing impact of the hospital's chimney.</p> <p><u>Impact from the proposed cruise terminal</u></p> <p>It is noted from S.2.4.2.30, p.2-18 that adverse air quality impact due to emissions from vessels berthing at the cruise terminal is not expected as the adjacent uses are all commercial uses with centralized air conditioning. Having said this, the consultants should identify any requirements of buffer distance from the berthing vessels or level above ground such that fresh-air-intakes of the centralized air conditioning commercial uses should be located to avoid adverse air quality impact. Such requirements should also be specified in the IS.</p>	<p>We suggest that the buffer distance recommended in HKPSG between difference types of roads and active recreation open spaces, passive recreation open spaces, and amenity areas (see Table 2.3 of the EIA Report) should be followed in planning the uses within the open spaces of SEKD. With the recommended buffer distance, exceedance of AQO at active recreation spaces is not anticipated. This recommended mitigation measure will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>There is no change in the emission characteristics of the hospital's chimney except the emission height of the chimney which was changed in accordance with change of the planned building height of the hospital.</p> <p>Noted and the following sentence will be inserted after the second sentence of S.2.4.2.11: "The modeling results showed no exceedance of the AQO at the ASRs adjacent to the hospital site."</p> <p>Since details of the cruise terminal as well as the characteristics of the vessel that would be berthed at the cruise terminal are not available at the current stage, we suggest that during the detailed design of the cruise terminal, air quality assessment should be carried out. This recommendation will be added to the Implementation Schedule and the following sentence will be appended to S.2.4.2.30: "This should be confirmed by a detailed air quality impact assessment to be carried out at the detailed design stage of the cruise terminal."</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Construction dust impact It is noted from the modelling results that the potential dust impact will be mitigated to within acceptable level at the ASRs surrounding SEKD. However, the consultants should as in accordance with their previous response (May 2001), review the development programme to take into consideration the construction stages so as to include occupiers of early phases as ASRs if they may be affected by works at later phases.</p> <p>The pollution contours of construction dust impact should be provided.</p> <p>Air quality inside full noise enclosures S.2.4.2.15, p.2-16 – The consultants should indicate if the full noise enclosures will be naturally ventilated and provide the calculations showing air quality inside the full noise enclosures will meet the tunnel air quality limits stipulated in the EPD’s Practice Note.</p> <p>Air quality inside full noise enclosures S.2.4.2.15, p.2-16 – The consultants should indicate if the full noise enclosures will be naturally ventilated and provide the calculations showing air quality inside the full noise enclosures will meet the tunnel air quality limits stipulated in the EPD’s Practice Note.</p> <p>Odour impact from reclamation activities The odour control measures for the ex-situ treatment facilities and the associated stockpiles should also be included at the relevant texts (S.2.5.1.2 to S.2.5.1.6, p.2-10) addressing the odour mitigation measures.</p> <p>The consultants should as in accordance with their response (May 2001), clarify in the report that there will not have any emission of pollutants from the proposed in-situ treatment or ex-situ treatment of sediment.</p>	<p>We consider that the construction dust modeling had been undertaken for the worst-case scenario with concurrent construction activities to be carried out for the entire SEKD development area. This is a very conservative assumption and some of the selected sensitive receivers are very close to the construction areas. After reviewing the construction program, at any interim stage of the development, the construction area would be smaller and the separation between the construction area and the sensitive receivers would also be similar or larger. The dust impacts at sensitive receivers would thus not be higher than those presented in the report.</p> <p>Noted and contour plot for TSP will be added to the report.</p> <p>As stated in S.2.4.2.15, during detailed design stage of the vehicle tunnel and full noise enclosure, the ventilation system should be designed to comply with the tunnel air quality limits stipulated in EPD’s <i>Practice Note on Control of Air Pollution in Vehicle Tunnels</i> by means of mechanical or natural ventilation or other control measures. If the air quality within the full noise enclosures could not comply with the tunnel air quality limits with only natural ventilation, mechanical ventilation with adequate capacity should be installed to achieve compliance of the tunnel air quality limits.</p> <p>Odour control measures discussed in Section 5 for <i>ex-situ</i> treatment facilities and the associated stockpiles will be added to S.2.5.1.3.</p> <p>Odour impact is considered as the major potential air quality impact associated with the reclamation activities involving contaminated sediment. As discussed in S.2.4.1.6 to S.2.4.1.9 of the EIA Report for different reclamation options, with the implementation of the recommended odour mitigation measures, emission of odour from the reclamation activities is not anticipated.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Odour impact from maintenance of drainage channel The consultants should as in accordance with their response (May 2001, clarify in the report the benefits of preventing odour emission from the covered culvert.</p> <p>S.2.4.2.17, p-2-16 to 2-17 – It is difficult to understand how the 2,888 m3 accumulate sediment and the 45-90 working weeks were estimated. Please clarify.</p> <p>Odour impact from open section of the Kai Tak Nullah KTN S.2.4.2.25 & S.2.4.2.26, P.7-18 – Please note that we are not in a position to comment on water quality issue. The KTN water quality issue included in these sections should be removed from the air Quality chapter and addressed in the Water Quality Impact Chapter.</p> <p>Automatic Refuse Collection System (ARCS) It is noted from the consultants' response (may 2001) that odour is not expected at the plant exhaust air. This should be clarified in the report. Besides, it is noted that there are odour control measures proposed for the plant exhaust air at p.7-30 to 7-31 of the Waste Management Chapter. The consultants should ensure that the proposed odour control measures are adequate to avoid odour impact from the plant exhaust air. The proposed odour control measures should also be specified in the IS.</p> <p>Environmental benefits It is appreciated to note from S16.1.1, p.16-1 that with the environmental friendly shuttle service, there will be reduction in the total daily car trips and bus trips to and from SEKD and hence reduce the daily nitrogen oxides and RSP emissions by about 160 kg and 16 kg respectively based on 2011 vehicle emissions factors. Such reduction of emissions should also be included in the Summary of Environmental Outcomes (Chapter 17).</p> <p>Besides, please include the calculations showing the above reduction of emissions in the Appendices for the reference.</p> <p>Others It is noted that Assessment Points were selected at the outermost boundary of Planned areas for the air quality impact assessments. To avoid confusing the impact at the Assessment Points with that at ASRs, please amend the relevant text such as "ASRs" at Tables 2.12 to 2.14, p.2-14 to "Assessment Point", "ASR 7004" to "Assessment Point 7004" at S.2.4.2.9, p.2-15 and "ASR 7240" at S.2.4.2.11, p.2-16 to "Assessment Point 7240".</p>	<p>The benefits of reclaiming KTAC and decking have been discussed in S.2.4.2.23.</p> <p>Noted and further elaboration will be added for clarification.</p> <p>Odour impact from Kai Tak Nullah is directly related to the water quality in the nullah. S.2.4.2.25 and S.2.4.2.26 are to provide the public with a background of the existing water quality conditions in Kai Tak Nullah to explain that odour impact from the proposed open sections of Kai Tak Nullah is not anticipated.</p> <p>Odour control measures recommended in Section 7 are practicable measures adopted for ARCS. During detailed design stage of the ARCS, odour control measures should be designed to avoid odour impact from the plant exhaust air. This requirement will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to Section 17 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>The reduction is calculated directly by multiplying 20,000 veh-km of car trip and 22,000 veh-km of bus trips by the vehicle emission factors listed in Table 2.8 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Appendices – All the relevant reference materials provided in the draft submission of the air quality impact assessment should also be provided in the EIA report to allow the report readers could follow the data used in the assessments. In this regards, please note the following:</p> <p>a) Provide the traffic data including volume flow and traffic mix used in the vehicular emissions impact assessment. Regarding this, please note that the figure included in the previous draft report (March 2001) showing locations of the roads was missing in this report such that the tabulated traffic data at Appendix B could not be followed.</p> <p>b) Provide the source emission data (construction dust emissions, chimney emissions and vehicular emissions) used in the assessment including the sample calculations for the emission rates.</p> <p>c) Provide figures showing locations of the roads links used in the vehicular emissions impact assessment and locations of the construction working areas used in the dust impact assessment.</p> <p>S.2.1.5, p.2-2 – Please replace “ug/m3” by “µg/m³”.</p> <p>S.2.1.6, p2-2 – Please avoid unnecessary details such as stating the exact implementation date of the Regulation in the report.</p> <p>S.2.3.2.6 – Please quote the reference section of AP-42 indicating the percentage of dust reduction by watering.</p> <p>Drawing 22936/EMN/330E – It appears that incorrect SO₂ concentration levels were indicated at the contours. Please rectify.</p> <p>Executive Summary (ES) Please note that our following previous comments on the draft ES (May 2001) are still applicable:</p> <p>a) S.3.1.3, p.6 – The consultants should indicate clearly if the air quality impact will be acceptable at all sensitive uses after implementing the recommended mitigation measures. Please avoid wordings such as “acceptable in broad terms”. Please note that this comment is also applicable to the Summary (S.2.6, P.2-22) and Conclusions (S.16.1,p.16-1) of the EIA report.</p> <p>b) S.6.1.8, p.8 – It is noted from the draft EIA report (March 2001) that there will be suction dredging and in-pipe chemical oxidation to control the odour emission from the fully dredged and minimum dredged options with ex-situ treatment. This should be properly reflected in the ES.</p>	<p>Noted and will be added to the appendix.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and S.2.1.6 will be revised to read: “The Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation specifies processes that require special control. Contractors and”</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p> <p>Noted and will be corrected accordingly.</p> <p>The last sentence of S.3.1.3 will be revised to read: “With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the air quality impact will be acceptable at all sensitive uses.”</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The third sentence of S.6.1.8 will be revised to read:“Odour emission could be minimised through suction dredging and in-pipe chemical oxidation as part of the <i>ex-situ</i> treatment process for fully dredged and minimum dredged options.”</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>c) Last para., S.1.4.3, p.2 – Typo. It should read as "... area of 133ha ...".</p> <p>d) Besides, please note comment 17) above to include the reduction of emissions in the Summary of Environmental Outcomes (Section2).</p> <p>EM&A manual Please note that the odour monitoring requirements at S.2.3, p.2-8 to 2-13 of the EM&A manual are in order. Besides, an our BAND colleagues should be able to comment the general EM&A requirements by their own capacity, we therefore shall not comment on the general EM&A requirements.</p> <p>Implementation Schedule (IS) Regarding the IS attached to the EM&A manual, please note our comments as given below.</p> <p>Please note that our following previous comments on the draft IS (May 2001) are still applicable:</p> <p>a) For an IS of more than 50 pages, it should be better structured such as grouping the mitigation measures into sections and providing an index page to allow the IS of various environmental aspects easily located.</p> <p>b) It is noted that the air quality impact mitigation measures are inserted at various parts of the IS. To allow for an overall picture of the air quality mitigation measures, they should be grouped as construction phase and operational phase air quality impact mitigation measures in the IS.</p> <p>c) the construction phase air quality impact mitigation measures should include the IS of the mitigation measures for construction dust impact and odour impact from reclamation activities.</p> <p>c) The operational phase air quality impact mitigation measures should include the IS of the mitigation measures for traffic emission impact, industrial emission impact, odour impacts from maintenance of box culvert sewage treatment works and sewage pumping stations, air impacts from Refuse Transfer Station and Public Filling Barging Point (RTS & PFBP).</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be added accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and an index page will be added for ease of reference.</p> <p>Noted and an index page will be added for ease of reference.</p> <p>Mitigation measures specific for reclamation activities are included in pages A-48 to A-55 of the Implementation Schedule. Construction dust mitigation measures for general construction activities (including reclamation activities where applicable) are included in pages A-1 to A-3 of the Implementation Schedule. An index page will be added for ease of reference.</p> <p>Operational phase air quality mitigation measures are included in the Implementation Schedule. An index page will be added for ease of reference.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Air Quality (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>e) Site 3V – air Quality mitigation Measures, p.A-36 – Please clarify if the recommended 60m buffer distance measured from the Planning area’s boundary or the Gas work’s site boundary. Besides, it is our understanding from findings of the EIA report that the recommended 60m buffer distance is for the high-rise residential development. The above requirements should also be specified in the IS.</p> <p>f) Site 4A – Air Quality Mitigation Measures, p.A-38 – It is our understanding from findings of the EIA report that the recommended environmental setback of 230m from the centre of East Vent Building of CKR is for the high-rise residential development. Besides, the acceptable impact is based on the assumptions that the proposed uses within the 230m setback distance are of low-rise development and the exhaust point of the vent shaft is 33m above ground level. The above requirements including any building height restriction for the proposed uses within the 230m setback distance should also be specified in the IS.</p> <p>g) It should be noted that no portal emission from tunnels or submerged roads is assumed in the impact assessment. Such requirement should also be specified in the IS.</p> <p>h) Mitigation measures to minimise odour impacts, p.a-29 to A-50: i) for clarity, it is suggested to replace “When ex-situ treatment is adopted” by “When fully dredged or minimum dredged option with ex-situ treatment is adopted”. Similarly, replace “When in-situ treatment is adopted” by “When no dredged option with in-situ treatment is adopted”. ii) Odour control measures such as fully enclosing the ex-situ treatment facilities and soil piles should also be specified in the IS.</p> <p>i) Odour mitigation measures for desilting, P.A-17 – Instead of referring to the O&M Plan for Box Culvert the odour mitigation measures for maintenance of box culverts should be stated in the IS.</p> <p>j) The text of “Air Pollution Control Ordinance” at the “All sites – Operational Phase Water Quality Mitigation Measures” row, p. A-16 and the “General” row of “SEKD Reclamation and the Associated Dredging”, p. A-48 appears irrelevant. Please delete.</p>	<p>As shown by the modeling results (see Drawing Nos. 22936/EN/329C, 330C, and 331C), the required buffer distance is for high-rise from 25m to 75m above ground. The buffer distance is marked on the layout plan Drawing No. 22936/TP/110 that is included in the drawings for Section 3. Text will be added to the Implementation for clarification.</p> <p>Agreed and the requirements will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Agreed and the requirement will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p> <p>Details of the operation and maintenance requirements for box culvert will be confirmed and subjected to the findings of the site trials to be carried out.</p> <p>Noted and will be deleted.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Dept/Hazard to Life (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>With regards to the aspects of hazard to life associated with non-fuel gas Dangerous Goods, please note that this submission contains substantial new material (Chlorine transport and DGV-FP site section) which we have not reviewed before. Therefore, we are offering comments on these new material of the EIA report.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Dept/Hazard to Life (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Addressing the comments may result in changes in detailed calculations for the DGV-EP but should not alter the overall conclusions for non-fuel gas Dangerous Goods (i.e. risk associated with the transport of chlorine and hydrocarbons through DGV-FP are acceptable).</p> <p>Please also note that the risk acceptability of the fuel gas Dangerous Goods, i.e. LPG and Towngas are to be advised by Gas Safety Offices of EMSD.</p> <p>Therefore, we consider the EIA Report submitted have met the requirements of "Technical Memorandum on EIA Process: and EIA Study Brief issued on 24.9.1999, subject to the Applicant addressing the comments to our satisfaction.</p> <p>S.9.4.4.1 Current provision The statement "the proposed location for the DGV-FP ... was selected as the optimum location..." needs to be qualified noting the recommendations for site search outside the Study Area (S.9.5.7.9, S.9.5.7.11, S.16.8.14 & S.16.8.16). The location cannot be considered "optimum" in terms of risk, if there is a recommendation for further site search.</p> <p>S.9.5.3.9 Please confirm if "Road at water front" is the Trunk Road T2/Western Coast Road (WCR), as mentioned in S.9.4.4.3 and S.9.4.4.4. and displayed in the Drawing No. 22936/MS/121 in Appendix 9E. Assuming it is, then a traffic flow of 444 per hour does not seem realistic, given the anticipated heavy traffic of this major route leading to Tseung O. Please also explain the deviation of the "Total population in area", and define the boundary of the "area".</p> <p>S.9.5.3.16 – Table 9.12 Please amend the type "2006" as "2012".</p> <p>S.9.5.3.18 Having checked against the 1997 DNV report on DG Transport Risk, all the figures of "Likelihood per vehicle km" reported here appear to have been doubled. Please clarify this inconsistency.</p> <p>s.9.5.3.19 In the 2nd sentence, please insert the missing word after the text "The risk presented to the ..."</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The statement will be revised to read: "the proposed location for the DGVFPwas selected as the optimum location within SEKD"</p> <p>Due to comments on the road populations raised by others the road populations have been reviewed. The traffic flow for the Trunk Road T2 has been revised to 1800 vehicles per hour.</p> <p>The Planning Department at the request of DNV has provided the populations for each of the areas.</p> <p>Typo will be amended.</p> <p>Due to the need for agreement with the risk assessment being undertaken by others for the DG Ferry Pier receiving the DG from this Pier reference has been made to the frequency data applied in the MEMCL Study.</p> <p>Text will be amended.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Dept/Hazard to Life (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>s.9.5.3.19 – 9.5.3.20 Please provide references for the data of “Likelihood per vehicle”, since we cannot find the data in the appendices of the DNV 1997 DG Report.</p> <p>s.9.5.5.6 – 4th and 5th bullets Please note that only continuous releases (medium vapour leak & medium liquid leak) of chlorine should be assumed to have impact on the entire building population up to the 15th floor (approx. cloud height 45m). For consistency with previous studies (North Point DGV Ferry Pier QRA and 8 Water Treatment Works Reassessment QRA), instantaneous releases (rupture) should be assumed to have impact only on ground floor (approx. cloud height 3m)</p> <p>s.9.5.5.7 In light of item (v), instead of a single set of population file for continuous and instantaneous toxic releases, there should be two sets of population files, one for continuous toxic releases (G/F & 15/F), and one for instantaneous toxic releases (G/F only).</p> <p>s.9.5.6.4 – Table 9.25 Since the LPG FN curve (Drawing No. 22936/BN/369) and FN pairs (Table A9C3 in Appendix 9C) are both higher than those of chlorine cylinders, the PLL figures for LPG should accordingly be higher than that of chlorine cylinders. However, this is not the case in Table 9.25. While the PLL figures for chlorine and hydrocarbon are consistent with their respective FN curves and FN pairs, their “Percentage Distribution of Total Risk” would be much overestimated if the LPG and hence the total are underestimated. Please check and clarify this discrepancy. The text is S.9.5.6.4, S.9.5.6.10; S9.5.6.11 should be revised accordingly.</p> <p>S.9.5.7.7 The FN curves for the waiting area for combined DGs that are in the acceptable region are that of the existing pier in 2001 (drawing NO. 22936/EN/368), but this has little bearing on the risk acceptability of the proposed location in 2012. For a meaningful comparison, please display the social risk in FN curves for the waiting area of the proposed location in 2001 and 2012.</p>	<p>Leak rates for the DG vehicles have been referenced from a previous DNV study into Transport risks in Hong Kong – DNV Report HK2/C6124, December 1995 for spontaneous leak and ruptures from cylinder and tankers.</p> <p>Population model will be amended to account for changes.</p> <p>Population model will be amended to account for changes.</p> <p>The results will change based on the modifications to the risk model as discussed above. The revised results will be reviewed with this comment in mind.</p> <p>The requested results will be developed.</p>
