

**Yau Tong Bay Development
Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Responses to EPD's Comments (11 July 2001) on Draft Final EIA Report**

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay</u> <u>Draft Final EIA Report</u> <u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>(1) As pointed out in our previous comment, we agree that quantitative dust impact assessment is not necessary for this EIA. For completeness, we suggest to indicate in the EIA report that relevant requirements of the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation shall be followed in dust control and an audit and monitoring program during construction shall be initiated to ensure construction dust impact will be controlled to within the relevant standards as stipulated in Annex 4 of the Technical Memorandum.</p>	<p>Noted. The requirements under the mentioned regulations will be included in the revised report.</p>
<p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(2) page 2-4, paragraph 2.2.12 under "Public Benefits of Minor Adjustment of the Gazetted Reclamation Boundary"</p> <p>The examples quoted in the 4th sentence should be amended, since it was concluded in section 5.4.10 that PCB, PAH and TBT contaminants in the sediment are unlikely to be released into the marine waters.</p>	<p>Noted. Text will be amended to read "Dredging of marine deposit for the construction of seawall foundation along this alignment might result in a high release of contaminants and harmful substances (e.g heavy metal) into the Harbour."</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(3) page 2-4, paragraph 2.2.15 under “Public Benefits of Minor Adjustment of the Gazetted Reclamation Boundary”</p> <p>“Soil sampling and soil testing” in the 3rd sentence should be amended to read as “sediment sampling and sediment testing”.</p>	<p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(4) pages 5-2 to 5-3, paragraphs 5.2.5 to 5.2.10 under “Marine Sediment”</p> <p>The paragraphs should be amended taking into account that the new WBTC No. 3/2000 and WBTC No. 12/200 have already been issued (which were copied to you under cover of our earlier letter ref (36) of the even series dated 17.5.2001). It should also be indicated that the new sediment management (WBTC No. 3/2000) was not in place during the site investigation work for the EIA study.</p>	<p>Text will be amended accordingly to refer to WBTC No. 12/2000. Please note that WBTC No. 3/2000 is discussed in para. 5.2.9 to 5.2.11.</p> <p>Please refer to 4th sentence of para. 5.2.9 where it is indicated that the new system was not in place at the time of the site investigation for the EIA Study.</p>
<p>(5) page 5-7, paragraph 5.4.1 under “Existing Sediment Characteristics”</p> <p>The first sentence is suggested to amend to read as “The results of the marine sediment quality analysis as compared with the EPD TC 1-1-92 are presented in Table 5.3. The sediments are also classified with reference to the sediment criteria under the WBTC No. 3/2000.”</p>	<p>Text will be amended accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(6) page 5-7, Table 5.3 “Classification of Contaminated Sediments Analysis Results”</p> <p>Some of the sediment analysis results are not presented in such a way as indicated in the notes to the table. For example, at vibrocore V3, the values for Pb at (1.05-1.25m) and Hg at (1.8-2.0m) should be underlined since they are both Category M sediment. Amendments are also required for V5 (all depths except 5.3-5.5m) and V7 (Zn at 0.0-0.5m and Cu at 6.25-6.45m).</p>	Text will be amended accordingly.
<p>(7) page 5-8, paragraph 5.4.2 under “Heavy Metals”</p> <p>The last sentence should be amended to read as “At these 3 vibrocore locations, the metals Cu, Pb, Ni and Hg were recorded at Class C level.”</p>	Text will be amended accordingly.
<p>(8) page 5-8, paragraph 5.4.3 under “Heavy Metals”</p> <p>At vibrocore V5, Class C sediment was not only found at the bottom layer. Moreover, Class C sediment was also found at the surface layer (0.0-1.35m). Please refer to our comment to Table 5.3 above.</p>	The second sentence will be revised to read as follows “At vibrocore V5, Class C sediment was found to reach around 3.5m.” Para. 5.4.3 will be revised to take into account the above comments on Table 5.3.
<p>(9) page 5-8, paragraph 5.4.4 under “Heavy Metals”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The profile of Class C contamination in the sediment is not summarized in Figure 5.1. Please clarify. • The 2nd sentence is not correct, since Category H material was also found at vibrocore V5. 	<p>Figure 5.1 should read Figures 2.3a & 2.3b.</p> <p>The 2nd sentence of para. 5.4.5 will be amended to read “The results indicate that Category H material was found at all vibrocore locations, due to high contaminant levels of Cu, Cr, Pb, Ni, Zn and Hg.”</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(10) page 5-12, paragraphs 5.5.1 & 5.5.2 under “Marine Sediments”</p> <p>The estimated volume of Cat. L, Cat. M and Cat. H sediment, which are based on the classification criteria under WBTC No. 3/2000, should be provided.</p>	<p>The estimated sediment volumes will be provided.</p>
<p>(11) pages 5-14 to 5-15, paragraphs 5.6.1 & 5.6.2 under “Marine Sediments”</p> <p>The requirements and procedures for dredged mud disposal should be specified under the new WBTC No. 3/2000 and WBTC No. 12/2000, since the dredging works for the Yau Tong Bay reclamation will commence in 2004.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference will be made to the requirements and procedures for dredged mud disposal specified under the new WBTC No. 3/2000 and WBTC No. 12/2000.</p>
<p>(12) page 5-15, paragraph 5.6.5 under “Marine Sediments”</p> <p>Please clarify whether sediments will be dredged near V4 for the bored pile seawall construction. Moreover, according to Figure 2.4a, sediments at the foundation of the box culverts near V8A and V9B will be dredged. Please assess the likelihood of such sediments passing / failing the biological test and propose special treatment / disposal method as necessary.</p>	<p>Sediment will be dredged within the steel casing of bore piled seawall. The steel casing will prevent the release of sediment into the harbour waters during bore pile construction. Special treatment/disposal methods will be proposed as necessary.</p>
<p>(13) page 5-18, paragraph 5.6.17 under “Construction and Demolition Material”</p> <p>As indicated in paragraph 5.6.9, steel and other metals should be separated for re-use and recycling prior to the disposal of C&D waste at landfills. Table 11.3 should also be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. Table 11.3 will be amended accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(14) pages 5-18 to 5-19, Table 5.5 “Summary of Waste Handling Procedures and Disposal Routes”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be specified only the inert portion of the C&DM (i.e. public fill) should be re-used on site. • Please clarify whether the contaminated sediments should also be required to be tight sealed on barge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will be specified. • Yes the contaminated sediments should also be required to be tight sealed on barge and this will be specified.
<p>(15) page 5-19, paragraph 5.8.1 under “Conclusion”</p> <p>This section should be amended according to our comments on paragraphs 5.6.1, 5.6.2 and 5.6.5 above.</p>	<p>This section will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(16) page 7-2, paragraph 7.5.2 under “Remediation Action Plan (RAP)”</p> <p>Since biopiling instead of landfarming is proposed to be used as the bio-remediation method for treating the TPH contaminated soil in this project, “landfarming” in this section should be amended to read as “biopiling”.</p>	<p>Text will be amended.</p>
<p>(17) Chapter 11 “Implementation Schedule of the Proposed Mitigation Measures for the Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay”</p> <p>The Implementation Schedule for land decontamination should be provided.</p>	<p>An implementation schedule will be included in the revised report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(18) pages 11-7 to 11-9, Table 11.3 “Implementation Schedule for Waste Management and Mud Disposal”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “WBTC No. 22/92” in the Relevant Legislation and Guidelines column should be replaced by “WBTC No. 3/2000”. • Please also refer to our comment on paragraph 5.6.5 above. The table should include the special treatment / disposal method as necessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text will be amended accordingly. • Noted. These details will be included, as necessary.
<p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>(19) pages 4-5 to 4-7, section 4.3 “Baseline Conditions”</p> <p>The 1999 data is now available, and this more up-to-date data should be used.</p>	<p>Table 4.4 in the EIA Report will be amended to include the 1999 data.</p>
<p>(20) page 436, paragraph 4.7.4.10 under “Mitigation Measures for Seawall Construction”</p> <p>Dredging is also required for the construction of the storm box culverts. Hence all the mitigation proposed for the dredging and filling of seawall foundations are also applicable to the box culverts. All the text in various parts of the report and the Implementation Schedule needs to be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>The heading and the first sentence of the paragraph 4.7.4.10 will be amended as:</p> <p><i>“Mitigation Measures for Stormwater Box Culver and Seawall Construction</i></p> <p>The mitigation measures proposed for the stormwater box culvert and seawall construction in YTB include:”</p> <p>The heading of Section 4.8.2 should be amended as:</p> <p>“Dredging / Filling Works for the Stormwater Box Culvert and Seawall Construction”</p>

