



China Harbour Engineering Company Limited

Contract No. HY/2010/02

**Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge
Hong Kong Boundary Crossing
Facilities –
Reclamation Works**

Monthly EM&A Report for January 2014

[02/2014]

	Name	Signature
Prepared & Checked:	Y T Tang	
Reviewed, Approved and Certified:	Echo Leong (ETL)	

Version:	Rev. 0	Date:	25 February 2013
----------	--------	-------	------------------

Disclaimer

This report is prepared for China Harbour Engineering Company Limited and is given for its sole benefit in relation to and pursuant to Contract No. HY/2010/02 Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities-Reclamation Works and may not be disclosed to, quoted to or relied upon by any person other than China Harbour Engineering Company Limited without our prior written consent. No person (other than China Harbour Engineering Company Limited) into whose possession a copy of this report comes may rely on this report without our express written consent and China Harbour Engineering Company Limited may not rely on it for any purpose other than as described above.

AECOM Asia Co. Ltd.
15/F, Grand Central Plaza, Tower 1, 138 Shatin Rural Committee Road, Shatin, NT, Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 3922 9000 Fax: (852) 2317 7609 www.aecom.com

Ref.: HYDHZMBEEM00_0_1712L.14

25 February 2014

Engineer's Representative
Ove Arup & Partners
Chief Resident Engineer's Office
5 Ying Hei Road, Tung Chung, Lantau
Hong Kong

By Fax (3698 5999) and By Post

Attention: Mr. Roger Marechal

Dear Mr. Marechal,

**Re: Agreement No. CE 48/2011 (EP)
Environmental Project Office for the
HZMB Hong Kong Link Road, HZMB Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities,
and Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link – Investigation**

**Contract No. HY/2010/02
Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge
Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities – Reclamation Work
Monthly Environmental Monitoring & Audit Report for January 2014**

Reference is made to the Environmental Team's submission of the Monthly Environmental Monitoring & Audit Report for January 2014 (letter ref. 60249820/C/RMKY14022501 dated 25 February 2014) copied to us by E-mail on 10 February 2014.

We are pleased to inform you that we have no adverse comment on the captioned Monthly EM&A Report. We write to verify the captioned report in accordance with Condition 5.4 of EP-353/2009/G and Condition 4.4 of EP-354/2009/B (for TM-CLKL Southern Landfall Reclamation only).

ET is reminded to closely monitor the condition of site mitigation measures and the implementation of EM&A programme in accordance with the EP.

Thank you very much for your kind attention and please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,



Raymond Dai
Independent Environmental Checker

c.c.	HyD	Mr. Matthew Fung	(By Fax: 3188 6614)
	HyD	Mr. Wai-ping Lee	(By Fax: 3188 6614)
	AECOM	Ms. Echo Leong	(By Fax: 2317 7609)
	CHEC	Mr. Lim Kim Chuan	(By Fax: 2578 0413)

