APPENDIX 1A STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

1A STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

1A.1 Objectives of Stakeholder Engagement

The objectives of the stakeholder engagement carried out for the Project include the following:

- To build an understanding of the need for the Project and explain the key elements of the Project to stakeholders, to actively seek their views and, address their concerns related to the future Project development and implementation; and
- To ensure transparent, responsive and responsible communications with stakeholders.

1A.2 Engagement Period

Project Profile No. PP-592/2019 was exhibited to the public for comments on 16 October 2019. Comments were received from the public during the 14-day public inspection period of the Project Profile stage. During this EIA Study, engagement with selected stakeholder groups commenced in June 2021 and was continued throughout the study period.

1A.3 Key Comments and Summary of Responses on the Project Profile

A summary of the key comments received from the public on the Project Profile and the responses are listed in ***Table 1A.1.1***.

Table 1A.1.1 Key Comments Received from the Public and Responses

Aspect	Key Comments	Responses
General	■ Commenters showed their concern on the environmental impact from the relocation of the fish rafts during adverse weather. Commenters recommended to include the associated environmental impacts of such relocation in the environmental impact assessment.	■ Impact due to the relocation of fish rafts under adverse weather, such as typhoons or algal blooms would be temporary and the associated impacts have been assessed in ***Sections 3.8.1.7***, ***4.5.2.2*** and ***5.5.2.2*** of this EIA Study.
Marine Ecology	■ Commenters suggested that invasive fish species that aggressively feed on native vulnerable species, e.g. corals, should be prohibited.	■ Measures on preventing the introduction of invasive species will be managed by AFCD, and has been presented in ***Appendix 2A*** of this EIA report.
Marine Ecology	■ Commenters showed their concern on the impacts of the fish rafts and the associated use of vessels during construction and operation phase on Finless Porpoise. Mitigation measures such as limitation of vessel type and boat speed shall be recommended.	■ According to AFCD's Marine Mammal Monitoring Report 2021/22, the long-term study on marine mammals in Hong Kong shows that, there are no records of Finless Porpoises within and in the vicinity of the Project site. It is also reported that Finless Porpoises are mostly distributed in the southern and eastern waters of Hong Kong. With the Project site located at the northeastern waters in Mirs Bay, the impact of the Project on marine mammals is not anticipated. Mitigation measures for Finless Porpoises are therefore not required.

Aspect	Key Comments	Responses
		Relevant description is provided in ***Section 4.3.3.5*** of this EIA Study.
Marine Ecology	▪ Commenters showed their concern on the impact of the Project on potential amphioxus habitat identified near the Project site. It was suggested to conduct impact assessment for amphioxus species and propose proper mitigation measures, if necessary.	▪ Impacts on amphioxus have been assessed in ***Sections 4.5*** and ***4.6*** of the EIA Study. As a high density of amphioxus species has been identified within the Project site during the EIA Study, mitigation measure was proposed to avoid any construction and operation works within the identified habitat. This is detailed in ***Section 4.8.1*** of this EIA Study.
Fisheries	▪ Commenters showed their concern on the environmental impact of the proposed fish culture zone on spawning and nursery grounds of fish and marine creatures and the impact of using additive and drug for fish disease treatment. These were suggested to be assessed in the environmental impact assessment.	▪ Impacts on spawning and nursery grounds of fish and marine creatures and the impact of using additive and drug for fish disease treatment due to the operation of the proposed fish culture zone have been assessed in ***Section 3*** and ***Section 5*** of this EIA Study.
Marine Ecology and Fisheries	▪ Commenters suggested that the ecological impact assessment of proposed neighbouring fish culture zones and existing fish culture zones shall be considered.	▪ Assessment on cumulative and residual impacts of the Project site and other proposed and existing FCZs have been mentioned under ***Sections 4.7*** and ***4.9*** and ***Sections 5.7*** and ***5.9*** of this EIA Study.
Water Quality and Waste	▪ Commenters showed their concern on the environmental impact from human activities on the fish rafts and additional structures on the fish rafts. It was suggested to be assessed in the environmental impact assessment.	▪ Impacts from human activities on water quality and waste management have been reviewed and assessed in ***Sections 3.7, 3.8.4, 3.8.5, 6.3.1, 6.4.3, 6.5.2, 6.5.3.3*** and ***6.5.3.4*** of this EIA Study respectively.
Waste	▪ Commenters showed their concern about the disposal of wastes related to fish farm construction and operation activities. It was suggested to impose effective measures to avoid illegal and inappropriate disposal of wastes.	▪ Control on illegal dumping has been discussed in ***Section 6.2.5*** of this EIA Study.
Visual	▪ Commenters showed their concern about the potential adverse visual impact of the Project on hikers and tourists travelling in the vicinity.	▪ Visual impacts of the Project on recreational users have been assessed in ***Section 7.8*** of this EIA Study, and the Study showed that there is no significant adverse visual impact.

1A.4 Key Comments and Summary of Responses during EIA Stage

1A.4.1 *Key Stakeholders*

Since June 2021, a series of briefings and meetings have been arranged with interest groups and stakeholders as listed in ***Table 1A.1.2***.

PowerPoint presentations were used as tools to inform the stakeholders and enhance their understanding of the Project.

Table 1A.1.2 Types of Stakeholder Consulted

Stakeholder Type
■ Fishermen Groups
■ Mariculture Groups
■ Green Groups
■ Legislative Councillors
■ Rural Committee Representatives

1A.4.2 *Comments and Responses*

This section provides a summary of the key comments and suggestions relating to the Project made by those stakeholders consulted.