Comments	Responses
	<p>The words “during the seawall construction” in the second sentence of paragraph 4.8.2.1 will be deleted.</p> <p>The first sentence in Section 4.11.2.3 will be amended as:</p> <p>“The proposed mitigation measures include: the use of closed grab dredgers with silt curtain for dredging and filling of seawall construction and dredging of stormwater box culvert; a silt curtain ...”</p> <p>The first sentence of the third column, second row in Table 11.2 will be amended as:</p> <p>“Implementation of the following measures for dredging and filling works during seawall construction and dredging works during the construction of stormwater box culvert:”</p> <p>Appendix C of the EM&A Manual will also be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(21) page 4-42, table 4.20 “A Summary of Time Series Statistics of SS concentration at the WSRs for Scenario 2B”</p> <p>It is expected that the cumulative impacts with Yau Tong Bay reclamation should be higher than without Yau Tong Bay reclamation. The results presented in this table, however, are the other way round; i.e. impacts for Scenario 2B_CB are more severe than Scenario 2B_CI. Please clarify.</p>	<p>As indicated in Note 7 of Table 4.20, an additional layer of silt curtain will be deployed at each intake under Scenario 2B_CI so that the SS impact under Scenario 2B_CI appears less severe than that under Scenario 2B_BK.</p> <p>The word “Scenario 2B_CB” in Table 4.20 should be amended as “Scenario 2B_BK”.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(22) pages 4-50 to 4-54, section 4.8 “Mitigation of Adverse Impacts”</p> <p>One of the mitigation measures is to construct a temporary channel / culvert at the beginning of the project to divert the existing storm drains to outside the bay before the formation of an embayment created by the new seawall. This mitigation should be specified in this section and in the Implementation Schedule.</p>	<p>The following paragraphs will be inserted after paragraph 4.8.1:</p> <p>“Temporary Diversion of YTB Stormwater Box Culvert</p> <p>To avoid the accumulation of the pollutants within the embayed water during construction, a temporary channel / culvert will be constructed to divert the existing culvert outfalls out of the YTB before the commencement of marine works.”</p> <p>Table 11.2 and Appendix C of the EM&A Manual will be amended correspondingly.</p>
<p>(23) pages 11-2 to 11-6, Table 11.2 “Implementation Schedule for Water Quality Control”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site remediation is required and all the mitigation in relation to prevention of water pollution due to the handling and treatment of contaminated soil and groundwater should be specified in this table. • It is noted that some of the sediments could be with high contamination levels, particularly at the inner bay where dredging will be carried out to prepare for the foundation of the new storm box culverts. The possibility that some of the sediments may fail the biological test, hence could not be dumped directly at East Sha Chu, should not be ignored. Please propose feasible treatment / disposal option to deal with this type of sediments. 	<p>The following items will be included in Table 11.2 and Appendix C of the EM&A Manual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to the sampling results of Contamination Assessment Plan of the site, any contaminated land treatments are subjected to EPD’s requirements on handling, treatment and disposal. Where effluent stream and extracted ground water are to be discharged from site, the discharge should comply with the WPCO and any EPD’s special requirements. <p>Please note that special treatment/disposal method of seriously contaminated sediment will be addressed in Section 5.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Draft EM&A Manual</u></p> <p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(24) Table of Contents</p> <p>The page numbers shown on page i do not correspond with the page number of the text. Please amend.</p>	<p>The page numbers will be amended.</p>
<p>(25) Chapter 4 “Waste Management”</p> <p>This chapter should be amended according to our comments given on the EIA above. The Implementation Schedule at Appendix D should also be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. This chapter and the implementation schedule will be amended in accordance with the comments given on the EIA report.</p>
<p>(26) Section 5.3 “Monitoring Locations”</p> <p>According to Figure 5.1, four of the proposed monitoring wells near the project site boundary are actually located on existing land (the existing YTML). Please review the monitoring locations and relocate the monitoring wells to within the reclaimed area. It should also be noted that there is no Figure 2.2c in the EIA report.</p>	<p>The monitoring locations will be reviewed. The last sentence will be amended to read “Monitoring wells should be located away from the areas dredged for the permanent stormwater culvert (as shown in Figure 2.4a of the EIA Report) and the temporary channel/culvert construction (as shown on Figure 2.4a of the EIA Report).”</p>
<p>(27) Implementation Schedule for Land Decontamination</p> <p>The Implementation Schedule for land decontamination should be provided.</p>	<p>An implementation schedule will be included in the revised report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(28) Appendix D “Implementation Schedule for Waste Management & Mud Disposal”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “WBTC No. 22/92” in the Relevant Legislation and Guidelines column should be replaced by “WBTC No. 3/2000”. • The environmental protection measures / mitigation measures for the handling of chemical waste are missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The text will be amended accordingly. • These mitigation measures will be included.
<p><u>Draft Executive Summary</u></p> <p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(29) paragraph 2.3.1 under “Waste Management”</p> <p>This paragraph should be amended according to our comments on paragraphs 5.6.1, 5.6.2 and 5.6.5 of the Draft Final EIA Report.</p>	<p>This paragraph will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(30) paragraph 2.3.2 under “Waste Management”</p> <p>The last two sentences in this paragraph will only be valid after feasible treatment / disposal procedures for the seriously contaminated sediments have been identified and provided in the EIA report.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**Yau Tong Bay Development
 Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Responses to EPD's Comments (11 July 2001) on Draft Final EIA Report**

