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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

i. This is the fourteenth Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM\&A) Report - September 2013 to November 2013 for the Site Formation for Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Development under Contract No. KL/2009/01. Dredging of marine sediment has been commenced since 28 June 2010 while removal and reconstruction of existing seawall has been commenced since 22 November 2010. This report presents the environmental monitoring findings and information recorded during the period from September 2013 to November 2013.

## Construction Activities in the Reported Period

ii. During the reporting period, the principle work activities are summarized as below:

Table I Principle Work Activities in the Reporting Quarter

| September 2013 | October 2013 | November 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Dredging of Marine Sediment; <br> - Maintenance of Silt Curtain and Silt Screens; <br> - Sorting of inert C\&D material from existing seawall; and <br> - Reconstruction of New Seawall. | - Maintenance of Silt Curtain and Silt Screens; <br> - Sorting of inert C\&D material from existing seawall; and <br> - Reconstruction of New Seawall. | - Construction of boundary wall; <br> - Construction of u-channels at NDA; and <br> - Collection of surplus rocks by other government projects. |

## Noise Monitoring

iii. Due to the non-existence of planned NSRs during the reporting quarter, no noise monitoring was required to be conducted at the planned noise monitoring locations NM1 and NM2.

## Water Quality Monitoring

iv. Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
v. Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.
vi. Water quality monitoring was conducted at 6 designated monitoring stations namely WSD9, WSD10, WSD15, WSD17, WSD19 and WSD21.
vii. Turbidity exceedances were found on 6 Sep 2013 at WSD10 during ebb tide; 21 Sep 2013 at WSD9 during ebb tide; 4 Oct 2013 at WSD9 during flood tide; 4 Nov 2013 at WSD19 during ebb tide. Investigations found that all exceedance was not related to the Project works.
viii. SS exceedances were found on the 19 Oct 2013 at WSD9 during ebb tide; 21 Oct 2013 at WSD10, WSD15, WSD19 during ebb tide and at WSD17 during flood tide; 1 Nov 2013 at WSD19 during ebb tide; 1 Nov 2013 at WSD17 during flood tide; 21 Nov 2013 at WSD17 during flood tide; and 23 Nov 2013 at WSD21 during flood tide. Investigations found that all exceedances were not related to the Project works.
ix. $\quad$ Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report - Review of Action and Limit Levels (Revision 1.2) was submitted to EPD on 13 October 2011. With respect to the EPD's no comment on the new Action and Limit Levels for water monitoring on 19 October 2011, the new set Action and Limit Levels for turbidity and SS was started to use from 19 October 2011.

## Water Quality against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbour

x. There were nine SS exceedances recorded in this reporting period. All of them were considered as not project-related. Among the nine recorded SS exceedances on 19, 21 October 2013 and 1, 21 and 23 November 2013, six of them were located at upstream of project location and no rising SS were observed at downstream stations.
xi. The other exceedances were concluded as not project-related since the immediate downstream station showed no exceedance of SS and relatively low level of SS. Furthermore, there were no marine works conducted by the contractor on that day. Overall, it is concluded that no water quality impacts were arising from the Project works.

## Natural Variation Comparison

xii. Based on the determination of upper bound of the natural variation levels from the Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report, most SS results in reporting period were well within the upper bound of natural variation levels.
xiii. Investigations on the recorded exceedances (SS) on 19 October 2013 at WSD9 (Mid-ebb); 21 October 2013 at WSD19 (Mid-ebb) and 1 November 2013 at WSD17 (Mid-flood) were upstream from project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
xiv. Investigations on the recorded exceedances (SS) on 23 November 2013 at WSD21 (Midflood) was considered as not project-related. There were no marine works conducted by the contractor on that day. Also, at WSD9, the immediate downstream station, there was no exceedance and recorded relatively low level of SS. No further exceedance of SS was recorded in the consecutive monitoring. Thus, it is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.

## Water Quality Surveillance System

xv. With reference to the upper bound of natural variation levels and water quality surveillance conducting in reporting period, most monitoring stations downstream of project were well within the action level and hence these further supports such exceedances are not caused by dredging activities.
xvi. Since the investigations found that the exceedances recorded in the reporting quarter were not related to the Project, it was concluded that all necessary steps under Event and Action Plan had been taken. The details of Event and Action Plans and Notification of Exceedance summarizing the finding of investigation, possible causes can be referred to the Monthly EM\&A Reports.

## Waste Management

xvii. In this reporting quarter, there was $429 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ marine sediment (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal) disposed to South Cheung Chau Spoil Disposal Area denoted "KTCT-1" and "KTCT -2". The dredging and disposal of the sediment (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal (Dedicate Sites) and Type 2 - Confined Marine Disposal) to East Sha Chau Contaminated Mud Disposal Site - Pit IVc was completed in June 2011.
xviii. There were $10 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ non-inert C\&D material related to dredging works were disposed off site in this reporting quarter.

Complaints, Notifications of Summons and Successful Prosecutions
xix. No complaint, notification of prosecutions or summons was received in the reporting quarter.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Scope of the Report

1.1.1. Lam Environmental Services Limited (LES) has been appointed to work as the Environmental Team (ET) for dredging works to implement the Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM\&A) programme for the Site Formation for Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Development under Contract No. KL/2009/01. Dredging of marine sediment and removal and reconstruction of existing seawall were commenced on 28 June and 22 November 2010 respectively.
1.1.2. This report presents the environmental monitoring and auditing work carried out in accordance to the Section 10.7 under Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM\&A) Manual.
1.1.3. This report documents the finding of EM\&A works during the quarter from September 2013 to November 2013.

### 1.2 Structure of the Report

Section 1 Introduction - details the scope and structure of the report.
Section 2 Project Background - summarizes background and scope of the Project, site description, project organization and contact details of key personnel during the reporting period.

Section 3 Monitoring Requirements - summarizes all monitoring parameters, monitoring locations, monitoring frequency, duration and action plan.

Section 4 Monitoring Results - summarizes the monitoring results obtained in the reporting period.

Section 5 Compliance Audit, Review of the Reasons for and the Implication of Non-compliance - summarizes the auditing of monitoring results, all exceedances environmental parameters, review the reasons for and the implication of non-compliance.

Section 6 Complaints, Notification of summons and Prosecution - summarizes the cumulative statistics on complaints, notification of summons and prosecution

## Section 7 Conclusion

## 2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Background

2.1.1. The former Kai Tak Airport located in the south-eastern part of Kowloon Peninsula was the international airport of Hong Kong. The Kai Tak Airport had come into operations since 1920s. The operation of the Kai Tak Airport was ceased and replaced by the new airport at Chek Lap Kok in July 1998. After closure, the disused airport site has been occupied by various temporary uses, including a golf driving range on the runway area.
2.1.2. In 2002, the Chief Executive in Council approved the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plans (No. S/K19/3 and S/K21/3) to provide the statutory framework to proceed with the South East Kowloon Development at the former Kai Tak Airport. However, following the judgment of the Court of Final Appeal in January 2004 regarding the Harbour reclamation, the originally proposed development which involves reclamation has to be reviewed. The Kai Tak Planning Review (KTPR) has resulted with a Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) for Kai Tak in October 2006. Subsequently, the Administration announced in October 2006 a plan to implement a cruise terminal at Kai Tak, as part of the development.
2.1.3. Development of the cruise terminal at Kai Tak would require dredging at the existing seawall at the southern tip of the former Kai Tak Airport runway for construction of a quay deck structure for two berths, and dredging the seabed fronting the new quay to provide necessary manoeuvring basin. The general layout of the proposed cruise terminal construction is shown in Figure 2.1.
2.1.4. The current Project involves a dredging operation exceeding $500,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ for construction and operation of the proposed cruise terminal at Kai Tak and is therefore classified as a Designated Project under Item C.12, Part I, Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Study for the Project has been undertaken in accordance with the EIA Study Brief (No. ESB-159/2006) and the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process (EIAO-TM).

### 2.2 Scope of the Project and Site Description

2.2.1. The scope of the Project comprises:

- Dredging of marine sediment of about $700,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ from the existing seabed (Stage 1 dredging) in the Harbour area off the southern tip of the former Kai Tak Airport runway to provide the necessary water depth within the manoeuvring area for cruise vessels; and
- Removal of existing seawall of about $322,300 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ by dredging at the southern tip of the former Kai Tak Airport runway for cruise berth construction.


