



Nighttime Spectacular in Hong Kong Disneyland

Environmental Review Report

15 July 2021 Project No.: 0517002



| Document details | The details entered below are automatically shown on the cover and the main page footer. PLEASE NOTE: This table must NOT be removed from this document. |
|-------------------|---|
| Document title | Nighttime Spectacular in Hong Kong Disneyland |
| Document subtitle | Environmental Review Report |
| Project No. | 0517002 |
| Date | 15 July 2021 |
| Version | 4a |
| Author | Pako Yu |
| Client Name | Hong Kong Disneyland Management Limited |

| Document | history | | | | | |
|----------|----------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------------------|
| | | | | ERM approva | l to issue | |
| Version | Revision | Author | Reviewed by | Name | Date | Comments |
| Draft | 1.0 | Pako Yu | Mandy To | Jasmine Ng | 21.02.2020 | - |
| Revised | 2.0 | Pako Yu | Mandy To | Jasmine Ng | 08.06.2020 | Comments from EPD |
| Revised | 3.0 | Pako Yu | Mandy To | Jasmine Ng | 29.09.2020 | Comments from EPD |
| Revised | 4a | Pako Yu | Mandy To | Jasmine Ng | 15.07.2021 | Comments from EPD |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Signature Page

15 July 2021

Nighttime Spectacular in Hong Kong Disneyland

Environmental Review Report

am

Dr Jasmine Ng Partner

ERM-Hong Kong, Limited 2509, 25/F One Harbourfront, 18 Tak Fung Street, Hunghom, Kowloon Hong Kong

© Copyright 2021 by ERM Worldwide Group Ltd and / or its affiliates ("ERM"). All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, without the prior written permission of ERM

 www.erm.com
 Version: 4a
 Project No.: 0517002
 Client: Hong Kong Disneyland Management Limited

 \\HKHKGDC02\Data\Hong Kong\Confidential Projects\0517002 Project Fantasy.MT\04 Deliverables\02 ERR\v4a\0517002_ERR_v4a.docx

CONTENTS

| 1. | INTRO | DUCTION | 1 | | | | |
|--------|------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 11 | Background | 1 | | | | |
| | 1.2 | Purpose of this Report | 1 | | | | |
| | 1.3 | Structure of this Report | 1 | | | | |
| 2. | PROPO | OSED VARIATIONS AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES | 2 | | | | |
| | 2.1 | Proposed Variations | 2 | | | | |
| | 2.2 | Key Environmental Issues Associated with the Proposed Changes | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.1 Air Quality | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.2 Noise | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.3 Hazard | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.4 Water Quality | 3 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.5 Waste Management | 3 | | | | |
| | | 2.2.0 Terrestrial Ecology | 4 1 | | | | |
| - | | | 4 | | | | |
| 3. | | JALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT | 5 | | | | |
| | 3.1 | | 5 | | | | |
| | 3.2 | Air Emissions from the Revised Snow | 5 | | | | |
| | 3.3 3.4 | Evaluation of Impacts | 6 | | | | |
| | 0.4 | 2.4.1 PSD and ESD Emissions | 6 | | | | |
| | | 342 Metal Emissions | 7 | | | | |
| | 3.5 | Mitigation Measures | 9 | | | | |
| 4 | NOISE | | 0 | | | | |
| 4. | NOISE | | 0 | | | | |
| | 4.1 | Introduction | 0 | | | | |
| | 4.3 | Identification of Noise Sensitive Receivers | 0 | | | | |
| | 4.4 | Assessment Methodology | 0 | | | | |
| | 4.5 | Identification of Potential Environmental Noise Impacts1 | 0 | | | | |
| | 4.6 | Mitigation Measures 1 | 1 | | | | |
| 5. | REVIE | W OF ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND AUDIT (EM&A) REQUIREMENTS 1 | 2 | | | | |
| 6. | CONCI | LUSIONS1 | 3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | of Appel | | | | | | |
| APPE | | SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR AIR QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
| APPE | ENDIX A | 1 CONFIRMATION LETTER FROM MPA | | | | | |
| APPE | ENDIX B | SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
| APPE | ENDIX B | PRODUCT INVENTORY FOR THE REVISED SHOW | | | | | |
| APPE | ENDIX B | 52 FIREWORK NOISE PREDICTION | | | | | |
| List | of Table | S | | | | | |
| Table | 2.1 | Comparison between the Revised Show and the Fireworks Displays assessed in the | _ | | | | |
| Table | 31 | EKK 2005 | 2 | | | | |
| 1 0010 | 5.1 | | able 3.1 Dreakdown of Metal Emissions from the revised Show and the Frevious Freworks | | | | |

| Table 3.4 | Air Quality Standards for Metal Species | 8 |
|-----------|--|------|
| Table 4.1 | Identified Noise Sensitive Receivers (NSRs) | . 10 |
| Table 4.2 | Predicted Firework Noise Levels, Leq (15min) dB(A) | . 11 |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A night-time spectacular with revised fireworks displays (the revised Show) will be hosted by the Hong Kong Disneyland Management Limited (HKDML) in the Theme Park at Lantau Island upon the completion of the new castle under its multi-year expansion plan. The layout of the Theme Park and updated launching area for the revised Show are presented in *Figure 1.1*.