Q:\Projects\HYDHZMBEEM00\02_Proj_Mgt\02_Corr\HYDHZMBEEM00_0_1712L.14.docx

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Background	4
1.2 Scope of Report	4
1.3 Project Organization	5
1.4 Summary of Construction Works	5
1.5 Summary of EM&A Programme Requirements	6
2 AIR QUALITY MONITORING	7
2.1 Monitoring Requirements	7
2.2 Monitoring Equipment	7
2.3 Monitoring Locations	7
2.4 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration	8
2.5 Monitoring Methodology	8
2.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month	10
2.7 Results and Observations	10
3 NOISE MONITORING	23
3.1 Monitoring Requirements	23
3.2 Monitoring Equipment	23
3.3 Monitoring Locations	23
3.4 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration	24
3.5 Monitoring Methodology	24
3.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month	24
3.7 Monitoring Results	25
4 WATER QUALITY MONITORING	26
4.1 Monitoring Requirements	26
4.2 Monitoring Equipment	26
4.3 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration	26
4.4 Monitoring Locations	26
4.5 Monitoring Methodology	27
4.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month	29
4.7 Results and Observations	29
5 DOLPHIN MONITORING	40
5.1 Monitoring Requirements	40
5.2 Monitoring Equipment	40
5.3 Monitoring Frequency and Conditions	40
5.4 Monitoring Methodology and Location	40
5.5 Monitoring Procedures	42
5.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month	42
5.7 Results and Observations	42
6 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE INSPECTION AND AUDIT	46
6.1 Site Inspection	46
6.2 Advice on the Solid and Liquid Waste Management Status	48
6.3 Environmental Licenses and Permits	49
6.4 Implementation Status of Environmental Mitigation Measures	49
6.5 Summary of Exceedances of the Environmental Quality Performance Limit	50
6.6 Summary of Complaints, Notification of Summons and Successful Prosecutions	50
7 FUTURE KEY ISSUES	52
7.1 Construction Programme for the Coming Months	52
7.2 Key Issues for the Coming Month	53
7.3 Monitoring Schedule for the Coming Month	53

8	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
8.1	Conclusions	54
8.2	Recommendations	55

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Contact Information of Key Personnel
Table 2.1	Air Quality Monitoring Equipment
Table 2.2	Locations of Impact Air Quality Monitoring Stations
Table 2.3	Air Quality Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration
Table 2.4	Summary of 1-hour TSP Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period
Table 2.5	Summary of 24-hour TSP Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period
Table 3.1	Noise Monitoring Equipment
Table 3.2	Locations of Impact Noise Monitoring Stations
Table 3.3	Noise Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration
Table 3.4	Summary of Construction Noise Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period
Table 4.1	Water Quality Monitoring Equipment
Table 4.2	Impact Water Quality Monitoring Parameters and Frequency
Table 4.3	Impact Water Quality Monitoring Stations
Table 4.4	Laboratory Analysis for Suspended Solids
Table 4.5	Summary of Water Quality Exceedances
Table 5.1	Dolphin Monitoring Equipment
Table 5.2	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Line Transect Co-ordinates (Provided by AFCD)
Table 5.3	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Effort Summary, Effort by Area and Beaufort Sea State
Table 5.4	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Details in January 2014
Table 5.5	The Encounter Rate of Number of Dolphin Sightings & Total Number of Dolphins per Area^
Table 6.1	Summary of Environmental Licensing and Permit Status

Figures

Figure 1	General Project Layout Plan
Figure 2	Impact Air Quality and Noise Monitoring Stations and Wind Station
Figure 3	Impact Water Quality Monitoring Stations
Figure 4	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Line Transect Layout Map
Figure 5	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Efforts and Sightings in January 2014
Figure 6	Environmental Complaint Handling Procedure

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Project Organization for Environmental Works
Appendix B	Three Month Rolling Construction Programmes
Appendix C	Implementation Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures (EMIS)
Appendix D	Summary of Action and Limit Levels
Appendix E	Calibration Certificates of Monitoring Equipments
Appendix F	EM&A Monitoring Schedules
Appendix G	Impact Air Quality Monitoring Results and their Graphical Presentation
Appendix H	Meteorological Data for Monitoring Periods on Monitoring Dates in January 2014
Appendix I	Impact Construction Noise Monitoring Results and their Graphical Presentation
Appendix J	Impact Water Quality Monitoring Results and their Graphical Presentation
Appendix K	Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Sighting Summary
Appendix L	Event Action Plan
Appendix M	Monthly Summary of Waste Flow Table
Appendix N	Cumulative Statistics on Exceedances, Complaints, Notifications of Summons and Successful Prosecutions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Contract No. HY/2010/02 – Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities – Reclamation Work (here below, known as “the Project”) mainly comprises reclamation at the northeast of the Hong Kong International Airport of an area of about 130-hectare for the construction of an artificial island for the development of the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF), and about 19-hectare for the southern landfall of the Tuen Mun - Chek Lap Kok Link (TMCLKL). It is a designated project and is governed by the current permits for the Project, i.e. the amended Environmental Permits (EPs) issued on 06 August 2013 (EP-353/2009/G) and 28 January 2014 (EP-354/2009/B) (for TMCLKL Southern Landfall Reclamation only).