### 2.3 Project Organization

2.3.1. Kowloon Development Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department is the overall project controller. For the construction phase of the Project, Project Engineer, Contractor,

Environmental Team and Independent Environmental Checker are appointed to manage and control environmental issues.
2.3.2. The proposed project organization and lines of communication with respect to environmental protection works are shown in Figure 2.2. Key personnel and contact particulars are summarized in Table 2.1:

Table 2.1 Contact Details of Key Personnel

| Party | Role | Name | Post | Contact No. | Contact Fax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Civil Engineering and <br> Development <br> Department (Kowloon <br> Development Office) | Project <br> Proponent | Ir. KY Shin | Senior <br> Engineer | 23011461 | 23011277 |
| URS Hong Kong <br> Limited | Engineer's <br> Representative | Mr. Wong Tze <br> Kwong | Senior <br> Resident <br> Engineer | 21487638 | 21487277 |
| Penta-Ocean <br> Construction <br> Company Limited | Contractor | Mr. H. Taguchi | Project <br> Manager | 21487238 | 21487138 |
|  | Mr. Yuen Tit | Sub Agent |  |  |  |
|  | Mr. Gideon Cheng | Environmental <br> Officer | 24506138 |  |  |
| Fugro (HK) Limited | Independent <br> Environmental <br> Checker (IEC) | Mr. Joseph Poon | Independent <br> Environmental <br> Checker (IEC) | 24508238 | 28823331 |
| Lam Environmental <br> Services Limited | Environmental <br> Team Leader | Mr. Raymond Dai | Environmental <br> Team Leader <br> (ETL) | 28823939 | 2882 |

### 2.4 Principal Work and Activities

2.4.1. During this reporting quarter, the principal work activities are summarized in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 Principle Work Activities during the Reporting Quarter

| September 2013 | October 2013 | November 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Dredging of Marine Sediment; <br> - Maintenance of Silt Curtain and Silt Screens; <br> - Sorting of inert C\&D material from existing seawall; and <br> - Reconstruction of New Seawall | - Maintenance of Silt Curtain and Silt Screens; <br> - Sorting of inert C\&D material from existing seawall; and <br> - Reconstruction of New Seawall | - Construction of boundary wall; <br> - Construction of u-channels at NDA; and <br> - Collection of surplus rocks by other government projects. |

2.4.2. Implementation status of the recommended mitigation measures during this reporting period is presented in Appendix 2.1.

## 3. MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

### 3.1. Noise Monitoring

3.1.1. In accordance with the EIA Report and the approved EM\&A Manual, it is anticipated that construction activities, if unmitigated, would not cause any adverse noise impact to the nearest NSRs in the vicinity of the work site. The predicted noise levels at the NSRs would comply with construction noise criteria. These nearest NSRs are designated for construction noise monitoring as listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Noise Monitoring Stations

| Station | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| NM1 | Planned Residential Development (R3 site) |
| NM2 | Planned Residential Development (R3 site) |

3.1.2. As per S.3.1.1 of the approved EM\&A Manual states that "Noise levels shall be monitored to evaluate the construction noise impact if there is any planned noise sensitive receivers (NSRs) occupied within 300 m from the works area of this Project during the proposed dredging works". Therefore, the impact monitoring for construction noise shall only be carried out when the planned residential development at the two identified monitoring stations are occupied at a later stage.

### 3.2. Water Quality Monitoring

3.2.1. The EIA Report has identified that suspended solids (SS) would be the most critical water quality parameter during the dredging operations. Water quality monitoring for SS and turbidity is therefore recommended to be carried out at selected WSD flushing water intakes. The impact monitoring should be carried out during the proposed dredging works for cruise terminal construction to ensure the compliance with the water quality standards.
3.2.2. It is proposed to monitor the water quality at six WSD flushing water intakes along the seafront of the Victoria Harbour. The proposed water quality monitoring stations are shown in Table 3.2 and Figure 3.1.

Table 3.2 Marine Water Quality Stations for Water Quality Monitoring

| Station Ref. | WSD Flushing Water Intake | Easting | Northing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WSD9 | Tai Wan | 837921.0 | 818330.0 |
| WSD10 | Cha Kwo Ling | 841900.9 | 817700.1 |
| WSD15 | Sai Wan Ho | 841110.4 | 816450.1 |
| WSD17 | Quarry Bay | 839790.3 | 817032.2 |
| WSD21 | Wan Chai | 836220.8 | 815940.1 |
| WSD19 | Sheung Wan | 833415.0 | 816771.0 |

## WATER QUALITY PARAMETERS AND FREQUENCY

3.2.3. During the period of dredging, monitoring should be undertaken three days per week, at midflood and mid-ebb tides, with sampling / measurement at the designated monitoring stations as shown in Table 3.2. The interval between two sets of monitoring should not be less than 36 hours except where there are exceedances of Action and/or Limit Levels, in which case the monitoring frequency will be increased. Table 3.3 shows the proposed monitoring frequency and water quality parameters. Duplicate in-situ measurements and water sampling should be carried out in each sampling event. For selection of tides for in-situ measurement and water sampling, tidal range of individual flood and ebb tides should not be less than 0.5 m .
3.2.4. Silt screens in frame type or floating type shall be deployed at these intakes during the dredging period. It is recommended to conduct the monitoring behind the silt screens at the seawater intake culvert at each seawater pumping station to collect information on the water quality condition after passed the silt screen.

Table 3.3 Water Quality Monitoring Frequency and Parameters

| Activities | Monitoring <br> Frequency | Parameters ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Notes:

1. For selection of tides for in-situ measurement and water sampling, tidal range of individual flood and ebb tides should be not less than 0.5 m .
2. Turbidity should be measured in situ whereas SS should be determined by laboratory.
3.2.5. Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report - Review of Action and Limit Levels (Revision 1.2) was submitted to EPD on 13 October 2011. With respect to the EPD's no comment on the new Action and Limit Levels for water monitoring on 19 October 2011, the new set Action and Limit Levels for turbidity and SS was started to use from 19 October 2011. The established Action and Limit levels can be referred to Appendix 3.1.

## 4. MONITORING RESULTS

### 4.1. Water Monitoring Results

4.1.1. Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
4.1.2. Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.
4.1.3. The water quality monitoring was commenced concurrently with the commencement of dredging works on 28 June 2010. Water quality monitoring was conducted at 6 designated monitoring stations namely WSD9, WSD10, WSD15, WSD17, WSD19 and WSD21 during the reporting quarter.
4.1.4. Water monitoring results measured in this reporting period are reviewed and summarized. Details of graphical presentation can be referred in Appendix 4.1. The details of exceedances are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Summary of Exceedances Recorded in the Reporting Quarter

| Period |  | Level | WSD9 |  | WSD10 |  | WSD15 |  | WSD17 |  | WSD19 |  | WSD21 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Turb | SS | Turb | SS | Turb | SS | Turb | SS | Turb | SS | Turb | SS |
|  |  | NTU | mg/L | NTU | mg/L | NTU | mg/L | NTU | mg/L | NTU | mg/L | NTU | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ |
| Mid-flood | Sep-13 |  | AL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Oct-13 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nov-13 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mid-ebb | Sep-13 | AL | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Oct-13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nov-13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total of AL Exceedances: |  |  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Mid-flood | Sep-13 | LL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Oct-13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nov-13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mid-ebb | Sep-13 | LL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Oct-13 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Nov-13 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total of LL Exceedances: |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Total of Exceedances: |  |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 1 |  |

Remark: Two sets of Action and Limit Level for Dry season (the period from October to March) and Wet season (the period from April to September) could be referred in Appendix 3.1.
4.1.5. Total 4 turbidity and 9 SS exceedances were recorded in the reporting period. Investigation found that the exceedances were located at the upstream station of the Project site or due to localized impact and were not due to the Project work. It concluded that no adverse water quality impact was arising from the Project works. Details of investigations can be referred in Section 5.

### 4.2. Water Quality Surveillance System

4.2.1. Six self water quality surveillance monitoring events for removal of existing seawall were conducted in the reporting period. Turbidity and SS monitoring were conducted at 12 locations as follows and shown in Figure 4.1.

