

**Confirmed Minutes of the 119th Meeting of
the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee
held on 9 January 2012 at 2:00 pm**

Present:

Mr TSANG Kam-lam, JP (Chairman)
Prof CHAU Kwai-cheong, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ms Teresa AU
Dr Dorothy CHAN, BBS
Prof FUNG Tung
Mr Edwin LAU, MH
Prof LI Xiang-dong
Miss Yolanda NG
Miss Evelyn LEUNG (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Ms Betty HO
Prof Joseph LEE
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Dr MAN Chi-sum, JP
Dr YAU Wing-kwong
Mr Simon WONG, JP
Dr Ray YEP

In Attendance:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Mr C W TSE, JP | Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) |
| Mr C C LAY | Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) |
| Ms Joanne CHIN | Executive Officer (CBD), EPD |
| Ms Daicie TONG | Executive Manager (CBD), EPD |

In Attendance for Agenda Item 3:

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Mr Ken WONG | Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), EPD |
|-------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Mr Maurice YEUNG | Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment & Noise), EPD |
| Mr Colin KEUNG | Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)2, EPD |
| Mr Steve LI | Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)3, EPD |
| Mr K H TO | Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment & Noise)5, EPD |
| Dr Glenn FROMMER | Chief Sustainable Development Manager, MTR Corporation Ltd. (MTRC) |
| Mr Stanley KEUNG | Construction Manager - SCL Civil, MTRC |
| Mr Lawrence CHUNG | Design Manager – SCL/KTE (To Kwa Wan – Ho Man Tin), MTRC |
| Mr Clement NGAI | Design Manager – SCL (Mong Kok East – Admiralty, Tai Wai - Hin Keng), MTRC |
| Mr Richard KWAN | Environment Manager, MTRC |
| Mr Freeman CHEUNG | Regional Managing Director, AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) |
| Mr Franki CHIU | Associate Director, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd (ARUP) |
| Mr Michael LEUNG | Chief Engineer/RD 1-2, Railway Development Office (RDO) |
| Dr. Venkatesh SOURIRAJAN | Director, Environmental Resources Management Ltd. (ERM) |
| Mr Herve BONNEL | Partner, ERM |
| Ms Lisa POON | Senior Environmental Engineer, MTRC |
| Ms Joanne TSOI | Senior Environmental Consultant, AECOM |
| Ms Felice WONG | Environmental Engineer I, MTRC |

Action

Agenda Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 118th meeting held on 5 December 2011

The draft minutes were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2 : Matters arising from the minutes of the 118th meeting held on 5 December 2011

2. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

Agenda Item 3 : EIA reports on “Shatin to Central Link”

- Tai Wai to Hung Hom Section (*ACE-EIA Paper 1/2012*)
- Mong Kok East to Hung Hom Section (*ACE-EIA Paper 2/2012*)
- Hung Hom to Admiralty Section (*ACE-EIA Paper 3/2012*)
- Stabling Sidings at Hung Hom Freight Yard (*ACE-EIA Paper 4/2012*)

Internal Discussion Session

3. The Chairman informed Members that agenda item 3 would be divided into the following four sessions –

- (a) Internal Discussion Session
- (b) Presentation Session
- (c) Question-and-Answer Session
- (d) Internal Discussion Session

The Presentation Session and Question-and-Answer Session under agenda item 3 would be opened to the public. Internal Discussion Sessions of agenda item 3 and all other sessions of the meeting would remain closed.

4. The Chairman informed Members that there were four separate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reports under discussion on the four sections of the “Shatin to Central Link” (SCL) which were designated projects under “Schedule 2” of the EIA Ordinance (EIAO). The public inspection period of the reports was opened from 24 November 2011 to 23 December 2011. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had received nine sets of public comments during the public inspection period. These public comments, together with the project proponent’s response to a Member’s question, had been circulated for Members’ information before the meeting.

5. The Chairman informed Members that a Member had declared interest before the meeting that her company was involved in the public engagement exercise for the Hung Hom to Admiralty Section of the SCL. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, the Member had asked to be excused from the meeting. Another Member declared that the Friends of the Earth (Hong Kong), in which he served as the Director, had hosted a charity walkathon at the beginning of 2012 and that the project proponent the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) had sponsored their staff to join the walkathon. The Chairman suggested and Members agreed that there was no direct or personal conflict of interest in this case, and the Member could stay to take part in the deliberation of the EIA reports.