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was appointed by Highways Department (HyD) as the consultants for the design and construction assignment for the Project’s reclamation works (i.e. the Engineer for the Project).

China Harbour Engineering Company Limited (CHEC) was awarded by HyD as the Contractor to undertake the construction work of the Project.

ENVIRON Hong Kong Ltd. was employed by HyD as the Independent Environmental Checker (IEC) and Environmental Project Office (ENPO) for the Project.

AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) was appointed by CHEC to undertake the role of Environmental Team for the Project for carrying out the environmental monitoring and audit (EM&A) works.

The construction phase of the Project under the EPs was commenced on 12 March 2012 and will be tentatively completed by early Year 2016. The EM&A programme, including air quality, noise, water quality and dolphin monitoring and environmental site inspections, was commenced on 12 March 2012.

This report documents the findings of EM&A works conducted in the period between 1 and 31 January 2014. As informed by the Contractor, major activities in the reporting period were:-

Marine-based Works

- Marine-base
- Cellular structure installation
- Connecting arc cell installation
- Laying geo-textile
- Sand blanket laying
- Sand filling
- Maintenance of silt curtain & silt screen at sea water intake of HKIA
- Stone column installation
- Band drain installation
- Backfill cellular structure
- Geotechnical Instrumentation works
- Construction of temporary seawall
- Ground investigation
- Surcharge laying
- Precast Yard setup
- Sand Drain
- Construction of temporary access from Portion D to Portion A

Land-based Works

- Maintenance works of Site Office at Works Area WA2
- Maintenance works of Public Works Regional Laboratory at Works Area WA3
- Geo-textile fabrication at Works Area WA2
- Installed sand bag at Works Area WA2
- Silt curtain fabrication at Works Area WA4
- Maintenance of Temporary Marine Access at Works Area WA2

A summary of monitoring and audit activities conducted in the reporting period is listed below:

24-hour Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) monitoring	5 sessions
1-hour TSP monitoring	5 sessions

Noise monitoring	4 sessions
Impact water quality monitoring	13 sessions
Impact dolphin monitoring	2 surveys
Joint Environmental site inspection	5 sessions

Breaches of Action and Limit Levels for Air Quality

All 1-Hour TSP results were below the Action and Limit Level in the reporting month. Four (4) Action Level Exceedances and two (2) Limit Level Exceedances were recorded at measured 24-hour TSP results in the reporting month. Investigation results showed that Four (4) Action Level Exceedances and two (2) Limit Level Exceedances were not related to project.

Breaches of Action and Limit Levels for Noise

For construction noise, no exceedance was recorded at all monitoring stations in the reporting period.

Breaches of Action and Limit Levels for Water Quality

Six (6) Action Level and one (1) limit level exceedances recorded at measured suspended solids (SS) values (in mg/L) in the reporting month. Investigation results shows that all Action and Limit Level Exceedance recorded were not related to project.

Impact Dolphin Monitoring

A total of ten dolphin sightings were recorded during the two surveys, six on 6 January 2014; two were made on 9 and 10 January 2014. No sightings were recorded on the 7 January 2014. Of the ten sightings, nine were “on effort” (which are all under favourable condition) and one was “opportunistic”. A total of thirty six individuals were sighted from the two impact dolphin surveys in the reporting period. Sighting details are summarised and plotted in Appendix K and Figure 5c, respectively.

Behaviour: Of the ten sightings made, three sightings were recorded as ‘multiple’ behavior (one of which was feeding and travelling and the other two sightings were feeding and “surface active”); three sightings were recorded as feeding; one in association with a small purse seiner/trawler; three was recorded as travelling and one sighting was recorded as “unknown”. Both of the “milling” groups contained calves and close approaches were not made. The locations of sighting with different behaviour are mapped in Figure 5d.

