

Appendix 1.1 Responses to Public Comments on Project Profile

Comments	Responses
<p>Public Comment Date: 01 August 2012</p>	
<p>Para. 1.2 The Study Brief [SB] needs to require:</p>	
<p>1. The clear, concise, cogent and comprehensive clarification & description why the earlier related EIA studies are now redundant and in what areas [ref. AEIAR-058/2002];</p>	<p>The project background including information of previous EIA study and the reason for a new EIA study have been discussed in Section 1.1. Information on the need, purpose and objectives of the Project have been discussed in Section 2.2.</p>
<p>2. The rationale and reason why landfilling of soil contaminated by hydrocarbons is no longer applicable. How the ground contamination standards have triggered changes to the proposed ground decontamination methods for the site?; whether this issue of alternative ground decontamination is in any way a function of the availability/ or lack of landfill space given, amongst others, the understood significant increase in volume of contaminated soil requiring treatment. Document the change in contaminated soil volumes arising from the alternative soil treatment, disposal methods.</p>	<p>Information on the need and environmental benefits of the Project have been discussed in Section 2.2. At the time of approval of the previous EIA report, Hong Kong was using the Dutch List “B” levels of the Netherlands which were referenced under the Practice Note for Professional Persons ProPECC PN3/94 issued by EPD in 1994 to interpret the levels of land contamination. In 2007, EPD promulgated the Risk-Based Remediation Goals (RBRGs) to replace Dutch List “B” levels as the new land contamination assessment standards for Hong Kong.</p>
<p>Para. 3.1 :</p>	
<p>3. The SB needs to require the clear, concise, cogent and comprehensive clarification & description for the proposed adoption of ground decontamination by biopiling and cement solidification, and identify the relevant quantities of material for each treatment process.</p>	<p>The volume and type of contaminated soil have been identified in Section 2.1. The consideration and comparison of different ground decontamination methods have been discussed in Section 2.4.</p>
<p>Para. 3.6 :</p>	
<p>4. The SB needs to justify the assumption that previous SI data is still valid & sufficient for the contaminated ground assessment and remediation given the</p>	<p>The previous SI data conducted is still valid for the contaminated land assessment and remediation either based on Dutch B levels or RBRGs have been discussed in Section 1</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>anticipated need for alternative soil treatment and disposal methods.</p>	<p>of Appendix 7.1. Additional SI has also been conducted within the existing bus depot area as discussed in Section 3 of Appendix 7.1.</p>
<p>With reference to Annex 1 of the TM for the EIA, the SB needs:</p>	
<p>5. to address the potential worst case scenario for any unforeseen accident associated with the proposed alternative contaminated ground/soil decontamination techniques/methods, notable with regard to potential discharges into Victoria Harbour marine waters</p>	<p>The potential discharge resulting from land decontamination process and surface runoff have been discussed in Sections 5.6 and 5.7.</p>
<p>6. to require the clear, concise, cogent and comprehensive clarification & description of the possible alternative soil/ground treatment/pollution control methods</p>	<p>Different ground decontamination methods have been listed in Table 2.2. The comparison for each ground decontamination method, including the environmental benefits and limitations have been discussed in Table 2.3.</p>
<p>7. to require the clear, concise, cogent and comprehensive clarification & description of the public's interest and the political sensitivity of the possible alternative soil/ground decontamination/ treatment/ pollution control methods; notably with regard to sensitive receivers in close vicinity to the project site e.g. residential developments, parks & sitting out areas, clinics, etc.</p>	<p>The potential environmental impacts expected to arise during the carrying out of the Project in relation to the sensitive receivers have been identified, predicted and assessed in Sections 3 to 10. The summary of potential environmental impacts to nearby sensitive receivers are shown in Section 12.</p>
<p>With reference to Annex 20 of the TM for the EIA, the SB needs:</p>	
<p>8. to require the clear, concise, cogent and comprehensive clarification, description & discrimination between fact, assumption & professional judgement in any assessment of alternative soil/ground decontamination & treatment/pollution control methods/techniques with reliance on past & audited case histories in Hong Kong, including any delays in completion of earlier project decontamination cases e.g.</p>	<p>A summary of assessment of alternative ground decontamination methods have been discussed in Section 2.4.</p>

Comments	Responses
<p>Kai Tak Airport decontamination projects, Disney development @ Lantau Island? as a matter of course.</p>	
<p>9. to require the Project Proponent to clearly, concisely, cogently & comprehensively document and assess previous' cases of soil biopiling and cement stabilization in HK, including any uncertainties over their past performance, and to give the reasons for any delay in the completion of such exercises, if delays did occur.</p>	<p>Alternative decontamination methods have been outlined in Section 2.4. The comparison for ground decontamination methods, including the environmental benefits and limitations have been discussed in Table 2.3.</p>