<p>Electrical & Mechanical Services Department/GasSO GSO/GPS/47/KLN/01 Pt. 15 28 June 2001</p>	<p>As agreed with the consultants, the effect of LPG continuous release on elevated roads is negligible in accordance with previous study and should not be considered.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Electrical & Mechanical Services Department/GasSO GSO/GPS/47/KLN/01 Pt. 15 28 June 2001</p>	<p>Table 9.9 Road population closed to the proposed relocated DG Ferry Pier</p> <p>Population = vehicle occupancy x time to complete section x flow rate. For Kwun Tong By-pass, the population we obtained is considerably lower than 208 people as calculated by the consultants. Would the consultants please revise the road population based on the above for each of the five road routes as listed in Table 9.9.</p> <p>The following relates to text amendments of the report. In general, the risk arising from the transport route i.e transport risk, should be separated from the risk of the ferry pier itself.</p> <p>The Drawing should also show the FN curve and IR contour for the Proposed DG ferry Pier risk on its own even though the risk is negligible. That is without the transport risk contour.</p> <p>In the FN diagrams, all reference to “Societal Risk Curve – Current Pier Location “ and “Societal Risk Curve – Proposed Pier Location” should be changed to “Transport Risk Curve for Current/Proposed Pier Location”</p> <p>In Drawing 22936/EN/372 Change Title to “Transport Risk Contour Proposed Pier Location “. Also a separate drawing should be produced for the “IR Contour for the Proposed Pier Location”</p> <p>Section 9.5.6.15 Different Location for Ferry Pier, Section 9.5.7.9 This section refer to a different location for a ferry pier. In this connection a technical paper has been produced which investigated different ferry pier location within the SEKD. This section should focus on the study of that technical paper. The original paragraph in the report which relates to a direct service from Tsing Yi to Hong Kong is outside the scope of this paper and should be deleted.</p> <p>Section 9.5.7.11, 9.8.2.10 It is mentioned that a site search be carried out to identify an alternative location for the ferry pier outside the study area. This is outside the scope of this study and should be deleted. On the second bullet point, the report has not demonstrated that the current location is not the most practical location for a ferry pier. I would recommend that a section on the alternative locations which has been investigated should be included in the Appendix of the report. I could see some drawings of the alternative location at the moment but I believe the whole technical paper should be included to show the public what location had been considered and why they were not feasible.</p>	<p>Noted and the road population will be reviewed accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and Section 9.5.6.15 and the corresponding sentence in Section 9.5.7.9 will be deleted.</p> <p>Site search is only presented as a recommendation to be considered by the Government to carry out outside this project. The wording will be revised to read: “A site search (outside the scope of this project) to identify an alternative location for the proposed DGVFP outside the study area is recommended.”</p> <p>The discussion on the examination of different locations for the proposed DGVFP has been included in Section 4 of the EIA Report to show the public what locations had been considered and why they were not feasible.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Electrical & Mechanical Services Department/GasSO GSO/GPS/47/KLN/01 Pt. 15 28 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 9.5.6.12 It is stated that the additional route section being considered is already optimized for the proposed ferry pier location based on risk in an earlier revision of the study. Clearly, as mentioned in our previous comments, the route section being considered is along the shoreline which has the largest separation distance with the nearby population. In this connection, the consultants is required to introduce traffic management measures to ensure that road tanker follows this low risk road route. The requirement for such traffic management measures should be included in the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>In drawing 22936/EN/373 and 374, "Proposed Pier Location" should be changed to "Transport Risk".</p> <p>Section 9.5.6.5, Heading "Proposed DG Ferry Pier Location Risk Results" should be changed to "Transport Risk Results for the Proposed DG Ferry Pier Location".</p> <p>A section should be added to discuss the risk result for the Waiting Area in terms of individual risk and societal risk. It should be under the heading " Risk Results for the proposed Ferry Pier"</p> <p>Section 9.5.6.12 The first sentence should be changed to "The proposed DG ferry pier relocation result in an increase in transport risk due to an increase in traveling distance for the road tankers. The FN curve for the transport risk lies in the"</p> <p>Section 9.5.7.2, Last sentence, Section 9.8.2.2, Last sentence Change to " The route is considered optimal for the proposed ferry pier location due greater separation distance to the population."</p> <p>Section 9.5.7.3, This section should be headed under "Transport Risk for the Proposed DG Ferry Pier Location, Individual Risk....."</p> <p>Section 9.5.7.7 A separate heading "Risk of the proposed DG Ferry Pier" should be created to report on the result of the Societal and Individual Risk of the DG ferry pier itself. Hence, section 9.5.7.7 should be reported under the heading "Risk of the proposed DG Ferry Pier". The first sentence should be changed to "The FN curve for the DG ferry pier for combined DG are in the acceptable region of" . Furthermore the individual risk for the proposed DG ferry pier ust be shown by means of discussion under the heading "Risk of the proposed DG Ferry Pier" and by IR contours in the form of drawings.</p>	<p>Noted and will be added accordingly. The routing to the new ferry pier location will be from the existing ferry pier location running along Hoi Bun Road Extension.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and the heading will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response		
<p>Electrical & Mechanical Services Department/GasSO GSO/GPS/47/KLN/01 Pt. 15 28 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 9.8.2 Again, the risk for the transport risk and the risk of the DG ferry pier itself should be separately discussed and reported.</p> <p>Section 9.5.7.10, Section 9.8.2.9 All references to waiting area should be changed to DG Ferry Pier.</p> <p>EIA Executive Summary Section 10.2.1 to section 10.2.10 is copied from the main report. Therefore the above comments on the main report which relates to text amendment equally applies here. Please amend text accordingly.</p> <p>Section 10.2.10, first bullet point For the same reason given above, the first bullet point relating to the site search outside the study area should be deleted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Site search is only presented as a recommendation to be considered by the Government to carry out outside this project. The wording will be revised to read: “A site search (outside the scope of this project) to identify an alternative location for the proposed DGVFP outside the study area is recommended.”</p>		
<p>Leisure and Cultural Services Department (16) in LCS AM 81/2/9 (VI) 26 June 2001</p>	<p>EIA Executive Summary English Version</p> <p>2. Regarding the 4th and 5th column under para. 13.1.4, please revise as:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="474 890 1361 948"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Sites of Cultural Heritage Importance</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Recommended Mitigation Measures / Further Investigation</td> </tr> </table> <p>Area at the foot of the former Sacred Hill Site of the Kowloon City Public Pier (the Old Lung Tsun Pier) and rock from the Kowloon Walled City</p> <p>3. Regarding para.13.1.2, if Sung Wong Toi rock inscription is removed to the new artificial hill, the Sung Wong Toi rock inscription may no longer exist in the park. Do you consider the name of Sung Wong Toi should be renamed? Besides, there are two stone memorials (one in English and one in Chinese) inside the park. These memorials were constructed by the colonial government in memory of the ancient rock inscription in 1959. Would these memorials be removed to the new artificial hill in the same occasion? Have you get the consent of our Planning Section for the removal of the ancient rock inscription?</p>	Sites of Cultural Heritage Importance	Recommended Mitigation Measures / Further Investigation	<p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>As recommended in Section 12.7.1.4 of the EIA Report, during the detailed design stage of the district open area in Area 2H, the details of the proposed artificial hill to be erected on the site of the Sacred Hill and the proposed relocation of the Sung Wong Toi Inscription Rock should be submitted to EPD and the Antiquities and Monuments Office well in advance for their review and comment. We believe other details of concern related with the relocation works should also be submitted to EPD and the Antiquities and Monuments Office well in advance for their review and comment.</p>
Sites of Cultural Heritage Importance	Recommended Mitigation Measures / Further Investigation			

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Leisure and Cultural Services Department (16) in LCS AM 81/2/9 (VI) 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Chinese Version</p> <p>4. Regarding para. 13.1.1, please revise as “研究.....歷史價值的古徑等。此外，還包括了該地在航空事業發展前後的歷史。其它已研究的歷史文化古蹟尚包括九龍城刑場、九龍城公眾碼頭(龍津石橋)、魚尾石、九龍石、啓德機場中的建築物,九龍寨城的石塊及馬頭角.....”</p> <p>5. Regarding para. 13.1.2, please revise as: “目前.....保留了前遠東航空學校內一塊休憩用地，.....並反映出這是一個重要.....”</p> <p>6. Regarding para. 13.1.3, please revise as: “此外.....行人通道連接東南九龍的新發展區域，使其更能.....”</p> <p>7. Regarding para. 13.1.4, please revise as:”另外，.....有關的紓緩措施或進行進一步調查的建議如下： 潛在文化古蹟 紓緩措施或進行進一步的調查 前遠東航空學校 啓德機場內的戰後建築物 東南九龍發展區舊機場內的 文化遺蹟和考古遺物 前聖山舊址腳下的地區 建議.....開挖試掘探方進行考古調查 九龍城公眾碼頭(龍津石橋) 建議.....開挖試掘探方/探溝進行..... 及建築九龍寨城的石塊等 建議.....結合物理探測進行水下考古調查...</p> <p>EIA Report (Volume 1) and Drawings for EIA Report</p> <p>2. Regarding para. 12.3.4.20 at p. 12-16, please revise as “It seemed likely The Hon. Sir Kai Ho Kai (何啓) and Mr. Au Tack (區德)”</p> <p>3. Regarding para.12.9.2 and the 1st column under Table 12.1 at pp. 12-33 and 12-34, please note that if Sung Wong Toi rock inscription is removed to the new artificial hill, the Sung Wong Toi rock inscription may no longer exist in the park. The name of the park may be needed to rename. Besides, there are two stone memorials (one in English and one in Chinese) inside the park. These memorials were constructed in 1959 by the colonial government in memory of the ancient rock inscription. Would these memorials be removed to the new artificial hill in the same occasion? Have the project proponent get the consent from the Planning Section of this Department for the removal of this ancient rock inscription from the park?</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>As recommended in Section 12.7.1.4 of the EIA Report, during the detailed design stage of the district open area in Area 2H, the details of the proposed artificial hill to be erected on the site of the Sacred Hill and the proposed relocation of the Sung Wong Toi Inscription Rock should be submitted to EPD and the Antiquities and Monuments Office well in advance for their review and comment. We believe other details of concern related with the relocation works should also be submitted to EPD and the Antiquities and Monuments Office well in advance for their review and comment.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Leisure and Cultural Services Department (16) in LCS AM 81/2/9 (VI) 26 June 2001</p>	<p>3. Regarding Table 12.1 at p. 12-34, please revise the heading together with the 6th and 7th column as:</p> <p>Sites of Cultural Heritage Importance Recommended Mitigation Measures / Further Investigation</p> <p>Area at the foot of the former Sacred Hill Site of the Kowloon City Public Pier (the Old Lung Tsun Pier) and rock from the Kowloon Walled City</p> <p>4. Regarding Photo C at p.12-39, please replace “Kau Pui Shek Upper Village” with “Kau Pui Shek Village”. For reason, please refer to para. 25 of my memo dated 6.6.2001 under reference (1) of the same series.</p> <p>Drawings for EIA Report</p> <p>5. Drawing No. 22936/EN/001, please replace the items A “Kau Pui Shek Upper Village” and item B “Kau Pui Shek Lower Village” with “Kau Pui Shek Village”.</p> <p>6. The EIA Report documents (Report, Executive Summary and EM&A Manual) will only be considered as acceptable by this Office to meet the requirements of Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process and EIA Study Brief from cultural heritage preservation point of view if my suggested amendments vide my memos dated 26.6.2001 under reference (16), (17), (20) and (21) could be incorporated into the EIA documents.</p> <p>7. I have no comments on EIA Report (Volume II).</p>	<p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Civil Aviation Department (51) in AS/KS/605/1 26 June 2001</p>	<p>There is only a single comment on the EIA aspect. With regard to para. 3.10.20.3 of EIA Report (Volume I), it is our understanding that new helicopters of GFS will be become operational soon. You may wish to include the relevant maximum noise levels of such helicopters in the study.</p> <p>For para. 3.10.20.2, neither the third heliport location identified to be at Sites 6A6 and 6A7 nor Site 6A7 itself can be traced from the “Drawings for EIA Report’. Would the consultant please enlighten us on those locations.</p>	<p>The information provided was the noise level from the new helicopter and the standard as specified by International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) for which involved noise measurements during helicopter landing, taking off and overflying. The noise is described as Effective Perceived Noise Level (EPNL) which is different from Lmax in EIAO-TM. The helicopter type given meets the ICAO standard. We are going to ask the manufacturer for further noise data in terms of Lmax.</p> <p>There should be three heliport in SEKD with one in 5L1 (provisional in the hospital site for emergency use) and two on the cruise terminal in 6A6. Text will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response														
<p>Highways Department/Railway Planning(2) RD 7/3/4 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Volume I</p> <p>1. Section 3.4.1.2 – In the table, please explain why the modal splits for trips to/from SEKD at year 2016 are different from that previously endorsed by the Traffic & Transport Working Group. The figures endorsed by the Working Group are reproduced below for easy reference.</p> <p>Breakdown of SEKD daily passenger trips at year 2016</p> <table data-bbox="472 427 1368 624"> <tr> <td>Mode</td> <td style="text-align: right;">%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Railway (including those transferred to/from shuttle, bus, PLB and taxi)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Shuttle (excluding those transferred to/from railway)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Road-based (bus/PLB)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Taxi</td> <td style="text-align: right;">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private car</td> <td style="text-align: right;">14</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">100</td> </tr> </table> <p>Section 3.4.2.1, line 2 – Please change ‘of the railway network’ to ‘for the railway network’ at the end of the 2nd sentence.</p> <p>Section 3.6.1.4 – To be accurate, the 2nd sentence should be revised to read ‘The noise levels presented show the cumulative impacts of construction activities due to the development packages listed in Table 3.8.’</p> <p>Section 3.7.8.2 – The ‘railway reserve in Prince Edward Road for East Kowloon Line’ refers to the old reserve shown in the concerned OZP. With the promulgation of Railway Development Strategy 2000, this railway line is expected to be replaced by the SCL which will route through the SEKD. As such, ‘railway reserve in Prince Edward Road’ should not be highlighted as a problem to the erection of noise barrier along Prince Edward Road.</p> <p>Sections 3.7.9.8 and 3.7.9.11 are duplicating.</p> <p>Section 3.8.1.2 – Neither the railway depot nor the approach rail fan is located at Site 1K (the proposed depot site for the shuttle system). Please revise the 2nd and 4th sentences.</p> <p>Section 3.9.1.1 – Please revise the 1st part of the last sentence to read ‘As tendering for the shuttle service would occur close to the time when the Shatin to Central Link is scheduled to be commissioned (i.e. between the years 2008 and 2011), the factors ...’</p> <p>Section 3.9.1.2 – The proposed Trolley Bus/LRT depot is not located at Site 2A. Please revise the 1st sentence.</p>	Mode	%	Railway (including those transferred to/from shuttle, bus, PLB and taxi)	62	Shuttle (excluding those transferred to/from railway)	2	Road-based (bus/PLB)	11	Taxi	11	Private car	14	Total	100	<p>The information given in the report was outdated. Figures as given endorsed by the Working Group will be incorporated.</p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Text will be amended in such a way to remove railway reserve as a constraint for Prince Edward Road mitigation measures.</p> <p>Section 3.7.9.11 will be deleted.</p> <p>Text will be revised.</p> <p>Text will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Text will be revised.</p>
Mode	%															
Railway (including those transferred to/from shuttle, bus, PLB and taxi)	62															
Shuttle (excluding those transferred to/from railway)	2															
Road-based (bus/PLB)	11															
Taxi	11															
Private car	14															
Total	100															

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Highways Department/Railway Planning(2) RD 7/3/4 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 13.6.4.4, Table 13.2 – The East Kowloon Line (EKL) referred to in the Table represents an old reserve shown in the concerned OZP. With the promulgation of Railway Development Strategy 2000, this railway line is expected to be replaced by the SCL and the station location in the subject area is dependent on the proposals from the Corporations and may not be at the junction of Gilles Avenue and Fat Kwong Street. In order not to mislead the public or cause false expectation, the item on EKL should be deleted from the Table.</p> <p>Section 13.6.4.10, Table 13.4 – Following the same argument as above, the item on EKL should be deleted from the Table.</p> <p>Drawings for EIA Report Drawing No. 22936/IM/011 – In order to tally with Table 3.8 of Volume I, work element WA12, which is shown in the Table, should also be shown on this Drawing.</p> <p>Drawing No. 22936/TP/101 – The depot approach track is recently found to have conflict with the New Police Headquarters Building in Area 1G. Whether the rail reserve and land use layout as shown on this Drawing is able to resolve the conflict is subject to agreement among concerned parties.</p> <p>Drawing No. 22936/TP/110 The layout of To Kwa Wan Station is missing. Please delete the note, ‘Road Widening Work for future TKW Station by others’, on the Drawing.</p>	<p>Noted and relevant text on EKL will be deleted/amended.</p> <p>Noted and relevant text on EKL will be deleted/amended.</p> <p>Work shown in the table is only provisional. Confirmation of the scope will be made in the next stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and will be deleted.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Noise Because of the site constraints, installation of direct mitigation measures at sources is not impracticable and hence special building design is required to abate the residual traffic noise impact. Nonetheless, we consider the consultant needs to provide the following information to order to prove that the assessment meets the EIAO-TM requirement.</p> <p>a) The practicability of imposing such constraint on building layout, e.g. Single Aspect Building, have not been demonstrated and endorsed by the relevant authority, e.g. Lands Department, as required by section 6.3, Annex 13 of the EIAO-TM. It has been repeatedly requested, but the consultant still failed to come up with practicable land lease conditions (endorsed by Lands Dept.) to that effect.</p> <p>b) The direct mitigation measures have not been exhausted for NSR in Area 1E, ie.. Assessment Points 8246 and 8431, as partial enclosure could be build near the road junctions to screen off the traffic noise (section 4.4.2(f) f the EIAO-TM); and</p>	<p>Suggestion on the lease conditions has been prepared separately for review by EPD and Lands Department.</p> <p>The mitigation measures for Area 1E have been revised. Barriers on the central divider and along the roadside are extended. With such arrangements, the APs 8426 and 8431 will no longer require specific measure “ avoid openable window” and will be within noise standard. Two APs which are affected by PER still required AOW.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>c) the terminology of the proposed building design – “Avoided Openable Window” is too vague and needs to be endorsed by relevant authority to be enforceable under the lease conditions, as required under section 6.3, Annex 13 of the EIAO-TM).</p> <p>d) All the development constraint, e.g. setback and podium design, needs to be spelt out in the report, endorsed by the relevant authority and put into appropriate conditions for implementation, as required under section 6.3, Annex 13 of the EIAO-TM.</p> <p>Some relatively less significant comments are as follows: For those situations that “Avoid Openable Window” be suggested, the consultants need to explain in the report about the constraints that preclude the use of direct mitigation measures. Also, it would be better to have non-openable window (or blank façade) instead of this vague terminology, which would be easily misunderstood by the relevant parties and the public. We are of the opinion that the consultant needs to explore further mitigation measures for the following sites with “Avoid Openable Window” proposed as building design:</p>	<p>Further explanation will be provided to describe “AOW”. Section 3.7.9.9 will be revised to read: “Some of the building-end façades with angle of view of 180 degrees would be subject to excessive traffic noise level. It is recommended that openable window for ventilation should be avoided locating at the concerned façade meaning this façade should have blank façade or non-openable window. The measure is termed “avoid openable window at building-end façade” or simply “avoid openable window (AOW)”. With the recent relaxation of planning guidelines, it is anticipated that more innovative design of environmental friendly buildings could be developed in the future. Ideas like provision of balconies and building fins could be readily achieving similar noise reduction effects as “AOW”.”</p> <p>The development constraints have been identified in the EIA Report for endorsement by relevant authorities through circulation of EIA report.</p> <p>We consider that certain development constraints must be imposed since it is not feasible to enclose all the distributors serving the developments themselves while providing junctions for change of traffic directions and pedestrian access to transportation system.</p> <p>For example, D1 road has a traffic flow of about 1700 vehicle per hour. Without screening, it would require more than 50 meters for setback. The developments on both sides of D1 are high-rise residential development. If they were no development constraints, whole D1 would require full enclosure to achieve full compliance. Full enclosure of D1 will border the purpose of serving the traffic orientated in these development and also pedestrian access and linkage to bus stops or shuttle system. Air quality may be a problem associated with passengers waiting inside the full enclosure for riding the shuttle system as well as potential impact in terms of visual and landscape. The current proposed provide an optimization between transport needs and potential traffic noise pollution. Firstly, development along D1 is proposed to have podium or non-sensitive base level structure to avoid being too close to road noise sources. Secondly, the traffic noise problem associated with development is relatively minor after careful planning, most of the essential façades are protected. Only sensitive façade with large angle of view at the building-end is affected with slight exceedance.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>i) Site 4S The consultant needs to consider podium design to mitigate the noise exceedance at lower floors.</p> <p>ii) Site 2E The consultant needs barrier and podium design to mitigate traffic noise from D1 and L3</p> <p>iii) Site 2C The consultant needs to consider podium design to mitigate the noise exceedance at lower floors.</p> <p>iv) Site 1E See comment 1b) above.</p> <p>Sec. 3.7.6 Evaluation of Impacts from Road Traffic Noise for Schools Table 3.15 (Traffic Noise Assessments) & Table 3.20 (Mitigation Measures)</p> <p>i) General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EPD has been requesting that the consultant should show each school site in its totality in at least one drawing to avoid cutting up any one site between a number of drawings. However, there has been no improvement to the report and the readers will have difficulties in comprehending the situation. - there is no section to generally overview the planning of schools against traffic noise. The consultant should mention the overall compliance percentage of classrooms after direct mitigation measures (we learnt that it is around 74%). An overview of common reasons for the non-compliance of the remaining classrooms should be discussed. Common reasons are practical difficulty in retrofitting existing road, sight-line problem and need to maintain opening for road junction. The paragraph should also mention indirect technical measures to be recommended. - The rationale for restricting the school boundary wall not over 3m should be stated. 	<p>Under the current policy, environmental friendly building design is encouraged. The traffic noise problem associated with building-end façade could be mitigated by adoption of balcony design, building fins or other environmental friendly design in the detail design stage.</p> <p>We have examined that increasing the setback to 15m could alleviate the exceedance.</p> <p>The affected APs could be mitigated by setback of 9m from L4, 16m & 24m from L3, 14 from the southern boundary and increased podium height from 10m to 15m.</p> <p>Further setback by 20m and 23m from roadside for the two affected building blocks could alleviate the noise impact. No exceedances were found.</p> <p>Noted and see our response above.</p> <p>The required information has been shown in the drawings. It will then be a matter of presentation. The layout drawings have been set up to show the entire SEKD in 29 drawings. For consistency, the same set of drawings will be used for other reports of this study. In any case, the cut lines of the drawings will unavoidably divide some of the areas, should they be school sites or residential sites.