- One sampling point inside the silt curtain (SP1);
- Four sampling points outside the silt curtain (MP1-MP4);
- Seven control points (C1-C7)
4.2.2. The graphical presentation of the SS levels at SP1, sampling points outside the silt curtain, control points and impact water quality monitoring stations against the distance are shown in Appendix 4.2.


### 4.3. Dredging and Disposal

4.3.1. Implementation of mitigation measures for dredging work and the associated dredging records were checked and the findings are summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Compliance with EP Conditions in the Reporting Quarter

| EP Condition | Compliance Status and/or Recommendation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Silt Curtain Deployment | In accordance with the EP requirement and Implementation <br> Schedule for Water Quality Measure and completed on November. |
| For removal of the existing seawall <br> and the seabed, Daily Dredging <br> Rate $\leq 4,000 \mathrm{~m} 3 /$ H Hourly Dredging <br> Rate $\leq 334 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{hr}$ | Completed. |
| Daily Dredging Rate $\leq 4,000 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{d}$ <br> Hourly Dredging Rate $\leq 334 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{hr} r$ | Complied with the EP requirement in reporting month: <br> Daily Dredging Rate maintained at $507 \mathrm{~m} 3 /$ day and <br> Hourly Dredging Rate maintained at $65 \mathrm{~m} 3 / \mathrm{hr} ;$ <br> and completed on November. |
| Silt Screen Deployment | In accordance with the Silt Screen Deployment Plan for all 6 <br> intakes, and completed on November. |

4.3.2. The daily and hourly dredging rates were checked and reviewed that were below the EP requirements. It was concluded that the dredging was conducted in compliance with the specific EP requirements.
4.3.3. The dredging and disposal of the sediment (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal (Dedicate Sites) and Type 2 - Confined Marine Disposal) to East Sha Chau Contaminated Mud Disposal Site - Pit IVc was completed.
4.3.4. No dredging works were conducted in the November. A letter of confirmation of the end of dredging operations dated 5th December, 2013 was sent to EPD by the contractor. No further dredging operations will be carried out without prior notification to EPD.
4.3.5. There were $10 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ non-inert C\&D material related to dredging works were disposed off site in this reporting quarter.
4.3.6. Details of the marine sediment dumping are summarized in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Waste Quantities Related To Dredging Works

| Waste Type | Quantity this quarter, $\mathrm{m}^{3}$, (Bulk Volume) | Cumulative Quantity-to-Date, ${ }^{3}$, (Bulk Volume) | Disposal / Dumping Grounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marine Sediment <br> (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal) | 429 | 561,891 | South Cheung Chau Spoil Disposal Area denoted "KTCT-1" and "KTCT -2" |
| Marine Sediment (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal (Dedicated Sites) \& Type 2 Confined Marine Disposal) * | NIL | Completed | East Sha $\quad$ Chau  <br> Contaminated Mud <br> Disposal Site - Pit IVc  |

* Remarks: The disposal of marine sediment (Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal (Dedicated Sites) and Type 2 Confined Marine Disposal) was completed.

5. COMPLIANCE AUDIT, REVIEW OF THE REASONS FOR AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF NON-COMPLIANCE
5.0.1. The Event Action Plan for construction noise and water quality is presented in Appendix 5.1.

### 5.1. Noise Monitoring

5.1.1. Noise monitoring was not necessary in the reporting period due to non-presence of NSR.

### 5.2. Water Quality Monitoring

5.2.1. Turbidity exceedance was found on 6 Sep 2013 at WSD10 during ebb tide; 21 Sep 2013 at WSD9 during ebb tide; 4 Oct 2013 at WSD9 during flood tide; 4 Nov 2013 at WSD19 during ebb tide. Investigations found that all exceedance was not related to the Project works.
5.2.2. SS exceedances were found on the 19 Oct 2013 at WSD9 during ebb tide; 21 Oct 2013 at WSD10, WSD15, WSD19 during ebb tide and at WSD17 during flood tide; 1 Nov 2013 at WSD19 during ebb tide; 1 Nov 2013 at WSD17 during flood tide; 21 Nov 2013 at WSD17 during flood tide; and 23 Nov 2013 at WSD21 during flood tide. Investigations found that all exceedances were not related to the Project works.
5.2.3. A total of four action level exceedances in turbidity and three action level exceedance and six limit level exceedances of SS were recorded in the reporting period. Silt curtain and silt screens were checked and confirmed in proper condition during the water monitoring. Investigations found that the exceedances were not related to the Project works.
5.2.4. For the exceedances, further investigations were conducted to determine the cause of impact in terms of the following areas:

- Water Quality against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbour;
- Natural Variation Comparison; and
- Water Quality Surveillance System
5.2.5. More details on the investigation are given in Section 5.3 to 5.5.


### 5.3. Water Quality against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbour

5.3.1. In order to conclude the cause of an adverse water quality impact, the trend across the 6 monitoring stations is reviewed. Whether the adverse impact is due to project work will be evaluated from the trend of SS level in downstream across the Victoria Harbour after passing the project location. By observing this trend of SS, contribution of the adverse water quality impact from the dredging activities under the project can be evaluated by checking if there is a significant rising up trend in the SS level in the WSD intakes at project downstream.
5.3.2. Moreover, a comparison of the monitoring station at project downstream stations with the upstream monitoring stations can also indicate whether the extent of exceedance in SS content recorded at the WSD intakes downstream to the project is likely to be caused by upstream source or not. If the SS values of the upstream and downstream show similar levels, the impact at the project downstream stations shall probably be due to the project
upstream streams and the contribution from project work can be eliminated. A review on the tidal movement across the Victoria Harbour is plotted against the SS results and graphical presentation is presented in Appendix 5.2.
5.3.3. Investigations on the recorded upstream exceedances revealed that there were no significant rising up trend of SS levels across the Victoria Harbour after passing the project location. No downstream exceedances recorded in this reporting period. It is concluded that no adverse water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.4. For the recorded exceedance (SS) on 19 October 2013, WSD9 (Mid-ebb) was upstream of project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.5. On 21 October 2013, the recorded exceedances at WSD10 and WSD15 (Mid-ebb) are considered as not project related. At WSD17, the immediate downstream station, no exceedance of SS and similar magnitude of SS compared with WSD10 and WSD15. No rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. Furthermore, there were no marine works conducted by the contractor on that day. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.6. For the other recorded exceedance (SS) on 21 October 2013 at WSD19 (Mid-ebb). It was located at upstream of project location. Silt screen washing conducted by WSD workers was observed during sampling. Hence, it is concluded that the source of impact was due to silt screen washing activities at WSD19 and not related to the Project works. No exceedance in SS was recorded at the next tide on the same day ( 21 Oct flood-tide was $9.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ). It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.7. The recorded exceedance (SS) on 21 October 2013 at WSD17 (Mid-flood) was upstream from project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.8. For the recorded exceedance (SS) on 1 and 21 November 2013, WSD19 (Mid-ebb) and WSD17 (Mid-flood) were located at the upstream of project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.3.9. On 23 November 2013, the recorded exceedance at WSD21 (Mid-flood) was considered as not project related. At WSD9, the immediate downstream station, there was no exceedance and recorded relatively low level of SS. No rising of SS was observed at the other downstream station. Furthermore, there were no marine works conducted by the contractor on that day. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.

### 5.4. Natural Variation Comparison

5.4.1. Referring to the ER Letter ref. CEDD/KL/2009/01/M45/130(369767) dated 14 February 2011, a Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report - Review Action and Limit Levels (Revision 1.0) has been provided to EPD by ER in February 2011 in according to

Sections 4.92 and 10.7 of EM\&A Manual. This report in Revision 1.1 has been provided on 26 April 2011 in response to EPD's comments dated 1 April 2011. This report presents the methodology for enlargement baseline database and the review and determination of the Action and Limit Levels in dry and wet seasons.
5.4.2. On the basis of this Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report, the maximum SS levels in the establishment of larger baseline database will be applied and acted as the upper bound of natural variation levels for the comparison with SS results in reporting quarter. The upper bound of natural variation levels are shown in Table 5.1. The graphic presentation of water quality results with respect to local variation is shown in Appendix 5.3.