The potential environmental impacts of the fireworks have been assessed and presented in the approved Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report for *Construction of an International Theme Park in Penny's Bay of North Lantau and it's Essential Associated Infrastructures* (Register No.: AEIAR-032/2000) (the approved EIA Report), and a Further Environmental Permit (FEP-01/059/2000) was granted on 21 July 2000. FEP-01/059/2000 was replaced by EP-01/059/2000/C on 25 October 2012. Under the requirement of Condition 3.6, "..... *Any changes to the details or design of the fireworks displays shall be reviewed by the ET Leader and deposited with the Director.*"

ERM-Hong Kong, Limited (ERM) was appointed by HKDML to undertake an environmental review to demonstrate that no adverse environmental impacts will arise from the revised Show based on the proposed changes in the design and other relevant details provided by HKDML.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

The objective of this Environmental Review Report (ERR) is to review the likely environmental impacts assessed in the approved EIA Report and the *Revised EIA Review Report* approved in June 2005 (ERR 2005) based on the proposed changes in the design of the revised Show. It also provides recommendations as to whether any modification and/or refinement of proposed mitigation measures and monitoring and audits requirements are needed.

1.3 Structure of this Report

The remainder of this Report is set out as follows:

- Section 2 describes the proposed variations;
- Section 3 provides details of air quality impact assessment;
- Section 4 provides details of noise impact assessment;
- Section 5 summarises updated environmental monitoring and audit (EM&A) requirements, if any; and
- Section 6 provides the conclusion of the environmental review.



2. PROPOSED VARIATIONS AND ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

2.1 Proposed Variations

A comparison between the revised Show and the fireworks displays assessed in the ERR 2005 are summarised in *Table 2.1.*

Table 2.1: Comparison between the Revised Show and the Fireworks Displaysassessed in the ERR 2005

| | Key Item | Previous fireworks displays (ERR 2005) | Revised Show |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1. | Show time | Around 20 minutes | No change |
| 2. | Shell products | Shell products were used | Shell products will not be used |
| 3. | Launching area | Fireworks products and pyro were launched from a launching area at the back of house, from the castle and the rooftop of adjacent buildings. | The existing launching area at the back of house was demolished. All pyro will only be launched from the original castle and adjacent rooftop launching sites, as well as several new launching sites on the new portion of the castle (at the rear side). |
| 4. | Number of products | Maximum nos. of 670 and 456 in the air quality and noise impact assessments, respectively. | Maximum nos. of 550 with quieter pyro products have been selected. |
| 5. | Maximum height | Maximum +140 mPD | Maximum +120 mPD, ie lowered by about 20m. |
| 6. | Total Net Explosive Quantity (NEQ) and black powder | About 165kg41% as black powder | 62.5kg, ie about 102kg lessNo black powder |

2.2 Key Environmental Issues Associated with the Proposed Changes

2.2.1 Air Quality

With regards to the proposed changes to the firework displays as presented in *Table 2.1*, the air quality impact due to the revised Show may be different from that of the previous fireworks displays as assessed in the ERR 2005. The air quality impact assessment presented in the ERR 2005 has been reviewed, taking into account the proposed changes. Details of the air quality impact assessment are given in *Section 3*.

2.2.2 Noise

A quantitative noise impact assessment has been prepared based on the product inventory and noise data provided by the Design Team from the US for the revised Show. Details are given in *Section 4*.

2.2.3 Hazard

As per Sections 10.6.4 and 10.6.5 of the approved EIA Report, the minor blast or project effects associated with fireworks and pyrotechnics referred to the blast and debris inherent in the functioning of the device. Also, Hazard Division 1.4 fireworks and pyrotechnics articles included the smaller calibre and non projectile types (including small diameter shells). Substances and articles of Division 1.4 presented only a small hazard in the event of initiation or ignition. The effects would largely be confined to the package and no projection of fragments of appreciable range or size is to be

expected. Even an external fire would not cause virtually instantaneous explosion of almost the entire contents of the package.

As such, the hazard assessment of dangerous goods (fireworks, sodium hypochlorite) has assessed the risks associated with the following facilities and activities associated with fireworks:

- Transport accidents leading to fire/ explosion of fireworks cargo on vehicle;
- Fire/ explosion in fireworks storage; and
- Fireworks shell landing/ bursting near spectators within the Theme Park or public road (assessment for the risk associated with landing/ bursting near spectators was limited to shell products only in the approved EIA Report, ie excluding impact from pyros as potential risk from pyros was considered to be insignificant)

As confirmed by HKDML and by the Design Team from the US, there is no change in the requirements given in the *Hazard Management Plan* prepared under Condition 3.12 of the EP, and also no change in the assumptions made in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005 in terms of the locations of firework stores, storage inventory, transport route, transport quantity and frequency and procedures for removal of aerial products.

Similarly, there is no change in the assumptions made in the approved EIA Report in terms of location of sodium hypochlorite stores, storage inventory, transport route, transport quantity and frequency.

Also, shell products will not be used for the revised Show and only same type of (1.4G) products as in the previous show will be used for the revised Show. The risks levels due to the storage, use, transport, handling and processing of dangerous goods (fireworks and sodium hypochlorite) evaluated in the approved EIA Report remain valid, and the hazard to life in terms of individual risk and societal risk are expected to be lower than those predicted in the approved EIA Report and in compliance with the risk criteria stipulated in Section 2 of Annex 4 of the *Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process* (EIAO-TM).