</p> <p>Detail compliance reviews and reasons for non-compliance have been provided for each of the schools in the report. An overview will be provided upon EPD's request.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>ii) Detailed comments (on table 3.20):</p> <p>School 1C3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the compliance rate should be 39% instead of 0% after direct mitigation measures. <p>School 1L3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noted serious exceedence of 8 dB(A). although the school may be related, the consultant still needs to consider the current arrangement as one of the possible option. Noise mitigation measure at D1, D5 and junction of D1/D5 should be sought. <p>School 2B3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as the school and the surrounding housing developments all affected by the road junction L3/L4, an enclosure covering junction L3/L4 and sections of L3 & L4 should be considered. - The consultant might note revising the orientation with the layout may achieve full compliance. <p>School 3X3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noted serious exceedence of 8 dB(A). The consultant needs to consider noise mitigation measure, in addition to that at D1, such as 5m cantilever barrier also at existing road and L15. <p>School 5L2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noted serious exceedence of 9 dB(A). The consultant needs to justify why retrofitting at KTBP cannot be carried out for this area concerned. <p>Sec. 3.7.8 Constrains for Mitigation Measures on Roads with High Traffic</p> <p>i) Sec. 3.7.8.1-15 (PEF & KTBP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - noted that the constrains for retrofitting barriers at Prince Edward Road East and Kwun Tong Bypass have been discussed. Positive confirmation from various authorities on the lack of space or impracticality for retrofitting should be sought. - The KTBP is affecting various areas including housing site at 5K and school sites at 4E2, 4L3, 4L4, 4N2, 4N3, 4Q3 & 5L2, each with its won specific layout. Therefore, just one section provided at 5k could not justify that retrofitting cannot be carried out for all areas affected. Areas of particular concern are 4Q3 and 5L2 where the exceedence at school can be 9 dB(A). 	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>We have reviewed the orientation of schools inside site 1L3 and worked out a revised layout plan. Due to the presence of tunnel reserve, there is a limitation on the school building locations. The compliance rate is now improved. Large structural mitigation measures e.g. full enclosure and semi-enclosure on D1 would not be feasible due to the railway underground and other restraints.</p> <p>A swap between the locations of secondary school and primary school proposed. The feasibility is subject to further investigation. With such a swap in location, full compliance could be achieved for the two schools.</p> <p>A section of roadside cantilever barrier instead of school boundary wall is proposed along existing Long Yuet Street and a section of cantilever barrier between the pavement and school boundary is also recommended. Noise level was found reduced from 8 dB exceedence to about 5 dB exceedence. Since there are existing buildings all along Kwei Chow Street, further retro-fitting of noise mitigation measures would not be feasible.</p> <p>This has been discussed in the Section 3.7.8 for feasible measures at KTBP.</p> <p>The constraints have been identified in the EIA Report for endorsement by relevant authorities through circulation of EIA report.</p> <p>Additional section drawings across KTBP will be prepared.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>ii) Sec. 3.7.8.9 & 3.7.8.12 (PER & KTBP) - direct measures in the form of low noise surfacing has been recommended for the two roads. A plan locating the existing and recommended two noise surfacing in the two roads should be prepared to ease understanding and implementation. The drawing no. 22936/EN/269 referred to in the table of (page 3 –44) is missing.</p> <p>iii) Sec. 3.7.8.16 (D1) - noted that the building layout of site 1D has been revised so that there will be no APW. Therefore, we have no further comment.</p> <p>iv) Sec. 3.7.8.17 – 18 (Sung Wong Toi Road) - the planned NSRs at Sung Wong Tai Road would be exposed to excessive traffic noise due to the widened road. As extensive road work would be carried out in that location the consultant needs strong justification on why diversion work of underground utilities or redesigning the road layout are not possible there. - Noted that the consultant has proposed in sec. 3.7.10.3 to defer the more detailed study to next stage. We have no objection to this proposal provided that the design of the adjacent G/IC site in 2G could also be deferred so that revision of the road layout if necessary can be made. If that is the case, the consultant needs to spell out in the report.</p> <p>d) Sec. 3.7.7.5-9 Planned Developments along Proposed Widened Sung Wong Tai Road i) Sec. 3.7.7.9 - This section is not in-line with section 3.7.8.17 – 18 in which more detailed study has been proposed. - We cannot find the referred drawing no. 22936/HS/508 in Appendix 3B.</p> <p>e) Sec. 3.7.9 Summary of proposed Mitigation Measures i) Sec. 3.7.9.6 (SAB) - noted that SAB has been proposed by the consultant. We've re-iterated that the previous experience, it was very difficult to derive a suitable land lease condition to suit this particular case and considered enforceable by LandsD. The consultant was required to suggest appropriate wording for incorporation into the lease conditions.</p>	<p>Noted and Drawing No. 22936/EN/269 will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>More detailed study has been proposed for this section of Sung Wong Tai Road which would take into account the possible layout or future requirements of the re-development of industrial sites.</p> <p>The wording of section 3.7.8.17-3.7.8.18 will be revised to support for the need for a detailed study. Drawing no. 22936/HS/508 will be provided in Appendix 3B.</p> <p>Currently single aspect buildings have been proposed within 4 sites at this stage. Three of these sites, Area 1K, 2A and 5K, will require further submission to Town Planning Board to confirm that the layout of the buildings is acceptable in many aspects, including environment. Site 1 E is currently planned as a residential site. However, there is a possibility of adding the requirement for a noise assessment, based on the planned layout by the developer, to be made for submission to seek the relevant approval.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>ii) Sec. 3.7.9.7.-8 (Conditions on developers/owners) - the consultant suggested to impose several requirements (such as following recommendation of the EIA report or proving their alternative design having same compliance rate) on the design of the developers/owner. The consultant needs to consult LandsD on whether the requirements of EIA report can become lease conditions (LandsD had confirmed that they would not attach block layout plan to the lease). The consultant also needs to check that such requirement could be practicably implemented.</p> <p>iii) Sec. 3.7.9.9 (AOW) - The building end facades subject to excessive traffic noise level should have blank façade or no openable window. Therefore, “avoid openable window” has understated the requirement. The consultant needs to come up with a more precise description.</p> <p>iv) Sec. 3.7.9.11 - it is the same as 3.7.9.8. Pls. Delete the later one.</p> <p>Sec. 14.4 Traffic Noise (Option arising from the latest layout of the stadium) i) General comments: noted that the proposed option was newly added for parallel consideration with the EIA report. However, Chapter 14 is lacking the details as those in the main report. I.e. it should have :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Layout plan showing all the noise mitigation measures (similar to 22936/TP/101-129 for the main report). - Revised traffic noise contour for the concerned areas (similar to 22936/EN/285-287 for the main report) - Table summarizing the noise mitigation for schools and the compliance (similar to table 3.20 for the main report). 	<p>With reference to the comments from LandsD on the EIA Report, consideration may be given the relevance of ‘Written submission to DEP clause’ before finalising the leases for private development sites.</p> <p>Further explanation will be provided to describe “AOW”. Section 3.7.9.9 will be revised to read: “Some of the building-end facades with angle of view of 180 degrees would be subject to excessive traffic noise level. It is recommended that openable window for ventilation should be avoided locating at the concerned façade meaning this façade should have blank façade or non-openable window. The measure is termed “avoid openable window at building-end façade” or simply “avoid openable window (AOW)”. With the recent relaxation of planning guidelines, it is anticipated that more innovative design of environmental friendly buildings could be developed in the future. Ideas like provision of balconies and building fins could be readily achieving similar noise reduction effects as “AOW”.”</p> <p>Noted and will be deleted.</p> <p>Layout plans, traffic noise contours and summary tables will be provided.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>ii) Detailed comments: Sec. 14.4.2 School Village 2B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposed road central barrier (1m) and school boundary wall (3m) will cross Airport Tunnel reserve and the Shatin to Central Link reserve, need to check with relevant authorities. <p>Sec. for 14.4.3 School village 4P/4Q</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - for the school at 4Q facing KTBP serious exceedence of 9 dB(A) noted. We opined that the consultant has not demonstrated that all practical mitigated measures of sources (KTBP) has been explored. - The option 2 (i.e. enclosure) should be better than option 1 as it would lower the noise level at one façade of the school to within the limit. As the classrooms would still be affected at the other side by KTBP, more direct mitigation measures at sources (KTBP) should be explored. <p>Sec. 14.4.4 School at 1E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the school site was originally the “noise set back” zone of the R1 site and there was 6 dB(A) exceedence even after mitigation measure. - More extensive mitigation measures at road D1 and the junction should be considered. - May orientate the school so that the small auxiliary block will not face the road. <p>Sec. 14.4.5 Site 4A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the school site was inside the CKR Air Quality Setback area. - Noted the predicted 6 dB(A) exceedence even after mitigation measures. - More mitigation measures at source should be explored. <p>Sec. 3.10 Impact from Fixed Noise Sources</p> <p>i) Sec. 3.10.1 Public Transport Interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mitigation measure such as “the exhaust of the ventilation system should be located facing away from any NSRs” should be added. <p>ii) Sec. 3.10.9 Ventilation Shafts for Underground Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the report has not provided comments/assessment on whether the noise criteria will be met. <p>iii) Sec. 3.10.15 Swimming Pool Complex</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to also address the alternative option arising from the new stadium layout i.e. one of the larger swimming pool will be moved to the stadium area. 	<p>The proposed measures have been identified in the EIA Report for endorsement by relevant authorities through circulation of EIA report.</p> <p>It has been explained in the report that direct mitigation measures at KTBP would not be feasible.</p> <p>Noted and option 2 will be adopted.</p> <p>School orientation is proposed to change with non-sensitive block facing the junction D1/D3. The roadside barriers are also extended and additional barrier on central divider of D3 is provided. The compliance rate is improved with 4 dB residual impact.</p> <p>Additional barriers are proposed along CKR and associated slip roads. Further reduction in noise level could be achieved.</p> <p>Noted and will be added accordingly.</p> <p>Noise criteria could be met with suitable mitigation measures incorporated in detailed design stage.</p> <p>A section on swimming pool complex will be provided for the stadium led option.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>iv) Sec. 3.10.17 Centralised Cooling System - the assessment should also mention various alternative location for the cooling system was under consideration. If location not firmed yet then qualitative assessment for different locations should be made.</p> <p>v) Sec. 3.10.19 Public Filling Baring Point - sec. 3.10.19.1 : the need to break down large size rock or concrete was mentioned. However, there is no assessment on the equipment to be used. Normally an excavator mounted breaker will be used. For noise mitigation crushers operated by hydraulic mean without use of percussive/impact should be adopted.</p> <p>Miscellaneous</p> <p>i) Table for Area Wide Traffic Forecasts - the drawing no. 2936/TR/712 referred to is missing.</p> <p>ii) Noise Emission Inventory - It is noted that the Automatic Refuse Collection System is not in the inventory. Qualitative assessment on the system should be provided with reference to similar existing system.</p>	<p>The centralised cooling system is under the feasibility study stage in the study titled “CE51/2000 Implementation Study for a District Cooling System at SEKD”. At this stage, this EIA report may not be in a position to address and comment on various possible options (locations and E&M systems) based on limited information. It is because critical noise components like E&M systems has not yet been selected and the viability of the system is subject to confirmation.</p> <p>In any event, the future service provider of the DCS will carry out the detailed EIA based on the final plant location and type adopted.</p> <p>A further assessment for the concerned rock breaking equipment has been included and found that the noise impact was within acceptable limits. To provide a better noise environment, hydraulic mean without the use of percussive/impact rock breaking will be suggested a measure for consideration.</p> <p>Drawing No. 22936/TR/712 will be provided.</p> <p>Automatic Refuse Collection system is a government’s initiative for refuse collection in development sites. The system would depend on the individual design of each development site. The ARCS may vary from different manufacturers and site design. Technical details have been given in Section 7.5 of the report. Major noise sources generally relate to air blowers, refuse compactor, refuse separator and the collection point, where are very site specific in nature and highly depends on the design layout. Subject to further study of the ARCS, preventive measures have to be adopted in the first place e.g. careful siting of noisy equipment like air blowers, refuse compactor, de-odorising facilities and exhaust. Further mitigation measures e.g. silencers, acoustic enclosure and shielding should be considered if necessary in order to comply with the noise standards. At the feasibility stage and detail design stage, it is suggested to review whether there is a need for carrying out detail noise assessment.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Noise (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>EIA Executive Summary Section 4.1.2 The consultant needs to explain what “level of impact” means and whether it is referring to unmitigated noise levels. The consultant needs to explained that direct mitigation measures at sources were exhausted instead of “tested”. It is suggested the consultant spells out in the report what are the “suggested measures within planned sites”.</p>	<p>Noted and text will be added for clarification.</p>
<p>Lands Department, Kowloon East (6) in LND KE L/M/ PD/103 26 June 2001</p>	<p><u>General</u> a. it is advisable to attach a plan showing the update layout and disposition of the sites mentioned in the Appendix with the proposed environmental mitigation measures. Development constraints super-imposed for clarify; b. Please consider whether the maximum building height of individual sites should be included in the Appendix as they are also intended to be part of the environmental mitigation measures;</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Mitigation</u> <u>Design of Buildings</u> c. The design, disposition and external finishes of buildings to be erected by private developers can, to a certain extent, be controlled through imposition of “Master Layout Plan’ and ‘Design Disposition and Height’ clauses in the lease(s); d. Standard ‘Tree’ and ‘Landscaping’ clauses may also be inserted to help mitigating the visual impact;</p> <p><u>Traffic Noise Mitigation</u> <u>PTI sites</u> e. As usual, Government requirements for the PTI can be pre-determined and set out in the form of technical schedule for attachment to the lease. The developer will be required under lease to construct the PTI in accordance with the technical schedules and to Government’s satisfaction;</p> <p><u>Traffic Noise Mitigation</u> <u>Private development sites other than PTI</u> f. Set backs from boundaries can generally be enforced through “Non-building Area’ clause provided they do not take up an unreasonable extent of the development sites;</p> <p>g. The requirement of podium structure is possible through the ‘Type of Development’ clause but consideration should be given to allow alternatives which can meet the same environmental standards/requirements;</p>	<p>The recommended environmental mitigation measures in terms of setback and buffer distance are shown in the layout plans (Drawing Nos. 22936/TP/101 to 129). Copies of the layout plans are included in the Drawings for Section 3. The maximum building heights of individual sites are also shown in the layout plan drawings (Drawing Nos. 22936/TP/101 to 129). They will also be included in the Outline Zoning Plan for the height control.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This is in line with our separate fax.</p> <p>The need to allow for flexibility by the developer is noted.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Lands Department, Kowloon East (6) in LND KE L/M/ PD/103 26 June 2001</p>	<p>h. As in point (a) above, we may control the design disposition of buildings to be erected on the lot through the clauses specified but it is doubtful if the clauses are strong enough to require single aspect buildings or to restrict locations of openable windows;</p> <p>i. Government may consider the relevance of 'Written submission to DEP' clause' before finalizing the leases;</p> <p>j. Please specify the set back (if any) required for site 4A clearly;</p> <p>K. Please explain the meaning of 'semi-enclosure' for some of the sites (e.g. site 5K) and specify the development constraints required;</p> <p>Mitigation Measures for Different Reclamation Options</p> <p>l. Please clarify Lands D's input required before I can offer my comments. My initial view is that the biogas and contamination problems affect health and safety. The should be cleared satisfactorily by Government before actual disposal of any sites in the vicinity affected; and</p> <p>Others</p> <p>m. Incidentally, I note from the EIA Executive Summary that the Ma Tau Kok Gas Works, the DG Vehicle Ferry Pier, the Chlorine unloading Point and the Kerry DG Godown pose risks to the SEKD. The Summary however assumes relocation of most of them. Please therefore confirm whether the SEKD could proceed and sites be disposed and habitated despite the risk posers still remain in-situ.</p>	<p>Noted and we suggest that the following clause can be added: 'Should the developer plan to locate residential flats within the restricted zone XYZ indicated, the developer is required to demonstrate in a dedicated noise assessment that the noise level achieved at the proposed residential block will at least be better than, in terms of compliance rate and noise level, what has been identified in the EIA assessment carried out under EIA Report ref. XXX submitted on XXX.'</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>The set back requirement for Site 4A is stated in Page A-38 under "Site 4A –Air Quality Mitigation Measures" and shown in Drawing No. 22936/TP/111.</p> <p>"semi-enclosure" refers to the semi-enclosure recommended to install for the roads affecting any particular site.</p> <p>Details of the mitigation measures will be subjected to the findings of the site trials on reclamation options to be carried out. LandsD will be informed of the findings when they become available.</p> <p>Our study has been based on the best available information. At this stage, there is no indication of any change. The eventual environmental acceptance of the sites will depend on the actual conditions prevailing at that time.</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sediment Treatment & Waste Management (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>i) <u>Section 5.3.1.3</u> Station VS6 is not shown on Drawings Nos. 23936/EN/017 to 019.</p>	<p>Station VS6 is one of the sediment sampling stations within the Victoria Harbour WCZ but it is located at a distance away from the SEKD. Therefore, sediment quality data for this station were not included in the drawings. Instead, the sediment quality data at Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelters (VS14 and VS20) were included in the drawings.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sediment Treatment & Waste Management (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>ii) <u>Section 5.5.3.33</u> A drawing showing the proposed passive barriers and passive ventilation systems for protection of individual buildings should be used to replace the conceptual layout of the methane gas collection layer and vents, which are not practical or desirable to be used for the future developments on the reclamation, shown on Drawing 22936/EN/144.</p>	<p>Noted and the drawing will be revised.</p>
	<p>iii) <u>Section 5.6.1.7</u> “The suitability of reusing the treated material as fill material would be determined in the field trials.” Should be added to the end of the section.</p>	<p>Noted and will be added.</p>
	<p>iv) <u>Section 5.7.1.6</u> The first sentence should read as “The bench scale testing including Fenton’s Reagent, ORC, Seditreat™, Biogenesis Sediment Washing and Daramend in the contaminated sediments.”</p>	<p>“Biogenesis Sediment Washing” will be added in this sentence.</p>
	<p>v) <u>Figure 5I</u> “See Note #” in the figure should be deleted.</p> <p>The text in the box at the right-hand-side second row should be amended to read as “Does pilot test/field trial shows that re-filling of treated material is acceptable from geotechnical/environmental point of view?”</p> <p>The title of the figure should be amended to read as “Proposed Procedures to deal with Biogas Problem”.</p>	<p>Noted and amendment will be made accordingly.</p>
	<p>vi) <u>Reuse as fill material</u> The phrase “the treated material could either be disposed of off-site or used as fill material” should be amended to read as “the treated material should be reused as fill material for reclamation as far as possible” in the following sections: Section 5.5.3.62 Section 5.5.3.72 Section 5.5.3.92 Section 5.7.1.1 Section 5.7.1.31 Section 5.7.1.38</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sediment Treatment & Waste Management (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>vii) <u>Section 5.7.1.7</u> The last sentence should be amended to read as “The treated materials after ex-situ treatment should be reused as fill material as far as possible unless they are environmentally unacceptable or geotechnically not feasible to be reused for the reclamation. Mixing of the treated materials with suitable material (e.g. the imported public fill) should be considered, if necessary, in order to enhance their geotechnical acceptability to be reused as fill material for the reclamation.”</p>	<p>Noted. The geotechnical suitability will require confirmation from site trial results.</p>
	<p>viii) <u>Section 5.9.1.8</u> The second sentence should be amended to read as “The preferred approach is to first backfill the reclamation and to apply in-situ treatment to the potential hotspots with high methane potential after the reclamation. Concurrently, methane gas monitoring would be carried out to cover the treated hotspots and the remaining reclaimed areas without treatment.”</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>ix) <u>Section 8.3.2.5</u> Only those sites within the Assessment Area of the Revised Scheme of SEKD, which are not included in the NAKTA decommissioning project, should be shown on Drawing No. 22936/EN/296.</p>	<p>Noted and the drawing will be revised accordingly.</p>
	<p><u>EM&A manual</u> i) <u>Chapter 5</u> It should be mentioned in this chapter for the recommended environmental mitigation measures for the sediment treatment is presented in Appendix A of the EM&A Manual and the provision therein would be properly enforced.</p>	<p>Noted and reference to Appendix A will be added.</p>
	<p>ii) <u>Section 5.1.1</u> The term “fully dredged reclamation” in the section should be amended to read as “dredge for ex-situ treatment reclamation”.</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended.</p>