6. The Chairman reminded Members to keep confidentiality of the discussion on the EIA reports as the recommendations of the Subcommittee had yet to be reported to the full Council for final decision. Members were also advised to refer any enquiries from the media to the secretariat for follow-up in case they were

approached on the discussion and/or decision of the Subcommittee.

7. The meeting agreed that the discussion should mainly focus on the key areas of concern including the tree transplantation and management plan, noise impact, air quality impact, cultural heritage impact, visual impact, construction waste issues and the liaison mechanism of the project.

[The project proponent team joined the meeting at this juncture.]

Presentation Session (Open Session)

8. Dr Glenn Frommer first gave an overview of the SCL EIA reports encompassing the four sections of the rail alignments from Tai Wai to Hung Hom, Mong Kok East to Hung Hom, Hung Hom to Admiralty, and the Stabling Sidings at Hung Hom Freight Yard. Messrs. Franki Chiu and Freeman Cheung respectively briefed Members on the findings of the four EIA reports.

Question-and-Answer Session (Open Session)

Site for stabling sidings

9. The Chairman first sought clarification from MTRC on the status of the proposed site for the stabling sidings at Hung Hom and Diamond Hill as indicated in the separate EIA reports. Dr Glenn Frommer said that the freight yard at Hung Hom was originally not available at the time when MTRC submitted their initial application for an EIA Study Brief under the EIAO. However, following the cessation of operations of various freight facilities thereat since April 2011, the Hung Hom Freight Yard was made available as an option for the stabling sidings of the SCL. As shown in the Government gazette drawings, the direction forward was to pursue the sidings at the former Hung Hom Freight Yard (SCL(HHS)) instead of at Diamond Hill. Since the proposed stabling sidings at Diamond Hill CDA Site (DHS) was covered in the previous application for the EIA Study Brief, the option of using DHS for train stabling had been included in the assessment under the SCL (TAW-HUH) EIA report so as to meet the consistency standard with the EIA Study Brief and the EIAO. Nevertheless, the preferred option would be to use the former Hung Hom Freight Yard to accommodate the train stabling requirements of the SCL.

Tree transplantation and management plan

10. A Member pointed out that a significant number of trees had to be felled or removed from the construction sites of the four rail projects. He enquired if there were any alternatives to minimize the number of trees to be affected, and whether trees of particular species at the project sites would be temporarily transplanted at the off-site locations and be re-planted back when the construction phase ended. He also considered that compensatory tree planting at the proposed 1:1 ratio would not

be sufficient as the new trees required relatively long time to grow to maturity. Benefits of these newly planted trees on cooling and absorbing air-borne pollutants would be hindered due to reduced tree coverage in the affected areas. He requested for the tree compensation ratio at 1:1 in the EIA reports be raised.

11. In response, Dr Glenn Frommer explained that tree felling could not be totally avoided in any construction projects. Approximately 4 000 trees along the SCL(TAW-HUH) Section would have been affected under the original plan. With the preferred sidings site to be located at Hung Hom, some 1 000 trees mainly in the former Tai Hom Village at Diamond Hill could be avoided. This represented the single largest mitigation on the number of trees affected by the whole SCL. The project would follow the compensation ratio of 1:1 as set out in the Works Branch Technical Circular. He pointed out that while it was physically impossible to temporarily remove and then re-plant the exact number of trees back to the project sites after the construction works, they were working with the Government to arrange compensatory re-planting to the maximum extent as far as practicable. Mr Franki Chiu supplemented that in gist, a total of 4 600 number of trees would be affected using the DHS option while 3 700 trees would be affected using the Hung Hom Station (HHS) option. Both the transplantation and compensation plans would be adopted in parallel for the construction of the project.

12. In answering a Member's enquiry on the age and size of trees to be re-planted back at the project sites, Dr Glenn Frommer explained that the plan would vary according to the species, size and health condition of the trees in question. Detailed assessment would be made as the project progressed along.

13. The Member further commented that the compensation ratio of 1:1 as mentioned in the EIA reports was only the basic requirement. Apart from transplanting the graded and mature trees back to the original sites, he suggested raising the ratio by planting more young trees to compensate for the reduced greening effect to the environment. Dr Glenn Frommer acknowledged the situation but stated that the proposed tree management proposal would involve additional land. Trees should be planted with adequate distance for their healthy growth. The detailed information on any transplantation and compensatory planting would be included in the Tree Removal Application (TRA), which would be submitted to the Director of Lands for approval prior to commencement of the construction works.