As mentioned in Table 2.1, all pyro will only be launched from the original castle and adjacent rooftop launching sites, as well as several new launching sites on the new portion of the castle, ie at the rear side. As the new launching locations are located at the rear side at the back of the castle, they are located further away from the audiences and hence will not pose an increased risk to the audiences.

The requirements given in the Hazards Management Plan that are applicable to pyros will continue to be implemented for the revised Show. Major requirements include full compliance with the *Dangerous Goods Ordinance* and Home Affair Bureau's Fireworks Permits, safety measures at the launch locations, quality control of fireworks vendor, locations and requirements of discharge and storage sites, capacity of the storage, emergency and contingency plans, and transportation requirements.

With the implementation of the requirements given in the Hazards Management Plan, no adverse risk impact is anticipated from the revised Show.

2.2.4 Water Quality

The spent fireworks will be collected immediately after the completion of the firework displays and disposed of in accordance with the *Waste Management Plan* (WMP) for the operational stage approved under Condition 3.21 of the EP to prevent adverse impacts to water quality from the discharge of fireworks residue. No adverse water quality impact is therefore expected.

2.2.5 Waste Management

The remains of fireworks may contain heavy metals in low concentration and mid-level fireworks remains may contain dioxins furans which is anticipated to be similar to the assumption made in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005. All fireworks remains will be treated as chemical waste and stabilised, if necessary, with cement to avoid the hazards and potential environmental impacts

associated with the disposal of waste. The stabilised fireworks remains should be safe for disposal at landfills. With implementation of the WMP, no adverse impact is anticipated.

2.2.6 Terrestrial Ecology

A review of the potential impacts to White-bellied Sea Eagle (WBSE) as a result of the proposed changes have been undertaken by comparing the assumptions made in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005.

The location of launching site at the back of house was demolished and the location of current Phase 1 launching site at the castle and the adjoining buildings will remain the same as presented in both the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005, which is located at about 2km from the WBSE nesting site reported in the approved EIA Report. In view of the large separation distance, the lower maximum bursting height of the revised Show, and that there are no additional noise impacts from the proposed changes (refer to *Section 4* of this Report), potential impacts of the revised Show is expected to be less than those predicted in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005.

In addition, the power range of lasers will not be greater than 30 Watt and the use of laser effects will be terminated against fixed and non-reflective objects within the Theme Park such that no laser beam will be directly pointing toward the Pa Tau Kwu area. The scale of the revised Show is expected to be similar to the assumptions made in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005, and potential impacts to the WBSE are therefore also expected to be similar.

2.2.7 Landscape and Visual

The landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) prepared in the approved EIA Report concluded that the operation phase of the Theme Park would create some visual intrusion of unscreened elements into the backdrop of the natural scenery and would also create a new landscape character with positive visual qualities. The proposed changes in the revised Show with lower maximum height will not have any impact on the results of the LVIA presented in the approved EIA Report.

3. AIR QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

As a result of the proposed changes as described in *Section 2.1*, the potential air quality impacts associated with the revised Show are reviewed. This *Section* reviews and assesses the potential air quality impacts associated with the proposed changes.

3.2 Air Emissions from the Revised Show

Air emissions from the fireworks of the revised Show may have the potential to cause air quality impacts to the Air Sensitive Receivers (ASRs) in the vicinity of the Theme Park. Bursting of fireworks during the revised Show may cause emissions of Particulate Matter (PM). The fireworks contain a number of metal species including aluminium (AI), antimony (Sb), barium (Ba), strontium (Sr), copper (Cu) and titanium (Ti), which may also be emitted to the atmosphere during the revised Show. Therefore, the key air pollutants of concern from the revised Show are PM (including respirable suspended particulates (RSP) and fine suspended particulates (FSP)) and the aforementioned metal species which were assessed in the ERR 2005. Odour was also assessed in the ERR 2005 as the previous fireworks displays contain black powder which, when detonated, may emit hydrogen sulphide (H₂S) and thus has the potential to cause odour impact. As the fireworks of the revised Show will no longer contain black powder, there will be no associated H₂S emissions and thus odour impact is not a concern for the revised Show.

As provided by HKDML and the Design Team from the US, the total Net Explosive Quantity (NEQ) of the revised Show is reduced to 62.5kg, whereas the total NEQ of the previous fireworks displays is 165kg as assumed in the ERR 2005. As advised by MP Associates, Inc. (MPA), the supplier of the pyrotechnic articles for the revised Show engaged by HKDML, the amount of metal emissions in the fireworks (i.e. AI, Sb, Ba, Sr, Cu and Ti) is 8.3% of the NEQ of the fireworks and the breakdown of the metal emissions is presented in *Table 3.1*. The breakdown of the metal emissions assumed in the ERR 2005 are also provided in *Table 3.1* for comparison. It can be seen that the emissions of individual metal species from the revised Show are lower compared with those from the previous fireworks displays except for Cu and Ti.

| Quantity ^(a) | Emission Quantity ^(b) | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | |
| | 2.03kg | |
| | 0.89kg | |
| | 2.12kg | |
| | 1.14kg | |
| | 0.63kg | |
| | 0.28kg | |
| - | | 0.89kg 2.12kg 1.14kg 0.63kg 0.28kg |

Table 3.1Breakdown of Metal Emissions from the Revised Show and the
Previous Fireworks Displays

Notes:

a) The emission quantities were calculated based on the metal breakdown in terms of % of NEQ provided by MPA (see *Appendix A*).

b) The emission quantities were made reference to ERR 2005.