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay</u> <u>Draft Final EIA Report</u> <u>Air Quality</u></p> <p>(1) <u>page 2-7 paragraph 2.10.5 under "Description of Scenarios with or without the Project"</u></p> <p>When addressing the scenario without the project, please do not state "current industrial operations will cause nuisance to the residents of the housing estate when completed" or "the harmful pollutants generated by the highly contaminated industry will affect the health of existing and Yau Tong Bay future residents" or similar texts in the report, as no assessment or any solid evidence has been provided in the report to demonstrate such findings.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>(2) pages 3-9 & 3-13, section 3.3 "Proposed Mitigation Measures"</p> <p>It appears more logical to present this proposed mitigation measures section after the impact assessment sections.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(3) page 3-14, paragraph 3.4.6 under “Development and Phasing Layout due to I/R Interface”</p> <p>Please clarify why the same development programme can be applied for Development Options with I/R interface. Besides, “Figure 2.2” should be replaced by “Figure 2.3”.</p>	Noted.
<p>(4) page 3-16, paragraph 3.6.12 under “Technical Assumptions”</p> <p>As calculated from the assumptions used ($0.19\text{kg/s} \times 0.175 \text{ kg/MT} / 1140 \text{ m}^2$), the emission factor should be $2.92 \times 10^{-5} \text{ g/s-m}^2$ instead of $2.89 \times 10^{-5} \text{ g/s-m}^2$. Please check. Besides, it was stated that emission of the dust could only be through openings of the enclosure. Please state the area of openings used in the assessment.</p>	Noted. The calculation will be amended.
<p>(5) pages 3-16 & 3-17, paragraphs 3.6.7 & 3.6.13 under “Technical Assumptions”</p> <p>Please rectify the inconsistency in the site area of YTML27 in these two paragraphs.</p>	Noted. The inconsistencies will be amended.
<p>(6) page 3-17, paragraph 3.6.16 under “Air Sensitive Receivers”</p> <p>It should be “TSP” instead of “VOC” being assessed for impact of sawmills. Please correct.</p>	Noted. The error will be amended.

Comments	Responses
<p>(7) pages 3-17 paragraph 3.6.16 & page 3-20 paragraph 3.6.33</p> <p>It is noted that the impact was predicted at breathing zone of the podium level, 1/F, 4/F and 7/F. Please note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The assumed breathing zone level in metre above the floor levels should be stated. (b) Clarify any difference between the “podium level” indicated at the I/R interface assessment compared with the “pedestrian floor level” or “ground floor level” indicated at the air quality assessment such as page 4-3 paragraph 4.4.3. (c) Rectify the inconsistent floor mPD levels (e.g. 1/F is 12mPD at page 3-22 paragraph 3.6.47 but 17mPD at page 4-3 paragraph 4.4.2). (d) In any case, please ensure that impact is assessed at the worst affected floors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The assumed breathing zone shall be 1.5m above floor levels. This will be stated in the final report. (b) Ground floor, pedestrian floor, and podium floor were referring to the same floor. We will amend the report to use only one of the terms in order to be consistent and to minimise confusion. (c) Noted. The report will be amended accordingly. (d) Noted. Contours will be given at the worst hit levels.
<p>(8) page 3-17 paragraph 3.6.18 under “Assessment Results”</p> <p>Please clarify why “cumulative impact of all <u>four</u> sites” was stated in this section. It should be noted that there are totally <u>five</u> possible timberyard/sawmill sites as tabulated at page 3-17 paragraph 3.6.13.</p>	<p>Noted. The inconsistencies will be amended.</p>
<p>(9) page 3-19, last bullet in paragraph 3.6.25 under “VOC Emission Factors”</p> <p>With volume of 0.028m³ and density of 870 kg/m³, the calculated weight of paint should be 24.4 kg instead of 23.8 kg. Please check.</p>	<p>Noted. The figure will be amended.</p>

Comments	Responses
(10) page 3-22 paragraph 3.6.45 under “Assessment Methodology” The conversion factors used for stability classes A, B, D, E and F should be provided.	Noted. All conversion factors will be included in the report for reference.
(11) page 3-25, 2nd line in paragraph 3.8.4 under “Overall Conclusion” It should read as “... predicted levels <u>of</u> ...”	Noted.
(12) Figures 3.4 & 3.5 “Provisional Development Phasing Plan” “REVERSE” at the 4 th Note should read as “RESERVES”.	Noted.
(13) Figures 3.6 to 3.13 “µG/m ³ ” should be replaced by “µg/m ³ ”.	Noted.
(14) Figures 3.10 to 3.13 “Hourly Average Xylene Concentration” Daily average xylene concentration contours instead of the existing hourly average contours should be shown in Figures 3.10 to 3.13 to bring them in-line with the WHO guideline for xylene, which is a daily average, as shown in the text.	Noted. Daily contours will be given.
(15) Figures 3.14 to 3.17 Please indicate if the contours are presented in odour unit.	The contours are indeed in odour units. This will be indicated in the revised report.