	<p>iii) <u>Sections 5.2.3 and 5.6</u> The conditions which monitoring of biogas in buildings will be required should be clearly stated.</p>	<p>Noted and the required conditions will be stated.</p>
	<p>iv) <u>Section 5.3.1 and 5.3.2</u> According to the EIA report, the recommended number of boreholes for KTAC is “10” instead of “16”.</p>	<p>Correction will be made.</p>
	<p>v) <u>Sections 5.8.2.4, 5.8.2.9, 5.8.3.5 and 5.8.3.10</u> The value of the maximum safe rate of gas emission (i.e. 10L/m²/d) should be indicated.</p>	<p>Noted and will be indicated.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sediment Treatment & Waste Management (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>vi) <u>Sections 5.8.2.5, 5.8.2.10, 5.8.3.6 and 5.8.3.11</u> The protection measures, which may pose constraints on the future developments on the reclamation and are not stated in the EIA report, should not be included. Whereas, the passive barriers and passive ventilation system is recommended in Section 3.5.3.33 of the EIA report should be included.</p>	<p>Noted and amendment will be made accordingly.</p>
	<p>vii) <u>Appendix A</u> It should be noted that this implementation schedule is prepared by the consultants based on the previous outdated version of the EIA report. Our previous comments given on the implementation schedule have not been incorporated into the schedule and are repeated here.</p>	<p>The implementation schedule will be updated accordingly.</p>
	<p><u>EIA Ref. S7.4.1 and EM&A Ref. S6</u> <u>Construction Phase Waste Management</u></p>	
	<p>a) <u>General</u> The term “construction waste” in the 1st and 2nd bullet points of the 3rd paragraph should be replaced with a more appropriate term, i.e. “inert construction and demolition material”.</p>	<p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p>
	<p>b) <u>Construction and Demolition (C&D) Material</u> “Construction and demolition waste (C&D waste)” throughout the 2nd paragraph should be amended to read as “construction and demolition material (C&D material)”.</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>c) <u>Waste handling and disposal</u> A trip-ticket system should also be implemented for the proper disposal of the C&D materials at the public filling areas and landfills.</p>	<p>Noted and the measure will be added.</p>
	<p><u>EIA Ref. S5.6 and EM&A Ref. S5</u> <u>Mitigation Measures for Different Reclamation Options</u></p>	
	<p>d) <u>Pilot tests</u> The pilot tests for in-situ and ex-situ treatments of the sediment as stated in the EIA report should be mentioned.</p>	<p>Noted and will be mentioned.</p>
	<p>e) <u>Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)</u> <u>Reclamation options</u> The hierarchy of preference for the reclamation options should be stated.</p>	<p>Noted and will be stated.</p>
	<p>f) <u>No dredged reclamation option – In-situ treatment</u> The recommended criteria for determining whether protection measures are required for the developments on the reclamation should be provided.</p>	<p>Noted and will be provided.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sediment Treatment & Waste Management (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>g) <u>Fully dredged reclamation option</u> The updated term “dredge for ex-situ treatment reclamation” should be used.</p> <p>In the 4th bullet point, the second sentence should be amended to read as “The treated material should be reused as fill material as far as possible.”</p> <p>The 5th bullet point, which is contrary to the present policy of leaving sediment in-situ as far as possible, should be deleted.</p>	<p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be deleted.</p>
	<p>h) <u>Fall back option</u> In the 3rd bullet point, protection measures should also be provided in areas where the maximum safe rate of gas emission is occasionally exceeded and with an increasing trend of the methane flow rate.</p> <p>In the 4th bullet point, the conditions which other protection measures such as the air tight sockets for electricity supply system will be required should be indicated.</p>	<p>Noted and text will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and text will be revised to indicate.</p>
	<p>(A) <u>Draft EIA Executive Summary</u> i) <u>Section 6.1.6</u> “Treatment of sediments is recommended to reduce risk of biogas emission.” Should be inserted after the first sentence.</p>	<p>Noted and will be inserted.</p>
	<p>The last sentence should be amended to read as “The no-dredge reclamation is most preferable and provision of gas protection measures for development serves as a fallback option in case the trial results of both in-situ and ex-situ treatment are unfavourable.”</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>
	<p>ii) <u>Section 6.1.7</u> The second sentence should be amended to read as “The preferred approach is to first backfill the reclamation and to apply in-situ treatment to the potential hotspots with high methane potential after the reclamation. Concurrently, methane gas monitoring would be carried out to cover the treated hotspots and the remaining reclaimed areas without treatment and to determine the existence of any additional hotspots in the reclaimed land that require treatment.”</p>	<p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Sewerage The EIA Report documents, in their present state, have NOT met the requirements in Clauses 3.5.4.2 (i) and (iii) of the EIA Study Brief, which state that</p> <p>“investigate and review the adequacy of the existing sewerage and treatment facilities for absorbing part of all of the sewage discharge from the proposed development:, and “the Applicant shall propose an optimal and cost-effective upgrading works to improve the existing or planned sewerage and sewage treatment facilities to receive and transport the sewage A contingency plan should be included to allow for the possible delay in implementing the planned sewerage and sewage treatment works.”</p>	<p>We do not agree with the statement. This EIA has investigated and reported on the adequacy of the existing sewerage and treatment facilities. It is the same information which was included in the EIU Report which was previously accepted by EPD. It has included impact on SSDS Stage I, Preliminary Treatment Works at To Kwa Wan and Kwun Tong and the existing sewerage system.</p> <p>For SSDS “The substantial rise in population projected for East Kowloon could result in capacity constraints in the SSDS system if development reaches TPEDM Scenario II levels beyond 2011 and peak flows coincide at all contributing catchments.”</p> <p>For To Kwa Wan PTW “Because flow to To Kwa Wan PTW comes from several major pumping stations plus a local catchment gravity flow, the peak flow arriving at the PTW is greater than if the total flow was from a single catchment (Based on DSD Sewerage Design Manual Peaking Factors). The Result of this flow capacity of the PTW is exceeded by 2016. To obtain a more realistic assessment of peak flows arriving at the PTW, a calibrated dynamic model would need to be carried out.”</p> <p>For Kwun Tong PTW “Depending on which PWWF projections are adopted, there may be a potential capacity constraint at Kwun Tong PTW by the year 2016.”</p> <p>For the existing trunk Sewerage System, we suggest the following: “The proposed option for conveying sewage from the early development areas allows NAKTA flows together with diverted sewage from the existing hinterland to be pumped directly to the To Kwa Wan PTW via a new rising main and therefore will not create an impact on the existing system. It is proposed that the rising main be constructed and commissioned as soon as possible. To cater for the first population intake of the SEKD early development areas, the sewer will flow to the sewerage system along Prince Edward Road which has been checked for spare capacity.”</p> <p>We have also proposed upgrading works to the appropriate level of details for the feasibility study.</p> <p>“The potential lack of capacity is a regional planning issue rather than a SEKD problem, nevertheless possible solutions include:</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overall telemetry system with real time control to utilise storage in the sewerage system. • Variable speed drives for pumping stations to allow pumping rates similar to inflow. • Balancing tasks at either the PTW or at pumping stations.” <p>“Planning includes for an area of land at the treatment plant to make allowance for holding tanks. The purpose of the holding tanks would be to store the difference between PTW discharge and SSDS capacity. The same holding tanks could be placed upstream of the PTW so that the excess inflow to the works rather than discharge from the works was stored. This has the same impact on flows but also allows the PTW to operate without further upgrade. Determination of the volume of holding tanks requires a detailed analysis of the entire SSDS Stage I system based on a comprehensive review of long term gauging information.”</p> <p>To allow for the possible delay in implementing the planned sewerage system, a contingency plan was developed to allow temporary connection to the existing system.</p> <p>“However, to provide additional flexibility and security for the early development area, it is proposed that a temporary sewerage connection be provided from PS1 into the existing hinterland” sewerage system (via. The DN1650 Prince Edward Road trunk sewer). The full flow capacity of this existing sewer has been assessed to be 2.06 m³/s. The projected hinterland flows (excluding SEKD flows) into this trunk sewer would be approximately 0.38 m³/s by year 2006. The peak flows to be discharged from the early development area within the SEKD, into this existing trunk sewer is approximately 0.82 m³/s. Therefore, this trunk sewer would have sufficient spare capacity to accept flows from the early development area, on a temporary basis, in the event that the downstream rising main from Pumping Station No. 4 could not be constructed in time to meet the population intake. In this regard, we have also liaised extensively with the consultant for the Review of Central and East Kowloon SMP (RCEKSMP) on this matter. The RCEKSMP consultant has modelled the existing hinterland’s sewerage system has confirmed the assessment made under this Study that the existing DN1650 sewer could accept the early development flows up to year 2006/2007. Additional hinterland flows to be diverted to PS 1 of approximately 1.2 m³/s are unlikely to occur before 2011 and therefore will not have any impact on the temporary connection.”</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Based on the consultants' assessment in the EIA Report, the consultants have identified that the Kwun Tong PTW and the HATS Stage I system at Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan will be inadequate within the planning horizon (2004-2018) of the SEKD. It is not acceptable that neither contingency for re-programming some of the SEKD projects affected by the identified sewerage capacity shortfalls nor upgrading works to improve the sewerage and sewage treatment facilities were stated to be included in the SEKD projects. The position stated in TDD's memo ref. (21) in KD 2.18/4 pt. 7 dated 18.5.2001 should be included in this Report. Please also refer to paragraph no. 7 below.</p> <p>As we have pointed out in EPD's letters of 17.4.2001 and 21.5.2001 and in the ESMG meeting of 18.4.2001, the unusually high pumped sewage flows from SEKD will pose additional capacity problems on the HATS systems and the two PTWs. The unusual high pumped sewage flows are due to the consultants' use of a higher peaking factor (generally around 4.5) in their design of the sewage pumping stations in SEKD. This peaking factor is higher than the recommended factor (below 3) in DSD's Sewerage Manual. This has also been pointed out in Hyder's letter of 26 April 2001 copied to the consultants of SEKD. Justification for the use of a higher peaking factor and the design calculations for each pumping station in SEKD are still outstanding. It is not acceptable that the consultants have not proposed corresponding upgrading works or new sewerage and sewage treatment facilities to cater for these unusually high pumped flows from SEKD, although these pumped flows could be reduced considerably by using appropriate design peaking factors and by incorporating adequate buffers in the pumping stations of SEKD.</p>	<p>Comments have previously been received from EPD suggesting that because there may be a shortfall in PTW capacity in the long term (2011-2016) we should recommend limiting certain developments within SEKD as a contingency plan. As consultants we are not in a position to recommend limiting development because of a possible need to expand government overall facilities in 10-15 years time.</p> <p>Further we believe this aspect of the brief is being taken out of context. We believe that "possible delay in implementing the planned sewerage and sewage treatment works" refers to short term or even medium term where time to plan and implement facilities is a major issue. Planning holding tanks or PTW expansion for 10-15 years time is outside this category.</p> <p>An additional paragraph will be added to Clause 6.4.6.3 as follows:</p> <p>"Possible extension facilities to the To Kwa Wan and Kwun Tong PTW's as described in section 6.4.3 and 6.4.4 will be included in the SEKD projects. Implementation of such facilities is contingent upon the findings of the HATS study to be completed in 2003."</p> <p>The comments are misleading. Firstly, the peaking factors used have been taken directly from the DSD Sewerage Manual. Details are as follow: The design peaking factor for sewers including stormwater allowance is given by</p> $P_{(sewers)} = 7.3 / N^{0.165}$ <p>Where N is the population equivalent in thousands, and this will be used for sizing both the sewer pipelines and pumping stations, as well as preliminary treatment.</p> <p>The design peaking factor for treatment works including stormwater allowance is given by</p> $P_{(STW)} = 3.9 / N^{0.075}$

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>		<p>Where N is the population equivalent in thousands. Reference will be made to this formula for the assessment of design capacity requirements for primary and secondary treatment.</p> <p>Table 3 of the Sewerage Manual is used as a guide to peaking factors for lower populations.</p> <p>In general, all flows collected by sewers should receive preliminary treatment and be conveyed to the preliminary treatment works without excessive surcharging/overflow. Hence the peaking factors for sewers [$P_{(sewers)} = 7.3 / N^{0.165}$] are applied for peak flow to pumping stations and preliminary treatment. As for flow to further (primary or secondary) treatment, any new units would be sized hydraulically to accept as a minimum the flow derived from the peaking factor for STWs [$P_{(STW)} = 3.9 / N^{0.075}$].</p> <p>For the range of flows applicable to this study, the ratio of the peaking factor for sewers/ preliminary treatment to the peaking factor for further treatment varies from 1.1-1.3 depending upon the size of the catchment. Downstream of preliminary treatment, further treatment units such as primary sedimentation tanks or aeration tanks provide further attenuation of peak flows, and the excess flows can be processed in three ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) passed through the treatment units, provided that connecting pipework/channels are sized accordingly; (2) diverted to storm tanks, from which the flows would be reintroduced into the main treatment stream once the storm peak flow period is over; (3) bypass further treatment and discharge together with treated flows to the outfall or a combination of these. <p>This approach has been used for sewerage master plans carried out for and accepted by EPD in the past. We do not believe SEKD warrants any different consideration.</p> <p>Secondly the letter from Hyder on 26th April, which has been copied to EPD amongst others, states the following:</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>In the consultants' responses of 11.5.2001 to EPD's comments of 17.4.2001, the consultants of SEKD agreed to provide outstanding information in this EIA submission. This outstanding information is required to justify the figures and findings presented in the EIA Report and the EIA Executive Summary. In EPD's letter ref. EP2/K19/S3/10 of 31.5.2001, we also reminded the consultants to provide accordingly. However, a lot of this information is still outstanding in the this EIA submission. It is not acceptable that this outstanding information is still not available for comments for the timely completion of the EIA process. The following is a summary of crucial outstanding information that the consultants agreed to submit in their responses to comments in the consultants' letter ref. 22936/3.20/YWY/JC/1480 dated 11.5.2001. All outstanding information should be included in the EIA Report for completeness.</p> <p>Item Ref. (as in the consultants' letter of 11.5.01) Outstanding information 1 (a) Developments categorised into sewerage sub-catchments A to I,</p>	<p><i>"HCL tabled an assessment of the impacts of the large pumping stations in the catchment on the flows arriving at To Kwa Wan PTW (copy attached). MW advised that the DSD peaking factors for sewers had been adopted for the design of the SEKD pumping stations. It was noted that both studies had involved static hydraulic assessments of the sewerage systems. It was further acknowledged that dynamic modelling would need to be carried out at a later stage to enable a more "realistic" assessment of the likely flows to the PTWs to be made. It was noted that this further assessment would involve analysis of detailed aspects of the system, such as pump control systems, and, therefore, would be most appropriate at the detailed design stage.</i></p> <p>This statement is consistent with our first point above. It does not point out that "the peaking factor is higher than the recommended factor in DSD's Sewerage Manual".</p> <p>The hydraulic calculations for the sewers and pump stations will be sent to EPD separately but to further explain the peaking factors of the proposed sewerage system and remove any further misunderstanding we have prepared and enclose a schematic diagram for the SEKD system in To Kwa Wan Catchment.</p> <p>Please see our response below.</p> <p>In EPD's letter of 17th April it requested "development parameters of different areas of SEKD and their development programs". We responded in our letter of 11th May stating "Development Parameters and Program will be included in the Appendix in the Final Report." This is exactly what we provided in Appendix 6A.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>(b) Hydraulic calculations for the sewerage (including pumping stations) in different catchment areas of the SEKD.</p> <p>3. Amended table to show the projected residential population figures and their breakdown information for sub-catchments A to I at different design years 2006, 2011 and 2016.</p> <p>5. Breakdown of commercial flows into sub-catchments A to I.</p> <p>6. (a) Flow figures (and their calculations and relevant information) for 2006, 20011 and 2016 in Table 6.4 and 6.6., (b) Reference for the figures quoted under all the columns for "2011 (Stage I)".</p> <p>7. Re-arrangement of relevant information under a same section.</p> <p>9(a) Background calculations for the figures in Table 6.5, (b) Peak pumped flows have not been taken into consideration in this Table and Tables 6.9 and 6.10.</p> <p>14. Information to substantiate that the measured instantaneous peak flows at the PTWs during the "current summer" did "not exceed 1.656xADWF".</p> <p>16(c) Backup calculations for the figures in the Tables.</p> <p>23(a) Hydraulic calculations for the proposed sewerage system and for assessing the impact of the additional sewage from SEKD on the existing sewerage system.</p>	<p>There has always been sufficient information in the report to easily ascertain which development areas were within catchment A to I. However, as EPD now want this tabulated we will add one column to the table in Appendix 6A devoting which sewerage sub-catchment each development belongs to. A revised Appendix 6A is attached.</p> <p>Hydraulic calculations were previously provided in January this year. Since that time there has been numerous changes in population and layout. However, the overall design framework is basically unchanged. The latest hydraulic calculations have now been completed and will be submitted shortly.</p> <p>The base information has been provided in Appendix 6A. As stated in our letter of 11th May we will amend Table 6.2 to include intermediate years of 2006, 2011. It is not our intention to repeat the information of Appendix 6A by breaking the table down to sub-catchment level. The intent of the table is to show residential population at PTW catchment level. Revised Table 6.2 will be submitted shortly.</p> <p>This information is already included in Appendix 6A.</p> <p>The revised Tables with references will be provided shortly.</p> <p>The subheading numbering will be rearranged.</p> <p>Background calculations will be provided shortly. The table presents average flows, not peak flows and therefore peak pumped flows have not been presented. Peak pumped flows have been taken into consideration in the text clause 6.4.3.3 following Table 6.9.</p> <p>Daily data was provided by DSD ST2 Division under the SSDS project. A graph of this data will be included.</p> <p>Backup calculations will be provided separately.</p> <p>The hydraulic calculations for the latest layout and population will be provided shortly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>27(b) (c) Hydraulic calculation for sewerage and sewage pumping station(s) I each sub-catchment included in section 6.8.</p> <p>31 Flows for catchment I.</p> <p>32(b) the sites for HATS shafts and facilities at Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan yet to be shown and excluded from the areas available for PTW extensions.</p> <p>32(c) The showing of the rising mains in the To Kwa Wan hinterland area on drawing no. 22936/SW/010</p> <p>32(d) the elimination of utilities and rising mains between the existing TKWPTW and its future extension area.</p> <p>The SEKD projects would span from year 2004 – 2018. The consultants have demonstrated that the original design philosophy of HATS system cannot be achieved and the capacities of HATS Stage I system at Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan are inadequate in paragraphs 6.4.2.13 – 6.4.2.17 of the EIA Report. The statement in the 4th – 5th lines of paragraph no. 6.4.2.18 is not true. Sewage flows from SEKD have contributed to the capacity shortfall in the sewage treatment and disposal facilities. The consultants have avoided the responsibility of proving that the proposed SEKD projects are acceptable and environmentally sustainable with respect to sewage infrastructure planning. With this consultants' statement, the feasibility of SEKD projects with respect to sewage infrastructure has yet to be demonstrated. It is also not acceptable that Executive Summary does not highlight the potential shortfalls in the HATS Stage I system.</p> <p>As agreed in the ESMG meeting of 18.4.2001, the consultants should include in the EIA Report a table showing site specific, year-by-year population intake to show which sites and at what time those site might have sewerage capacity problems. Although a list of sites is enclosed in Appendix 6A of the EIA Report, there is no indication on which sub-catchments these sites are in and which sites would be affected by the identified potential HATS and KTPTW shortfalls. The Applicant should therefore include in the EIA Report and the Executive Summary at table of affected SEKD sites.</p>	<p>The hydraulic calculation for the latest layout and population are attached. Please note the latest changes to population/layout have resulted in some changes to sizes/gradients of sewers. Drawings are currently being updated and will be available shortly.</p> <p>Flow calculations will be included in updated Appendix 6A.</p> <p>Drawings are being amended and will be available shortly.</p> <p>Drawings are being amended and will be available shortly.</p> <p>Utilities have already been diverted away from the area between the existing TKWPTW and the future expansion area to Road L8.</p> <p>Clause 6.4.2.18 will be amended. The last sentence will read "If Drawings are being amended and will be available shortly, measures can be taken to alleviate the constraints through provision of additional facilities at Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan PTW's on land already allocated for the purpose, specifically the additional facilities would consist of holding tanks. Determination of the volume of holding tanks requires the detailed analysis of SSDS stage 1 based on a comprehensive review of long term gauging information."</p> <p>An additional sentence to be added -"Subject to the above studies and provision of the additional facilities at the PTW sites if demonstrated to be required by those studies, SEKD is environmentally sustainable with respect to sewerage infrastructure planning.</p> <p>As discussed earlier Appendix 6A will be amended to include the sub-catchment for each development site.</p> <p>Potential shortfalls in capacity of PTW's and HATS needs further investigation and planning. It is a regional issue which cannot be solved by SEKD. As consultant, we are not in a position to propose limiting development. However we point out that any potential shortfall will not occur until beyond 2011. This should be sufficient time to plan and implement augmentation of PTW facilities.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Sewerage (17) in Ax(1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 26 June 2001</p>	<p>6.4.2.5 & 6.4.6.1 As commented previously, there is no such breakdown of populations stated in SSDS Stage I Report. The conclusion that “projected flows from the SEKD, as presently envisaged, essentially are the same as those which have been allowed for in the design of SSDS Stage I” is considered unacceptable with any substantiation.</p> <p>6.4.2.7 EPD is currently undertaking a flow reassessment for SSDS Stage I, not the assessment of tunnel capacities, which have been well defined.</p> <p>6.4.2.9 The last sentence is not complete.</p> <p>6.4.2.12 – 16 No change in the original design philosophy of SSDS is acceptable.</p> <p>6.4.2.18 & 6.4.6.3 the sewage flows from the proposed SEKD will contribute to the potential capacity problems in the sewage treatment and disposal systems. The conclusion in the 1st sentence</p> <p>6.9.1.2 As agreed in the meeting between the consultants of RCEKSMP and the SEKD sewerage sub-consultant on 24.4.2001, SEKD sewerage sub-consultant had adopted DSD peaking factors in the Sewerage Manual for the design of the SEKD pumping stations. Paragraph 3.2 of the minutes of meeting in Hyder’s letter ref. EA00565-10/WAT2001-20728 dated 26.4.2001 refers. However, higher peaking factors for pumping stations have still been adopted in this EIA Report without substation. Peak pumped sewage flows from the pumping stations in SEKD designed based on the DSD Sewerage Manual should be included in the EIA Report.</p> <p>Drg No. 22936/SW/010 – It is not acceptable that the area reserved for the PTW extension at To Kwa Wan has been reduced by the relocation of the sewage pumping station no. 6 to this reserved site.</p>	<p>The spreadsheet calculations for SSDS Stage 1 design will be provided shortly.</p> <p>The text will be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>This in fact is a subheading – a formatting error has occurred and will be corrected.</p> <p>We have not proposed a change in the original design philosophy of SSDS.</p> <p>The last sentence will be deleted.</p> <p>Please refer to earlier comments above. The peaking factors used are from DSD Sewerage Design Manual. A schematic plan is attached to demonstrate the flows and peaking factors.</p> <p>The area allowed for the extension of TKWPTW is in fact more than the provision made in the earlier study.</p>