Also, as confirmed by MPA, about 11% of the total NEQ will be used as lift charge, where oxygen, nitrogen and water vapour will be produced as byproducts of the lift charge (see *Appendix A*). As a conservative and worst case assumption, apart from 8.3% of metals and 11% of lift charge, the remaining 80.7% of the total NEQ are assumed to contribute to RSP emissions arising from the revised Show. The amount of RSP emissions was assumed to be 42% of the NEQ of the fireworks in the ERR 2005. Considering the total NEQ and its proportion of RSP, the total amount of RSP

emissions from the revised Show (50.4kg) is about 27% less compared with that from the previous fireworks displays (69.4kg).

3.3 Identification of Air Sensitive Receivers

The representative ASRs identified in the ERR 2005 have been reviewed. The identified representative ASRs in the vicinity of the Theme Park are listed in *Table 3.2* and their locations are shown in *Figure 3.1*.

| ASR No. | Description | Type of Use | Approx. Base Elevation (m) | Approx. Maximum Height (m above ground) | Separation Distance from the Nearest Project Site Boundary (m) |
|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| A1 | Administration Building of Penny's Bay Gas Turbine Power Station | Industrial | 4 | 10 | 330 |
| A2 | Penny's Bay Fire Station | GIC | 4 | 5 | 45 |
| A3 | Penny's Bay Police Post | GIC | 4 | 5 | 20 |
| A4 | Inspiration lake Recreation Centre | Recreational | 4 | 5 | 250 |
| A5 | Luk Keng Tsuen | Residential | 3 | 5 | 2,200 |
| A6 | Cherish Court Discovery Bay | Residential | 5 | 60 | 1,660 |
| A7 | Peng Chau | Residential | 26 | 5 | 1,745 |
| A8 | Siena Two Block 30 in Discovery Bay | Residential | 28 | 25 | 2,400 |
| A9 | Resort in Theme Park | Hotel | 3 | 25 | _ (b) |
| A10 | Potential Resort in Phase II of Theme Park | Hotel | 3 | 25 | _ (b) |
| A11 | Potential Hotel on Northern Land | Hotel | 4 | 25 | _ (b) |
| A12 | Potential Sunny Bay Development ^(c) | Recreational | 0 | 25 | 2,250 |
| A13 | Potential Sunny Bay Development ^(c) | Recreational | 0 | 25 | 2,220 |
| A14 | Potential Sunny Bay Development ^(c) | Recreational | 0 | 25 | 2,440 |
| A15 | Amalfi Discovery Bay | Residential | 0 | 50 | 2,010 |
| A16 | Greenvale Village | Residential | 35 | 85 | 2,530 |

Table 3.2 Details of the Identified Representative ASRs

Note:

(a) GIC = Government, institution or community uses.

(b) Located within the Project site.

(c) With reference to the Approved North-east Lantau Outline Zoning Plan (No. S/I-NEL/12), the potential Sunny Bay Development will be planned for tourism and recreation related developments, including public open space, potential tourism uses such as retail, entertainment and hotel uses and other compatible uses. Maximum building height is assumed to be 25m as a reasonable assumption.

3.4 Evaluation of Impacts

3.4.1 RSP and FSP Emissions

As mentioned in *Section 3.2*, the total RSP emissions from the revised Show are considerably less than those from the previous fireworks displays (about 27% less). To evaluate the potential RSP impact at the identified ASRs due to the revised Show as compared with that due to the previous fireworks displays, the RSP emissions from the revised Show and the previous fireworks displays are broadly broken down into 3 different bursting heights for comparison as shown in *Table 3.3*.



| Previous Fire | works Displays ^(a) | | Revised Show ^(b) | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Emission | Total NEQ (g) | Total RSP | Emission | Total NEQ (g) | Total RSP |
| Height | | Emissions (g) | Height | | Emissions (g) |
| 140mPD | 24,298 | 10,205 | 120mPD | 2,121 | 1,712 |
| 100mPD | 9,764 | 4,101 | 100mPD | 4,845 | 3,910 |
| 70mPD | 131,210 | 55,108 | 70mPD | 55,507 | 44,794 |
| Total: | 165,272 | 69,414 | | 62,473 | 50,416 |
| Notes: | | | | | |

Table 3.3RSP Emissions from the Revised Show and the PreviousFireworks Displays at Different Bursting Heights

(a) The NEQ and RSP emissions at different bursting heights were made reference to ERR 2005.

(b) The NEQ and RSP emissions at different bursting heights were confirmed by HKDML.

As shown in *Table 3.3*, RSP emissions from the revised Show have reduced at all of the 3 emission heights. Majority of the RSP is emitted at the lower emission level (i.e. 70mPD) for both the previous fireworks displays and the revised Show, with about 19% reduction of RSP emissions at this level from the revised Show. The highest emission level for the revised Show is about 20m lower than that for the previous fireworks displays, but the RSP emissions from the revised Show at this level only account for 5% of the total and are considerably less than that from the previous fireworks displays. The identified near-field ASRs (i.e. A1 to A4, A9 to A11) in this ERR were also identified in the ERR 2005 and they are all low-rise buildings (i.e. less than 30mPD, see *Table 3.2*). Given the large vertical separation between the near-field ASRs and the highest emission level of the revised Show (i.e. 120mPD) and that the impact at low level ASRs is dominated by the lowest emission level (70mPD) where the emission will be reduced, the RSP impact at these near-field ASRs due to the revised Show is expected to be lower than that due to the previous fireworks displays.

