

## Appendix 10B Key Assessment Assumptions and Limitation of Assessment Methodologies

Assessment Methodology	Key Assessment Assumptions	Limitations of Assessment Methodologies / Assumptions	Prior Agreements with EPD	Proposed Alternative Assessment Tools/ Assumptions (if applicable)
<b>Air Quality Impact</b>				
<b>Construction Phase</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 4 and 12 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction method was determined based on the Project design and / or engineering assessments, which is subject to change by the Contractor in future.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
<b>Operational Phase</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 4 and 12 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> <li>Guidelines on Assessing the 'TOTAL' Air Quality Impacts</li> <li>Guidelines on Choice of Models and Model Parameters</li> <li>Guidelines on the Estimation of 10-minute Average SO<sub>2</sub> Concentration for Air Quality Assessment in Hong Kong</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the short duration of the Landing and Take-off cycle and low frequency of helicopter operation, 10-min average SO<sub>2</sub> was quantitative assessed. The other pollutants were considered to be negligible as the AQOs for other pollutants in longer time averaging period which pollutants are further dispersed and diluted with ambient air.</li> <li>AERMOD was employed for the assessment of the emission from the helicopter operation and marine emission.</li> <li>PATH background concentration at year 2020 was adopted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The background SO<sub>2</sub> concentration is expected to be further reduced in the assessment year of 2025 as compared with the adopted PATH background at 2020.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A

Assessment Methodology	Key Assessment Assumptions	Limitations of Assessment Methodologies / Assumptions	Prior Agreements with EPD	Proposed Alternative Assessment Tools/ Assumptions (if applicable)
<b>Hazard to Life Impact</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annex 4 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The annual number of helicopter movements for the proposed helipad was assumed to be 330 as a conservative approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The probability of helicopter crash was estimated using the methodology proposed by the UK HSE</li> <li>PHAST software was used fire and gas dispersion modelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment methodology</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Noise Impact</b>				
<b>Construction Phase</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 5 and 13 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction noise was predicted based on the Sound Power Levels (SWLs) of powered mechanical equipment (PME) in Table 3 of TM-GW published by EPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The prediction of construction noise impact was based on the procedures in TM-GW under the NCO.</li> <li>The construction plant inventory and programme for proposed helipad were determined based on the Project design and / or engineering assessments, which is subject to change by the Contractor in future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise Sensitive Receivers</li> <li>Assessment area</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Operational Phase</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 5 and 13 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helicopter noise is considered as a 'point' source. Corrections are applied for distance, façade and barrier effect;</li> <li>Noise measurement of Airbus H175 in non-lateral movements for conservative approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As there is no statutory requirement for evening and night-time period, a review has been conducted to determine the appropriated assessment approach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise Sensitive Receivers</li> </ul>	N/A

Assessment Methodology	Key Assessment Assumptions	Limitations of Assessment Methodologies / Assumptions	Prior Agreements with EPD	Proposed Alternative Assessment Tools/ Assumptions (if applicable)
<b>Waste management</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 7 and 15 of TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> <li>Waste Disposal Ordinance (Cap.354)</li> <li>Waste Disposal (Chemical Waste) (General) Regulation (Cap. 354C)</li> <li>Land (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance (Cap. 28)</li> <li>Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) - Public Cleansing and Prevention of Nuisances Regulation</li> <li>Waste Disposal (Charges for Disposal of Construction Waste) Regulation (Cap. 354N)</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction method was determined based on the Project design and / or engineering assessments, which is subject to change by the Contractor in future.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
<b>Visual Impact</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 10 and 18 of TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIAO Guidance Note No. 8/2010</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Water Quality Impact</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes 6 and 14 of the TM-EIAO</li> <li>EIA Study Brief (ESB-311/2019)</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Types and quantities of water pollution to be generated from the Project are based on the Project design and / or engineering assessments</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A