Comments	Responses
<p>(16) Others</p> <p>Please note that the following previous comments (August 2000) are still applicable:</p> <p>(a) <u>Page 4-4, paragraph 4.6.2 & page 4-12, paragraph 4.8.29</u> “SO₂” at the 2nd last line of paragraph 4.6.2 and 2^d last line of paragraph 4.8.29 should be replaced by “NO₂”.</p> <p>(b) <u>page 4-9, Heading before paragraph 4.8.16</u> Prediction of emissions from Flaring Plant was indicated. However, this was not indicated in the industrial air quality impact assessment (page 4-4 section 4.7) that there are emissions from Flaring Plant. Please clarify.</p> <p>(c) <u>page 4-10, paragraph 4.8.21 under “Noise Barriers”</u> It is noted that provision of noise barriers is not confirmed and the worst case will be to model the future road without any noise barrier. However, it is noted that noise barriers were recommended in the noise chapter. To be consistent in the presentation, it is appropriate to address the air quality impact under the recommended noise barriers scenario.</p> <p>(d) <u>page 4-11, paragraphs 4.8.27 & 4.8.28 under “Results”</u> The industrial emission impact results should be presented under the industrial emission impact section (i.e. section 4.7). Besides, paragraph 4.8.27 is duplicate with page 4-5 paragraph 4.7.7.</p> <p>(e) <u>page 4-12, paragraph 4.8.32 under “Conclusions”</u> Please confirm the predicted impacts and avoid wordings of “likely be complied with the AQO” in presenting the predicted impacts.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Flaring Plant’s emission is mainly heat which is unlikely to be affecting the proposed development. This will be clarified in the revised report.</p> <p>Noted. Noise barriers proposed under the noise chapter will be taken into account in the assessment. In fact, 4.8.23 has already stated so. A clearer statement will be given in the revised report to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Noted. The duplicates will be eliminated and the paragraph placed under industrial emission.</p> <p>Noted. A more conclusive statement will be given.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(f) <u>page 4-11, paragraph 4.11.11 under “Emission Source Strength”</u> Please double-check the estimated odour emission rate. It appears that basing on the equations and parameters as indicated in the report, it should be 598 ou/s instead of 537 ou/s.</p>	<p>Noted. The inconsistencies will be amended.</p>
<p>(g) <u>Please proof read the report to avoid typos such as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th line, S.4.7.3, p.4-4 –It should read as “Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations”. • 11th row, Table 4.4, p.4-8 – It should read as “... from roundabout”. • S.4.8.17, p.4-9 – It should read as “... Tunnel Company ...”. • 3rd line, S.4.11.7, p.4-15 – It should read as “..1.5m above ground ...”. • 2nd line of S.4.11.10 and Note 1 at p.4-16 – It should read as “... Stage III Extension ...”. • Appendix 4C – Title of the Table is for the “WCR Tunnel Option” but “Eastern Harbour Crossing” is indicated in the Table. There are also typos for “Vehicle Type” under the Table showing calculations of the emissions from the toll plaza. 	<p>Noted. The typos will be amended.</p>
<p>(h) <u>Figure 4.4 “Odour Strength Contours”</u> Please indicate clearly the elevation of the odour pollution contours shown in the figure. Please also confirm this represents the elevation of worst impact.</p>	<p>Noted. The elevation of the odour pollution contours will be included.</p>
<p>(i) <u>Page 11-1, paragraph 11.2.3 under “Odour Impact from Temporary Sewage Retention Tank”</u> It appears that findings of the industrial emission assessment are missing in this conclusion section.</p>	<p>Noted. Findings for the odour impact from temporary sewage retention tank will be included in the conclusion section.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(j) <u>Page 11-2, paragraph 11.2.4 under “Odour Impact from Temporary Sewage Retention Tank”</u></p> <p>It should be noted that the use of activated carbon filter to the efficiency of 99% was recommended to mitigate the odour impact. This should also be reflected in this conclusion section.</p> <p>(k) <u>Table 12.2 of Implementation Schedule</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recommended odour control measures should also be included. • The proposed mitigation measures at Section 3 (such as provision of open space to act as buffer area, proper development phasing development) for the potential I/R interface with the Dissenting Lots should be incorporated into the Implementation Schedule. 	<p>Noted. The use of activated carbon filter will be included in the conclusion section.</p> <p>Noted. The required information will be included in the appropriate section.</p>
<p>(17) Vehicular Emission Impact Assessment</p> <p>There are some major discrepancies on the vehicular emission impact assessment. Basically, we find that the modelling results are unreasonable such that the cumulative hourly and daily NO₂ concentrations as shown by the contours at Appendix 4G are less than the background NO₂ concentration. Please rectify the error and re-run the model.</p>	<p>We have checked the modelling parameters and have amended some parameters of the model. The re-modelled results showed that the development shall comply with the AQO requirements. Hence the conclusion for this assessment shall remain unchanged.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(18) page 4-7, paragraph 4.8.8 under “Traffic Emission from Open Road Traffics”</p> <p>Two Tunnel Options for Western Coast Road (WCR) (with and without Ko Fai Road connection) were indicated in the previous formal submission (August 2000). It is noted from that the traffic data for the Tunnel Option with Ko Fai Road connection was used in the assessment. Please clarify if the assessment based on the traffic data is adequate for the Tunnel Option of WCR.</p>	<p>There are only very small differences between the traffic data for the Tunnel option with and without Ko Fai Road connection. The data with Ko Fai Road connection was used because there might be impact from the Ko Fai Road connection itself. The traffic data is adequate for the Tunnel option of WCR. Besides, at the time of compiling these responses, updated traffic data is being prepared by the traffic consultant. Fresh assessments will be carried out with the new data.</p>
<p>(19) page 4-9, paragraph 4.8.13 under “Source Types and Emission Strength”</p> <p>Despite our previous comments (August 2000), the vehicle types used in the assessment are still found inconsistent in this draft report such that there are two vehicle types (i.e., P/C-p and HGV) but other vehicle types at Table 4.5 and Appendix 4C. Besides, sample calculations of the emission rates from the open road sections are still outstanding.</p>	<p>Four categories of vehicle types are used in the assessment. It will be clarified in the revised report. Sample calculations of the emission rates from the open road sections will be included in the revised report.</p>
<p>(20) page 4-9, paragraph 4.8.15 under “Source Types and Emission Strength”</p> <p>The inconsistency between the adopted Caline4 option and the output file in Appendix 4E should be rectified.</p>	<p>Noted. The files will be rectified.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(21) page 4-10, paragraph 4.8.19 under “Source Types and Emission Strength”</p> <p>In assessing the toll plaza emissions, it was stated that “the traffic on all lanes approaching or leaving the portal tunnel at a distance of 100m or less from the toll was assumed to be stationary”. However, it was also stated that “the idling vehicles queue was observed to be shorter leaving the tunnel and has been assumed to be half of the approaching queue length”. Please clarify the apparent discrepancies.</p>	<p>A figure will be included to clarify the assumptions.</p>
<p>(22) page 4-11, paragraph 4.8.26 under “Traffic Emission from Open Road Traffics”</p> <p>Despite our previous comments (August 2000), details of the major assumptions on the Tunnel Option were still yet to be found in the report. We reiterate that such details of assumptions (such as figure showing alignment of the road networks and location of exhaust of the WCR tunnel) should be properly presented in the report. Without such information, we are unable to verify that the right parameters are used in the assessment.</p>	<p>A figure will be included to clarify the assumptions.</p>
<p>(23) page 4-11, paragraph 4.8.28 under “Results”</p> <p>It is indicated that the predicted SO₂ concentration contours are only presented on “Development Option 2A – Full Reclamation without I/R Interface” as this represents the worst case scenario. However, the predicted SO₂ concentration contours for “Development Option 1A – Minimised Reclamation without I/R Interface” were presented in the report. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The worst case, i.e., “Development Option 2A – Full Reclamation with I/R Interface” will be used.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(24) page 4-12, paragraph 4.8.29 under “Results”</p> <p>It was stated that NO₂ concentration contours were presented at G/F, 1/F & 7/F for the WCR Tunnel Option. However, it was found at appendix 4G that NO₂ and RSP concentration contours were presented at G/F & 1/F for the WCR Tunnel Option and at G/F, 1/F & 7/F for the WCR Coastal Option. Please rectify the discrepancies. Besides, bearing in mind that there was vent shaft emission assumed for the Tunnel Option, please also clarify if any high level ASRs will be subject to adverse impact for the Tunnel Option. In any case, please ensure that impact at the worst hit levels will be presented.</p>	<p>The missing results for 7/F will be included in the revised report.</p>
<p>(25) Appendix 4C “Calculation of Pollutant Emission Rates from the EHC and the tunnel of Tseung Kwan O Western Coast Road Tunnel Portals, Toll Plaza Idling Vehicles, and Ventilation Exhaust Building”</p> <p>The traffic mix data used in the current assessment are different from those used in the previous submission. Please ensure that appropriate traffic data were used in the assessment and acceptable to the TD.</p>	<p>At the time of compiling these responses, the project traffic consultant is preparing a new set of data subject to comments from TD. The updated figures will be used in the revised assessment.</p>
<p>(26) Others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide the diskette containing the modelling input and output files. • A figure showing the road links (such as CKL-W1, CKL-W2) used in the modelling exercise should be included for reference. • Findings of the I/R interface impact and the construction dust impact should also be included in the Conclusion and Summary Sections. 	<p>A diskette containing the output files will be included in the revised report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(27) page 7-2, paragraph 7.2.6 under “Works Branch Technical Circular (WBTC) No. 2/93”</p> <p>It should be noted that the PFSC had been disbanded, and its responsibility had been shifted to PFC.</p>	<p>PFSC will be replaced by PFC.</p>
<p>(28) page 7-3, paragraphs 7.2.7 & 7.3.3</p> <p>“Public dump” should be amended to read as “public filling area”. The updated terminology should be used.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(29) page 7-3, paragraph 7.3.1 under “Construction and Demolition (C&D) Material”</p> <p>Please address the possible constraints for the interconnection between the reclamation phasing and the construction phasing of the Yau Tong Bay development project. Justifications should be provided to demonstrate whether a total of 215,650m³ of public fill generated from the construction phasing could be all reused on-site for reclamation.</p>	<p>The main constraints will be the programme and space for stockpiling of C&D material. Justification will be provided in the Final EIA report.</p>
<p>(30) page 7-3, paragraph 7.3.3 under “Construction and Demolition (C&D) Material”</p> <p>“Table 6.1” and “Section 7.2.4” in the first and second sentences should read “Table 7.1” and “Section 7.2.7” respectively. Please amend.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
(31) page 7-4, paragraph 7.3.7 under “Chemical Waste” “Sections 7.3.18 to 7.3.20” in the second last sentence should read “Sections 7.3.19 to 7.3.21”. Please amend.	The text will be amended accordingly.
(32) page 7-4, paragraph 7.3.10 under “Workforce Waste and General Site Wastes” “Sections 7.3.21 to 7.3.22” in the last sentence should read “Sections 7.3.22 to 7.3.23”. Please amend.	The text will be amended accordingly.
(33) page 7-5, paragraph 7.3.14 under “Good Site Practice and Waste Reduction Measures” Recommendations to achieve waste reduction should also include measures such as maximizing the use of reusable steel formworks and metal site hoardings and signboards.	Noted. Such measures to achieve waste reduction will be included.
(34) page 7-6, paragraph 7.3.18 under “Construction and Demolition Material” “Section 7.3.16” in the third sentence should read “Section 7.3.17”.	The text will be amended accordingly.
(35) page 7-8, Table 7.1 “Summary of Waste Handling Procedures during Construction Phase” It should be specified only the inert portion of the C&DM (i.e. public fill) should be re-used on-site for reclamation.	The text will be amended accordingly.