A number of far-field ASRs (i.e. A5 to A8, A12 to A16) were also identified in this ERR. As these farfield ASRs are all at least more than 1.6km away from the Project site boundary, the influence due to the change of emission height by 20m at the highest emission level (i.e. 140mPD reduced to 120mPD) from such great distance is likely to be minimal. Considering that the lowest and middle emission levels which account for the majority of the RSP emissions remain unchanged at 70mPD and 100mPD with a RSP emission reduction of about 18%, the RSP impact at these far-field ASRs due to the revised Show is expected to be lower than that due to the previous fireworks displays.

FSP was not assessed in ERR 2005. As FSP is part of RSP, FSP impact at both near-field and farfield ASRs due to the revised Show is also expected to be lower than that due to the previous fireworks displays.

Air quality impact arising from RSP and FSP emissions from the revised Show is lower than that due to the previous fireworks displays.

3.4.2 Metal Emissions

With reference to the assessment results in ERR 2005, the predicted contributions from the previous fireworks displays for the concerned metal species are minimal with respect to the relevant assessment criteria. The assessment criteria for the metal species as adopted in ERR 2005 have been reviewed with reference to the following recognised international air quality standard reference documents and databases:

- World Health Organisation (WHO);
- United States Environmental Protection Agency Integrated Risk Information System (USEPA IRIS);
- Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Environmental Protection Agency (OEHHA); and
- EH40/2005 Workplace Exposure Limit (2018 Version), Health & Safety Executive, UK.

The current air quality standards for the metal species from the abovementioned documents and database, if available, are presented in Table 3.4. The adopted assessment criteria as shown in Table 3.4 was selected in the order of preference as presented above.

| | | | • | | • | |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Metal Species | Air Quality Standards (Chronic) (µg/m ³) | | | | Assessment Criteria (μg/m³) | |
| | WHO ^(b) | USEPA IRIS ^(c) | OEHHA ^(d) | UK OEL ^(e) | Updated Criteria | Criteria in ERR 2005 |
| Al | - | - | - | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Sb | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Ва | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Sr | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cu | - | - | - | 10 | 10 | 2.4 |
| Ti | - | - | - | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Notes: | | | | | | |

| Table 3.4 | Air Quality | / Standards | for Metal | Species |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| | | | | |

(a) "-" means standard is not available.

- (b) WHO Air Quality Guidelines for Europe, Second Edition: http://www.euro.who.int/ data/assets/pdf file/0005/74732/E71922.pdf
- (c) USEPA IRIS: https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris drafts/AtoZ.cfm
- (d) OEHHA: https://oehha.ca.gov/air/general-info/oehha-acute-8-hour-and-chronic-reference-exposure-level-relsummary
- (e) EH40/2005 Workplace Exposure Limit 2nd Edition (2011), Health & Safety Executive, UK http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/priced/eh40.pdf A safety factor of 100 has been applied for conversion of time-weight-average value to long-term exposure limit, with reference to the approach adopted in the approved EIA report and 2005 ERR.

As shown in Table 3.1, the emissions of individual metal species from the revised Show have reduced compared with those from the previous fireworks displays except for Cu and Ti. Adopting the same analysis as presented in Section 3.4.1, the air quality impact due to emissions of Al, Sb, Ba and Sr from the revised Show at the identified ASRs is expected to be minor and lower than that from the previous fireworks displays.

According to the assessment results in the ERR 2005, the maximum Cu and Ti contributions among the identified ASRs due to the previous fireworks displays are predicted to be only $0.0347\mu g/m^3$ (i.e. 0.35% of the Cu assessment criterion) and 0.0151µg/m³ (i.e. 0.015% of the Ti assessment criterion), respectively.

Given that the Cu emissions from the revised Show are about 1.4 times of those from the previous fireworks displays (see Table 3.1), the maximum Cu contributions at the identified ASRs due to the revised Show would be about 0.05µg/m³ (i.e. 0.5% of the Cu assessment criterion). Taking into account the background Cu concentration of 0.174µg/m^{3 (1)}, the cumulative Cu concentration at the identified ASRs is about 0.23µg/m³, which is well within the relevant Cu assessment criterion of $10\mu g/m^{3}$.

Given that the Ti emissions from the revised Show are about 2.5 times of those from the previous fireworks displays (see Table 3.1), the maximum Ti contributions at the identified ASRs due to the revised Show would be about 0.04µg/m³, which is well within the relevant Ti assessment criterion of $100\mu g/m^{3} (^{2}).$

Therefore, unacceptable air quality impact arising from emissions of the identified metal species during the revised Show is not anticipated.

⁽¹⁾ Maximum measured Cu annual average concentration among all stations in 2015-2019 with reference to EPD's Air Quality Reports in 2015-2019 - Summary of Airborne Species Concentration Derived from RSP.

⁽²⁾ Ti concentration is not available with reference to EPD's Air Quality Reports in 2019 – Summary of Airborne Species Concentration Derived from RSP.

3.5 Mitigation Measures

As unacceptable air quality impact is not anticipated as a result of the proposed changes to the revised Show, additional mitigation measures are not required.

4. NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction

This Section reviews and assesses the potential noise impact associated with the proposed changes in the firework displays.

4.2 Statutory Requirements and Evaluation Criterion

In accordance with the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005, an evening noise limit of $L_{eq(15 min)}$ 55dB(A) at residential premises was adopted for the noise impact assessment for firework displays at the Theme Park. This noise limit has been adopted for the noise impact assessment in this ERR.

4.3 Identification of Noise Sensitive Receivers

The representative Noise Sensitive Receivers (NSRs) that may be affected by the revised Show have been reviewed and identified. The locations of the identified NSR are listed in *Table 4.1* and presented in *Figure 4.1*.

| | | | | | - |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------------------|---|---------------|
| NSR | Description | Ground Level mPD | Number of Storey | Minimum Separation Distance from the Launching Site (m) | Sensitive Use |
| N1 | Peng Chau (Block D of Sea Crest Villa) | 6 | 3 | 2,670 | Residential |
| N2 | Discovery Bay (Block 48 of Crestmont Villa) | 40 | 5 | 2,420 | Residential |
| N3 | Discovery Bay (95 Headland Village) | 40 | 3 | 2,550 | Residential |

Table 4.1 Identified Noise Sensitive Receivers (NSRs)

4.4 Assessment Methodology

As discussed in *Section 2.1*, revisions have been made to the design of the firework display including the number of products and quieter pyros. It should be noted that the duration of the revised Show is similar to the assumptions made in the approved EIA Report and ERR 2005.

Although ultimately there will be potentially two fireworks shows (one for the Phase I Park and one for Phase II Park) which may be updated from time to time, the shows at these two sites will be staged separately and will not coincide within any 15 minute period interval as mentioned in ERR 2005 and *Section 4.4.29* of the approved EIA Report. For the purpose of this assessment, the noise impact from one firework show is therefore assessed and compared against the assessment criteria.

Reference has been made to the assessment methodology adopted in approved EIA Report and ERR 2005 for this assessment. The noise output of the revised Show has been calculated based on the Sound Exposure Levels (SEL) for the individual firework items selected and established by the Design Team from the US from the product inventory presented in ERR 2005. Details of the product inventory are shown in *Appendix B1*.

4.5 Identification of Potential Environmental Noise Impacts

The firework noise levels at the representative NSRs have been predicted and are summarised in *Table 4.2.* Details of the calculation are presented in *Appendix B2.* The predicted firework noise levels for the revised Show are in the range of 44 to 48 dB(A) at the representative NSRs, ie lower than the predicted noise levels of 52 and 55 dB(A) in the ERR 2005 and comply with the noise criteria of 55dB(A).



Figure 4.1

Location of Noise Sensitive Receivers

File: T:\GIS\CONTRACT\0517002\mxd\0517002_NSR.mxd Date: 1/11/2019 Environmental Resources Management



| NSR | Description | Predicted Firework Noise Levels, | Noise Criterion, |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|------------------|
| | | L _{eq (15min)} dB(A) | dB(A) |
| N1 | Peng Chau (Block D of Sea Crest Villa) | 44 | 55 |
| N2 | Discovery Bay (Block 48 of Crestmont Villa) | 48 | 55 |
| N3 | Discovery Bay (95 Headland Village) | 48 | 55 |

| Table 4.2 | Predicted Firework Noise Levels, Leq (15min) dB(A |
|-----------|---|
|-----------|---|

It should be noted that the maximum SELs of the firework items were adopted in the assessment for worst-case scenario. As the revised Show will continue to be refined, *Appendix B1* is only an indication of the quantities of devices expected to be used for the revised Show. It should be noted that the final quantities of devices to be used is expected to be lower than this worst case scenario. Noise monitoring during testing and commissioning will be carried out to confirm any modifications to the expected show design are required to ensure noise compliance.

4.6 Mitigation Measures

As no exceedance of the noise criterion due to the revised Show is predicted, no specific mitigation measures are necessary. Noise monitoring for the revised Show will be carried out during testing and commissioning and regular noise monitoring will be resumed upon commissioning. The results of the revised Show during testing and commissioning will be used to verify the noise assessment and if required, the monitoring results will be used for improving the fireworks show design to ensure compliance with the noise criterion.

5. REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND AUDIT (EM&A) REQUIREMENTS

The ongoing environmental monitoring and audit (EM&A) programme will be continued in accordance with the requirements given in the *Operational EM&A Plan* (Revision H).

The air quality and noise monitoring for fireworks have been suspended since 2 January 2018 as the fireworks show at the Castle has been temporarily suspended since then. The noise monitoring for fireworks will be carried out during testing and commissioning, and regular air quality and noise monitoring will be resumed upon commissioning. Monitoring will be carried out in accordance with the requirements given in the *Operational EM&A Plan*, including monitoring locations, frequency, equipment, parameters and Action and Limit Levels.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The assessment indicates that the air quality impact arising from RSP and FSP emissions from the revised Show is lower than that due to the previous fireworks displays. The assessment further confirms that the identified metal species assessment criteria will not be exceeded. No unacceptable air quality impact is anticipated.

The Project Proponent has reviewed the entire Project as a whole, the proposed changes will not constitute a material change to the environmental impact of the Project and the Project fully complies with the EIAO-TM requirements.