Complaint, Notification of Summons and Successful Prosecution

As informed by the Contractor on 6 Jan 14. A complaint involves barges loaded with sand material without properly covered was blown to the inside of the residential area of Tuen Mun Pierhead Garden which caused disturbance to residence. With refer to available information provided. It is considered the complaint is unlikely to be related to this project.

EPD referred a complaint from complainant who advised that blackish mud was found along the edge of the construction site of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Project near the airport in the morning of 18 January 2014. After receipt of the complaint, site daily was reviewed and follow-up investigation has been conducted and excavation and dredging activities were not observed within the site boundary of HKBCF during the joint site inspection audit. Therefore in accordance with the investigation results, the complaint is considered as not related to contract HY/2010/02.

No notification of summons and successful prosecution was received in the reporting period.

Reporting Change

There was no reporting change required in the reporting period.

Future Key Issues

Key issues to be considered in the coming month included:-

- Site runoff should be properly collected and treated prior to discharge;
- Minimize loss of sediment from filling works;
- Regular review and maintenance of silt curtain systems, drainage systems and desilting facilities;
- Exposed surfaces/soil stockpiles should be properly treated to avoid generation of silty surface run-off during rainstorm;
- Regular review and maintenance of wheel washing facilities provided at all site entrances/exits;
- Conduct regular inspection of various working machineries and vessels within works areas to avoid any dark smoke emission;
- Suppress dust generated from work processes with use of bagged cements, earth movements, excavation activities, exposed surfaces/soil stockpiles and haul road traffic;
- Quieter powered mechanical equipment should be used;
- Provision of proper and effective noise control measures for operating equipment and machinery on-site, such as erection of movable noise barriers or enclosure for noisy plants;
- Closely check and replace the sound insulation materials regularly;
- Better scheduling of construction works to minimize noise nuisance;
- Properly store and label oil drums and chemical containers placed on site;
- Proper chemicals, chemical wastes and wastes management;
- Maintenance works should be carried out within roofed, paved and confined areas;
- Collection and segregation of construction waste and general refuse on land and in the sea should be carried out properly and regularly; and
- Proper protection and regular inspection of existing trees, transplanted/retained trees.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Contract No. HY/2010/02 – Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities – Reclamation Work (here below, known as “the Project”) mainly comprises reclamation at the northeast of the Hong Kong International Airport of an area of about 130-hectare for the construction of an artificial island for the development of the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF), and about 19-hectare for the southern landfall of the Tuen Mun - Chek Lap Kok Link (TMCLKL).
- 1.1.2 The environmental impact assessment (EIA) reports (Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities – EIA Report (Register No. AEIAR-145/2009) (HKBCFEIA) and Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link – EIA Report (Register No. AEIAR-146/2009) (TMCLKLEIA), and their environmental monitoring and audit (EM&A) Manuals (original EM&A Manuals), for the Project were approved by Environmental Protection Department (EPD) in October 2009.
- 1.1.3 EPD subsequently issued the Environmental Permit (EP) for HKBCF in November 2009 (EP-353/2009) and the Variation of Environmental Permit (VEP) in June 2010 (EP-353/2009/A), November 2010 (EP-353/2009/B), November 2011 (EP-353/2009/C), March 2012 (EP-353/2009/D), October 2012 (EP-353/2009/E), April 2013 (EP-353/2009/F) and August 2013 (EP-353/2009/G). Similarly, EPD issued the Environmental Permit (EP) for TMCLKL in November 2009 (EP-354/2009) and the Variation of Environmental Permit (VEP) in December 2010 (EP-354/2009/A) and January 2014 (EP-354/2009/B).
- 1.1.4 The Project is a designated project and is governed by the current permits for the Project, i.e. the amended EPs issued on 6 August 2013 (EP-353/2009/G) and 28 January 2014 (EP-354/2009/B) (for TMCLKL Southern Landfall Reclamation only).
- 1.1.5 A Project Specific EM&A Manual, which included all project-relation contents from the original EM&A Manuals for the Project, was issued in May 2012.
- 1.1.6 Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) was appointed by Highways Department (HyD) as the consultants for the design and construction assignment for the Project's reclamation works (i.e. the Engineer for the Project).
- 1.1.7 China Harbour Engineering Company Limited (CHEC) was awarded by HyD as the Contractor to undertake the construction work of the Project.
- 1.1.8 ENVIRON Hong Kong Ltd. was employed by HyD as the Independent Environmental Checker (IEC) and Environmental Project Office (ENPO) for the Project.
- 1.1.9 AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM) was appointed by CHEC to undertake the role of Environmental Team for the Project for carrying out the EM&A works.
- 1.1.10 The construction phase of the Project under the EPs was commenced on 12 March 2012 and will be tentatively completed by early Year 2016.
- 1.1.11 According to the Project Specific EM&A Manual, there is a need of an EM&A programme including air quality, noise, water quality and dolphin monitoring and environmental site inspections. The EM&A programme of the Project commenced on 12 March 2012.