Comments	Responses
<p>(36) page 11-5, paragraph 11.2.20 under “Operational Phase”</p> <p>This paragraph should be amended to state the information as contained in paragraph 7.5.3.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(37) Table 12.4 “Implementation Schedule for Waste Management”</p> <p>It should be included in the mitigation measures that the inert portion of the C&DM (public fill) should be re-used on site as far as possible.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>(38) page 6-12, paragraph 6.6.5 under “Construction Phase Assessment”</p> <p>It is stated in the text that during excavation works, no groundwater will be discharged into the stormwater drains or marine waters. Please clarify whether all the groundwater will be re-discharged back into the ground? Is this practicable? If affirmative, this should also be specified in the Implementation Schedule as one of the mitigation measures.</p>	<p>The method of re-discharging groundwater back into the ground is called recharge well method which is commonly used in excavation of cofferdam. The recharge well method is used to prevent excessive settlement of adjacent ground due to draw down of ground water table at cofferdam.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(39) pages 6-21 to 6-22, section 6.8 “Mitigation Proposals”</p> <p>To mitigate the potential shortfall in the sewerage capacity if the development population intake is prior to the completion of the upgrading of the public sewerage systems, the sewage generated by the proposed Yau Tong Bay Development would have to be attenuated by providing an on-site retention tank. The need to review the situation at the detailed design stage, and to provide the retention tank if found necessary, should be specified in the Implementation Schedule as one of the mitigation to avoid water quality problem during operation stage. To ensure the reliable operation of the retention tank and to minimize overflow, in addition to the provision of stand-by pumps as recommended in the EIA, dual-power supply should also be provided. If the retention tank is not manned 24 hours, telemetry system should be provided to other 24 hours facilities to ensure the operation of the retention tank will be monitored continuously and any malfunctioning of the retention tank will be readily detected and rectified.</p>	<p>The following paragraph will be inserted after paragraph 6.8.7</p> <p>“As described in paragraph 6.7.4, an on-site retention tank for the sewage from the proposed YTB Development may be provided as a contingency measure to mitigate the potential shortfall in the sewerage capacity, if the development population intake is prior to the completion of the upgrading of the public sewerage systems. The measure should be reviewed at the detailed design. If retention tank is provided, stand-by pumps and dual-power supply should be installed to ensure reliable operation of the retention tank and to minimise overflow. If the retention tank is not manned 24 hours, telemetry system should be provided to other 24 hours facilities to ensure the operation of the retention tank will be monitored continuously and any malfunctioning of the retention tank will be readily detected and rectified.”</p> <p>Table 12.3 of the EIA Report (Package 2 – Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay) and Appendix 4A of the EM&A Manual (Package 2) will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Sewerage & Sewage Treatment</u></p> <p>(40) General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of findings in Chapter 8 are outdated. Please refer to the latest findings in the Draft Final Report of Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans (RCEKSMP) issued in April 2001. Similar to the findings in the Interim Report of RCEKSMP, the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP states that there will be potential shortfall in the HATS Stage I system starting some time between 2006-2011. • Please note that the “Strategic Sewage Disposal Scheme” has been re-named as “Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS)” since March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. The findings in the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP will be incorporated into the assessment. • Noted and the relevant text will be revised.