Table 5.1 Upper Bound of Natural Variation Levels at Water Monitoring Stations

| Upper Bound of Natural <br> Variation Levels (mg/L) | WSD9 | WSD10 | WSD15 | WSD17 | WSD19 | WSD21 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dry Season | 12.0 | 19.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 15.0 |
| Wet Season | 15.1 | 21.2 | 22.7 | 17.9 | 17.1 | 18.8 |

5.4.3. According to the graphic presentation, most $S S$ results were well within the upper bound of natural variation levels.
5.4.4. Based on the graphic presentation and the trend description of the SS levels in Appendix 4.2, conclusion of the water quality surveillance can be draw as follows:

- SS levels at all control points and downstream WSD intakes were below SP1 and well within the Action level;
- When the WSD intakes were located at upstream of the Project, it found that SS level was occasionally higher than the control points and sampling points near dredging area. Thus, uncertain interference of water quality was apparently interfering in the vicinity of intakes frequently;
5.6.1. Investigations on the recorded exceedances (SS) on 19 October 2013 at WSD9 (Mid-ebb) and on 21 October 2013 at WSD19 (Mid-ebb) were upstream from project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.6.2. Investigations on the recorded exceedances (SS) on 1 November 2013 at WSD17 (Mid-flood) was upstream from project location, no rising of SS was observed at downstream stations. It is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.6.3. Investigations on the recorded exceedances (SS) on 23 November 2013 at WSD21 (Midflood) was considered as not project-related. There were no marine works conducted by the contractor on that day. Also, at WSD9, the immediate downstream station, there was no exceedance and recorded relatively low level of SS. No further exceedance of SS was recorded in the consecutive monitoring. Thus, it is concluded that no water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
5.4.5. With reference to the upper bound of natural variation levels and water quality surveillance conducting in reporting period, it shows no fluctuation over the upper bound most of the time and hence this further supports such exceedance is not caused by dredging activities.
5.4.6. Since the investigations found that the exceedances recorded in the reporting quarter were not related to the Project, it was concluded that all necessary steps under Event and Action Plan had been taken. The details of Event and Action Plans and Notification of Exceedance summarizing the finding of investigation, possible causes can be referred to the Monthly EM\&A Reports.


### 5.5. Site Audit

5.5.1. There was no non-compliance from the site audits in the reporting period. During environmental site inspections conducted during the reporting quarter, no particular finding was obtained on the dredging works during the site inspections.
5.6. Summary of action taken in the event of and follow-up on non-compliance
5.6.4. Since the exceedances recorded were not project-related, follow-up mitigation measures were therefore not required.
6. COMPLAINTS, NOTIFICATION OF SUMMONS AND PROSECUTION
6.0.1. In the reporting quarter, no complaints, notification of summons or prosecution was received in the reporting period. Cumulative statistic on complaints and successful prosecutions are summarized in Table 6.1, Table 6.2 and Table 6.3 respectively.

Table 6.1 Environmental Complaints Log

| Complaint <br> Log No. | Date of <br> Receipt | Received From <br> and Received By | Nature of <br> Complaint | Date <br> Investigated | Outcome | Date of <br> Reply |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NIL | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Table 6.2 Cumulative Statistics on Complaints

| Environmental <br> Parameters | Cumulative No. <br> Brought Forward | No. of Complaints This <br> Month | Cumulative No. <br> Project-to-Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Noise | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Waste | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

Table 6.3 Cumulative Statistics on Successful Prosecutions

| Environmental <br> Parameters | Cumulative No. <br> Brought Forward | No. of Successful <br> Prosecutions this <br> month (Offence Date) | Cumulative No. <br> Project-to-Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Noise | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Waste | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

## 7. CONCLUSION

7.0.1. The EM\&A programme was carried out in accordance with the EM\&A Manual requirements, minor alterations to the programme proposed were made in response to changing circumstances.
7.0.2. Three action level exceedances and six limit level exceedances of SS concentration, four action level exceedances and no limit level exceedances of turbidity were recorded in the reporting period. Investigations found that the exceedances were either located at the upstream station of the Project site or due to localized impact, and not due to the Project work. It is concluded that no adverse water quality impact was arising from the Project works.
7.0.3. Supplementary to Baseline Water Quality Monitoring Report - Review of Action and Limit Levels (Revision 1.2) was submitted to EPD on 13 October 2011. With respect to the EPD's no comment on the new Action and Limit Levels for water monitoring on 19 October 2011, the new set Action and Limit Levels for turbidity and SS was started to use from 19 October 2011.
7.0.4. Noise monitoring was not necessary in the reporting period due to non-presence of NSR.
7.0.5. The construction programmes in reporting quarter are provided in Appendix 7.1.
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## Appendix 2.1

Implementation Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures

| EIA Ref ${ }^{\#}$ | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S3.6 | Requirements of the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation shall be adhered to during the construction period. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation |
| S3.6 | In order to minimize the potential odour emissions, if any, the dredged sediment placed on barge should be properly covered as far as practicable to minimise the exposed area and hence the potential odour emissions during the transportation of the dredged sediment. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM |
| S4.8 | Good Site Practices: <br> - Only well-maintained plant should be operated on-site and plant should be serviced regularly during the construction program. <br> - Mobile plant, if any, should be sited as far away from NSRs as possible. <br> - Machines and plant (such as trucks) that may be in intermittent use should be shut down between works periods or should be throttled down to a minimum. <br> - Plant known to emit noise strongly in one direction should, wherever possible, be orientated so that the noise is directed away from the nearby NSRs. <br> - Material stockpiles and other structures should be effectively utilised, wherever practicable, in screening noise from on-site construction activities. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NCO } \\ & \text { EIAO-TM } \end{aligned}$ |