<p>Housing Department () in HD (PM) 55/945/1 26 June 2001</p>	<p>EIA Report - Vol 1 Page 3-10 under Section 3.5.1.1 The updated flat no. of site 1D should be 4,656. For the public housing sites on the Runway, the plot ratio shown on the table is higher than (by PR1) the PR shown on the drawing. The consultant should clarify.</p>	<p>Text and PR will be amended.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Housing Department () in HD (PM) 55/945/1 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Page 3-21 under Section 3.7.3.14 The proposed noise barrier along Road D1 are on top of the railway reserve of the proposed Shatin to Central Link (SCL). The EIA Report recommends to review the proposed noise mitigation measures at the detailed design stage of Road D1, and a detailed EIA study will be carried out for Road D1. I understand that different forms of at source noise mitigation measures can be introduced. However, any future design should achieve an equivalent attenuation effect such that no additional on-site treatment at the HKHA site is required.</p> <p>Page 3-43 (Section of Local Roads Mitigation Measures) and EMAM – Page A24 As shown in your layout plan 22936/TP/105, barrier L1-2 should be 5m high instead of 3m. Please amend the dimension stated in the table.</p> <p>Page 3-46 and 47 Table 3.19 (Site 1D & 5J) According to the layout plan 22936/TP/104, the setback from D1 is only 10m instead of 13.5m. Please amend.</p> <p>Drawing 22936/104, 115 and 121 We would like to make it clear that the mitigation measures such as setback distance and podium height are only effective in associated with the block position and block type on the conceptual layout. In the detail design stage, HD might change the layout design, setback distance and podium height but we would still try to retain the 100% compliance rate.</p> <p>Page 3-52 under Section 3.8 Mitigation measures for structural vibration due to running of SCL train should be recommended.</p> <p>Page 3-60 under Section 3.10.13, Table 3.29 Sites 1C and 1D are also NSRs affected by the Stadium</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The dimension will be amended as 5m.</p> <p>Setback will be amended to 10m.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There have been a number of possible solutions to reduce vibration for the trains running inside the development lot with buildings directly above the tracks (e.g. Admiralty). For SEKD, the situation is much better as the tracks run generally under the road and open space, which is similar to the bulk of other sites in Hong Kong, where no special mitigation measure will be required. This will be further confirmed by the future project proponent of Shatin to Central Link.</p> <p>The table is intended for predicting SWL for worst-case. Since NSRs at sites 1C and 1D are further away, the worst-case SWL is enough to protect 1C and 1D. Furthermore, 1C and 1D NSRs have been specified in Sec 3.10.13.18 as constraints for the stadium.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Housing Department () in HD (PM) 55/945/1 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Page 3-53 under Section 3.9.3.4 (first bullet) The shuttle system will not be in place before 2008 at the earliest. The current conceptual layout is likely to have changed by this time and environmental mitigation measures for the shuttle system should therefore be proposed with regard to the latest layout.</p> <p>Page 6-2 under Section 6.3.1 The flat and population estimates for public housing are outdated. Environmental consultant may wish to refer to the revised development schedule which is currently under preparation by Arup's planning consultant</p> <p>Drawing Layout Plan 22936/TP/104 & 121 The setback requirement should be deleted since the setback could only be effective in associated with the overall layout and the building design and could not be universally applicable in isolation.</p> <p>Drawing 22936/SW/026C Sewage line L8 should be extended towards the southeast to facilitate future connection from site 4B.</p> <p>Drawing 22936/IM/011A Road D2 should be constructed to its junction with the temporary Road D1.</p> <p>EM&A Page 1-2 under Section 1.2.2 The public housing sites in NAKTA will be completed when the construction works by TDD are still in progress.. As such, the public housing sites in Areas 1 should also be included as a NSR.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. The EIA study to be carried out for the shuttle system should take into account the latest layout at the time of the study.</p> <p>Flat and population estimates will be updated through consultation with HD and Arup's planning consultant.</p> <p>Noted. The setbacks specified are site constraints for the conceptual layout plan used in this EIA report for assessment. If the future developer is going to change the layout, he should achieve equivalent and better environmental performance (in this case is 100%) as stated in Sec 3.7.9.8.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The intention is to facilitate the construction of Shatin to Central Link. This will be subject to the confirmation of the project proponent of Shatin to Central Link in the detailed design. In the long term, full linkage between 2 roads will be provided.</p> <p>Noted and will be added.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Housing Department () in HD (PM) 55/945/1 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Page 2-3 under Section 2.2.5.1 Page 3-1 under Section 3.1.3 The development programme proposes that the HKHA development (especially for site 1a) will be the first intake development within the SE Kowloon Development area. It is anticipated from the construction programme that there would be some other on-going infrastructure works still under construction by Yr 2005. There is no information on any potential impact arising from different phasing of construction works. Please advise whether there is any potential impact at the HKHA site. Please confirmed whether the potential impact can be mitigated by standard mitigation measures, such as adopting good site practice, periodic watering, use of quiet plant and working method, using temporary barrier or reducing number of plant, etc.</p> <p>If there is any potential impact on the HKHA site during construction phase of the SE Kowloon development, it is recommended to include a monitoring location at the HKHA site and such requirement should be explicitly stated in the EM&A manual.</p> <p>Page A22 – 24 (Sites 1A, 1B) Please include the low noise surface along PERE as one of the measures.</p> <p>Page a24 (Site 1C) Barrier L2-1 would be required to protect Site 1C from L2 but not PER.</p>	<p>Worst affected NSRs close to construction activities had been assessed. They were found complied with noise standards after implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Monitoring stations will be selected by the EMT in agreement with ET, ENPO/EAT and EPD with reference to concurrent site conditions e.g. occupancy and distance to construction activities, etc.</p> <p>A line for “low noise surfacing at PER” will be added as requested for sites 1A and 1B.</p> <p>Text will be amended.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>Executive Summary s. 1.2.3 Implies schedule 2 DPs with sufficient design details in this study can apply for Environmental Permits prior to construction. This statement is inconsistent with the ????. Suggest that any condition of approval clearly state that no Schedule 2 DPs will be allowed to apply for EP unless EIAs undertaken separately., <i>as per my understanding</i></p> <p>s. 1.3.1 1st bullet; how will the stepped building height concept be enforced? Full details of the who, what, when, why to what standard are required to be covered in the full EIA to demonstrate the effective means to translate words into actions i.e. the Implementation Schedule should clearly identify the commitments given by the relevant concerned authorities to such a concept e.g. LD, etc.</p> <p>3rd bullet, as per above how will the state of the art recycling and energy efficient facilities be implemented. Similar documentation of the commitments of concerned parties to these initiatives is required to be included in the EIA full report and Implementation Schedule. Also, how will the urban open space contribute to HK's bio-diversity. Elaboration is required in the full EIA study report.</p> <p>4th bullet, ditto above the how of the rail-based transport usage, pedestrian and cycle movement "wish list" needs to be substantiated in the full EIA study report.</p> <p>5th bullet, the extent of surface road space will be reduced from "what to what"? What are the standards for urban road space against which this statement is made?</p>	<p>Noted and S.1.2.3 of the EIA Executive Summary will be revised to be consistent with S.1.5.4 of the EIA Report as follow: "The EIA Report satisfies the EIA Study Brief for the Schedule 3 Designated Projects. Depending on the design details of specific items that are established in this study, the environmental impacts of some of the items that fall within Schedule 2 DPs of the EIAO are assessed in this EIA study. Prior to the application of the Environmental Permit for the construction and operation of any of these Schedule 2 DPs, a detailed EIA should be undertaken with reference to the EIA Report for those assessed impacts. The environmental impacts should be reviewed for any material change defined under the EIAO during the design stage of the project. Other Schedule 2 DPs, of which the environmental impacts largely depend on the detailed design, should be fully assessed in further detailed EIA studies to be carried out at a later stage."</p> <p>The stepped building height concept will be implemented by enforcing planning requirements including building height restriction developed in this study.</p> <p>As the title of Section 1.3 "Planning Theme" suggests, the initiatives are explored in this study for the consideration by the Government. We note that separate studies would be carried out or is carrying out by Government departments on some of the initiatives. In addition, environmental friendly initiatives, such as Automated Refuse Collection System, is being considered by PlanD, Building Department and Lands Department to encourage the use in private development.</p> <p>This is a planning concept incorporated into the Outline Master Development Plan. Rail based transport is facilitated by the choice of the heavy rail routing (together with the environmental friendly shuttle system) and the location of population centres.</p> <p>Noted and the bullet point will be revised to read: "..... the extent of surface road space will be reduced to 23% of the development area (compared to over 30% in typical urban area), minimising"</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 2.1.9 is conspicuous by the absence of any Govt initiative to take forward the Automated Refuse Collection System, when compared with the EMSD approach to the WACS.</p> <p>S. 6.1.8 How will the sediment plume dispersion be controlled easily in the KTAC reclamation if dredging for ex-situ treatment is carried out?</p> <p>s.10.2.2 the meaning of the text is unclear.</p> <p>s. 10.2.7 the meaning of the text is not clear.</p> <p>s. 10.4.1 the treatment of the DG Godown is demonstrably less robust than that of the Chlorine Unloading point</p> <p><u>Volume 1</u> General</p> <p>1. It is considered prudent to include a summary, possibly as an annex of the public consultation and discussions related to the preparation of the revised Outline Concept Plan. (ref s. 4.5.1 (c), annex 20 s. 1.11</p> <p>2. There is no programme for the SEKD. (ref annex 20 s. 2.3 of the EIAO TM).</p>	<p>As the text of S.2.1.9 suggests, this study has explored the initiative of ARCS for SEKD for the consideration by Government.</p> <p>The second sentence of S.6.1.8 will be revised to read: “Sediment plume dispersion could be easily controlled in the KTAC reclamation if dredging for <i>ex-situ</i> treatment is to be carried out by sucking dredging.”</p> <p>S.10.2.2 will be rewritten to read: “The proposed location of the relocated DGVFP would be more than 100m from nearby high rise residential buildings. The route to the relocated DGVFP would follow the same road to the existing DGVFP and then an additional 0.7km on a new waterfront road through the Hoi Bun Road Extension, with limited population adjacent to this road. This route is consider optimal for the proposed location.”</p> <p>S.10.2.7 will be rewritten to read: “The FN curves for the additional transport route from the existing DGVFP to the relocated DGVFP lie in the “ALARP” (As Low As Reasonably Practicable) region of the HK Risk Guidelines for both LPG and total risk. Therefore the risk must be demonstrated to be ALARP in order to be considered acceptable.”</p> <p>S.10.3 will be revised to “Chlorine Unloading Point and DG Godown” and S.10.4.1 will be renumbered as S.10.3.3.</p> <p>A summary relating to the Outline Concept Plan will be prepared for inclusion in the report.</p> <p>A development program is included in Table 3.8 and could be copied under S.1.2 for easy reference.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>3. All study recommendations for further studies, pilot tests/studies (bench scale and field trials), detailed EIA study of Schedule 2 Designated Projects, follow-ups, etc should be included in the Implementation Schedule in the EM&A Manual as a matter of course e.g. ref roads & other facilities identified in table 1.1 & table A3.2.8 of the EIA Volume II; HK & China Gas Works motor replacements (2.4.2.8), Hospital site @ area 5L & need for air quality assessment (2.4.2.11); potential height restriction @ ASR 8 (2.4.2.15), establish Centralised Dewatering Facility (2.4.2.19), odour field trials for maintenance of drainage channels (2.5.2.7), review of proposed roadside noise barriers to D1 @ EIA study for Schedule 2 DP (3.7.3.16), additional within site measures to mitigate noise levels for Sung Wong Toi Road NSRs.(3.7.7.5 <i>et seq</i>), developers to design site layouts with the recommendations of the EIA study report (3.7.9.7 <i>et seq</i>), Sha Tin to Central Link (3.8), Shuttle System (3.9), trolley bus (3.9.2), LRT (3.9.3), Stadium (3.10.13 <i>et seq</i>), RTS (3.10.18 <i>et seq</i>), <i>in-situ</i> 7 <i>ex-situ</i> trials (4.4.2.44), DCM trials (4.4.2.66), assessment of sewage treatment capacity/design for KTPTW & TKWPTW (4.4.3.1), flow dynamics of thermal plume related to Cooling Water Discharges (4.4.3.42), design of submarine outfall to avoid operational adverse water quality impacts (4.4.3.58), review of distance between the seawater intake point and the discharge point for the DCS (4.5.2.14), suitable control mechanisms at overflow weir (4.5.2.16) recommended methane gas protection measures to be incorporated in the design, tender, and construction stages of individual documents, lease documents, and specifications (5.5.3.34), foundation works requiring diaphragm walls or bored piles should be subject to special attention during detailed design (5.5.3.90), comprehensive and robust measures to be adopted to protect workers during in-situ and ex-situ treatment of contaminated sediments, asbestos containing materials site investigations and site surveys (7.4.1.8), CED's study on pilot for C&DM materials recycling facility @ Kai Tak (7.4.1.12), new RTS DP (7.4.2.13), ARCS institutional arrangements e.g. land requirements, cost splitting, funding private/public developments, regulatory requirements, incentives, etc.(7.5 <i>et seq</i>), GFS Hanger CAP review, MTK Gas Works mitigation measure implementation (9.3.6.8 <i>et seq</i>), site search for alternative location for DG ferry pier outside the study area (9.5.7.11), Chlorine Unloading Point relocation (9.6 <i>et seq</i>), DG Godown relocation (9.7 <i>et seq</i>), marine archaeological/geophysical surveys & site investigations (12.8.2 <i>et seq</i>), land archaeological site investigations (12.8.1 <i>et seq</i>), restriction of building height, mass, design design of engineering structures (13.9.2.9, 13.9.4.7, 13.9.4.10, <i>et seq</i>),</p> <p>The Implementation Schedule is not user friendly in cataloguing impact mitigation measures by sites and crude section references.</p>	<p>Noted and some of the recommendation and mitigation measures have already been included in the Implementation Schedule. We will review and revise the Implementation Schedule accordingly.</p> <p>A content page will be added to the Implementation Schedule for ease of reference.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 1.1.10 & 1.1.11 population figures vary from 250,000 to 270,000?</p> <p>s. 1.5.3 & 1.5.4 re the earlier comment on the ES, the report states that some Schedule 2 DPs are assessed in the current report, but will be subject to further detailed EIA study (See table 1.1)</p> <p>s. 2.3.2.3 are there envisaged to be any asbestos containing structures that need to be demolished? (ref s. 4.3.1 © (ii) (iii), 4.4.2 (d), (f), annex 20 s.5.5, 5.6 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 2.3.2.4 excludes reference to the stockpiling of materials that is ongoing in the environs of Kai Tak and is not known when such operations will cease. (ref s. 4.3.1 © (ii) (iii), 4.4.2 (d), (f), annex 20 s.5.5, 5.6 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 2.4.1.5 <i>et seq</i> the assessment & evaluation of odour impacts is considered less than robust. What consideration has been given to a 'what if scenario' that the odour impact is a significant problem. How close are sensitive receivers to the expected dredging operations? What previous experiences are available in HK to support the confidence expressed in the report? What examples/precedents of the effective mitigation of odour on the scale likely to be experienced from the dredging of KRAC, KTTS and Hoi Sham have been reviewed/considered by the consultants? E. g. reference to earlier West Kowloon Reclamation, Adrich Bay Reclamation, Shing Mun River clean-up (<i>biological treatment in-situ?</i>). (ref s. 4.4.2 (h)(k) annex 20 s. 6.2, 6.5, 6.6 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 2.4.2.19 where is the Centralised Dewatering Facility? How and when will it function, and be operated by whom? (ref s. 4.4.3 (i), (k), annex 20 s.5.2, 5.9, 5.10, 6.2, 6.5, of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 2.4.2.23 <i>et seq</i> the consideration of odour impact from open sections of the Kai Tak Nullah is less than robust.(ref annex 20 s. 6.6 of the EIAO TM)</p>	<p>Population figure in the new developed area, as given in S.1.2.2 will be amended to 250,000.</p> <p>Noted and please see our response to comment on S.1.2.3 of the EIA Executive Summary.</p> <p>The concern on Asbestos Containing Materials is discussed in S.7.4.1.8.</p> <p>The second bullet point of S.2.3.2.4 will be revised to read: "Wind erosion of open sites and stockpiling areas."</p> <p>With reference to Section 5 of the EIA Report, a comprehensive sediment sampling was carried out at KTAC, KTTS and Hoi Sham area as part of this study. The sediment samples were analysed for the total sulphide content and acid volatile sulphide (AVS) to determine the likelihood of hydrogen sulphide gas emission (see S.5.5.1.9 to S.5.5.1.11). More reference to Section 5 will be added to S.2.4.1.5 <i>et seq</i> for completeness.</p> <p>With reference to S.2.5.2.7, details on the maintenance of the box culvert will be further investigated and developed in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Water quality modelling was carried out to determine the DO content and thus the potential of hydrogen sulphide gas emission from the nullah (see S.4.4.3.25 <i>et seq</i>). Reference to Section 4 will be added.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 2.5.1.2 et seq the consideration of odour impact mitigation from reclamation activities is less than robust (ref annex 20 s. 6.6 of the EIAO TM).</p> <p>S.2.5.2.1 Does not address the matter of the proposed development of ASR 8 into a residential development and the potential need for height restriction on ASR 8 if no change in emission condition from Ma Tau Kok Gas Works.(re. 2.4.2.14)</p> <p>s. 2.5.2.2 et seq confirmation is required from the relevant authority (DSD) to the adoptions of the proposed impact mitigation measures, their field trials and ultimate implementation. (ref s. 4.4.2 (h), (i), (j), (k), 4.4.3 (a)(x), annex 20 s. 6.6, 6.7)</p> <p><i>Where is the potential risk to life due to biogas/methane emissions covered viz sediment removal?</i></p> <p>s. 2.4.1.8 & 4.3.4.14, table 4.10 the apparent contradiction between the identification of suction dredging in the former section (beneficial to air quality impact mitigation) and closed grab dredging in the latter section requires clarification. (ref 4.5.1 (b), annex 20 s. 1.5 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 4.4.2.24 scenarios 1, 2, & 3 are unclear and are required to be described in the context of the foregoing text s. 4.4.2.9?, 10?, 15? et seq, (ref annex 20 s. 1.5 of the EIAO TM).</p> <p>s. 4.4.2.34 no cumulative impact water quality assessment does not meet the requirements of the EIAO TM (ref s.4.3.3, 4.4.3 (ii), annex 11, annex 20 s. 5.6)</p> <p>s. 4.4.2.40 states that PAHs & PCBs were below detection limits, however table 4.32 appears to indicate levels of PAHs, PCBs and TBT to be greater than the assessment criteria. Clarification is required (ref annex 20 s. 1.5 of the EIAO TM).</p>	<p>More details are covered in Section 5 of the EIA Report. Additional reference to Section 5 will be added to S.2.5.1.2 et seq for completeness.</p> <p>With reference to a previous comment from EPD that ASR 8 is outside SEKD and the major source of air quality impact (i.e. Ma Tau Kok Gas Works) is also outside SEKD, the constraint on ASR8 should not be stated in this EIA Report.</p> <p>The requirements have been identified in the EIA Report for endorsement by relevant authorities through circulation of EIA report.</p> <p>The biogas issue was covered in Section 5 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>S.2.4.1.8 refers to the suction dredging of contamination sediment for <i>ex-situ</i> treatment. Whereas S.4.3.4.14 and Table 4.10 refer to the worst-case modelling scenarios for sediment plume modelling with the use of closed grab dredger for the dredging of uncontaminated sediment.</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 for sediment plume modelling were described in Section 4.3.4 and details were summarized in Table 4.10. The modelling results for these 3 scenarios and the additional mitigated scenarios were presented and discussed in detail in Section 4.4.2.19 to Section 4.4.2.44.</p> <p>The reason has been spelt out in S.4.4.2.34. Earlier EPD comment accepted that the cumulative impacts could be taken into account after this EIA Report but before the EP application for the reclamation work that is a Schedule 2 DP.