Comments	Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that the implementation of further stages of HATS will be subject to review by a series of studies / trials as recommended by the International Review Panel (IRP). The current preliminary estimate is that the subsequent works proposed by the IRP are not expected to be commissioned until 2012 to 2014 at the earliest but could be as late as 2015 to 2017. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment will be updated with the current recommendation of implementation stage of the HATS.
<p>(41) page 8-2, Table 8.1 “Global Unit Flows”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The unit of the “Unit Flow Factors” should be m³/person/day or m³/employee/day. Please amend. The unit flow factor for “Manufacturing Industry” should be 1.0 m³/employee/day. Please amend. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text revised. The unit flow factor of 0.6 m³/manufacturing employee/day follows that adopted in the SSDS Stage III/IV.
<p>(42) page 8-3, paragraph 8.3.3 under “Development Population and Sewage Generation”</p> <p>As indicated in Table 8.2, the plot ratio of the proposed development is 4.79. However, the residential accommodation is stated to be “R3” in this paragraph. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, residential type R3 usually applies to development with a plot ratio less than 3. Please clarify the residential type of the proposed development to justify the use of a higher unit flow factor of 0.37 m³/h/d.</p>	<p>A unit flow factor of 0.37 m³/person/d is used for conservatism.</p>
<p>(43) page 8-4, Table 8.4 “G/IC and Commercial Sewage Flow”</p> <p>The employee flow (0.35 m³/employee/day) for the schools should be included in this table for the derivation of the total flow.</p>	<p>The employee flow from the schools will be added in the estimated flow from the development.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(44) page 8-7, paragraph 8.4.9 under “Yau Tong Urban Restructuring Development Scheme”</p> <p>The Draft Final Report of the RCEKSMP presents the current population projections for the sewerage system in East Kowloon. Please make reference to this information to demonstrate that the population projections in the Appendix 8B are suitable for this sewage impact assessment.</p>	<p>The population projection presented in RCEKSMP will be adopted in the sewerage and sewage treatment implications assessment.</p>
<p>(45) page 8-8, paragraph 8.5.4 under “Impact to Strategic Sewage Disposal Scheme”</p> <p>The word “latest” in the last line of this paragraph should be replace by “May 1998”. Please amend.</p>	<p>Text amended.</p>
<p>(46) pages 8-9 to 8-10, paragraphs 8.5.6 to 8.5.9 under “Impact to Strategic Sewage Disposal Scheme”</p> <p>Please note that the recommendations of Stage III/IV PPFS will be subject to review by the IRP recommended studies / trials. Conclusions based on these outdated recommendations are not acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted. The conclusion will be updated with the latest findings in the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP and IRP recommendations.</p>
<p>(47) page 8-10, paragraphs 8.5.10 to 8.5.11 under “Impact to Kwun Tong Sewage Treatment Plant”</p> <p>The result of the Sewerage Impact Assessment for the Development of Anderson Road was outdated. Please make reference to more updated study reports such as the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP, which was issued in April 2001.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(48) page 8-11, paragraph 8.5.14 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>There is no programme for the upgrading of KTPTW. Therefore, the quoted completion date of the upgrading works is unrealistic.</p>	<p>Noted. The text will be revised.</p>
<p>(49) page 8-11, paragraph 8.5.15 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>The HATS tunnel system is a potential constraint on the future development in East Kowloon. Please update the proposed retention requirements based on our comments above.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>(50) page 8-11, paragraph 8.5.16 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>The diurnal graph extracted from the East Kowloon Sewerage Improvements and Pollution Control – Stage II Report may be outdated. Please make reference to the latest observed diurnal graphs (see Attachment A) in the Working Paper No. 2 Hydraulic Modelling Revised – October 2000 of RCEKSMP. Sufficient allowance should be made in the design diurnal peak flows above the observed diurnal multipliers. Please note that for future assessment and design work, the peaking factors included in the DSD Sewerage Manual have been used in the RCEKSMP.</p>	<p>The diurnal graph from RCEKSMP will be referred to.</p>
<p>(51) page 8-11, Table 8.11 “Daily Retention and Discharging Period”</p> <p>Storage should also be provided for the morning peak period.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(52) page 8-11, paragraph 8.5.17 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>Based on the comments above, the peaking factor 2 on DWF would be inadequate, and would require further justification. Please explicitly state that all sewage discharged to the retention tank will be retained during peak flow periods and discharged back to the sewerage system over the low flow periods. Taking into account our comments above, please include contingencies for providing adequate holding capacity in the retention tank, which may need to be completed / commissioned in modules to cater for all the sewage from the proposed development.</p>	<p>The storage capacity of the retention tank will be reviewed in the light of items 1.11 and 1.12.</p>
<p>(53) page 8-12, paragraph 8.5.19 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>There are 4 possible discharge points from Yau Tong Bay Development shown on Figure 8.8. Please confirm that all sewage from the development would be discharged to Q_b (Ex. 8) via the proposed retention tank when required.</p>	<p>All sewage from the development will be discharged to proposed retention tank and finally Manhole EX. 8 in the interim stage.</p>
<p>(54) page 8-12, paragraph 8.5.20 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>Based on the comments above, the operating period of this proposed retention tank may be longer than 2 years. Provision of additional capacity for longer periods of usage as a contingency measure may be required. Please re-assess the storage arrangement of the retention tank to take into account the factors listed above.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(55) page 8-12, paragraph 8.5.21 under “Mitigation Measures”</p> <p>Please take into account the programme implication of the required EIAO process in providing a sewage retention tank within the development site.</p>	Noted.
<p>(56) page 8-12, paragraph 8.5.24 under “General Risk Consideration and Maintenance”</p> <p>Noise, septicity and air quality issues related to the retention tank should be assessed in this EIA. Maintenance requirements should be stated.</p>	Noted.
<p>(57) page 8-13, paragraph 8.5.26 under “General Risk Consideration and Maintenance”</p> <p>Please double-check against the requirements of the Water Pollution Control Ordinance whether it is acceptable to release excess sewage at emergency outfall at southern end of Ko Fai Road.</p>	Noted.
<p>(58) page 8-14, Table 8.12 “Total Sewage Flow Received by Yau Tong Sewage Pumping Station”</p> <p>Please note that sewage from the site ref. 14 or a portion of it is currently planned to discharge to the KTPTW via a proposed gravity sewer along Cha Kwo Ling Road.</p>	The flow to Yau Tong Sewage Pumping Station will be updated with the findings in the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP.

Comments	Responses
<p>(59) page 8-15, paragraph 8.5.36 under “Yau Tong Pumping Station”</p> <p>According to the current findings (in the draft Final Report) of Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans, the Yau Tong Pumping Station will have adequate capacity for all future scenarios based on the assumptions of sewage flows from the proposed Yau Tong Bay Development. Although these findings are subject to comments of various departments, please verify and make reference to these findings in paragraphs 8.5.36 – 8.5.39.</p>	Noted.
<p>(60) page 8-19, paragraph 8.5.55 under “Proposed Discharge Points from Yau Tong Bay Development”</p> <p>To meet the programme of Yau Tong Bay development, please consider the worst case scenario and upgrade all the sewers identified to be insufficient in capacity. Subject to the resolution of project interface between the proposed Yau Tong Bay Development and the sewerage works by others, please re-lay a portion or the whole of these under-capacity sewers to suit the development programme.</p>	The extent of upgrading works will be reviewed by incorporating the findings in the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP.
<p>(61) page 8-19, paragraph 8.5.56 under “Proposed Discharge Points from Yau Tong Bay Development”</p> <p>According to the current sewage diversion proposal as detailed in <i>Tseung Kwan O Extension Contract 612 – EHC and Lam Tin Tunnels – Sewerage Impact Assessment Report</i>, there will not be any upgrading works for the existing sewer along Cha Kwo Ling Road. The consultants of TKO Extension Contract 604 is reviewing their sewerage impact assessment for the sewer serving the proposed Yau Tong Station. Please liaise with them for their latest findings.</p>	Noted.