14. The Chairman enquired about the criteria for identifying the types of trees to be transplanted or felled, as well as whether there would be a detailed transplantation plan to preserve all *Aquilaria sinensis* identified in the SCL (TAW-HUH) EIA report. Mr Franki Chiu advised that the species were mostly found in Hin Keng area where there were some works around the portal area. He said that other considerations, e.g. health condition of the trees and their locations would have to be taken into account. It was clear that those located on steep slope would pose great difficulty for transplanting. He assured that before commencement of the construction works, a more detailed survey would be

conducted to identify any tree species requiring conservation, and advice from the Lands Department (LandsD) and from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department would be sought beforehand.

15. The Chairman enquired for the reason why the number of trees to be transplanted was far below that to be felled according to the EIA reports. Dr Glenn Frommer responded that their consultant would conduct a detailed assessment on the trees' condition when preparing the TRA for advice of LandsD.

16. A Member asked if there would be any monitoring scheme to ensure that the transplanting rate had been complied with and whether the result would be reported to the general public. Dr Glenn Frommer said that there were currently tree management reporting. This reporting system should continue in future. The monitoring was not only to ensure the transplantation process was in order, but also as an initiative to improve upon the experience gained from the South Island Line project.

17. A Member requested MTRC to provide the TRA to the ACE for comments as the ACE was obliged to advise the Government on various environmental issues and provide comments on the application if any. Dr Glenn Frommer explained that the TRA was a process for the approval by LandsD. He appreciated Members' understanding that the submission to LandsD would be under tight construction schedule. He supplemented that they had consulted different green groups on the tree issues, and these contacts would continue for the benefits of the community.

Visual impacts

18. A Member stated that while he appreciated that mitigation measures would be adopted to minimize the visual impacts to the environment such as green roofing, vertical greening and provision of recreation or open space, he was concerned on the visual impacts or residual visual impacts caused by the scars due to removal of trees, in particular for the SCL(TAW-HUH) Section. He asked whether there were any cut slopes involved at the portal area and suggested MTRC to adopt more innovative design to reduce the visual impacts pertaining to the cut slopes. Dr Glenn Frommer explained that the portal at Hin Keng Station had been moved further away from the country park area to minimize the impact to this site which was of conservation importance. Landscaping work would be implemented in the surrounding areas.

19. Mr Franki Chiu informed that the project would avoid encroachment to the country park. Neither permanent nor temporary works would be instituted therein. They would endeavour to conserve the landscape resources as much as possible. Dr Glenn Frommer supplemented that the project would take on greening measures that would give an outlook compatible with the surrounding areas.

20. In response to a Member's enquiry on the inclusion of biological elements to the project design, Dr Glenn Frommer said that their engineers were conscious of the need to bring environmental design to all sections of the SCL for the benefits of the community.

Noise impact

21. A Member enquired on the mitigation measures to be implemented in respect of air-borne construction noise impact on the noise sensitive receivers (NSRs) as they were mainly school users and residents nearby. The situation was further complicated as there would be other constructions works in the area in parallel with the SCL. Dr Glenn Frommer responded that they would coordinate among different teams of these projects, for example in the case of Wing Fung Building in Hung Hom which was being affected by impacts of the concurrent construction projects in the vicinity. They would ensure that the contractors would implement the mitigation measures recommended in the EIA report which would also be set out in the construction contracts. They would also ensure that the contractors would provide those mitigation measures as listed in the Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) Manual and the EIA report as far as practicable that entailed the cumulative noise impacts to be controlled at the acceptable level. They indicated that the noise impact assessment in the EIA report had adopted the practical worst-case scenario in the case of Carmel Secondary School near the Hung Hom Station (HUH) at which exceedance in the cumulative air-borne construction noise would be expected. Nevertheless, they would work closely with the contractors to minimize the environmental impacts based on their construction methodology/methodologies along the rail alignment. The NSR locations highlighted in the EIA report would particularly be taken into account when formulating the project construction plans.

22. To address the Chairman's concern on the extent of the exceedance of noise control limits in the NSR locations mentioned in the EIA report despite implementing all the mitigation measures, Dr Glenn Frommer said that the methodology in measuring the noise level of the construction works was based on the time period between 7:00 am to 7:00 pm. Day-time activities were assessed to the 75 decibels (dB(A)) criteria, at which any exceedance was referred to. A construction noise permit under the Noise Control Ordinance was required for any works after 7:00 pm. Apart from the proposed mitigation measures such as putting up noise barriers on the construction sites for abating construction noise, other initiatives would be exhausted to help reduce air-borne noise impacts to the NSR locations.

23. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether any indirect technical remedies (ITRs) for the NSRs would be adopted to relieve the continuous exceedance of noise level, Dr Glenn Frommer said that they would look into implementing the necessary noise mitigation measures on a case-by-case basis to resolve the issues before working with the contractors on individual cases to resolve

the need for providing ITRs.

24. Following a Member's further enquiry on how to ensure the overall noise level of the project was within the assessment criteria, Dr Glenn Frommer explained that the EM&A Manual had already set out the frequency and methodologies for the monitoring programme. Ad hoc monitoring would also be instituted once a complaint was received and the issue would be documented in the monthly EM&A report. He assured that there would be adequate monitoring especially for those highlighted areas in the EIA report.

25. In response to a Member's enquiries on how the examination period of the schools affected was defined and whether the Education Bureau would be advised not to use these schools for public examination as the noise level of 60 dB(A) or above would prove very disturbing to students. Dr Glenn Frommer explained that there were on-going discussions with these schools relating to their schedule of activities including examinations. MTRC would then arrange with the contractors to reduce the level of construction works if there were either school examinations or public examinations going on in the concerned schools.

26. A Member suggested the greater use of green elements, e.g. incorporating real plants in designing the vertical barriers for noise attenuation. Dr Glenn Frommer explained that the detailed design of the types of materials to be used was still under planning, and no information could be made available at this juncture. He assured that any materials to be used must be adequate for the attenuation purpose. As regards the suggestion to incorporate real plants into the vertical barriers, Dr Frommer pointed out that experiences gained from previous projects were not always satisfactory as maintenance for the plants, which involved services more than watering and weeding, had never been easy. The plants would wither and cause unsightly appearance on the barriers. He was more concerned with the safety aspect of the issue and whether there would be any inadvertent consequential effects if real planting was to be done extensively on the operating rails and on the barrier walls. He had every confidence that MTRC would come up with a pleasing design which the community should feel proud of.

Community liaison groups

27. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the stakeholders would be invited to join the discussion groups, especially for Wing Fung Building and Carmel Secondary School, Dr Glenn Frommer said that dialogues/discussions were already in place with the concerned groups. Mr Clement Ngai pointed out that, same as previous rail projects, affected and concerned parties would be engaged before and during the construction phase. These stakeholders would be invited to join regular liaison meetings to raise their concerns while the project proponent would have the opportunity to explain the work progress to them and to address their concerns. These community liaison groups had proved very successful. He expected that this liaison arrangement would continue for the current SCL project.

28. Taking on a Member's suggestion on adopting a more proactive approach to engage the residents of Wing Fung Building in the discussion of the project, Dr Glenn Frommer said that there would be more extensive public engagement during the SCL project implementation stage. They had also launched a website in both Chinese and English to explain in details the EIA findings in simple layman terms to facilitate the community's understanding on the project.

Air quality impact

29. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the expected air quality impacts of the project to the affect areas, Dr Glenn Frommer assured Members that with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures as stated in the respective EIA reports, there would be no exceedance of the 24-hour or annual Air Quality Objectives (AQO) for the SCL. Mr Franki Chiu further illustrated with the chart on dust contours (which showed quantities of dust generated by the project) and the annual total suspended particulates (TSP) concentrations that with the mitigation measures in place, due compliance could be achieved at the affected areas in respect of the air quality requirements as set out in the EIA reports.

30. The Chairman noted that the air quality impacts in respect of some of the air sensitive receivers (ASRs), for example the Sung Wong Toi Playground, was very close to exceedance of the acceptable limits. He was concerned that the limit might actually have exceeded should the model have not been properly formulated. Noting that the exceedance of the annual TSP concentrations at Kai Tak area was due to the operation of Yau Lee CBP rather than this project, he enquired on the duration of the exceedance viz. the Yau Lee project. Dr Glenn Frommer replied that while recognizing that no study model would give absolute accurate prediction, particular attention would be paid to those areas where the model reported high level of impacts, and to draw up corresponding monitoring programme. Mr Franki Chiu added that taking into account the possible model inaccuracies, they had opted for the conservative side when making the assessment as far as practicable. As regards the exceedance at Kai Tak area, he pointed out that the existing sand depots in the area would cease operation before the commencement of construction of this project. The impact brought about by these sources would have been removed and would not have concurrent impacts with the SCL project.