1.2 Scope of Report

- 1.2.1 This is the twenty-third monthly EM&A Report under the Contract No. HY/2010/02 Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities – Reclamation Works. This report presents a summary of the environmental monitoring and audit works, list of activities and mitigation measures proposed by the ET for the Project in January 2014.

1.3 Project Organization

- 1.3.1 The project organization structure is shown in Appendix A. The key personnel contact names and numbers are summarized in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Contact Information of Key Personnel

Party	Position	Name	Telephone	Fax
Engineer's Representative (ER) (Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited)	Chief Resident Engineer	Roger Marechal	3698 5700	2698 5999
IEC / ENPO (ENVIRON Hong Kong Limited)	Independent Environmental Checker	Raymond Dai	3465 2888	3465 2899
	Environmental Project Office Leader	Y. H. Hui	3465 2868	3465 2899
Contractor (China Harbour Engineering Company Limited)	Environmental Officer	Richard Ng	36932253	2578 0413
	24-hour Hotline	Alan C.C. Yeung	9448 0325	--
ET (AECOM Asia Company Limited)	ET Leader	Echo Leong	3922 9280	2317 7609

1.4 Summary of Construction Works

- 1.4.1 The construction phase of the Project under the EP commenced on 12 March 2012.
- 1.4.2 As informed by the Contractor, details of the major works carried out in this reporting period are listed below:-

Marine-based Works

- Cellular structure installation
- Connecting arc cell installation
- Laying geo-textile
- Sand blanket laying
- Sand filling
- Maintenance of silt curtain & silt screen at sea water intake of HKIA
- Stone column installation
- Band drain installation
- Backfill cellular structure
- Geotechnical Instrumentation works
- Rubble mound seawall construction
- Construction of temporary seawall
- Ground investigation

Land-based Works

- Maintenance works of Site Office at Works Area WA2
- Maintenance works of Public Works Regional Laboratory at Works Area WA3

- Geo-textile fabrication at Works Area WA2
- Installed sand bag at Works Area WA2
- Silt curtain fabrication at Works Area WA4
- Maintenance of Temporary Marine Access at Works Area WA2

1.4.3 The 3-month rolling construction programme of the Project is shown in Appendix B.

1.4.4 The general layout plan of the Project site showing the detailed works areas is shown in Figure 1.

1.4.5 The environmental mitigation measures implementation schedule are presented in Appendix C.

1.5 Summary of EM&A Programme Requirements

1.5.1 The EM&A programme required environmental monitoring for air quality, noise, water quality, marine ecology and environmental site inspections for air quality, noise, water quality, waste management, marine ecology, and landscape and visual impact. The EM&A requirements for each parameter described in the following sections include:-

- All monitoring parameters;
- Monitoring schedules for the reporting month and forthcoming month;
- Action and Limit levels for all environmental parameters;
- Event / Action Plan;
- Environmental mitigation measures, as recommended in the Project EIA reports; and
- Environmental requirement in contract documents.