| EIA Ref ${ }^{\#}$ | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S4.9 | If there is any planned NSRs within 300 m from the work area occupied during the dredging period, an EM\&A programme is recommended to be established according to the predicted occurrence of noisy activities. All the recommended mitigation measures for daytime normal working activities should be incorporated into the EM\&A programme for implementation during dredging. | Representative NSRs at the former Kai Tak Airport runway / Upon formal occupation | N/A | Not applicable | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NCO } \\ & \text { EIAO-TM } \end{aligned}$ |
| S5.9 | - Dredging will be carried out by closed grab dredger to minimize release of sediment and other contaminants during both capital and maintenance dredging. <br> - The maximum production rate for dredging from the seabed to provide necessary manoeuvring area would not be more than $4,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ per day (and no more than 2 closed grab dredgers) during capital dredging and $2,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ per day (and no more than 1 closed grab dredger) during maintenance dredging. <br> - The maximum production rate for dredging at or near the seawall area would not be more than $4,000 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ per day for berth construction. No more than two closed grab dredger would be operated at the same time at or near the seawall for berth construction. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM WPCO |
| S5.9 | Silt curtains should be deployed around the closed grab dredgers used for dredging at and near the existing seawall of the former Kai Tak Airport runway for construction of the cruise berth structures. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM, WPCO |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation <br> Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation <br> and Guidelines |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S5.9 | Silt screens should be installed at the WSD <br> flushing water intakes at Cha Kwo Ling, Sai Wan <br> Ho, Quarry Bay, Sheung Wan, Wan Chai and Tai <br> Wan for dredging in the manoeuvring basin of the <br> first berth during the capital dredging. | Seawater <br> intakes in <br> Victoria Harbour/ <br> During the <br> construction of <br> cruise terminal | Contractor for capital <br> dredging | Implemented |  |
| S5.9 | Silt screens should be installed at the WSD <br> flushing water intakes at Cha Kwo Ling, Quarry <br> Bay and Tai Wan for dredging in the <br> manoeuvring basin of the second berth during <br> the capital dredging. | Seawater <br> intakes in <br> Victoria Harbour <br> / During the <br> construction of <br> cruise terminal | Contractor for capital <br> dredging | Implemented |  |
| S5.9 | If the opening has been introduced at the <br> northern runway, silt screens should also be <br> installed at the WSD flushing water intake at Sai <br> Wan Ho, Sheung Wan and Wan Chai for <br> dredging in the manoeuvring basin of the second <br> berth during the capital dredging. | Seawater intake | Contractor for capital <br> Sheung Wan <br> and Wan Chai / <br> During the <br> construction of <br> cruise terminal | Implemented | EIAO-TM, WPCO |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S5.9 | Other good site practices that should be undertaken during dredging include: <br> - all vessels should be sized so that adequate clearance is maintained between vessels and the seabed in all tide conditions, to ensure that undue turbidity is not generated by turbulence from vessel movement or propeller wash; <br> - all barges / dredgers should be fitted with tight fitting seals to their bottom openings to prevent leakage of material; <br> - construction activities should not cause foam, oil, grease, scum, litter or other objectionable matter to be present on the water within the site or dumping grounds; <br> - barges or hoppers should not be filled to a level that will cause the overflow of materials or polluted water during loading or transportation. | Work site and adjacent waters / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO, EIAO-TM, WPCO, WDO |
| S5.9 | Appropriate numbers of portable chemical toilets shall be provided by a licensed contractor to serve the construction workers over the construction site. The Contractor shall also be responsible for waste disposal and maintenance practices. | Work site and adjacent waters / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM, WPCO, WDO |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation <br> Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation <br> and Guidelines |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S5.9 | Collection and removal of floating refuse should <br> be performed at regular intervals on a daily basis. <br> The contractor should be responsible for keeping <br> the water within the site boundary and the <br> neighbouring water free from rubbish during the <br> dredging works. | Work site and <br> adjacent waters / <br> During dredging <br> in construction <br> stage | Contractor for capital <br> dredging | Implemented |  |
| WIAO-TM, WPCO, |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | An environmental monitoring and audit <br> programme should be implemented to verify <br> whether or not impact predictions are <br> representative, and to ensure that all the <br> recommended mitigation measures are <br> implemented properly. If the water quality <br> monitoring data indicate that the proposed <br> dredging works result in unacceptable water <br> quality impacts in the receiving water, appropriate <br> actions should be taken to review the dredging <br> intakes in <br> Victoria Harbour/ <br> Duration and additional measures such as use <br> in construction <br> stage <br> silt curtains, slowing down, or rescheduling of <br> works should be implemented as necessary. | Environmental Team <br> and verified by <br> Independent <br> Environmental <br> Checker | Implemented | EIAO-TM, WPCO |  |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation <br> Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S5.9 | Silt screens are recommended to be deployed at <br> and Guidelines |  |  |  |
| selected WSD flushing water intakes during the <br> capital dredging. The contractor for capital <br> dredging shall demonstrate and ensure that the <br> design of the silt screen will not affect the normal <br> operation of flushing water intake. The contractor <br> shall obtain consensus from all relevant parties, <br> including WSD and Marine Department on the <br> design of the silt screen at each of the six <br> selected flushing water intake points before <br> installation of the silt screen and commencement <br> intakes in <br> Victoria Harbour/ <br> During dredging <br> stage | Contractor for capital <br> dredging <br> of the proposed dredging works. As a mitigation <br> measure to avoid the pollutant and refuse <br> entrapment problems and to ensure that the <br> impact monitoring results are representative, <br> regular maintenance of the silt screens and <br> refuse collection should be performed at the <br> monitoring stations at regular intervals on a daily <br> basis. The Contractor should be responsible for <br> keeping the water behind the silt screen free from <br> floating rubbish and debris during the impact <br> monitoring period. | EIAO-TM, WPCO |  |  |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S6.7 | Good Site Practices <br> It is not anticipated that adverse waste management related impacts would arise, provided that good site practices are adhered to. Recommendations for good site practices during the dredging activities include: <br> - Nomination of an approved person, such as a site manager, to be responsible for good site practices, arrangements for collection and effective disposal to an appropriate facility, of all wastes generated at the site. <br> - Training of site personnel in proper waste management and chemical waste handling procedures. <br> - Provision of sufficient waste disposal points and regular collection for disposal. <br> - Appropriate measures to minimise windblown litter and dust during transportation of waste by either covering trucks or by transporting wastes in enclosed containers. <br> - A recording system for the amount of wastes generated, recycled and disposed of (including the disposal sites). <br> - Segregation and storage of different types of waste in different containers, skips or stockpiles to enhance reuse or recycling of materials and their proper disposal. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM |


| EIA Ref ${ }^{\text {\# }}$ | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S6.7 <br> (cont.) | - Encourage collection of aluminium cans, PET bottles and paper by providing separate labelled bins to enable these wastes to be segregated from other general refuse generated by the workforce. <br> - Any unused chemicals or those with remaining functional capacity shall be recycled. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | EIAO-TM |
| S6.7 | Marine Sediments <br> The dredged marine sediments would be loaded onto barges and transported to the designated disposal sites allocated by the MFC depending on their level of contamination. Sediment classified as Category L would be suitable for Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal. Contaminated sediment would require either Type 1 - Open Sea Disposal (Dedicated Sites) or Type 2 Confined Marine Disposal and must be dredged and transported with great care in accordance with ETWB TCW No. 34/2002. Subject to the final allocation of the disposal sites by MFC, the dredged contaminated sediment must be effectively isolated from the environment upon final disposal and shall be disposed of at the East Sha Chau Contaminated Mud Pits that are designated for the disposal of contaminated mud in Hong Kong. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | ETWB TCW No. 34/2002 |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S6.7 | It will be the responsibility of the Contractor to satisfy the appropriate authorities that the contamination levels of the marine sediment to be dredged have been analysed and recorded. According to the ETWB TCW No. 34/2002, this will involve the submission of a formal Sediment Quality Report to the DEP, prior to the dredging contract being tendered. The contractor for the dredging works shall apply for the allocation of marine sediment disposal sites from all relevant authorities. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Dumping Permits were issued by EPD | ETWB TCW No. $34 / 2002$ |
| S6.7 | During transportation and disposal of the dredged marine sediments requiring Type 1 and Type 2 disposal, the following measures shall be taken to minimise potential impacts on water quality: <br> - Bottom opening of barges shall be fitted with tight fitting seals to prevent leakage of material. Excess material shall be cleaned from the decks and exposed fittings of barges and hopper dredgers before the vessel is moved. <br> - Monitoring of the barge loading shall be conducted to ensure that loss of material does not take place during transportation. Transport barges or vessels shall be equipped with automatic self-monitoring devices as specified by the DEP. <br> - Barges or hopper barges shall not be filled to a level that would cause the overflow of materials or sediment laden water during loading or transportation. | Work site / During dredging in construction stage | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | WDO; WPCO |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation <br> Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Relevant Legislation <br> and Guidelines |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S6.7 | Chemical Wastes <br> After use, chemical wastes (for example, <br> cleaning fluids, solvents, lubrication oil and fuel) <br> should be handled according to the Code of <br> Practice on the Packaging, Labelling and Storage <br> of Chemical Wastes. Spent chemicals should be <br> collected by a licensed collector for disposal at <br> the CWTF or other licensed facility in accordance <br> with the Waste Disposal (Chemical Waste) <br> (General) Regulation. | Work site / <br> During dredging <br> in construction <br> stage | Contractor for capital <br> dredging | Implemented <br> Waste Disposal <br> (Chemical Waste) <br> (General) <br> Regulation; <br> Code of Practice on <br> the Packaging, <br> Labelling and <br> Storage of <br> Chemical Wastes |
| S6.7 | General Refuse <br> General refuse should be stored in enclosed bins <br> or compaction units separate from C\&D material. <br> A reputable waste collector should be employed <br> by the contractor to remove general refuse from <br> the site, separately from C\&D material. An <br> enclosed and covered area is preferred to reduce <br> the occurrence of 'wind blown' light material. | Work site / <br> During dredging <br> in construction <br> stage | Contractor for capital <br> dredging | Implemented |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S6.7 | Construction and Demolition Material <br> It is recommended that the extent of dredging of the existing seawall should be kept to a minimum in the detailed design of the new cruise terminal to minimize generation of C\&D material. Mitigation measures and good site practices should be incorporated in the contract document to control potential environmental impact from handling and transportation of C\&D material. The mitigation measures include: <br> - Where it is unavoidable to have transient stockpiles of C\&D material within the Project work site pending collection for disposal, the transient stockpiles shall be located away from waterfront or storm drains as far as possible. <br> - Open stockpiles of construction materials or construction wastes on-site should be covered with tarpaulin or similar fabric. <br> - Skip hoist for material transport should be totally enclosed by impervious sheeting. <br> - Every vehicle should be washed to remove any dusty materials from its body and wheels before leaving a construction site. <br> - The area where vehicle washing takes place and the section of the road between the washing facilities and the exit point should be paved with concrete, bituminous materials or hardcores. | Work site / During the construction period | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | ETWB TCW No. 33/2002, 31/2004, 19/2005 |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S6.7 <br> (cont.) | - The load of dusty materials carried by vehicle leaving a construction site should be covered entirely by clean impervious sheeting to ensure dust materials do not leak from the vehicle. <br> - All dusty materials should be sprayed with water prior to any loading, unloading or transfer operation so as to maintain the dusty materials wet. <br> - The height from which excavated materials are dropped should be controlled to a minimum practical height to limit fugitive dust generation from unloading. | Work site / During the construction period | Contractor for capital dredging | Implemented | ETWB TCW No. 33/2002, 31/2004, 19/2005 |
| S6.7 | When delivering inert C\&D material to public fill reception facilities, the material shall consist entirely of inert construction waste and of size less than 250 mm or other sizes as agreed with the Secretary of the Public Fill Committee. In order to monitor the disposal of the surplus C\&D material at the designed public fill reception facility and to control fly tipping, a trip-ticket system should be included as one of the contractual requirements and implemented by the Contractor under the Waste Management Plan certified by the Environmental Team and verified by the Independent Environmental Checker who should be responsible for auditing the results of the system. | Work site / During the construction period | Contractor for capital dredging, Engineer, Environmental Team and Independent Environmental Checker | Not applicable | ETWB TCW No. $31 / 2004$ |