</p> <p>The detection limits for PAHs and PCBs were the lowest values that could be measured during the laboratory analysis. The assessment criteria, which were used for comparison, represent the acceptable standards or limits for protection of aquatic environment. These two sets of limits are basically different.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 4.4.2.63 potential pore water impacts due to the consolidation process are suggested to be subject to suitable site arrangement and control facilities, retained within reclaimed land, etc. Few/if any details are provided of such arrangements apart from reliance on the DCM and site trials. (ref s. 4.4.2 (j), (k) annex 20 s. 6.5, 6.6, of the EIAO TM). There is no consideration of the 'what if scenario' viz what if the innovative techniques (for HK) do not work? This comment applies equally to all other proposed trials. (See General comment 3 above).</p> <p>It appears as though all water quality impact mitigation measures are reliant to some degree on 'dilute and discharge'/'discharge & dilute' principles. My understanding is that such approach is not preferred within EPD.</p> <p>s. 4.4.2.70 What are the suitable settling facilities for the removal of SS from extracted groundwater? (ref s. 4.4.2 (i), (k) and annex 20 s. 6.1, 6.5, 6.6 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 4.4.3.13 & 4.5.2.4 What are the negative impacts of increased current speed? increased erosion, marine safety impacts? (ref annex 20 s. 5.1, 5.6 of the EIAO TM)</p> <p>s. 4.4.3.17 water quality is predicted to be relatively poor in the new marina, what impact mitigation measures are identified for this impact consequential to the nullah diversion works redistributing pollutants from Kwun Tong area to Kowloon Bay? (ref s 4.3.1 (c) (v), (d) (i), (ii), (iii), 4.4.2 ((i), (j), (k), annex 20 s. 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, 6.1, 6.2, of the EIAO TM).</p> <p>s.4.4.3.39 potential water quality deterioration in the Tsui Ping Nullah, is proposed to be remedied by a control mechanism to prevent tidal flow from entering the nullah during flood tides. What are the control mechanisms? (ref s.4.3.1 (d) (i), (ii), (iii), 4.4.2 (i), (k), annex 20 s. 5.1, 5.5, 5.9, 5.10, 5.11, 6.2, 6.3, 6.5, 6.7 of the EIAO TM).</p> <p>s.4.5.1.3 it is inappropriate to refer to an earlier scheme of the SEKD to justify the current configuration's environmental performance of a smaller reclamation area.</p>	<p>Section 4.5.1.32 had provided mitigation measures to deal with release of excess pore water. Besides the DCM, the following methods were also proposed in Section 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-loading and installation of vertical drains; • Soil Mixing; • Vibroreplacement / vibrodisplacement; and • Lime columns. <p>Dilution in the receiving ambient water is achieved by the mixing between the discharged fluid and the ambient water. The interaction is dominated by the flow dynamics and is different from the method of introducing additional cleaner water into the contaminated water for discharge. Dilution as a means of meeting effluent discharge standard is not allowed.</p> <p>Sedimentation tank is normally used for removal of SS.</p> <p>The increase in current speed was predicted to be relatively small in magnitude. This is not likely to cause marine safety impacts and cause erosion.</p> <p>Impact mitigation measures were incorporated through the allocation of the nullah outlets away from the new marina to minimize water quality impacts. In addition, discharge of emergency overflow from the TKWPTW was extended about 150m from the shoreline to prevent the effluent plume from entering the new marina. These arrangements aimed to mitigation potential water quality to the new marina.</p> <p>The proposed control mechanism was recommended in Section 4.5.2.12.</p> <p>The mentioned earlier scheme of the SEKD was to give an indication only. All the potential water quality impacts were assessed using the revised reclamation scheme.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>4.5.1.10 how robust is the proposal to reduce dredging rates on the basis of the results of EM&A data for contaminants? How long will the testing of contaminants take before the results can be included in regular EM&A monthly reports? How long does it take for the testing and reporting procedures for contaminants including TBT, PAH, PCB, TKN, TP, <i>et al</i> ? How will the mitigation measures identified in s. 4.5.1.10 <i>et seq</i> be incorporated into contract documents and enforced thereunder?</p> <p>s. 4.5.1.18 it is considered imperative that a provisional programme for the proposed site trials, pilot tests is provided in the study report, and in addition, programme coverage of the “what if” fall back scenarios when site trials/pilot tests are unsuccessful.</p> <p>s. 4.5.1.31 How will the fill sand blanket be placed on top of undredged sediments to avoid the resuspension of sediment particles and the release of contaminated substances?</p> <p>s. 4.5.1.33 & 35, 5.5.3.55 details of the competence requirements of the competent persons are required for carrying out the ground improvement works.</p> <p>s. 4.5.2.7 What are the effective controls on illegal discharges of wastewaters into the KTN & JV box culvert to minimise adverse water quality impacts?</p>	<p>In situ water quality monitoring can reveal the actual water quality condition during dredging. In addition, the monitored data can provide information to reflect the influence of dredging activities to the changes in water quality. The testing of contaminants would be carried out by local laboratory and may take a short period to complete the analysis. The EM&A report is in general submitted on a monthly basis. However, once the laboratory results are obtained, the monitoring team will check for any exceedance of Action and Limit Levels. Action plans will be initiated if exceedance are recorded.</p> <p>The contract documents should define the responsibility of the contractors. Mitigation measures should be specified in the EM&A document of which the contractors should follow. Event and action plans should also be specified in order to initiate appropriate remedial actions in case of any exceedance.</p> <p>Programme for pilot tests, which include bench scale tests and site trials, would be prepared during the implementation stage. Fall back scenario of adopting protection measures, i.e. provision of passive barrier and venting system was proposed in the report.</p> <p>Bottom split trailer hopper dredger can be used to place the sand blanket which cover the contaminated sediments on the top to minimize the disturbance to the sediment layer, hence the release of contaminants from the sediments.</p> <p>The requirement will be in line with the usual GEO/BD requirements.</p> <p>Illegal discharge of wastewater into the nullahs would be controlled through the implementation of legislation, enforcement of the laws and policies, regular inspections and prosecution by relevant departments.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 5.5.3.4 How will dredging of uncontaminated sediments beneath the contaminated layer be achieved in terms of an acceptable control & environmental performance during dredging? What examples exist to show that these methods are environmentally acceptable?</p> <p>s. 5.5.3.20 <i>et seq</i> & 5.5.3.37 does not address the heavy metal fixation that could/could not be achieved by ORC, Seditreat, calcium nitrate, etc.?</p> <p>s. 5.5.3.38 the treatment of risks to life due to methane gas during reclamation options is generic and insufficiently robust nor specific.</p> <p>s. 5.5.3.54 <i>et seq</i> the proposal for leachate control is insufficiently robust or convincing, and appears totally reliant on the control of injection rate. What other controls are inferred?</p> <p>s. 5.7.1.1 fig 5I should also include the washing and biotreatment of washed sediments derived from the ex-situ pilot tests.</p> <p>s. 5.7.1.11 <i>et seq</i> What consideration has been given to the potential for high methane emission hotspots to migrate during the reclamation process? What period of time is considered necessary and appropriate to achieve steady state methane emission rates to measure with confidence the maximum safe rate of methane gas emission?</p> <p>s. 5.7.1.18 <i>et seq</i> what comprehensive and robust measures shall be implemented to protect the health of workers during <i>ex-</i> and <i>in-situ</i> treatment of contaminated sediments? How would the methane generation in the washed sediments be estimated?</p>	<p>Dredging of uncontaminated sediments can only be carried out after the removal or dredging of the contaminated sediments on the top. The potential water quality impact arising from dredging of uncontaminated sediments would be similar to that presented in Section 4. Mitigation measures for dredging of uncontaminated sediments presented in Section 4 have mostly been adopted and proofed to be effective in many reclamation projects in Hong Kong.</p> <p>Heavy metal fixation is a method to immobilize the heavy metals so as to minimize potential impacts to the environment. The ORC, Seditreat and use of calcium nitrate are to oxidize the organic contaminants in the sediments and are different treatment techniques to lower organic content, hence reduce methane potential.</p> <p>Reduction in methane potential in the sediments through sediment treatment already minimizes the risk that would be posed to the developments. Monitoring of methane gas emission after the reclamation can further ensure the risk is within acceptable levels.</p> <p>Release of leachate is related to the injection rate, which needs to be suitably controlled to minimize excess leachate to be generated. Residual impacts would be assessed during the field trials of the DCM.</p> <p>Figure 5I shows the approach to deal with the contaminated sediments. Ex-situ treatment covers the sediment washing and biotreatment of washed sediments. These two techniques would be examined in the pilot tests.</p> <p>A number of monitoring points were proposed at the KTAC, KTTS and Hoi Sham to monitor the methane emission rates. High methane emission hotspots can be detected. The monitoring would last about 1 year, and possibly longer if abnormal trend is detected.</p> <p>This is an occupational health issue. Protection measures to the workers during ex-situ and in-situ treatment would be similar to those for drilling and dredging activities.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>s. 5.7.1.22 it is considered imperative that an indicative drawing is included that shows the potential land-take and location of all expected sediment and wastewater treatment facilities (worst case).</p> <p>s. 5.7.1.22, 5.7.1.35 & 5.7.1.42 the residual protection measures referred to are assumed to be those as identified in s. 5.5.3.30 <i>et seq</i>, and should be explicitly stated or cross-referenced.</p> <p>s. 10.6.2.1 estimate of the area of parks, open spaces (grassland & other habitats) should be included in the report to balance the terrestrial losses.</p> <p><u>EM&A Manual</u> s.1.1.1 <i>et seq</i> it is insufficient for a project of the scale and magnitude of the SEKD to rely on an EM&A Manual to address solely systematic procedures for monitoring, auditing and minimising environmental impacts associated with construction works.</p> <p>Attached please find copy of the Environmental Monitoring and Audit Guidelines for Development Projects in HK. The Guidelines provide, <i>inter alia</i>, framework and guidance to Project Proponents and their respective environmental consultants, Engineers, Contractors (and their Environmental Teams), Independent Environmental Checkers and Environmental Project Offices (ENPOs), viz the consideration of comprehensive EM&A requirements for EM&A programmes, manuals, protocols and procedures, etc. The aim of the Guidelines is to serve as a core reference document to the scope, nature, extent of a project's EM&A requirements; and the means for the effective implementation and environmental management of a project through all stages of project development, including but not limited to post EIA study follow-up of Implementation Schedule requirements, input at tender specification & contract award stages, construction, post construction/operation and any necessary decommissioning phases of the project.</p>	<p>The approach for estimation of methane generation rate from washed sediments would be similar to that presented earlier in Section 5 for contaminated sediment.</p> <p>Estimation on the space and location to allocate the ex-situ treatment facilities were recommended in this section.</p> <p>Noted and will be stated explicitly.</p> <p>The total area of the open spaces in SEKD will about 127 ha, including the 24 ha Metropolitan Park. This will be added..</p> <p>Noted. We would be pleased to receive.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>It is imperative to ensure appropriate, effective and efficient environmental management systems and procedures are incorporated and implicit to the project's delivery of its predicted and committed environmental performance.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that the suite of future DPs, further studies, field trials, pilot tests, and implementation of the catalogue mitigation measures can be successfully and effectively implemented solely on the basis of environmental monitoring and audit requirements during the construction stage of a project.</p> <p>Implicit to the above concerns is the need for a clear, comprehensive and exhaustive listing of all project DPs, further studies, pilot test, field trials, mitigation measures, etc. The Implementation Schedule as presented @ appendix A does not fit this purpose</p> <p>s. 1.4.1 <i>et seq</i> For the reasons given above ENPOs should be established to ensure compliance with EIA study recommendations & and commitments and EP conditions, hence it is likely that the ENPO organisations will be required to be established in advance of the tender preparation phase of project implementation.</p> <p>s. 1.4.3 <i>et seq</i> Nowhere do the duties of the ENPO, EAT, & EMT include instructions to the Contractor to enhance work practices and environmental performance, to rectify inadequate environmental performance, to carry out enhanced environmental protection works in response to complaints, breaches of environmental conditions <i>et al.</i></p> <p>When viewed in the context of s. 1.4.3 & fig 1.1, the event/action plans do not appear to accord with the roles and responsibilities of the ENPOs viz table 2.2, 3.2, 4.5, EPD & the ENPOs absence from many event/action plans is noticeable. Also there is event/action plan for sediment contamination,</p> <p><u>EP Conditions</u> All tunnel emissions would be exhausted from the vent shafts and there would be no portal emissions; to be implemented during design (ref 2.3.3.15)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The EM&A Manual does include the EM&A requirements for both the construction and operational phases of the project. Some of the recommendation and mitigation measures presented in the EIA Report have already been included in the Implementation Schedule. We will review and revise the Implementation Schedule where necessary.</p> <p>See our response above.</p> <p>Noted and agreed and the following sentence will be appended to S.1.4.1.2: "ENPOs should be established to ensure compliance with EIA study recommendations & and commitments and EP conditions, hence it is likely that the ENPO organisations will be required to be established in advance of the tender preparation phase of project implementation."</p> <p>It is assumed that the formal instructions to the Contractor from ENPOs are through the Engineer.</p> <p>ENPO consist of EAT and EMT and both are involved at every stage of the event/action plan shown in Table 2.2, 3.2, and 4.5. With reference to Figure 1.1 and discussed in the third bullet point of S.1.4.3.3, ENPOs should report to EPD on various aspects of the EM&A program.</p> <p>Since the reclamation option can only be confirmed after the field trials to be carried out, the event/action plan for sediment contamination that is highly related to the reclamation option should also be developed after the site trial and confirmation of the reclamation option.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department (30) in Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 II 3 July 2001</p>	<p>Hospital @ area 5L requires an air quality assessment during detailed design.</p> <p>Height restriction on proposed development in area 8 due to chimney emission from Ma Tau Kok Gas Works.</p> <p>Vehicle tunnel & full noise enclosures, ventilation systems to comply with EPD's practice note on control of air pollution in vehicle tunnels, by means of natural mechanical or other control measures.</p> <p><u>Risks to workers</u> Condition required to satisfy the design of suitable perimeter channels, wastewater treatment facilities, ground improvement excess pore water retention systems i.e. a submission to ensure that appropriately sized located systems are available from day one of the construction process. WMP or similar shall cover submission of a programme for establishment of construction site run-off facilities in advance of any substantive site formation works.</p> <p>All wastewater, sewage, construction site run-off collection treatment and disposal systems shall be audited by the IEC, ENPO, et al prior to submission to DEP for approval/deposit.</p> <p>Competent persons are required to be employed to carry out the ground improvement work.</p>	<p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>See our response above.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p> <p>Noted and will be added to the Implementation Schedule.</p>
<p>Civil Engineering Department/Port Works PW DS/STU/31 26 June 2001</p>	<p>General</p> <p>a) the suggestion to treat contaminated sediment to an acceptable level for reuse is supported.</p> <p>b) The suggestion to use deep cement mixing method to improve property of sediment below seawall to avoid dredging is supported.</p> <p>Table 1.1 (a) The long-term public filling barging point is missing from Table 1.1.</p> <p>Section 3.10.19.1 The first sentence should be revised to read "A barging point for collection of inert construction and demolition materials destined for reclamation areas"</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Public filling barging point is not classified as Designated Project under Schedule 2 of the EIAO.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Civil Engineering Department/Port Works PW DS/STU/31 26 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 3.10.19.3 and 3.10.19.8 (a) Aldrich Bay Reclamation has already been completed. Hence, the term “existing PFBP at Aldrich Bay Reclamation” should be changed to “previous PFBP at Aldrich Bay Reclamation.”</p> <p>Section 4.3.4.5 : Hydraulic Modelling (a) The settling velocity adopted was very low and resulted in a wide dispersion of sediment plume. With such low settling velocity, the prediction would be unrealistic.</p> <p>Section 5 – Sediment Contamination General planning to reduce environmental impact to water quality due to reclamation : (a) It is noted that a new piece of land earmarked for use as a public fill barging point would be reclaimed next to a to-be-demolished breakwater inside Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. It is suggested that considerations should be given to re-using foundation of the existing breakwater for the new seawall so as to reduce dredging.</p> <p>(b) At the corner of the Refuse Transfer Station and the public fill barging point, it is suggested that the proposed coastline should be streamlined so as to avoid having an area of stagnant water.</p> <p>Environmental impact to water quality due to the proposed breakwaters: (a) More details about the circulation openings in the proposed breakwater are required before we could comment from the marine works point of view.</p> <p>Section 5.5.3 Reclamation Options and Associated Environmental Impacts (a) Para. 5.5.3.39 thru 61: The potential environmental impact due to DCM should be assessed and discussed since it would be the first time for having such foundation treatment in Hong Kong.</p>	<p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>Same settling velocity was also adopted to assess sediment dispersion due to dredging and filling activities in other EIA studies, e.g. 1800MW Gas-fired Power Station at Lamma Extension, Part B-Lamma Extension EIA Report. For the present study, the modelling results showed that the mitigated scenarios were acceptable even a more conservative value of settling velocity was adopted.</p> <p>The reuse of existing foundation of existing breakwater will be further explored in the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Your suggestion is noted. However, the current configuration will provide more flexibility to accommodate different type of vessels for berthing and manoeuvring. The type of vessels for the RTS operation cannot be determined until the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The water quality modelling results did not show unacceptable conditions with the presence of the proposed breakwater arrangement.</p> <p>Your concern is noted. However, the openings were closed with a vertical blockwater seawall will be constructed instead, to avoid the effluent from Tsui Ping Nullah, as a response to some comments.</p> <p>Use of DCM has positive effect in terms of environmental protection. The volume of sediments to be dredged and disposed of can be minimized. This in turn minimizes the effect on the capacity of the dumping sites. The potential impact due to DCM would mainly be the release of leachate from the use of cement stabilizer. Noise and air impacts are expected to be minimal. Mitigation measures such as control of the release of leachate and provision of a sand blanket prior to the carrying out of the DCM were included in Section 5.5.3.54. It was also recommended in Section 5.5.3.56 that the residual environmental impacts would be assessed during site trials.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Civil Engineering Department/Port Works PW DS/STU/31 26 June 2001</p>	<p>(b) Several other ground treatment methods were also mentioned. The consultant should also provide information on the environmental impact of each treatment method for reference.</p> <p><u>EIA Executive Summary</u></p> <p>(a) Para. 6.1.2: The second sentence is misleading. Reducing the amount of dredging should not induce stability problems if the marine structures are properly designed. Appropriate ground treatment methods should be applied, where necessary, to improve the strength of the founding materials.</p>	<p>Potential impacts of the proposed ground treatment methods will be addressed for reference. It is however expected that the potential impacts associated with the proposed ground treatment methods are minimal and would not cause significant impact to the surrounding environment. Obviously any ground treatment method associated with adverse environmental impact will not be considered.</p> <p>The paragraph will be re-worded as follows: - “Generally, the soft materials underneath the seawall, either vertical or sloping seawall, have to be removed to improve the stability of the seawall under the recommended minimum dredged option. At reclamation area, ground treatment would be required if the marine deposits / softer alluvium deposits were to be left in place. DCM method is recommended as one of the ground treatment technique without the need for dredging at seawall position. A pilot scheme is proposed to test for its effectiveness.”</p>
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Refuse Transfer Station (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>Comments on EIA Report Vol. I Section 7.2 Table 7.6</p> <p>Please clarify how the quantity of waste is evaluated for the amount of waste deducted from the “old SEKD”.</p> <p>Section 7.4.2.14</p> <p>We have mentioned earlier that the site hand over dated of 2014 was not acceptable as SENT Landfill would be closed as early as 2009. The proposed SEKTS would serve as the major regional waste outlet for both the Study Area and the adjacent areas. The Consultants had not proposed workable programme for the mitigation measure.</p>	<p>The “old SEKD” refers to the population and employment numbers from the mid-1999 TPEDM estimates for SEKD under Scenario II that have been included in EPD’s waste forecast.</p> <p>It should be noted that the location of the RTS was relocated from the original location at Cha Kwo Ling to the exist location in front of Kwun Tong. The new location will have several constraints on the implementation programme and hence early commencement on the construction work is not feasible.</p> <p>From the latest implementation programme of the SEKD, reclamation of the concerned area would be at mid year 2009. Assuming the construction period of two and half years, the completion date of the RTS facilities would be at late year 2011. Hence, the only feasible solution to cater for the closure of the SENT landfill, two feasible solutions are worth for further investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Extending the life of SENT landfill, it could be achieved by increasing the formation level to increase the void space. (ii) Increase the throughput of the existing facilities at Kowloon Bay to cater for the increased demand up to year 2011.