2 AIR QUALITY MONITORING

2.1 Monitoring Requirements

2.1.1 In accordance with the Project Specific EM&A Manual, baseline 1-hour and 24-hour Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) levels at 4 air quality monitoring stations were established. Impact 1-hour TSP monitoring was conducted for at least three times every 6 days, while impact 24-hour TSP monitoring was carried out for at least once every 6 days. The Action and Limit level of the air quality monitoring is provided in Appendix D.

2.2 Monitoring Equipment

2.2.1 24-hour TSP air quality monitoring was performed using High Volume Sampler (HVS) located at each designated monitoring station. The HVS meets all the requirements of the Project Specific EM&A Manual. Portable direct reading dust meters were used to carry out the 1-hour TSP monitoring. Brand and model of the equipment is given in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Air Quality Monitoring Equipment

Equipment	Brand and Model
Portable direct reading dust meter (1-hour TSP)	Sibata Digital Dust Monitor (Model No. LD-3 and LD-3B)
High Volume Sampler (24-hour TSP)	Tisch Environmental Mass Flow Controlled Total Suspended Particulate (TSP) High Volume Air Sampler (Model No. TE-5170)

2.3 Monitoring Locations

2.3.1 Monitoring locations AMS2 and AMS7 were set up at the proposed locations in accordance with Project Specific EM&A Manual. For AMS6 (Dragonair/CNAC (Group) Building), permission on setting up and carrying out impact monitoring works was sought, however, access to the premise has not been granted yet on this report issuing date. For monitoring location AMS3 (Ho Yu College), as proposed in the Project Specific EM&A Manual, approval for carrying out impact monitoring could not be obtained from the principal of the school. Permission on setting up and carrying out impact monitoring works at nearby sensitive receivers, like Caribbean Coast and Coastal Skyline, was also sought. However, approvals for carrying out impact monitoring works within their premises were not obtained. Impact air quality monitoring was conducted at site boundary of the site office area in Works Area WA2 (AMS3A) respectively. Same baseline and Action Level for air quality, as derived from the baseline monitoring data recorded at Ho Yu College, was adopted for this alternative air quality location.

2.3.2 Reference is made to ET’s proposal of the omission of air monitoring station (AMS 6) dated on 1 November 2012 and EPD’s letter dated on 19 November 2012 regarding the conditional approval of the proposed omission of air monitoring station (AMS 6) for Contract No. HY/2010/02. The aforesaid omission of Monitoring Station AMS6 is effective since 19 November 2012.

2.3.3 Figure 2 shows the locations of monitoring stations. Table 2.2 describes the details of the monitoring stations.

Table 2.2 Locations of Impact Air Quality Monitoring Stations

Monitoring Station	Location	Description
AMS2	Tung Chung Development Pier	Rooftop of the premise
AMS3A	Site Boundary of Site Office Area at Works Area WA2	On ground at the area boundary
AMS6*	Dragonair/CNAC (Group) Building	On ground at boundary of the premise
AMS7	Hong Kong SkyCity Marriott Hotel	On ground at boundary of the premise

*Remarks: Reference is made to EPD conditional approval of the omission of air monitoring station (AMS 6) for the project. The omission will be effective on 19 November 2012.

2.4 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration

2.4.1 Table 2.3 summarizes the monitoring parameters, frequency and duration of impact TSP monitoring.

Table 2.3 Air Quality Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration

Parameter	Frequency and Duration
1-hour TSP	Three times every 6 days while the highest dust impact was expected
24-hour TSP	Once every 6 days