APPENDIX A SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR AIR QUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX A1 CONFIRMATION LETTER FROM MPA



P.O. BOX 546 • IONE, CA 95640-0546 (209) 274-4715 • FAX (209) 274-4843

September 22, 2020

Environmental Protection Department Environmental Assessment Division Regional Assessment Group

27th Floor, Southorn Centre, 130 Hennessy Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong

To Whom It May Concern:

Disney has requested that MP Associates, Inc. (MPA) provide certain confidential information regarding the custom-made pyrotechnic articles manufactured by MPA for use at Hong Kong Disneyland (HKDL). The information below only applies to the pyrotechnic articles currently being considered for use at HKDL:

- 1. The lift charge contained in the pyrotechnic articles is an average of approximately 11% of the total Net Explosive Quantity (NEQ) of the articles planned for use. The current lift charge propellent used in the show incorporates a high-energy inorganic oxidizer. Upon combustion, the oxidizer primarily produces the gaseous byproducts of oxygen, nitrogen and water vapor.
- 2. The formulae for the pyrotechnic compositions of the new articles do not include chromium, lead, mercury, arsenic, manganese, nickel or zinc.
- 3. The approximate average percentage of metals in the articles' current pyrotechnic compositions is 8.3% (see attached table for details).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this information.

Sincerely,

David Pier Executive Vice President MP ASSOCIATES, INC.

Attachment

DP:gp cc: File

Hong Kong Disneyland Resort <u>"HKNC PET"</u>

Metals Breakdown

as of 08/23/2019

- CONFIDENTIAL-

| Total Aluminum per show: | 3.0% |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Total Antimony per show: | 0.2% |
| | 0.270 |
| Total Barium per show: | 1.8% |
| | |
| Total Copper per show: | 1.4% |
| | |
| Total Strontium per show: | 0.8% |
| | |
| Total Titanium per show: | 1.1% |

NOTICE: This document, including any related attachments, contains copyrighted, confidential and/or trade secret information, which is the exclusive property of MP Associates, Inc. (MPA). All information contained in this document, including any attachments, is solely intended for internal use by the government of Hong Kong, and may not be relied upon by any other person or entity for any purpose. No disclosure, dissemination or duplication of all or part of the information contained in this document should occur without the express written approval of MPA. All information in this document and any related attachments, is based upon data derived or compiled by MPA and/or recognized technical sources. While the information is believed to be materially accurate, MPA makes no express or implied warranty or representation as to its accuracy or sufficiency for any particular purpose. All stated measurements and weights are approximate and variable within standard manufacturing tolerances to control burn time and performance specifications. Any performance specifications are as tested at MPA. This information relates only to the product designated herein for the intended use described by Hong Kong Disneyland Resort.