31. In response to a Member's enquiry on the type of fuel used by the construction vehicles or marine vessels engaged for delivery of construction and demolition (C&D) materials and other construction machinery on site, Mr C W Tse advised that fuels for all road vehicles had to comply with Euro V standard, and there was not yet a similar requirement to use cleaner fuels for marine vessels. In this connection, Dr Glenn Frommer expressed that there were issues of availability and applicability of the fuel types that had to be taken into consideration. Some plants were very specialized equipment and might not be able to run on ultra low sulphur diesel (ULSD). In answering the Member's request for the project

proponent to require their contractors to engage marine vessels and construction vehicles powered by environmental green fuel as far as practicable, Dr Frommer said that they had been in constant discussion with the contractors regarding the fuel issue. He assured that they would endeavour to engage their contractors to use the latest green fuel types available in the market at the time of construction of the project.

Heritage and archaeological conservation at Diamond Hill site

32. In response to a Member's enquiry on the impact to the archaeological sites in the Diamond Hill area, Mr Franki Chiu said that the proposed stabling sidings at the Diamond Hill CDA Site under the SCL(TAW-HUH) EIA report would be pursued only if the preferred sidings option at Hung Hom Freight Yard described in the SCL(HHS) EIA report was not accepted. If the sidings at Hung Hom Freight Yard was to be proceeded, the extent of archaeological site at the former Tai Hom Village affected would be reduced and the SCL(TAW-HUH) alignment could totally avoid the Stone House, but the former Royal Air Force (RAF) Hanger (Grade 3 Historical Building) and the Old Pillbox (Grade 2 Historical Building) would still be within the boundary of the temporary works area and be affected to the same extent.

33. A Member noted that some built heritage were recommended for relocation and reinstatement, while others would be retained in situ and monitored for vibration impacts. She was concerned that any remedial action would come too late when it was eventually found out that the vibration had actually affected the structures. She suggested the project proponent to consider reinforcement measures before commencement of works around those sites to be retained in situ. Dr Glenn Frommer quoted the example of a special design adopted in the alignment coming out of the Kai Tak Station from underneath Lung Tsun Stone Bridge. The monitoring sensors would give immediate alert to effect the event and action plan should the intensity of vibration exceed the trigger levels. Experience with other heritage structures on other rail lines under construction had proved that the monitoring programme had been adequate in this regard.

34. The Chairman noted that some disused air raid precaution tunnels at Chatham Road and Valley Road would be backfilled by concrete prior to commencement of construction works. He enquired if the fillings would be removed afterwards. Dr Glenn Frommer said that these tunnels, as part of the EIA recommendation under the EIA for Kwun Tong Line Extension (KTE), were filled up for safety purpose and would not be reinstated. Such backfilling works would be properly documented under the KTE project.

Waste management

35. In response to a Member's enquiry about the reduction and management plan on the different classes of waste generated by the project, Dr Glenn Frommer

said that they would work to reduce the generation of waste by carefully designing, planning out and implementing the various phases of the project. They would also incentivize the contractor to reuse the waste so generated by allowing them to pocket the proceeds on the sale of materials for reuse while charging them the responsibility to pay for any disposal charges entailed. Experience from the West Island Line project had proved the effectiveness of this approach as over 50% of the predicted 1.3 million cubic metres of waste so generated had been recycled by the contractor.

36. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the plan in handling the estimated 4 million cubic metres of C&D materials to be generated by the project, Mr Stanley Keung explained that they had adopted the "Reduce, Reuse and Recycle" principle during the design stage in 2008 and had been in liaison with the Public Fill Committee (PFC) and the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) on ways to reuse the materials. The proposed adoption of the HUH option for the stabling sidings had actually reduced the C&D materials by nearly 0.5 million cubic metres as compared to the less preferred DHS option. Besides, about one-tenth of the materials generated could be reused for backfilling in the SCL project. Since 2009, they had started liaison with the project offices like those of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Boundary-crossing Facilities (HZMB BCF) and the Tuen Mun to Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLK Link), on matching project schedules and assessing the volume/qualities of construction materials required so that they could make ready the materials to their contractors for use in these projects. Among others, they had already scheduled with the contractor of the HZMB BCF project to receive the C&D materials generated from the SCL project from late 2012 until mid to late 2014. He estimated that some 4-5 million cubic metres of filling materials would be required for the HZMB BCF project, while another 2 million cubic metres would be taken up by the Hong Kong Link Road and the TM-CLK Link Road.