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Environmental Protection Department/Refuse Transfer Station (30) in L/M to Ax (1) to EP2/K19/S3/10 29 June 2001</p>	<p>Comments on Compliance of the EIA Study Brief</p> <p>We have pointed out the outstanding items under the EIA Study Brief in draft EIA Report. We have also repeatedly expressed our desire to resolve outstanding issues with the Consultants expediently and invited the Consultants to contact us any time convenient to them. Up to date, we still have not received positive response from the Consultants, Outstanding items, according to Section 3.5.5 of the EIA Study Brief, are repeated here for easy reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) details of the new RTS; (ii) environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the RTS and any mitigation measures required; (iii) justification on waste quantities and design capacity; (iv) interaction between the new RTS and existing KBTS/SENT Landfill; and (v) Development programme for the proposed RTS. 	<p>Additional details on the new RTS will be added. Operational and construction phases impact of the RTS have been covered in the EIA Report and will be summarised under Section 7. The waste forecast and required design capacity of the RTS are presented in Section 7.4.2. The development program for the proposed RTS is indicated in Section 7.4.2.14. The material will be rearranged to produce a separate sub-section for the RTS and references to other sections will be added where appropriate.</p>
<p>Drainage Services Department/Mainland South () in MS 8/CE/3299/0 27 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 4.3.5.2 Pollution loads</p> <p>Please clarify with PM/K's consultants whether the pollution loads were taken from the original Central and East Kowloon SMP Studies or the current Review of Central and East Kowloon SMP Study. It would be extremely unrealistic to take the pollution loads from the original Central and East Kowloon SMP Studies. Since the publication of the original Central and East Kowloon SMP Studies. Since the publication of the original Central and East Kowloon SMP Studies about a decade ago, there have been much improvements to the sewerage system and rectification of expedient connections that reduces the amount of pollution entering the open channels and the coastal waters.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3.36 Presence of Hydrogen sulphide</p> <p>I do not consider it appropriate to carry out regular cleaning and desilting of the culvert to ensure that the potential hazard of hydrogen sulphide would be minimal. The culvert would only be desilted to maintain the hydraulic capacity.</p>	<p>The pollution loads were taken from the current Review of Central and East Kowloon SMP Study.</p> <p>We will rephrase the last sentence to "Regular cleaning and desilting of the culvert should be undertaken to maintain the hydraulic capacity in the culvert. This in turn minimizes the potential hazard of hydrogen sulphide emission."</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Drainage Services Department/Mainland South () in MS 8/CE/3299/0 27 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 4.4.3.38 Water quality in Tsui Ping Nullah According to Section 4.2.4.5, the water quality in Tsui Ping Nullah along King Yip Street was considered as “very bad”. In Table 4.50, PM/K’s consultants have only demonstrated that the water quality in the Tsui Ping Nullah extension would be acceptable but have not drawn conclusion as to the water quality impact further upstream along King Yip Street. You are probably aware that there has been complaint against bad odour in this tidal section of Tsui Ping Nullah and the water quality there is very sensitive to change in water quality in the coastal waters. I am obliged to advise you to guard against even the slightest deterioration of water quality in Tsui Ping Nullah along Kong Yip Street.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3.57 emergency overflow from KTPTW The alignment of the overflow bypass pipe is not shown entirely in Drawing No. 22936/DR/060 and Drawing No. 22936/MS/231 is not available. It is difficult to foresee two an existing gravity seawall overflow bypass could work properly through an inverted siphon extension as proposed. It is likely that the KTPTW has to be modified to enable the proper functioning of the proposed emergency overflow bypass extension. Please ask PM/K’s consultants to ascertain that there is no insurmountable problem in the associated modification. Operationally, the infrequently used inverted siphon would be readily silted up an emergency seawall by-pass at the edge of the RTS would nonetheless be required. Please ask PM/K’s consultants to assess the impact on water quality under most likely situation.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3.58 emergency overflow from TKWPTW It is difficult to foresee how a gravity seawall overflow bypass could go through a submarine outfall arrangement as proposed. It is likely that the TKWPTW has to be modified to enable to proper functioning of the proposed emergency overflow bypass extension. Please ask PM/K’s consultants to ascertain that there is no insurmountable problem in the associated modification. Operationally, the infrequently used submarine outfall would be readily silted up and an emergency seawall by-pass next to Outfall P1 would nonetheless be required. Please ask PM/K’s consultants to assess the impact on water quality under most likely situation.</p>	<p>The water quality condition in the Tsui Ping Nullah extension was predicted to be acceptable. The exchange of water during flood tide would not cause deterioration of water quality in Tsui Ping Nullah. The bad odour in the tidal section of Tsui Ping Nullah would be related to the deposition of debris and sediment.</p> <p>A note will be included in Drawing No. 22936/DR/060 to indicate the discharge arrangement of the bypass pipe at end of the breakwater. Drawing No. 22936/MS/231 shows details of the bypass pipe and is not directly relevant in the Water Quality Impact section. Therefore, this drawing was not repeatedly showed in this section.</p> <p>The operational problems related to the infrequently uses of submarine outfall could be dealt with through the proper design of the outfall diffuser and diffuser outlet to avoid marine growth and to prevent entrance of foreign matter and saline intrusion into the pipeline. An example of the diffuser outlet is the Tideflex™ Diffuser Check Valves. Details of the operational issues of the submarine outfall would be dealt with during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>An alternative routing of the bypass pipe is to run along the northern boundary of RTS and along the whole length of the new breakwater to discharge the overflow at end of the breakwater. This avoids the use of inverted siphon. The technical issues would be fully incorporated at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>Extension of the emergency overflow outlet is to prevent the discharged effluent from entering the new marina. Please also see our responses to the comments on Section 4.4.3.57.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Drainage Services Department/Mainland South () in MS 8/CE/3299/0 27 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 4.5.2.5 Odour problem at KTAC Anaerobic decomposition of accumulated sediment at its seabed causes the odour problem at the embayed KTAC. It will be eliminated by the proposed reclamation of KTAC, not by the diversion of Kai Tak Nullah and Jordan Valley box culvert flows as suggested. The last sentence "There would be a positive affect on the KTAC is redundant as there will not be any KTAC left after the reclamation.</p> <p>Section 4.5.2.7 Effective control on illegal discharge of wastewater into nullahs Please ask PM/K's consultants to advise what effective controls on illegal discharge of wastewater into the nullahs were anticipated to minimise the water quality impacts. For instance, there were already quite a number of Dry Weather Flow Interceptors inmost of the hinterland stromwater drain. Please ask PM/K' consultants to advise whether they are proposing more DWFI in the hinterland or inside SEKD to intercept future polluted flow from the new development areas.</p> <p>Section 4.5.2.8 Overflow from dry weather flow interceptors Overflow from dry weather flow interceptors are intrinsic part of the design. Please ask PM/K's consultants to clarify what do they meant by controlling the overflows from DWFI during operational phase, as the trigger point of overflow is pre-determined in the design phase.</p> <p>Section 4.5.2.11 Maintenance dredging The purpose of maintenance dredging of river channels and box culverts is to restore their hydraulic capacity. It is not intended to and is not effective in improving water quality.</p> <p>Section 13 Visual Impact Assessment Open channel with vertical walls are being proposed and it should be visible from the adjacent high-rise buildings. You may wish to see if a Visual Impact Assessment of such vertical sided open channel is required.</p> <p>EM&A Manual Page A-16 & 17 Water quality in Extended Section of Diverted Nullahs Please ask PM/K's consultants to delete DSD from the implementation agent of the first bullet point.</p>	<p>The odour generation is closely linked to the deposition of pollutants, which are carried in the Kai Tak Nullah and Jordan Valley box culvert flows. Diversion of the nullah and box culvert cuts off the source of pollutants from entering the KTAC. It is however noted that KTAC would no longer exist after reclamation. The last sentence in Section 4.5.2.5 will be deleted.</p> <p>Discharges of effluents are subject to control under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance. Illegal discharge of wastewater into the nullahs would be controlled through the implementation of legislation, enforcement of the laws and policies, regular inspections and prosecution by relevant departments.</p> <p>Control of overflows from DWFI can be achieved through the proper design of DWFI. It is anticipated that this issue would be dealt with at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>It is understood that one of the purposes of maintenance dredging is to restore the hydraulic capacity of channels/box culverts. As the presence of deposited sediment in channel/box culvert may generate odour and decomposition of organic matter would deteriorate water quality, the removal of sediment from the channel/box culvert during maintenance dredging can also minimize these impacts.</p> <p>Landscaping proposal adjacent to the open channel to mitigate visual impact, if any, will be given in the detailed design.</p> <p>Noted and the phrase "and maintenance dredging would then be implemented" will be deleted from the first bullet point. DSD will be deleted from the agent.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Drainage Services Department/Mainland South () in MS 8/CE/3299/0 27 June 2001</p>	<p>Please ask PM/K's consultants to delete the second to the fifth bullet points as they are not relevant or not applicable.</p> <p><u>Drawings</u> Drawing No. 22936/TP/103 Screenings to Rail Tracks Screening to rail tracks above drainage reserves are being proposed but no detail is available. Please be reminded that structures are not permitted on top of drainage reserves and, without seeing the details, I am not in a position to confirm that I agree with the proposed screenings to rail tracks.</p> <p>Drawing No. 22936/EN/090 The drawing shows the fall back option of the outing of the diverted KTN for KTAC Reclamation. This should be a fall back option to another option, but that initial option is apparently not shown for comparison.</p> <p>Drawing no. 22936/SW/016 Section A-A The section as shown in unrealistic and the drainage reserve should extended three metres beyond the outermost sewer, not from the box culvert s shown.</p> <p>Drawing No. 22936/AR/033 Section 1-1 A flood relief path is proposed to run along the box culvert. I have reservation as whether it is possible to lay a 500mm diameter waste transfer pipe above the box culvert without blocking the flood relief path.</p> <p>As to the Technical Checklist (on TM Annex 11) to Review an EIA Report circulated with your memo dated 14.6.2001, I fully agree with you that a section on considerations given to options for different reclamation areas and coastline, siting of RTS/PFBP, DGVFP, etc should be given in the introduction section. Please also ask PM/K's consultants to include the considerations given to options for box culvert and open channel, as one of key infrastructures planning decision in SEKD is to deck the river channels and turn the areas above into Open Spaces.</p>	<p>As per EPD's comment that all the recommendation for field trials should be included in the Implementation Schedule, we suggest to change the second to the fifth bullet points to: "Carry out the environmental mitigation measures included in the O&M Plan for Box Culvert to be confirmed by field trials at the detailed design stage."</p> <p>The screenings will be supported on a separate structure erected across the drainage reserve along the railway reserve on top of the drainage reserve. It will be supported by 2 deep beam / steel truss of about 5m deep to span over the drainage reserve. The structures will be simply supported across the drainage reserve over piled foundation of each end to eliminate any structural interaction with the culvert below. Closely spaced steel portals will be erected on top of the structures to support the screenings. The design of the screen wall to facilitate easy dismantling will also be targeted for.</p> <p>The routing of the initial option of the diverted KTN for KTAC Reclamation has been shown in Drawing No. 22936/IM/201 KTAC/KTTS Development Work Package WB11.</p> <p>The section was previously corrected on 22936/DR/017. The same section will replace the one shown on 22936/SW/016.</p> <p>The ARCS pipework will avoid the flood relief path.</p> <p>The Outline Concept Plan prepared in the consultation in 1999 has been used as a basis for preparing the current plan. The reclamation area and the drainage system were developed from that Outline Concept Plan.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Highways Department () in KH 8/4/205 (D4) 28 June 2001</p>	<p>General For those noise barriers that are proposed to be maintained by this Department in future, a 2 metre clearance should generally be made available around the barriers to facilitate future inspection and maintenance works. The following list out the barriers that may not have the stated clearance or inside development sites that are unlikely to satisfy the above criteria, and future maintenance party should be resolved a early stage.</p> <p>Drawing nos. 22936/TP Structures</p> <p>104D Cantilever barrier D1-1A D3-7, D5-1, L2-1 113E Cantilever barriers D1-2, D103 108D Cantilever barrier D2-1 101E Cantilever barrier D3-4, D305 102D Vertical barrier L1-1 105D Vertical barrier L1/A-1, semi-enclosure T1-1, T1-2, full-enclosure T1-F1 110C Vertical barrier L15-2 111E Cantilever barrier CKR2 111E Semi-enclosure plus cantilever barrier on top is considered too high for maintenance.</p> <p>EIA Report Volume I Section 3.3.1.2(h) – It is suggested not to use “HD” to denote “Highways Department Depot”. Please ask the Consultant to amend.</p> <p>Section 3.7.9.3 mentions that low noise surfacing is request for CKR (exposed section), while this is not listed in the table on page 3-44. Moreover, the extent of it should be indicated on Drawing No. 22936/TP/111E.</p>	<p>Noted and the listed barriers will be examined and the drawings will be revised where necessary.</p> <p>Drawing Nos./ Access Arrangements Structures 22936/TP/104D D1-1A Access from District Open Space and School Village EVA D3-7 Access from amenity strip and pavement D5-1 Access from School Village and from road L2-1 Access from pavement and from with housing site 1C 22936/TP/113E D1-2 Access from pavement and within school EVA D1-3 Access from pavement and within school EVA 22936/TP/108D D2-1 Access from pavement and amenity strip 22936/TP/101E D3-4 Access from pavement and within school EVA D3-5 Access from pavement and within open space 22936/TP/102D L1-1 Access from pavement and within amenity strip 22936/TP/105D L1/A-1 Access from pavement and within school EVA T1-1 Structure is on elevated road T1-2 Structure is on elevated road T1-F1 Structure is on elevated road 22936/TP/110C L15-2 Access from pavement and open space 22936/TP/111E CKR To be addressed at detailed design</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly. The extent of low noise surfacing will be indicated in the drawing.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Highways Department () in KH 8/4/205 (D4) 28 June 2001</p>	<p>Section 13.9.4.25 – Under Planting Proposals, the Consultant should clarify if “Roadside and below viaducts” should be amended to read “Roadside verge and planting area below viaducts”. If so, the Consultant should clarify the difference between “Roadside Verge” and “Amenity Area”. For “Roadside and below viaducts” and the two items under “Design of Road Structures”, please remove HyD under the “Management” column.</p> <p><u>EM&A Manual</u> <u>Appendix A – Implementation Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures</u> <u>Ventilation Shafts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages A-30 & 38 – The implementation agent for “1L5”, “3Z2” and “3Z3” should be TDD as TDD will be the works agent for Tunnels D4 and D5. Hence, the entries under the ‘Implementation Agent/Maintenance Agent’ column should read “Implementation: TDD/Maintenance : HyD”. <p>Landscape and Visual Mitigation Measures (Decks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pages A-57, 59 & 61 – Under “Landscape and Visual Mitigation Measures”, it is essential to clearly state what measures are proposed to be maintained by HyD, instead of simply stating a table title in the schedule. In absence of such information, this Department is not prepared to agree at this stage to maintain these measures. Also, the Consultants should quote drawing numbers for locations for the measures. Page A-20 items (a) Advanced design of Open Space over Engineering Structures – The Consultants should clarify what this item means. Does this mean the proposed landscaped deck? I understand that the maintenance for the landscaped deck would be subjected to further discussion and this Department has not agreed to maintain these decks. Pages A18 & 21 – For items proposed to be maintained by HyD/LCSD, it is necessary to clearly define which elements to be maintained by HyD and LCSD respectively. <p>Noise Barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page A-22 – The agents under the “Implementation Agent/Maintenance Agent’ column should be amended to read “Implementation: TDD/Maintenance : HyD” subject to the “General” comments above. 	<p>Noted and agreed. The table shall be revised to reflect as requested such that it shall read Roadside Verge and Area Below viaducts. Roadside verge are those areas immediately adjacent to the road and, while Amenity Areas are the planned zones in the Layout Plans. HyD shall be removed from the table as requested. For the “Roadside Verge and Area Below Viaducts” the management column shall read LCSD, for “Design of Road Structures”, HyD shall be removed from both the management and maintenance columns as this was intended as a design measure only.</p> <p>Noted and will be revised accordingly.</p> <p>The comment is noted. The division of implementation, management and maintenance with respect to landscape works is complex and not suitable within this table. Notwithstanding this information is given the table under para 13.9.4.25 of the main EIA report. We suggest that this table is referred to in the EMA Manual and included as part of it.</p> <p>Generally this refers to the open space and park area, e.g. Metropolitan Park. The responsibility of maintaining the landscaped deck will be subject to further discussion.</p> <p>Noted. As for the earlier comment, it is considered more appropriate that reference is made to the table under para 13.9.4.25 of the EIA and that it is included within the EMA manual in order to clarify the responsibilities.</p> <p>Noted and will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Highways Department () in KH 8/4/205 (D4) 28 June 2001</p>	<p>Operational Phase Noise Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page A-60 – I would like to clarify that all required operational phase noise monitoring for the proposed noise mitigation measures, including any necessary remedial measures (NMMs), shall be carried out by the implementation agent, despite such NMMs may have been handed over to the maintenance agent. These should be clearly stated in the schedule. <p>Others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page A-40 – There are discrepancies between the names of Environmental Protection Measures for ventilation shafts of D4 Tunnel as shown on page A-40 (“4K2” and “4K4”) and those shown on Drawing No. 22936/TP/15 in the Final EIA report (“4H3” and “4H4”). <p>EIA Executive Summary The Chinese version for Paragraph 4.1.2 seems to be incomplete when compared with the English version.</p>	<p>Noted and the last sentence of S.1.4.1.3 will be revised to read: “Any operational phase EM&A requirements will be undertaken by the implementation agent identified in the Implementation Schedule (see Appendix A).”</p> <p>The names will be amended for consistency.</p> <p>Noted and the Chinese version will be amended accordingly.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>District Planning Office / Kowloon () in K-R/OTH/181A</p>	<p>GENERAL</p> <p>(i) Even since the issuance of the Draft Final Report in April, there have been revisions to the OMDP/layout plan, e.g. land uses surrounding the stadium site, relocation of school villages and fine-tuning of building heights and plot ratios of some development sites. I note that the above technical assessments have not used the updated development parameters and layout plans. To provide the necessary support to the forthcoming gazetting of the Outline Zoning Plans for the development scheme, there reports should include a confirmation in a suitable format that the final OMDP/layout plan to be included in the Final Report is sustainable from the environmental point of view.</p> <p>(ii) The visual impacts of VSR Zone 3 (i.e. Harbour front from North Point to Taikoo, VSR Group 7 to 10) are considered to be “slight to moderate adverse” as there involves significant reduction depth of views by prominent development. As shown in Drawing NO. 22936/LV/S29, some green mountain backdrop and ridgelines will be blocked.</p> <p>(iii) Similarly to VSR Zone 3, the visual impacts of VSR Zone 4 (i.e. Eastern Coastal Area: Shau Kei Wan and Chai Wan, VSR Group 11 to 18) are considered to be “neutral to moderate adverse”.</p> <p>(iv) For VSR Zone 5 (i.e. Western High Ground (Lung Fu San to Mount Cameron VSR Group 19 to 23), the visual impacts in the long term are “neutral to moderate adverse”.</p> <p>(v) For VSR Zone 14 (i.e. High Ground to North: Lion Rock/Kowloon Peak, VSR Group 63 to 65), its visual impact should be “slight to moderate adverse” as there involves major change to character of views over harbour.</p>	<p>Noted. We recognise that there are a number of changes initiated by different government departments or other reasons. In fact, we are in the process of updating the final report to incorporate all these changes.</p> <p>The major item of change is the relocation of schools in associated with the layout to the stadium. There is a separate chapter in the EIA Report to over for this.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zone 3 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zone 3 will be “slight to moderate adverse”. Para 13.10.3.5 shall read “The SEKD will create a major change in character in views across the harbour including the foreshortening of views. However, in the long term the impacts are considered to be <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> as there is a reduction in depth of views by prominent development.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zone 4 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zone 4 will be considered as “neutral to moderate adverse”. Para 13.10.3.6 shall read “Some reduction in depth of views and a change in visual character will result in a range from <i>neutral to moderate adverse</i> overall in the long term.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zone 5 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zone 5 will be considered as “neutral to moderate adverse”. Para 13.10.3.7 shall read “Where visible, the SEKD will cause a major change in visual character to a high-rise urban waterfront development. In the long term these impacts are considered to vary from <i>neutral to moderate adverse</i> overall.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zone 14 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zone 14 will be considered as “slight to moderate adverse”. Para 13.10.3.16 shall read “SEKD will cause a major change in the visual character of these views which</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>District Planning Office / Kowloon () in K-R/OTH/181A</p>	<p>(vi) For VSR Zone 15 (i.e. view from ridge to east, VSR Group 66 to 72), Jordan Valley currently has open views over the project area. It is considered that the visual effects of the project will be “slight to moderate adverse”, instead of “neutral” in the long term.</p> <p>(vii) Regarding views from the harbour, it is considered that the project will generate similar visual impacts on VSR Zones 20 (i.e. Eastern Harbour), 21 (i.e. Central Harbour) and 22 (i.e. Western Harbour) in the long term. All VSRs will experience a change in visual character and the impacts will be “slight to moderate adverse”.</p> <p>(viii) In view of the above, relevant text in relation to VSR Zones 3,4,5,14,15,20,21 and 22 in Chapter 13 of the EIA Report (i.e. paragraphs 13.8.7 and 13.10.3; Tables 13.14 and 13.17; and Drawing Nos 22936/LV/554 and 22936/LV/555) should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>SPECIFIC Drawings for EIA Report (ix) VSR Zone 24 is missing. <u>Drawing nos. 22936/LV/527 to 22936/LV/543</u> (x) The photomontage cannot clearly show the existing views and the visual effects of the project. Good quality colour photos should be used to show key views and proper annotation should be given to facilitate easy understanding of the visual effects of the project. (xi) According to paragraph 13.10.4 of EIA Report (Volume I), there should be seventeen viewpoints for photomontage visualisations. However, the existing and future views of viewpoints 7,8,13 and 16 (i.e. Lion Rock, Hoi</p>	<p>is not considered to be negative, except during construction. These impacts are thus likely to be <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> in the long term.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zone 15 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zone 15 will be considered as “slight to moderate adverse”. The last sentence of Para 13.10.3.17 shall read “SEKD will be clear within these views causing <i>significant adverse</i> impacts during construction, however, these are considered to be <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> in the long term.