1A.4.2.1 *Water Quality*

Stakeholders were concerned about the potential impacts to water quality from the Project, in particular, the generation of wastewater, carrying capacity and water quality monitoring of the Project site.

The key views relating to water quality, and responses are summarised in ***Table 1A.1.3***.

Table 1A.1.3 Key Views and Responses Relating to Water Quality

Key Views	Responses
■ Domestic wastewater produced by personnel during future operation on the fish farm should be treated properly with modern technology to minimise potential impacts of water pollution.	■ Impact of domestic wastewater production by personnel has been assessed in ***Section 3.8.4*** of this EIA Study. As the Project operation would be typically manned minimally onsite and relies mostly on automated / remote control, generation of domestic wastewater would be limited.
■ How should the carrying capacity of the Project site be interpreted?	■ The carrying capacity of the Project site should be considered as the maximum standing stock of fish that can be kept under sustainable environmental conditions within the Project site area.
■ Will the water quality monitoring data of the Project site be available to the public?	■ Water quality monitoring data of existing FCZ (e.g. Tung Lung Chau FCZ) has been published online for public's reference and the same

Key Views	Responses
	arrangement would be applied to the Project site.

1A.4.2.2 *Marine Ecology and Fisheries*

Stakeholders were concerned with the potential impacts to marine ecological and fisheries resources, and the cumulative impacts from concurrent operation of nearby existing and proposed FCZs.

The key views relating to marine ecology and fisheries, and responses are summarised in ***Table 1A.1.4***.

Table 1A.1.4 Key Views and Responses Relating to Marine Ecology and Fisheries

Key Views	Responses
■ Impacts of the Project on nearshore capture fisheries and mariculture stakeholders, particularly near the Project site should be considered.	■ Impacts which are related to environmental aspects of fisheries have been evaluated in ***Section 5*** of this EIA Study.
■ Have the coral habitats, including rare coral species in the vicinity of the Project site been assessed?	■ Coral habitats, including uncommon coral species have been assessed in ***Sections 4.3.3.8, 4.3.4, 4.3.5, 4.5*** and ***4.6*** of this EIA study.
■ Are there any plans to deal with issues arising from marine fouling with the establishment of the FCZ?	■ Good mariculture practices will be implemented at the FCZ, such as regular fish net maintenance to prevent and minimise impacts from marine fouling. Also, new methods of cleaning fish nets are currently being explored in the Tung Lung Chau FCZ and will be considered at the Project site if applicable.
■ Will there be any cumulative impacts of the proposed FCZs on nearby oyster reef restored in Tolo Harbour Channel?	■ Cumulative impacts have been assessed in ***Sections 3.11, 4.7*** and ***5.7*** of this EIA study. The water quality modelling results indicated that the proposed FCZ operation would not result in unacceptable change in water quality at the identified WSRs. The oyster reef restored in Tolo Harbour Channel is located further away from the identified WSRs and hence unacceptable cumulative impacts are not anticipated.
■ Will the harvesting of mariculture products cause potential impact on nearby tern colonies or seabirds of concern during their breeding season?	■ A review on the impacts to the White-Bellied Sea Eagle (WBSE) has been provided in ***Section 4.3.3.11***. As the nesting grounds of WBSE is far away from the Project site and that the foraging distance generally reaches 2 km from their nesting location, the impact of the Project on the WBSE is therefore not anticipated. Fish cages or nets that would be

Key Views	Responses
	used in the new FCZ would be properly secured and maintained in the fish farm and the harvesting of mariculture products would not result in free floating nets or other equipment that could pose threats to the seabirds e.g. entanglement. The presence of fish farm is not expected to pose threats to seabirds.

1A.4.2.3 *Waste Management*

Some stakeholders were concerned about the treatment of potential waste generated by the Project.

The key views relating to waste management and responses are summarised in ***Table 1A.1.5***.

Table 1A.1.5 Key Views and Responses Relating to Waste Management

Key Views	Responses
■ What will be the waste treatment arrangements of fish farms, such as general waste produced by fish farm workers?	■ New mariculture facilities are expected to be mostly automated, with minimal manual support. Proper-labelled enclosed waste containers will be provided to store general refuse, floating waste, recyclables and operation wastes generated at the Project site to avoid waste being thrown into the sea. The collected waste will also be regularly transported to landside refuse collection points / authorised recyclers via marine vessels.

1A.4.2.4 *Visual*

Some stakeholders were concerned about the potential visual impact during the construction and operation of the Project.

The key views relating to visual, and responses are summarised in ***Table 1A.1.6***.

Table 1A.1.6 Key Views and Responses Relating to Visual

Key Views	Responses
■ Will the potential impact of glare associated with light sources generated from the Project considered in this EIA Study?	■ The potential impact of night lighting and glare has been assessed in ***Section 7.8.6*** of this EIA Study.

1A.4.2.5 *Noise*

Some stakeholders were concerned about the potential impact of noise during the construction and operation of the Project.

The key views relating to noise, and responses are summarised in ***Table 1A.1.7***.

Table 1A.1.7 Key Views and Responses Relating to Noise

Key Views	Responses
■ Will the potential impact of noise generated from the Project considered in this EIA Study?	■ The potential impact of noise has been reviewed in ***Section 9*** of this EIA Study.