APPENDIX B SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX B1 PRODUCT INVENTORY FOR THE REVISED SHOW

Appendix B1 - Product Inventory for the Revised Show

| Item | | | Number of |
|---------------------|--------------|--|-----------|
| no. Type | | Description | Devices |
| 38mm Crossette | | | |
| 3 Crossette 38mm | | PF SS | 4 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm P | lastic Case | Pink/Eusia Strobe I SPE UI SI | 8 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm, P | Plastic Case | Red & Lemon Octopus LSPF ULSL | 6 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm, P | lastic Case | White Strobe LSPF ULSL | 6 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm, P | lastic Case | Firefly & Crackle PF ULSL | 10 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm, P | lastic Case | Gold Glitter Waterfall 4sec BT PF ULSL | 8 |
| 6 Starburst 44mm, P | lastic Case | Green & Lemon Octopus LSPF ULSL | 6 |
| 39 Type 34B Mine | | Blue Bottom & SS Ton mine w/Blue Starburst Appears@2sec SPE SI | 24 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Blue w/Tail LSPF ULSL | 24 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Pink w/Tail LSPF ULSL | 2 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Pink/Fushia w/Tail w/Pink/Fushia Strobe Base LSPF ULSL | 4 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | SS Bottom &Blue Top mine w/SS Starburst Appears@2sec LSPF ULSL | 4 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | SS Bottom & Varigated Top mine w/SS Starburst Appears@2sec LSPF ULSL | 6 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Stinger Mine w/White Strobe Base PF ULSL | 6 12 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Varigated Bottom & 55 Top mille w/varigated Starburst Appears@2sec LSFF OLSE | 12 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Varigated Crossette w/Varigated Base & SS Middle LSPF ULSL | 18 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | Violet w/Firefly Base LSPF ULSL | 4 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | White Strobe Base, Violet Middle, Green Top mine LSPF ULSL | 3 |
| 39 Type 3AB Mine | | White Strobe Base, Green Middle, Violet Top mine LSPF ULSL | 3 |
| 38mm Comet | | | |
| 4 Comet 38mm | | L/S P/F Green with Tail | 11 |
| 4 Cornet 38mm | | L/S P/F Lemon with Tail | 9 |
| 4 Comet 38mm | | L/S P/F Voilet with Tail | 9 |
| 44mm Comet/Mine | | | C C |
| 4 Comet 44mm | | PF Firefly | 8 |
| 4 Comet 44mm - Cro | ossing | FireFly Long Throw PF ULSL | 14 |
| 4 Comet 44mm | | Green w/Tail ULSL | 3 |
| 4 Comet 44mm | | Lemon w/Tail ULSL | 3 |
| 4 Comet 44mm | | Blue w/Mbite Strobe Base I SPE I II SI | 1 |
| 4 Mine 44mm | | Firefly PF ULSI | 28 |
| 4 Mine 44mm | | Firefly PF w/Small LSPF Varigated Strobe ULSL | 6 |
| 4 Mine 44mm | | Green LSPF w/Gold Glitter PF Base ULSL | 2 |
| 4 Mine 44mm | | Pink w/Tail LSPF ULSL | 1 |
| 4 Mine 44mm | | Seafoam LSPF w/Gold Glitter PF Base ULSL | 2 |
| 5 Comet Mine 44mm | 1 | Lemon w/Tail & Green Mine LSPF ULSL | 3 |
| 5 Cornet Mine 44mm | | Lemon w/White Stroke Mine LSPF ULSL | 3 |
| 5 Comet Mine 44mm | 1 | Red w/White Strobe Mine LSPF ULSL | 2 |
| 5 Comet Mine 44mm | 1 | Orange w/Purple Mine LSPF ULSL | 9 |
| 5 Mine 44mm | | PF Gold Glitter & L/S P/F Seafoam | 18 |
| 5 Mine 44mm | | PF Gold Glitter & L/S P/F White Strobe | 18 |
| 5 Comet Mine 44mm | ו | SS Comet w/Blue Mine LSPF ULSL | 17 |
| 5 Comet /Mine44mm | 1 | SS PF Comet w/Green LSPF Mine ULSL | 17 |
| 5 Comet /Mine44mm | | SS PF Comet w/Red LSPF Mine ULSL | 7 |
| 5 Comet /Mine44mm | 1 | SS PF Comet w/White Strobe Mine ULSL | 9 |
| 5 Comet /Mine44mm | า | SS PF Comet w/Varigated LSPF Mine ULSL | 18 |
| 5 Stinger Symulator | 44mm | Stinger Symulator PF ULSL | 34 |
| 100mm | | | |
| 38 Type 4AB Mine | | Blue LSPF w/Gold Glitter PF Base ULSL | 4 |
| | | Green W/Lemon Base LSPF ULSL | 1 |
| 38 Type 4AB Mine | | Violet LSPF & Clackle FF OLSE | 12 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Blue LSPF w/White Stobe Base ULSL | 2 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Kamuro Look w/30%White Strobe & 70% Pink Strobe Base LSPF ULSL | 8 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Kamuro Look w/White Strobe Base LSPF ULSL | 8 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Lemon w/Green Base LSPF ULSL | 1 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Lemon w/Red Base LSPF ULSL | 1 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Orange & Fast Crackle Base PF ULSL | 20 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Reu W/Lemon Base LOPF ULOL Stinger Mine w/White Stroke Base DE LII SI | 1 |
| 39 Type 4AB Mine | | Varigated w/Tail LSPF w/SS PF Base ULSL | o 36 |
| | | Tota | 550 |

Note:

(a) The items are selected and established by the Design Team from US with reference to the product list presented in Annex C7a of ERR 2005. Similar or quieter items have been selected for the revised Show.

APPENDIX B2 FIREWORK NOISE PREDICTION

Appendix B2 - Firework Noise Prediction

| | | N1 | | N2 | | N3 | |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Itom no | Number of Dovices | Individual Corrected | Total SEL for | Individual Corrected | Total SEL for | Individual Corrected | Total SEL for |
| item no. | Number of Devices | Measureu Max. SEL | each item | Measureu Max. SEL | each item | Weasured Wax. SEL | each itein |
| 3 | 4 | 51 | 57 | 53 | 59 | 53 | 59 |
| 4 | 122 | 34 | 55 | 36 | 57 | 36 | 57 |
| 5 | 164 | 40 | 62 | 42 | 64 | 42 | 64 |
| 6 | 44 | 49 | 65 | 56 | 72 | 56 | 72 |
| 38 | 25 | 57 | 71 | 60 | 74 | 60 | 74 |
| 39 | 191 | 44 | 67 | 46 | 69 | 46 | 69 |
| | 550 | Total SEL = | 74 | | 77 | | 77 |
| | | Time Correction = | -29.5 | | -29.5 | | -29.5 |
| Predicted | d Fireworks Noise Level | s (Facade) - L _{eq (15min)} , dB(A) = | • 44 | | 48 | | 48 |

Notes:

(a) The SELs are with reference to the SELs presented in Annex C7a of ERR 2005 for conservatism. Similar or quieter products have been selected for the revised Show such that predicted noise levels should be lower than the predicted noise levels assessed in ERR 2005.

(b) N3 is located at 2,550m from the firework launching area which is ~130m farther than N2. SELs for each item at N2 have been adopted for N3 for worst case scenario.

ERM has over 160 offices across the following countries and territories worldwide

Argentina New Zealand Australia Norway Belgium Panama Brazil Peru Canada Poland China Portugal Colombia Puerto Rico France Romania Germany Russia Hong Kong Singapore Hungary South Africa India South Korea Indonesia Spain Ireland Sweden Italy Switzerland Japan Taiwan Kazakhstan Thailand Kenya UAE UK Malaysia US Mexico Myanmar Vietnam The Netherlands

ERM-Hong Kong, Limited 2507, 25/F One Harbourfront

18 Tak Fung Street Hunghom Kowloon Hong Kong

T: +852 2271 3000 F: +852 2723 5660

www.erm.com