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The visual impacts of the VSR groups in VSR Zones 20, 21 and 22 shall be reviewed and amended such that the overall visual impact of VSR Zones 20, 21 and 22 will be considered as “slight to moderate adverse”. The last sentence of Para 13.10.3.22 shall read “The SEKD will cause a major change in visual character of views, together with a foreshortening of the waterfront resulting in a <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> impact in the long term.” Para 13.10.3.23 shall read “The SEKD will cause a major change in visual character of views, together with a foreshortening of the waterfront resulting in a <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> impact in the long term.” Para 13.10.3.24 shall read “These impacts are considered to be <i>slight to moderate adverse</i> in the long term as they will experience a change in visual character.” Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40 shall be reviewed in context of the comment in order to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted. Tables 13.14, 13.17 and 13.40, Paras 13.8.7 and 13.10.3 and drawings 22936/LV/554 and 22936/LV/555, shall be reviewed and amended in context of the comments in order to reflect the final overall visual impacts outlined in the comments but also to maintain consistency with the methodology.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be added. Noted. Every effort has been made to provide the clearest photographs possible, however, the prevailing atmospheric conditions in Hong Kong do affect the quality. Notwithstanding, they shall be reviewed and replaced where possible.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. These shall be included.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>District Planning Office / Kowloon () in K-R/OTH/181A</p>	<p>Sham Park area, North Point. (e.g. NPGO) and Metropolitan Park to Lion Rock) are missing.</p> <p><u>Drawing no. 22936/LV/554</u> (xii) For VSR Zone 6 (i.e. Eastern High Ground: Mount Nicholson to Mount Parker), paragraph 13.8.7.9 of EIA Report (Volume I) states that the visual impacts will be “slight to moderate adverse”. The visual impact now in the drawing is “slight adverse” only. Please request the Consultants to rectify.</p> <p>(xiii) Similarly, impact of VSR Zone 13 (i.e. South-west) should be tie in with that given in paragraph 13.8.7.16 of EIA Report (Volume I) in which the visual impacts of VSR Zone 13 will be “slight to moderate neutral”.</p> <p>(xiv) My above comments (i.e. points (ii) to (v)) regarding visual impacts on VSR Zones 3,4,5 and 14 are applicable.</p> <p><u>Drawing No. 22936/LV/555</u> (xv) My above comments (i.e. points (vi) and (vii)) regarding visual impacts on VSR Zones 15, 20, 21 and 22 are applicable.</p> <p><u>EIA Report (Volume 1)</u> <u>3rd sentence in paragraph 3.7.2.3</u> (xvi) The Consultants state some NSRs to experience minor exceedance. More details about there NSRs should be given.</p> <p><u>2nd sentence in paragraph 3.7.2.6</u> (xvii) Drawings No. 22936/EN/285 to 286 are missing.</p> <p><u>Table 3.19: Summary of the Essential Noise Mitigation Measures/Assumptions Used in the Conceptual Layout Plan in Relation to Traffic Noise</u> (xviii) Under the Town planning Ordinance, it appears that there is no provision for Plan D to ensure the provision of noise mitigation measures (such as 15m high podium, specific building façade, non-openable windows and setback) proposed by the Consultants. In practice, it may be more effective to incorporate relevant clauses into leases so as to ensure that developers would provide the proposed noise mitigation measures. It is therefore suggested to delete Plan D from the list of implementation agents.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 13.8.7.30</u> (xix) The overall visual impacts are considered to be “slight adverse” in the long term because there involves reduction in open views across the harbour and significant change in visual character.</p>	<p>The comment is noted, however, the drawing refers to the summary of residual impacts after implementation of mitigation measures as outlined in Table 10.40, not prior to mitigation as described in 13.8.7.9.</p> <p>Please refer to previous response</p> <p>Noted, The drawing shall be amended to incorporate the revisions to VSR Zones 3, 4, 5 and 14.</p> <p>Noted, The drawing shall be amended to incorporate the revisions to VSR Zones 15, 20, 21 and 22.</p> <p>The exceedance has been described in sections following including paragraph 3.7.2.4.</p> <p>Drawing nos. 22936/EN/285 and 286 are in the form of a series of drawings; namely 22936/EN/285A-285C and 286A-286L.</p> <p>Noted. The role that PlanD will play is limited for the development implementation of noise mitigation measures as the issues relate more to EPD (technical aspect on noise measures) and LandsD (on the land lease condition drafting and enforcement). The role of PlanD will be more to control overall development framework. We will delete PlanD from the list.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Para 13.7.8.30 shall read “The distant open views from the hillsides will experience long term impacts due to the reduction in open views across the harbour and a change in visual character, resulting in slight adverse impacts. Adverse impacts will also be experienced during construction”.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response																				
<p>District Planning Office / Kowloon () in K-R/OTH/181A</p>	<p>Table 13.14; Visually Sensitive Receiver Groups and Visual Impact Assessment (xx) My above comments (points (ii) to (viii)) are applicable. The visual effects on the following VSRs during operation are considered as follows:</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="481 391 1243 678"> <tr> <td><u>VSR Group</u></td> <td><u>Potential Impact</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7.8.9 and 10</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13,14,15,16 and 18</td> <td>Neutral</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>19 and 20</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>23</td> <td>Slight Adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>63, 64 and 66</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>67</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> <tr> <td>108, 109, 110 and 111</td> <td>Slight to moderate adverse</td> </tr> </table> <p>3rd sentence in paragraph 13.9.2.5 (xxi) As shown in Drawing No. 22936/LV/529, the SEKD layout helps to preserve views to redgelines, as far as it possibly can, Ridgelines to the east of Lion Rock have not been preserved in total. The Consultants may be requested to suitable revise the sentence.</p> <p><u>Paragraph 13.10.4.1</u> (xxii) Photomontage visualisations in relation to viewpoints 7, 8, 13 and 16 are missing.</p> <p><u>Table 13.14; Residual Visual Impacts to Visually Sensitive Receivers</u> (xxiii) Residual impacts are considered same as potential impacts mentioned in points (xx) above.</p> <p><u>Environmental Monitoring and Audit Manual</u> (xxiv) There is no comment on the manual.</p> <p><u>EIA Executive Summary</u> <u>Paragraph 14.15</u> (xxv) As point (xix) above, the overall visual impacts are considered "slight adverse" in the long term.</p>	<u>VSR Group</u>	<u>Potential Impact</u>	7.8.9 and 10	Slight to moderate adverse	11	Slight to moderate adverse	13,14,15,16 and 18	Neutral	17	Slight to moderate adverse	19 and 20	Slight to moderate adverse	23	Slight Adverse	63, 64 and 66	Slight to moderate adverse	67	Slight to moderate adverse	108, 109, 110 and 111	Slight to moderate adverse	<p>Noted. The visual impact for the said VSRs groups is agreed, however, it is considered that the amendments are more appropriate in Table 13.17 to be in accordance with the methodology, i.e. after implementation of mitigation measures. As such suitable amendment will be made in Table 13.17. With respect to the impacts of 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18, a significance threshold of neutral only is not included in the methodology. With reference to the comment (iii) and in accordance with the methodology and standard terminology it is recommended that the impacts are as follows: 13-neutral to slight adverse, 14-neutral to moderate adverse, 15-neutral to moderate adverse, 16- neutral to moderate/slight adverse, 18-neutral to moderate adverse.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Para 13.9.2.5 shall read "When viewed from areas such as Hong Kong Island and the southern areas of Kowloon, e.g. Tsim Sha Tsui, the surrounding ridgeline of the Kowloon Hills to the north currently provides a dramatic natural backdrop to the high-rise urban areas of Kowloon and are integral to the character of the city. This ridgeline is partially breached by the existing high-rise developments particularly in Lam Tin, Sau Mau Ping, Crocodile Hill and Ngau Tau Kok. The SEKD layout respects this by having a restricted building height (maximum 40 storeys) and preserving views of the natural hillside ridgeline as far as possible. At some locations the ridgeline is reduced in elevation and is broken by the existing high-rise developments. Ridgelines to the east of Lion Rock have not been preserved in total, however, the SEKD layout has retained views as far as possible."</p> <p>Noted and agreed. These shall be included</p> <p>The comment is noted and agreed, please refer to the response for (xx). The impacts as outlined in the comment are more appropriate in Table 13.17 with some amendment to Table 13.14 in accordance with the methodology and to reflect the implementation of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>
<u>VSR Group</u>	<u>Potential Impact</u>																					
7.8.9 and 10	Slight to moderate adverse																					
11	Slight to moderate adverse																					
13,14,15,16 and 18	Neutral																					
17	Slight to moderate adverse																					
19 and 20	Slight to moderate adverse																					
23	Slight Adverse																					
63, 64 and 66	Slight to moderate adverse																					
67	Slight to moderate adverse																					
108, 109, 110 and 111	Slight to moderate adverse																					

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
Water Supplies Department (31) in WSD/MSW 1744/1484/99 Pt. 10 26 June 2001	No comment.	Noted.
Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001	<p>A. General</p> <p>1) A cursory review of the report reveals that some of our previous advisory comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report in May 2001 have not been incorporated into this submission. Our formal comments on this statutory submission are listed below for consideration by relevant parties.</p> <p>2) The comment made on the captioned submission shall not absolve the project proponent or his agent from their responsibilities under EIA Ordinance.</p> <p>3) The comments below have been prepared on the assumption that all the information on the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) of this report is the most up-to-date and that there are no discrepancies between the information provided in the LVIA and that provided for in other assessments.</p> <p>4) We have assumed that the accuracy of the baseline information upon which the LVIA is prepared has been verified by the project proponent and his agent.</p> <p>5) We have also assumed that in-principle agreement of relevant departments have been sought in respect of the responsibility of funding, implementation, management and maintenance of the proposed landscape and visual mitigation works prior to finalization of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>6) It is understood from the recent ESMG meeting that this report is prepared to fulfil the requirements of a Schedule 3 Designated Project (DP) and it is not the intention to use this report to apply environmental permits (EP) for the 20DPs within the Study Area. It is on the basis that we consider the LVIA is in order despite the fact there are inadequate in LVIA to support application of EPs for the Schedule 2 DPs.</p> <p>7) The following comments should be incorporated in the report prior to public inspection under section 7 of the EIA report. This would avoid casting doubts on the accuracy and validity of the findings and raising of unnecessary comments on landscape and visual aspect by the general public.</p> <p>8) The Consultants should conduct internal quality checking by making reference to Annexe 20 of the Technical Memorandum (TM) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) as a first step to satisfy themselves the suitability of the report for public inspection rather than relying on this Landscape Planning Unit to do the proof reading for them. Please note that our requirements are all based on the study brief and the TM that the Consultants should fully conversant with.</p>	<p>Noted. All comments will be reviewed to ensure their incorporation. However, it should be noted that we must incorporate comments from a number of departments and in certain cases compromise is sought.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001	<p>9) Presumably, you will provide district planning input in respect of the Proposed Development, coverage of VSRs and other district planning matters.</p> <p>B. Specific I) EIA Report</p> <p>11) <u>Para.13.3.3.3 - Landscape Impact Assessment</u> (i) The typo in the 2nd sentence “The With reference” should be rectified.</p> <p>(ii) Maturity, rarity, distinctiveness and sensitive landscape designation of landscape resource should be included in the consideration of the rating of landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>(iii) Duration and reversibility of the change should also be included in the consideration of the rating of magnitude of change.</p> <p>12) <u>Section 13.3.5 - Magnitude of Change</u> Description in the magnitude of change in the matrix should be consistent with that of in para. 13.3.5.1. Please revise.</p> <p>13) <u>Para. 13.3.5.2 – Magnitude of Change</u> (i) “Magnitude of Change” should be added to the table.</p> <p>(ii) “Negligible” in the 5th row 2nd column of the table should be deleted.</p> <p>14) <u>Section 13.4.5 and Section 13.4.6 – Visual Sensitivity and Visual Impact</u> (i) All relevant factors affecting the rating of visual sensitivity should be included. Factors as listed in para. 13.4.6.4(a) should be incorporated under this section. The 5th bullet point “sensitivity of VSR” in para 13.4.6.4 should be changed to “type of VSR”.</p> <p>(ii) A separate section listing all relevant factors affecting the magnitude of change should be provided. Factors as listed in paras. 13.4.6.2 and 13.4.6.4(a) should be properly organized into this section.</p> <p>(iii) Description in the magnitude of change in para 13.4.6.6 should be consistent with that in para 13.4.7.1.</p> <p>15) <u>Table 13.1 – List of Schedule 2 Designated Projects under EIAO included within this study</u> All the schedule 2 DPs should be clearly indicated on plan.</p>	<p>Noted. This has been received earlier and responded.</p> <p>Noted. The sentence shall read “With reference”</p> <p>Noted. These have been included within the assessment and will be referenced here.</p> <p>Noted. These have been included within the assessment and will be referenced here.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be amended.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be added.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be deleted.</p> <p>Noted. Factors relating to sensitivity shall be moved to 13.4.5. Sensitivity shall be amended to type.</p> <p>Noted. Factors relating to magnitude of change shall be under 13.4.6.5 (revised to 13.4.6.4).</p> <p>Noted. 13.4.7.1 will be revised to be in accordance with 13.4.6.6.</p> <p>Noted. All the Schedule 2 DPs are listed in Table 1.1 in Section 1 of the EIA Report and are shown in the layout drawings (Drawing Nos. 22936/TP/101 to 129) included in the Section 3 drawings. Reference to the drawings will be added to Section 13.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001</p>	<p>16) <u>Para. 13.5.3.1 – Phasing of Development</u> Open space and landscape works should be included under the column of “Development Proposed”.</p> <p>17) <u>Para. 13.6.2.2 – Overview of Planning Context</u> Please rectify the typo in respect of the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan.</p> <p>18) Comments collected in the last round of public consultation on landscape and visual aspects from relevant statutory/advisory bodies such as Advisory Council on the Environment, Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures, District Councils, Town Planning Board and the general public should be summarized together with a discussion on how their comments have been addressed in the report.</p> <p>19) <u>Section 13.7.4 – Landscape Impact Assessment and Table 13.11 – Landscape Character and Potential Landscape Impacts</u> Please use “neutral impact” instead of “slight, moderate or significant neutral impact” if the change is generally compatible with the existing landscape setting and there is no adverse impact.</p> <p>20) <u>Para. 13.7.4.5 – Potential Impacts to Existing Landscape Elements</u> The impact on the Harbour should be included.</p> <p>21) <u>Table 13.12 – Existing Landscape Elements and Potential Landscape Impacts</u> (i) Under the heading of Open Space, Hoi Bun Road Park should also be included. (ii) Under the heading of Features of Cultural/Heritage Importance, the rating of the magnitude of change should follow the proposed methodology. (iii) Since part of the harbour will be reclaimed, the significance threshold at operation stage should not be “significant neutral”. “Slight adverse” will be more appropriate.</p> <p>22) <u>Section 13.8.7 – Visual Impact Assessment, Table 13.13 Summary of Visual Envelope Zones and Table 13.14 – Visually Sensitive Receiver Groups and Visual Impact Assessment</u> (i) Please use “neutral impact” instead of “slight, moderate or significant neutral impact” if the change is generally compatible with the existing visual setting and there is no adverse impact.</p>	<p>Noted. It will be added under phases 2 and 3.</p> <p>Noted. Mau shall be revised to Ma.</p> <p>The submission to ACABAS will be made in the detailed design stage. We have presented the project to different parties such as ACE, District Councils, Town Planning Board and the general public. Amongst a number of issues such as transport, environment, land use, some have raised the importance of landscaping, which has been reflected in this study reports.</p> <p>Noted. This had be termed in order to provide a describe the level of change likely to occur. However it will be deleted.</p> <p>Noted. Additional information shall be given noting the significant adverse impact during construction and slight adverse during operation.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be added.</p> <p>Noted. Magnitude for change for <i>Rocks</i> under operation shall be negligible.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be amended.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer above. Only the term neutral shall be used.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001</p>	<p>(ii) It is noted that the operational impact of the VSRs in non-waterfront zones will be slight adverse impact e.g. zone 8, however, the operational impact of the VSRs in the waterfront of the HK Island will be “slight, moderate or significant neutral” e.g. zones 3 and 4. The operational visual impact of the VSRs along the waterfront, which have a prominent view to the development, should not be less than that of the non-waterfront VSRs. Some of the residual impact should be slight adverse if the view to the harbour or green backdrop is reduced. The consultant should review the impact assessment.</p> <p>(iii) Future VSRs within the project site should be indicated on plan.</p> <p>23) <u>Para. 13.9.2.15 (b)</u> Provision of adequate underground space and soil depth over box culvert for landscaping and recreational facilities should also be included.</p> <p>24) <u>Para. 13.9.3.4 – Protection of existing vegetation and trees to be retained</u> Penalty clause for the damage of tree cannot be enforced under government contract. The consultant should proposed alternative measures to protect the trees.</p> <p>25) <u>Section 13.9.4.25</u> (i) Stockpiling and reuse of topsoil should be addressed under construction stages (ii) Earthworks design should be addressed under detailed design stage.</p> <p>(iii) Management and maintenance agents for construction stage mitigation measures should be specified.</p> <p>26) <u>Para. 13.10.2.5(b) – Residual Landscape Impacts to Landscape Elements</u> Quantified loss in area of Victoria Harbour should be specified.</p> <p>27) <u>Table 13.15- Residual Landscape Impacts to Landscape Character and Table 13.16 – Residual Landscape Impacts to Landscape Resources</u> (i) Please use “neutral impact” instead of “slight, moderate or significant neutral impact” if the change is generally compatible with the existing landscape setting and there is no adverse impact. (ii) Please use alternative description instead of “none” to represent impact arising from the SEKD schedule 3 DP as a whole.</p>	<p>The comment is noted. However it is considered that the non-waterfront VSRs do not benefit from viewing the overall waterfront development of SEKD, rather they will simply experience additional high-rise buildings in their backgrounds. The waterfront VSRs however, will be able to view the entire SEKD and will be able to appreciate the overall effect, e.g. promenade, metropolitan park, mixed built development from their existing views of the industrial frontage.</p> <p>They are indicated on Figure 22936/LV/518.</p> <p>Noted. The following shall be added “It should be ensured during the detail design, maximum provision of underground space and soil depth over box culvert for landscaping and recreational facilities will be made as far as practicable.”</p> <p>Noted. This shall be deleted. Fencing, prohibition of storage, clear identification of “no-go” areas shall be described.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be moved to construction stage.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be considered under detail design stage.</p> <p>Noted. Most of these will be under the contractor and the client department/TDD. This shall be added.</p> <p>Noted. This shall read “Loss of approx. 116Ha of Victoria Harbour”</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to above.</p> <p>Noted. The term Schedule 3 DP shall be used.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001	<p>(iii) The information for “Rocks” in table 13.16 is outstanding.</p> <p>(iv) The terminology used to describe the significance threshold and landscape impact should be consistent with the methodology. “No impact” should be changed to “Negligible” or “Not applicable” where appropriate.</p> <p>28) <u>Table 13.17 – Residual Visual Impacts to Visually Sensitive Receivers</u></p> <p>(i) Please use “neutral impact” instead of “slight, moderate or significant neutral impact” if the change is generally compatible with the existing landscape setting and there is no adverse impact.</p> <p>(ii) Please use alternative description instead of “none” to represent impact arising from the SEKD schedule 3 DP as a whole.</p> <p>(iii) Previous comments on the review of the impact on the VSRs along the waterfront of the Hong Kong Island should be incorporated.</p> <p>29) <u>Tables 13.18 to 13.39</u></p> <p>(i) Assessment of impact to the future sensitive receivers within the development should be included.</p> <p>(ii) Please use “neutral impact” instead of “slight, moderate or significant neutral impact” if the change is generally compatible with the existing landscape setting and there is no adverse impact.</p> <p>30) <u>Table 13.39 – Summary of Landscape Impact Assessment - Resources</u></p> <p>(i) It is noted that approx. 1000 trees will be affected. The applicant should consider maximizing the preservation of existing trees to reduce the landscape impact.</p> <p>(ii) The operational impact for Sung Wong Toi Rock can be described as “negligible” if the rock and the landscape setting will be reprovisioned.</p> <p>31) <u>Table 13.40 – Summary of Visual Impact Assessment</u> Previous comments on the review of the impact on the VSRs along the waterfront of the Hong Kong Island should be incorporated.</p> <p>32) <u>Dwg. nos. 22936/LV/504 – 515 – Existing Landscape Context</u></p> <p>(i) Coloured photos should be used to present the existing landscape context.</p>	<p>Noted. This shall be added.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. No impact shall be deleted and negligible or Not applicable be used as appropriate.</p> <p>Noted. Please also refer to previous comments.</p> <p>Noted. The term Schedule 3 DP shall be used.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to response for comment 22.</p> <p>Noted. These have been included where appropriate, e.g. Table 13.30. It should be noted, that many of these VSRs form part of the same overall phased works as the DPs, or will be screened from the future works by the buildings at their southern edge. Notwithstanding they shall be reviewed.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to above responses.</p> <p>Noted. All measures to minimize works have been incorporated, particularly with respect to reducing the extent of the trees affected.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. This shall read negligible.</p> <p>Noted. Please refer to response for comment 22.</p> <p>Noted. These shall be used in the final report.</p>

Parties/ Ref. No/ Date	Comments	Response
<p>Planning Department () in K-R/OTH/181A 6 July 2001</p>	<p>(ii) Viewpoint locations should be indicated on plan.</p> <p>(iii) Description and annotation of the existing landscape condition should be added.</p> <p>(iv) Typo in dwg. no. 22936/LV/515 "Lebbeck Tree" should be rectified.</p> <p>33) <u>Dwg. no.22936/LV/518 –Visually Sensitive Receiver Groups</u> Visually sensitive receiver group nos. 113 to 134 cannot be identified on plan. The consultant should improve the presentation on plan.</p> <p>34) <u>Dwg. nos. 22936/LV/527 to 543</u> Quality of photomontages should be improved to present the impact of the development.</p> <p>35) <u>Dwg. nos. 22936/LV/550 to 555 – Summary of Residual Landscape and Visual Impacts</u> Previous comments on the review of the impact should be incorporated.</p> <p><u>II) EIA Executive Summary</u></p> <p>36) Quantified information regarding the landscape impact should be included e.g. area of harbour to be reclaimed, area of open space affected, etc.</p> <p>37) <u>Para. 14.1.5</u> "Significant neutral impacts" should be revised to a more easily understood terms description such as change of landscape character.</p> <p>38) Key mitigation measures should be listed.</p> <p><u>III) Environmental Monitoring and Audit Manual</u></p> <p>39) Formulation of design measures to maximize the preservation of existing trees should be included.</p> <p>40) Provision of adequate underground space and soil depth over box culvert for landscaping and recreational facilities should also be included.</p>	<p>Noted and additional plan will be provided.</p> <p>Noted. Notation shall be included.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be amended.</p> <p>Boundary lines will be included around the VSRs.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted. This shall be reviewed to incorporate the above, however, please also refer to response to comment 22.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. This shall be given.</p> <p>The comment is noted, however, in accordance with DPO/KIn comments this shall be revised to slight adverse.</p> <p>The main ones will be listed.</p> <p>Noted. Design measures have been included where possible, primarily through the minimisation of the site works. Notwithstanding additional information will be given to highlight the need for the detail design to preserve trees as far as possible.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. As above, maximum soil depth shall be included.</p>