Comments	Responses
<p>(62) page 8-21, paragraph 8.6.1 under “Conclusion”</p> <p>Please confirm whether you would undertake all the required sewerage upgrading works to substantiate that the Yau Tong Bay Development.</p>	<p>The extent of the upgrading works will be addressed in the Conclusion.</p>
<p>(63) page 8-21, paragraph 8.6.3 under “Conclusion”</p> <p>Please update this paragraph with the latest findings in the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP.</p>	<p>Noted. The conclusion will be updated.</p>
<p>(64) page 8-21, paragraph 8.6.5 under “Conclusion”</p> <p>This statement is not correct as the HATS Stage I system has been demonstrated in recent planning studies that it would be a potential constraint on developments, in particular in East Kowloon. Please make reference to the Draft Final Report of RCEKSMP and revise this paragraph.</p>	<p>The text will be updated to incorporate the latest recommendation of IRP.</p>
<p><u>Draft EM&A Manual</u></p> <p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(65) Chapter 5 “Waste Management”</p> <p>This chapter should be amended according to our comments given on the EIA above. The Implementation Schedule at Appendix 5A should also be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Noted. This chapter and the implementation schedule will be amended in accordance with the comments given on the EIA report.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Draft Executive Summary</u></p> <p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>(66) paragraph 2.4.2 under “Operational Phase”</p> <p>This paragraph should be amended according to state the information as contained in paragraph 7.5.3 of the Draft Final EIA Report.</p>	<p>This para. will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Sewerage & Sewage Treatment</u></p> <p>(67) Based on the above comments, the Executive Summary concerning the sewerage and sewage treatment should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Executive Summary concerning sewerage and sewage treatment will be revised accordingly.</p>

**Yau Tong Bay Development
 Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Responses to EPD’s Comments (16 July 2001) on Draft Final EIA Report**

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay</u> <u>Draft Final EIA Report</u> <u>Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>(1) page 2-12, paragraph 2.5.1 under “Designated Project”</p> <p>As mentioned in paragraph 1.2 of the EIA Study Brief, the decommissioning of ship building and repairing facilities at the marine lots are also designated projects (fall within schedule 2 Part II item 17 of the EIA Ordinance). For completeness, these details should be added to the above paragraph.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p>(2) page 2-13, 1st sentence in paragraph 2.7.1 under “Description of Scenarios with or without the Project”</p> <p>Since the proposed reclamation is required to fulfill the requirements in the three ordinances, i.e. Town Planning Ordinance, EIA Ordinance and Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, it is inappropriate to claim that “significant portion of the reclaimed area has already been zoned as Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) and is not subject to both EIAO and the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. For accuracy, the sentence should be amended / deleted.</p>	<p>The text will be amended accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(3) page 6-16, last sentence in paragraph 6.6.3 under “Conclusions”</p> <p>Please specify from which operation to which operation where gas monitoring is required.</p>	<p>Noted. The sentence will be amended to read “In addition, it is recommended to undertake gas monitoring in the immediate post-reclamation period and prior to the commencement of construction works on the reclamation to measure methane concentrations in the fill”</p>
<p>(4) Chapter 11 “Implementation Schedule of the Proposed Mitigation Measures for the Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay”</p> <p>The “3” under the “Implementation Stages” column should be replaced by “v”. Please amend.</p>	<p>The table will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Draft EM&A Manual</u> <u>Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>(5) page 15, Table 2.3 “Event and Action Plan for Construction Noise”</p> <p>Please add a bullet “stop the relevant portion of works as determined by the ER until the exceedance is abated” as the contractor’s action when the limit level is exceeded.</p>	<p>The table will be amended accordingly.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Draft Executive Summary</u> <u>Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>(6) page E/5, 1st sentence in paragraph 2.2.5 under “Construction Phase Water Quality Impacts”</p> <p>This paragraph raises that with the proposed mitigation measures fully implemented, a <i>minor exceedance</i> of the WSD target limit for SS of 10mg/L at the YTSPS is anticipated during the Phase 1 reclamation. However, this is contradictory to the last sentence of paragraph 4.11.2.7 of the EIA Report, which states that “with appropriate mitigation measures to be proposed by the TKO NTIE EIA study, it is anticipated that the <i>exceedance at the YTSPS may be rectified.</i>” Please clarify.</p>	<p>The last sentence in paragraph 4.7.10.5 in the EIA Report of Package 1 – Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay should be amended as:</p> <p>“With appropriate mitigation measures for the TKO NTIE, sediment plume dispersion of the marine works of TKO NTIE will be essentially confined within Junk Bay and the residual SS concentration at the YTSPS is expected to very similar to the mitigated water quality under the Scenario 2A_P1 (as presented in paragraph 4.7.5.9). That is, the residual SS level at the intake of YTSPS will comply the WSD SS tolerable limit (20 mg L⁻¹) all the time, but marginal exceedance of SS target limit (10 mg L⁻¹) (by maximum 2.4 mg L⁻¹) will occur for less than 3.3% of the time in the wet season.”</p> <p>The last two sentences in paragraph 4.11.2.7 in the EIA Report of Package 1 – Reclamation of Yau Tong Bay should be amended as:</p> <p>“Exceedance of the WSD target limit for SS concentration of 10 mg L⁻¹ at the YTSPS is essentially associated with the unmitigated works of the TKO NTIE mentioned earlier. With appropriate mitigation measures to be proposed by the TKO NTIE EIA study, sediment plume dispersion of the marine works of TKO NTIE will be essentially confined within Junk Bay and the residual SS concentration at the YTSPS is expected to very similar to the mitigated water quality under the Scenario 2A_P1 (as presented in paragraph 4.11.2.4). That is, the residual SS level at the intake of YTSPS will comply the WSD SS tolerable limit (20 mg L⁻¹) all the time, but marginal exceedance of SS target limit (10 mg L⁻¹) (by maximum 2.4 mg L⁻¹) will occur for less than 3.3% of the time in the wet season.</p>

**Yau Tong Bay Development
 Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Responses to EPD's Comments (16 July 2001) on Draft Final EIA Report**