\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { EIA Ref\# } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Environmental Protection Measures I Mitigation } \\
\text { Measures }\end{array} & \text { Location / Timing } & \text { Implementation Agent } & \text { Implementation Status } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Relevant Legislation } \\
\text { and Guidelines }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { S7.8 } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The dredging activities of the proposed cruise } \\
\text { terminal should ensure that disturbance to the } \\
\text { existing seawall masonry outside the Project } \\
\text { boundary should be avoided as far as } \\
\text { practicable. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Work site/ } \\
\text { During } \\
\text { construction of } \\
\text { cruise terminal }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Contractor for capital } \\
\text { dredging as per } \\
\text { CEDD's advice }\end{array} & \text { Implemented } \\
\text { Monuments }\end{array}
$$\right] \begin{array}{l}Ordinance <br>
EIAO, EIAO-TM <br>
Guidance Notes on <br>
Assessment of <br>
Impact on Sites of <br>
Cultural Heritage in <br>

Environmental\end{array}\right]\)| Impact Assessment |
| :--- |
| Studies (GN-CH) |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status | Relevant Legislation and Guidelines |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.7 | Translocate those existing coral colonies attached on boulders that are manually movable by a diver underwater (possibly longest dimension of less than 50 cm ) located within the hard substrata sea area within the dredging site as far as practicable prior to the commencement of the capital dredging activities. The entire translocation exercise include the preparation of a detailed translocation plan, the pretranslocation coral survey, the coral translocation, and the quarterly post-translocation monitoring for one year. Pre-translocation survey would be focused on identifying and mapping of coral colonies that would be directly impacted by the proposed dredging and investigating the translocation feasibility of these coral colonies. A detailed translocation plan (including pretranslocation coral survey, translocation methodology and monitoring of transplanted corals) should be prepared during the detailed design stage of the Project which, together with the ecologist involved in coral translocation, should be approved by AFCD prior to commencement of the translocation exercises. The proposed relocation of the coral colonies should not affect any private/public marine rights at the recipient site. | Along the section of the former Kai Tak Airport runway that will be directed affected by the cruise terminal construction / During detailed design stage | Other ET specifically employed for coral translocation works | Final Detailed Coral Translocation Plan was approved by EPD in letter ref. (18) in EP2/K19/C/19 Pt. 5 dated 5 June 2009. <br> Form 5 was submitted under CEDD's memo ref. (6) in KD 2/31/4 Pt. 3 dated 10 June 2009 regarding minor alteration of the position of the coral recipient site. <br> Coral Translocation Report was submitted in Scott Wilson letter ref. 08290/325723 dated 2 July 2009. <br> Post-translocation report shall be referred to the submissions by another ET specifically employed for coral translocation works. | EIAO-TM |


| EIA Ref\# | Environmental Protection Measures / Mitigation <br> Measures | Location / Timing | Implementation Agent | Implementation Status |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| S8.7 | New seawalls at the berth structure of the cruise <br> terminal shall be constructed in order to provide <br> and Legislation <br> large area of hard substrata for settlement and <br> recruitment of intertidal and subtidal <br> assemblages similar to those previously recorded <br> from existing habitats. | The section of <br> the former Kai <br> Tak Airport <br> runway that will <br> be directed <br> affected by the <br> cruise terminal <br> construction / <br> During detailed <br> design stage | To be confirmed at <br> later stage | To be confirmed at later <br> stage |
| EIAO-TM |  |  |  |  |
| 9.6 | No fisheries-specific mitigation measures would <br> be required. | - | Not applicable | Not applicable |

## Appendix 3.1

Action and Limit Levels

## Action and Limit Levels

## Action and Limit Levels for Noise Monitoring

| Time Period | Action Level | Limit Level |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 07:00 - 19:00 hours on normal <br> weekdays | When one documented <br> complaint is received from <br> any one of the sensitive <br> receivers | $75 \mathrm{~dB}(\mathrm{~A})$ |

Remarks: No noise monitoring was conducted due to no planned noise sensitive receivers (NSRs) occupied within 300 m from the works area of this Project during the dredging works.

Action and Limit Levels for Water Monitoring

| Parameters | Action Level |  | Limit Level |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turbidity in NTU | WSD9 <br> WSD10 <br> WSD15 <br> WSD17 <br> WSD21 <br> WSD19 | All Season <br> 5.67 <br> 6.26 <br> 8.15 <br> 11.60 <br> 9.11 <br> 13.09 | WSD9 <br> WSD10 <br> WSD15 <br> WSD17 <br> WSD21 <br> WSD19 | All Season <br> 12.27 <br> 10.47 <br> 14.41 <br> 16.91 <br> 15.38 <br> 15.34 |
| Suspended Solids (SS) in mg/L | WSD9 <br> WSD10 <br> WSD15 <br> WSD17 <br> WSD21 <br> WSD19 | Dry Season  Wet Season <br> 6.9  9.7 <br> 7.7  9.1 <br> 7.8  13.5 <br> 9.5  11.2 <br> 13.3  17.1 <br> 16.3  15.1 | WSD9 <br> WSD10 <br> WSD15 <br> WSD17 <br> WSD21 <br> WSD19 | Dry Season Wet Season <br> 7.8 10.9 <br> 10.3 12.2 <br> 8.4 14.5 <br> 13.7 16.2 <br> 13.9 17.8 <br> 17.0 15.7 |

Remarks:
Wet season is the period from April to September.
Dry season is the period from October to March.

Revised Action and Limit Levels for Water Monitoring

| Station | Turbidity (NTU) |  |  |  | Suspended Solid (mg/L) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Action Level for individual stations |  | Limit Level for individual stations |  | Action Level for individual stations |  | Limit Level for individual stations |  |
|  | Dry Season | Wet Season | Dry Season | Wet Season | Dry Season | Wet Season | Dry Season | Wet Season |
| WSD9 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 10.6 | 13.4 | 10.2 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 13.5 |
| WSD10 | 6.3 | 8.1 | 9.4 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 11.2 | 11.8 | 13.2 |
| WSD15 | 7.5 | 11.9 | 12.5 | 19.6 | 10.8 | 17.5 | 11.8 | 19.1 |
| WSD17 | 10.0 | 12.9 | 15.3 | 19.7 | 13.2 | 14.7 | 15.3 | 17.0 |
| WSD19 | 10.9 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 18.4 | 14.0 | 13.3 | 17.0 | 16.2 |
| WSD21 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 13.4 | 17.6 | 13.3 | 16.7 | 14.0 | 17.5 |

Remarks:
Revised Action and Limit Levels for water monitoring was approved on 19 October 2011.

## Appendix 4.1

Graphical Presentation of Water Quality Monitoring Results



## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.




## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD15 - Sai Wan Ho



## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.




## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD19 - Sheung Wan



## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.