37. In response to a Member's enquiry on the disposal of sediments, Mr Freeman Cheung explained that the largest portion of sediments would be generated from the SCL(HUH-ADM) section by the dredging of marine mud across Victoria Harbour for laying the foundation of the immersed tube tunnel. There was no well-proven method for possible reuse of such marine sediments under current engineering know-how. Most of them would have to be disposed of according to government requirements. There had been continuous dialogues with CEDD to work out the disposal arrangements.

38. Since Members had no further questions on the reports, the Chairman thanked the project proponent for attending the meeting and sharing the information with the Members.

Internal Discussion Session

39. Members were satisfied that the project proponent had addressed all their concerns in the EIA reports and the Question-and-Answer Session.

40. After discussion, the meeting agreed to recommend to the full Council that the EIA reports could be endorsed with the following proposed composite conditions covering the four reports, and that the meeting also made the following proposed composite recommendation –

(I) Proposed conditions

- (a) The project proponent (PP) should submit to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for approval, before commencement of the construction of the project, an updated plan on the construction noise mitigation measures and other initiatives proposed by the PP such as Indirect Technical Remedies (ITRs), if applicable, for the noise sensitive receiver (NSR) locations with EIA predicted exceedance in air-borne construction noise impact, having regard to the powered mechanical equipment, construction schedule and the latest planned construction methods;
- (b) PP should carry out continuous noise monitoring during construction at locations to be agreed with DEP, make available the monitoring results to the public through the PP's website for the entire construction period, and take active remedial measures in the event that the measured noise levels exceed the worst-case scenario predicted in the EIA reports or the levels as revised by the construction noise mitigation measures plan;
- (c) PP should set up community liaison groups comprising representatives of concerned and affected parties, including local committees, residents and schools in the affected areas along the railway alignment, to facilitate communications, enquiries and complaint handlings on environmental issues related to the project. A designated complaint hotline should also be set up for the project to address such concerns and complaints in an efficient manner. The PP should follow up with the community liaison groups on the implementation of mitigation measures and other initiatives proposed by the PP such as ITRs in the form of upgraded glazing and air-conditioning for eligible NSRs affected by air-borne construction noise impacts along the Tai Wai-Hung Hom section, arrangement of continuous construction noise monitoring as well as tree management and transplantation plan, etc.;
- (d) PP should submit a quality tree planting and landscape plan as well as a post-planting care plan, in consultation with the relevant authorities, including, but not limited to, the Lands Department and the Agriculture,

Fisheries and Conservation Department, to DEP for approval. The plan should set out details of the measures for protecting trees affected by the project as well as trees to be transplanted. PP should appoint a certified arborist for the project to advise on, monitor and ensure proper implementation of the measures;

- (e) PP should submit an updated construction and demolition (C&D) material management plan to DEP for approval before commencement of the construction works. The plan should include, but not limited to, measures for maximizing the reuse of C&D materials in other infrastructure projects and prohibiting illegal dumping of C&D materials generated by the project;
- (f) PP should submit an updated sediment management plan to DEP for approval before commencement of the construction works. The plan should include, but not limited to, the proper treatment and handling of sediments so generated by the project before disposal; and
- (g) PP should ensure that all diesel-fuelled construction plants, including marine vessels if possible, used by the contractors within the work sites are powered by ultra low sulphur diesel fuel.

(II) Proposed recommendations

The project proponent should require contractors to, as far as practicable, engage marine vessels powered by the cleanest fuel, e.g. ultra low sulphur diesel, for transporting the C&D materials and sediments generated by the project to the user sites and/or disposal sites.

41. The Subcommittee agreed that there was no need to invite the project proponent to attend the full Council meeting on the reports.

Agenda Item 4: Monthly updates of applications under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance

42. Members noted the updates.

Agenda Item 5: Any other business

Tentative items for discussion at the next meeting

43. The Chairman informed Members that the agenda was being compiled. Members would be informed in due course.

Agenda Item 6: Date of next meeting

44. The Chairman informed Members that the next meeting was tentatively reserved for 27 February, depending on whether there would be EIA report(s) for discussion by the Subcommittee.

**EIA Subcommittee Secretariat
January 2012**