Comments	Responses
<p><u>Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay</u> <u>Draft Final EIA Report</u> <u>Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>(1) page 5-14, paragraph 5.6.16 under "Cumulative Impact due to Construction of Other Developments in Yau Tong Area"</p> <p>The paragraph raises that there will be 1-5dB(A) exceedance to the housing developments in the EHC3 site during the first half year of the construction. Please check whether the construction programme / construction methods can be adjusted in order to avoid such exceedance.</p>	<p>The following will be added:</p> <p>"The 1-5dB(A) exceedance is attributable to the construction sites around EHC site while the proposed Development has a minor contribution to the cumulative noise impact."</p>
<p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>(2) page 5-17, paragraph 5.6.11 under "Predicted Road Traffic Noise Levels at Schools"</p> <p>For traffic noise at School P3 and assessment point 1023 under Option 1A – minimized reclamation without I/R interface (referring to Figures 5.15a and 5.16a), traffic noise exceeds the criteria. Compared with other options (for example Figure 5.16b), please explain why the 5m high barrier is omitted at that particular section of Cha Kwo Ling Road facing School P3 and Tower 23.</p>	<p>To extend the 5m high barrier to protect School P3 and Tower 23 , i.e. same extent as shown in Figure 5.16b.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>(3) page 5-19, last bullet in paragraph 5.6.13 “Decking Over and Extended Podium”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity and avoid misunderstanding, please highlight the areas (and the residential towers) for which there is one storey podium, and clarify whether the 5m high podium barrier refers to 5m high barrier above the podium. Please list out the details of mitigation measures, e.g. barriers, setback distance, non-openable windows and podium design, and locations of their applications to avoid misunderstanding. 	<p>To amend the last bullet in paragraph 5.6.13 “Decking Over and Extended Podium”:</p> <p>"As all However, in order to screen off part of the traffic noise, one storey podium has been proposed and extended up to the site boundary along Ko Fai Road and Cha Kwo Ling Road together with other noise mitigation measures including barriers, setback distance, non-openable windows (as indicated in Figures 5.6a to 5.6f) and podium design (as indicated in Figures ?? to ?? (AWAIT figures from DLN showing with podium highlighted will be added)).</p>
<p><u>Draft EM&A Manual</u> <u>Environmental Assessment</u></p> <p>(4) page 18, Table 3.3 “Event and Action Plan for Construction Noise”</p> <p>Please add a bullet “stop the relevant portion of works as determined by the ER until the exceedance is abated” as the contractor’s action when the limit level is exceeded.</p>	<p>The table will be amended accordingly.</p>
<p><u>Draft Executive Summary</u> <u>Noise</u></p> <p>(5) page E/6, 1st sentence in paragraph 2.2.5 under “Operational Phase”</p> <p>Please clarify whether the 3.5m high barrier is proposed or not.</p>	<p>5m high barrier is proposed.</p>

Yau Tong Bay Development Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay
Revised Sewerage and Sewage Treatment Implications Assessment
Responses to Comments

Ref.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>From : EPO/Environmental Protection Department Ref : (22) in EP 1/K15/YT-CDA/11 (PT.11) Date : 15 October 2001</p>	
(a)	<p><u>2nd Bullet of Item Ref. (c):</u></p> <p>It is not acceptable if there is a forecast increase in overflows at the KTPTW due to the additional sewage flow from the Yau Tong Bay Development (YTBD). Mitigation measures, contingent upon the outcome of the study entitled Environmental and Engineering Feasibility Assessment Studies”, should be proposed.</p>	<p>Mitigation measure, in a form of on-site retention tank, is proposed in the event that the KTPTW becomes overloaded. The outcome of the Environmental and Engineering Feasibility Assessment Studies”, for HATS, cannot be incorporated at this stage, as the study has not yet commenced. Nevertheless, the outcome and recommendations from the study should be taken into account during the detailed design stage.</p>
(b)	<p><u>Item Ref. (d):</u></p> <p>The Review of Central and East Kowloon Sewerage Master Plans (RCEKSMP) does not assume that the population in-take of YTBD would be completed by 2011. As we stated in our previous comments, the study population data in Appendix B of the RCEKSMP Draft Final Report indicate that the population figures of street block nos. 29015, 29806 and 29808 increase from the 2011 scenario to the 2016 scenario. It means that the RECKSMP has assumed that the population in-take period of the YTBD will span beyond 2011.</p>	<p>As discussed between your Mr. Wallace Yiu and our Ms. Angela Wong on 23 October 2001, this comment has been withdrawn by EPD.</p>
(c)	<p><u>Item Ref. (e):</u></p>	

Ref.	Comments	Responses
(d)	<p>If there is a forecast increase in overflows at the KTPTW due to the additional sewage flow from the proposed YTBD, mitigation measures, contingent upon the results of the study environmental and Engineering Feasibility Assessment Studies”, should be proposed.</p> <p><u>Item Ref. (h):</u></p> <p>The diurnal graphs from RCEKSMP are dry weather flow patterns for verification of hydraulic models for comparatively large catchments. For smaller sewage catchments such as YTBD, more peak factors of the Sewerage Manual, as recommended in paragraph nos. 6.3.13 and 6.3.24 of the RCEKSMP Draft Final Report, should be used. A peaking factor lower than that shown in Table 3 may lead to overflow during the retention period of the mitigation facilities and is therefore not acceptable.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to item (a).</p> <p>The peaking factor shown in Figure 3 of Sewerage Manual will be adopted for the design of the retention tank. The revised calculation of the retention tank is attached.</p>

Yau Tong Bay Development Environmental Impact Assessment Study
Engineering Feasibility Study for the Comprehensive Development at Yau Tong Bay
Revised Sewerage and Sewage Treatment Implications Assessment
Responses to Comments

Ref.	Comments	Responses
1.	<p>From : EPO/Environmental Protection Department Ref : (31) in EP 1/K15/YT-CDA/11 (PT.11) Date : 5 November 2001</p>	
(a)	<p><u>Item 1(a):</u></p> <p>The proposed mitigation measures in the form of an On-site retention tank” is noted. Please delete the last sentence of paragraph 8.5.7 of the Revised Sewerage and Sewerage Treatment Implications Assessment Report (the Report), as it is neither correct nor appropriate.</p>	Text revised.
(b)	<p><u>Item 1(d) and the revised calculation:</u></p> <p>According to paragraph 8.5.13 of the Report, the morning peak of the diurnal profile for the Ho Man Tin area will be used for determining the storage period required, and a retention period of 1.5 hours have been adopted. However, from the Figure WP2/9, the morning peak period of the diurnal curve is considerably more than 1.5 hours. Please demonstrate that the total volume of the retention tank is adequate to ensure that “the peak flow to KTPTW is not increased by YTBD” as stated.</p>	<p>The on-site retention tank is designed to mitigate the overloading of the KTPTW due to the additional flow from the Yau Tong Bay Development (YTBD) only, rather than the total flow to the PTW. As a result, the retention tank should be designed to store the flow from the development in excess of the peak base flow to the KTPTW only, instead of the total flow from YTBD during the peak hours. The storage period will therefore be the period within which the flow from YTBD exceeds the peak base flow to the PTW and is approximately 1 hour according to the diurnal curve for Ho Man Tin in Figure WP2/9. Allowance is also included in the calculation of the retention tank by using a storage period of 1.5 hr.</p>