## Remarks:

- Two sets of Suspended Solid Action and Limit levels for the dry season (October to March) and wet season (April to September).
- New sets of Turbidity and SS Action Level and Limit Level for dry and wet season were approved by EPD on 19 Oct 2011
- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.


## Appendix 4.2

Graphical Presentation of Water Quality Surveillance

Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 9 September 2013 (Ebb Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in mg/L | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 5.52 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.17 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.09 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 4.99 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.82 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.34 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 4.97 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.85 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.61 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 5.43 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.25 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.32 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP4 | Im below the surface | 4.74 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.07 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.37 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 4.94 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 5.33 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
|  | Im above the seabed | 4.76 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 3.19 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.06 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.90 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.38 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.51 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.43 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 2.59 | Lower | 8 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.22 | Lower | 8 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.97 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 4.49 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.89 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.73 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 2.88 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.95 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.62 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 4.41 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.72 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.93 | N/A | 4 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Wet Season <br> (April - September) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C3 | 16.9 | 18.5 |
| C4 | 10.5 for Ebb Tide |  |





Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 25 September 2013 (Flood Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.12 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.34 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.99 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.00 | N/A | $<2$ | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.31 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1m above the seabed | 4.04 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 3.61 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.32 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.83 | N/A | 9 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 5.29 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.74 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.85 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP4 | 1 m below the surface | 4.02 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.31 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.64 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 2.99 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.92 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.70 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 4.55 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.00 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.62 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.29 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.26 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.99 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 2.90 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.97 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.22 | Lower | 8 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 3.43 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.66 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.18 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 4.55 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.65 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.08 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 4.13 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.54 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.29 | N/A | 4 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Wet Season <br> (April - September) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C 1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C 2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C 3 | 16.9 | 18.5 |
| C 4 | 10.5 for Ebb Tide |  |





Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 21 October 2013 (Ebb Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in mg/L | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 5.88 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 6.34 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.63 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 7.76 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 6.37 | N/A | 9 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.80 | N/A | 9 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 4.62 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 9.16 | N/A | 12 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 7.02 | N/A | 11 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 5.13 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 6.82 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 6.08 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
| MP4 | 1 m below the surface | 6.61 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.95 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.80 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.51 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.50 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.62 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 3.58 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.45 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.98 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 4.61 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.34 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.74 | Lower | 7 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 4.18 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.57 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.31 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 3.98 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.24 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.94 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 3.23 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.92 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.17 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 4.72 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.85 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.55 | N/A | 4 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Dry Season <br> (October - March) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C3 | 16.9 | 14.0 |
| C4 | 10.5 for Ebb Tide |  |





Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 28 October 2013 (Flood Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in mg/L | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.39 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.45 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.57 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 2.90 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.72 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.43 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 2.64 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.91 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.81 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.06 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.35 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.29 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| MP4 | 1 m below the surface | 2.25 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.62 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.10 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 1.85 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.57 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.58 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 2.81 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.68 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 1.92 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.20 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.62 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.05 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 2.65 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.20 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.96 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 2.11 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.11 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.23 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 2.05 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.11 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.28 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 2.66 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.59 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.57 | N/A | 3 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Dry Season <br> (October - March) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C3 | 16.9 | 14.0 |
| C4 | 10.5 for Ebb Tide |  |





Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 15 November 2013 (Ebb Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in mg/L | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.73 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.85 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.92 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 4.83 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.63 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.42 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 3.39 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.06 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.99 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 4.68 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.43 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.24 | N/A | 7 | N/A |
| MP4 | 1 m below the surface | 5.90 | N/A | 9 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.65 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.93 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 3.73 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.64 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.49 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 4.30 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.69 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.34 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 4.90 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.32 | Lower | 6 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.23 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 4.09 | Lower | 3 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 4.42 | Lower | 4 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.12 | Lower | 5 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 3.97 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.49 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.33 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 4.66 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.23 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 5.17 | N/A | 5 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 4.21 | N/A | 8 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.73 | N/A | 6 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.28 | N/A | 6 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Dry Season <br> (October - March) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C3 | 16.9 |  |
| C4 | 10.5 for Ebb Tide |  |





Water Quality Surveillance System Monitoring Results - 25 November 2013 (Flood Tide)

| Monitoring Location |  | Turbidity in NTU | Compare to Trigger Level | Suspended Solids in mg/L | Compare to Trigger Level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SP1 | 1 m below the surface | 5.69 | N/A | $<2$ | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 4.18 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.78 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| MP1 | 1 m below the surface | 5.09 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.17 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.38 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| MP2 | 1 m below the surface | 4.89 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.58 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.74 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
| MP3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.65 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 5.29 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.77 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
| MP4 | 1 m below the surface | 4.58 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.99 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 4.38 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
| C1 | 1 m below the surface | 2.65 | Lower | 2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.89 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.77 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
| C2 | 1 m below the surface | 3.14 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.78 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.56 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
| C3 | 1 m below the surface | 3.34 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 2.70 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 2.42 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
| C4 | 1 m below the surface | 2.54 | Lower | $<2$ | Lower |
|  | mid depth | 3.42 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 1.94 | Lower | <2 | Lower |
| C5 | 1 m below the surface | 2.79 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.52 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.02 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
| C6 | 1 m below the surface | 3.26 | N/A | 2 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 3.90 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.69 | N/A | 3 | N/A |
| C7 | 1 m below the surface | 2.84 | N/A | 4 | N/A |
|  | mid depth | 2.29 | N/A | <2 | N/A |
|  | 1 m above the seabed | 3.02 | N/A | <2 | N/A |


| Control <br> Point | Trigger Level for Turbidity in <br> NTU for All Season | Trigger Level for SS in mg/L for Dry Season <br> (October - March) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C2 | 12.3 for Flood Tide |  |
| C3 | 16.9 |  |
| C4 | 14.0 |  |





## Appendix 5.1

## Event and Action Plan

## Event and Action Plan for Construction Noise

| EVENT | ACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ET | IC(E) | ER | CONTRACTOR |
| Action Level | 1. Notify IEC and Contractor; <br> 2. Carry out investigation; <br> 3. Report the results of investigation to the IEC, ER and Contractor; <br> 4. Discuss with the Contractor and formulate remedial measures; <br> 5. Increase monitoring frequency to check mitigation effectiveness. | 1. Review the analysed results submitted by the ET; <br> 2. Review the proposed remedial measures by the Contractor and advise the ER accordingly; <br> 3. Supervise the implementation of remedial measures. | 1. Confirm receipt of notification of failure in writing; <br> 2. Notify Contractor; <br> 3. Require Contractor to propose remedial measures for the analysed noise problem; <br> 4. Ensure remedial measures are properly implemented. | 1. Submit noise mitigation proposals to IEC; <br> 2. Implement noise mitigation proposals. |
| Limit Level | 1. Identify source; <br> 2. Inform IEC, ER, EPD and Contractor; <br> 3. Repeat measurements to confirm findings; <br> 4. Increase monitoring frequency; <br> 5. Carry out analysis of Contractor's working procedures to determine possible mitigation to be implemented; <br> 6. Inform IEC, ER and EPD the causes and actions taken for the exceedances; <br> 7. Assess effectiveness of Contractor's remedial actions and keep IEC, EPD and ER informed of the results; <br> 8. If exceedance stops, cease additional monitoring. | 1. Discuss amongst ER, ET, and Contractor on the potential remedial actions; <br> 2. Review Contractor's remedial actions whenever necessary to assure their effectiveness and advise the ER aocordingly; <br> 3. Supervise the implementation of remedial measures. | 1. Confirm receipt of notification of failure in writing; <br> 2. Notify Contractor; <br> 3. Require Contractor to propose remedial measures for the analysed noise problem; <br> 4. Ensure remedial measures properly implemented; <br> 5. If exceedance continues, consider what portion of the work is responsible and instruct the Contractor to stop that portion of work until the exceedance is abated. | 1. Take immediate action to avoid further exceedance: <br> 2. Submit proposals for remedial actions to IEC within 3 working days of notification; <br> 3. Implement the agreed proposals; <br> 4. Submit further proposal if problem still not under control; <br> 5. Stop the relevant portion of works as instructed by the ER until the exceedance is abated. |

Event and Action Plan for Marine Water Quality

| EVENT | ACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ET | IEC | ER | CONTRACTOR |
| Action level being exceeded by one sampling day | 1. Repeat in-situ measurement to confirm findings; <br> 2. Identify source(s) of impact; <br> 3. Inform IEC and Contractor; <br> 4. Check monitoring data, all plant, equipment and Contractor's working methods; <br> 5. Discuss mitigation measures with IEC and Contractor; <br> 6. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) <br> 7. Repeat measurement on next day of exceedance. | 1. Discuss with ET and Contractor on the mitigation measures; <br> 2. Review proposals on mitigation measures submitted by Contractor and advise the ER accordingly; <br> 3. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 4. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Discuss with IEC on the proposed mitigation measures; <br> 2. Make agreement on the mitigation measures to be implemented. <br> 3. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Inform the ER and confirm notification of the non-compliance in writing; <br> 2. Rectify unacceptable practice; <br> 3. Check all plant and equipment; <br> 4. Review the working methods and consider additional measures such as use of frametype silt curtain, deployment of double silt curtains, slowing down, or rescheduling of works; <br> 5. Discuss with ET and IEC and propose mitigation measures to IEC and ER; <br> 6. Implement the agreed mitigation measures. <br> 7. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) |
| Action level being exceeded by more than one consecutive sampling days | 1. Identify source(s) of impact; <br> 2. Inform IEC and Contractor; <br> 3. Check monitoring data, all plant, equipment and Contractor's working methods; <br> 4. Discuss mitigation measures with IEC and Contractor; | 1. Discuss with ET and Contractor on the mitigation measures; <br> 2. Review proposals on mitigation measures submitted by Contractor and advise the ER | 1. Discuss with IEC on the proposed mitigation measures; <br> 2. Make agreement on the mitigation measures to be implemented; <br> 3. Assess the effectiveness | 1. Inform the Engineer and confirm notification of the non-compliance in writing; <br> 2. Rectify unacceptable practice; <br> 3. Check all plant and |


| EVENT | ACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ET | IEC | ER | CONTRACTOR |
|  | 5. Ensure mitigation measures are implemented; <br> 6. Prepare to increase the monitoring frequency to daily; <br> 7. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) <br> 8. Repeat measurement on next working day of exceedance. | accordingly; <br> 3. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 4. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 4. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | equipment; <br> 4. Review the working methods and consider additional measures such as use of frametype silt curtain, deployment of double silt curtains, slowing down, or rescheduling of works; <br> 5. Discuss with ET and IEC and propose mitigation measures to IEC and ER within 3 working days; <br> 6. Implement the agreed mitigation measures. <br> 7. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) |


| EVENT | ACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ET | IEC | ER | CONTRACTOR |
| Limit level being exceeded by one sampling day | 1. Repeat in-situ measurement to confirm findings; <br> 2. Identify source(s) of impact; <br> 3. Inform IEC, Contractor and EPD; <br> 4. Check monitoring data, all plant, equipment and Contractor's working methods; <br> 5. Discuss mitigation measures with IEC, ER and Contractor; <br> 6. Ensure mitigation measures are implemented; <br> 7. Increase the monitoring frequency to daily until no exceedance of Limit Level. <br> 8. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Discuss with ET and Contractor on the mitigation measures; <br> 2. Review proposals on mitigation measures submitted by Contractor and advise the ER accordingly; <br> 3. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 4. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Discuss with IEC, ET and Contractor on the proposed mitigation measures; <br> 2. Request Contractor to critically review the working methods; <br> 3. Make agreement on the mitigation measures to be implemented; <br> 4. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 5. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Inform the Engineer and confirm notification of the non-compliance in writing; <br> 2. Rectify unacceptable practice; <br> 3. Check all plant and equipment; <br> 4. Review the working methods and consider additional measures such as use of frametype silt curtain, deployment of double silt curtains, slowing down, or rescheduling of works; <br> 5. Discuss with ET, IEC and ER and propose mitigation measures to IEC and ER within 3 working days; <br> 6. Implement the agreed mitigation measures. <br> 7. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) |


| EVENT | ACTION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ET | IEC | ER | CONTRACTOR |
| Limit level being exceeded by more than one consecutive sampling days | 1. Identify source(s) of impact; <br> 2. Inform IEC, Contractor and EPD; <br> 3. Check monitoring data, all plant, equipment and Contractor's working methods; <br> 4. Discuss mitigation measures with IEC, ER and Contractor; <br> 5. Ensure mitigation measures are implemented; <br> 6. Increase the monitoring frequency to daily until no exceedance of Limit level for two consecutive days. <br> 7. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Discuss with ET and Contractor on the mitigation measures; <br> 2. Review proposals on mitigation measures submitted by Contractor and advise the ER accordingly; <br> 3. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures. <br> 4. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Discuss with IEC, ET and Contractor on the proposed mitigation measures; <br> 2. Request Contractor to critically review the working methods; <br> 3. Make agreement on the mitigation measures to be implemented; <br> 4. Assess the effectiveness of the implemented mitigation measures; <br> 5. Consider and instruct, if necessary, the Contractor to slow down or to stop all or part of the marine work until no exceedance of Limit level. <br> 6. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) | 1. Inform the ER and confirm notification of the non-compliance in writing; <br> 2. Rectify unacceptable practice; <br> 3. Check all plant and equipment; <br> 4. Review the working methods and consider additional measures such as use of frametype silt curtain, deployment of double silt curtains, slowing down, or rescheduling of works; <br> 5. Discuss with ET, IEC and ER and propose mitigation measures to IEC and ER within 3 working days; <br> 6. Implement the agreed mitigation measures; <br> 7. As directed by the Engineer, to slow down or to stop all or part of the marine work or construction activities. <br> 8. (The above actions should be taken within 1 working day after the exceedance is identified) |

## Appendix 5.2

Graphic Presentation of SS Results against to Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbour

Graphic Presentation of SS Results Against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbouı
Suspended Solid on 19 Oct 2013





Graphic Presentation of SS Results Against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbou


Graphic Presentation of SS Results Against the Tidal Movement along Victoria Harbou


## Appendix 5.3

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result with respect to Local Variation

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD9 - Tai Wan with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD9 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.


## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD10 - Cha Kwo Ling with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD10 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.


## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD15 - Sai Wan Ho with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD15 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.


## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD17 - Quarry Bay with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD17 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD19 - Sheung Wan with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD19 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.


## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD21 - Wan Chai with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD21 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

- Due to hoisting of Amber Rainstorm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 4 Sep 2013 (ebb tide) was cancelled.
- Due to hoisting of No. 8 Southwest Gale or Storm Signal, the water quality monitoring on 23 Sep 2013 (flood tide) was cancelled.

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD9 - Tai Wan with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD9 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD10 - Cha Kwo Ling with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD10 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

## am



Remarks: WSD15 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD17 - Quarry Bay with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD17 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD19 - Sheung Wan with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD19 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD21 - Wan Chai with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD21 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.


Remarks: WSD9 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD10 - Cha Kwo Ling with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD10 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.


Remarks: WSD15 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD17-Quarry Bay with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD17 is located at upstream during the flood tides while at downstream during ebb tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD19 - Sheung Wan with respect to Local Variation


Remarks: WSD19 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

## am

Graphic Presentation of Water Quality Result of WSD21 - Wan Chai with respect to Local Variation
Suspended Solid

Remarks: WSD21 is located at upstream during the ebb tides while at downstream during flood tides.

## Appendix 7.1

## Construction Programme for Reporting Quarter




|  | PENTA－DLEAN <br> CHNETIRLETIUN ETOLID．敾建設 <br> Primavera Systems，Inc． | $\square$ $\nabla$ Early Bar <br> $\square$ Target <br> $\square$ $\nabla^{2}$ Progress Bar <br> $\square$ Critical Activity |  |  | Penta－Ocean Construction Co．，Ltd． <br> CEDD Contract No．KL／2009／01 <br> Site Formation for Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Development Three Month Rolling Programme （November 2013－January 2014） | Sheet 2 of 2 | Start Date Finish Date Data Date Run Date | $30 / 11 / 09$$02 / 01 / 14$$20 / 10 / 13$$31 / 10 / 1308: 57$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { Date }}{31 / 05 / 11}$ |  |  |  |  | K Revision | Checke | Approved |
|  |  |  |  | 10／10／12 |  |  |  |  | L | TT | WT |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ，$\ldots$ |