2.5 Monitoring Methodology

2.5.1 24-hour TSP Monitoring

- (a) The HVS was installed in the vicinity of the air sensitive receivers. The following criteria were considered in the installation of the HVS.
 - (i) A horizontal platform with appropriate support to secure the sampler against gusty wind was provided.
 - (ii) No two samplers should be placed less than 2 meters apart.
 - (iii) The distance between the HVS and any obstacles, such as buildings, was at least twice the height that the obstacle protrudes above the HVS.
 - (iv) A minimum of 2 meters separation from walls, parapets and penthouse for rooftop sampler.
 - (v) A minimum of 2 meters separation from any supporting structure, measured horizontally is required.
 - (vi) No furnace or incinerator flues nearby.
 - (vii) Airflow around the sampler was unrestricted.
 - (viii) Permission was obtained to set up the samplers and access to the monitoring stations.
 - (ix) A secured supply of electricity was obtained to operate the samplers.
 - (x) The sampler was located more than 20 meters from any dripline.
 - (xi) Any wire fence and gate, required to protect the sampler, did not obstruct the monitoring process.
 - (xii) Flow control accuracy was kept within $\pm 2.5\%$ deviation over 24-hour sampling period.

- (b) Preparation of Filter Papers
 - (i) Glass fibre filters, G810 were labelled and sufficient filters that were clean and without pinholes were selected.
 - (ii) All filters were equilibrated in the conditioning environment for 24 hours before weighing. The conditioning environment temperature was around 25 °C and not variable by more than ± 3 °C; the relative humidity (RH) was < 50% and not variable by more than $\pm 5\%$. A convenient working RH was 40%.

- (iii) All filter papers were prepared and analysed by ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd., which is a HOKLAS accredited laboratory and has comprehensive quality assurance and quality control programmes.
- (c) Field Monitoring
- (i) The power supply was checked to ensure the HVS works properly.
 - (ii) The filter holder and the area surrounding the filter were cleaned.
 - (iii) The filter holder was removed by loosening the four bolts and a new filter, with stamped number upward, on a supporting screen was aligned carefully.
 - (iv) The filter was properly aligned on the screen so that the gasket formed an airtight seal on the outer edges of the filter.
 - (v) The swing bolts were fastened to hold the filter holder down to the frame. The pressure applied was sufficient to avoid air leakage at the edges.
 - (vi) Then the shelter lid was closed and was secured with the aluminum strip.
 - (vii) The HVS was warmed-up for about 5 minutes to establish run-temperature conditions.
 - (viii) A new flow rate record sheet was set into the flow recorder.
 - (ix) On site temperature and atmospheric pressure readings were taken and the flow rate of the HVS was checked and adjusted at around 1.1 m³/min, and complied with the range specified in the updated EM&A Manual (i.e. 0.6-1.7 m³/min).
 - (x) The programmable digital timer was set for a sampling period of 24 hrs, and the starting time, weather condition and the filter number were recorded.
 - (xi) The initial elapsed time was recorded.
 - (xii) At the end of sampling, on site temperature and atmospheric pressure readings were taken and the final flow rate of the HVS was checked and recorded.
 - (xiii) The final elapsed time was recorded.
 - (xiv) The sampled filter was removed carefully and folded in half length so that only surfaces with collected particulate matter were in contact.
 - (xv) It was then placed in a clean plastic envelope and sealed.
 - (xvi) All monitoring information was recorded on a standard data sheet.
 - (xvii) Filters were then sent to ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. for analysis.
- (d) Maintenance and Calibration
- (i) The HVS and its accessories were maintained in good working condition, such as replacing motor brushes routinely and checking electrical wiring to ensure a continuous power supply.
 - (ii) 5-point calibration of the HVS was conducted using TE-5025A Calibration Kit prior to the commencement of baseline monitoring. Bi-monthly 5-point calibration of the HVS will be carried out during impact monitoring.
 - (iii) Calibration certificate of the HVSs are provided in Appendix E.

2.5.2 1-hour TSP Monitoring

(a) Measuring Procedures

The measuring procedures of the 1-hour dust meter were in accordance with the Manufacturer's Instruction Manual as follows:-

- (i) Turn the power on.
- (ii) Close the air collecting opening cover.
- (iii) Push the "TIME SETTING" switch to [BG].
- (iv) Push "START/STOP" switch to perform background measurement for 6 seconds.
- (v) Turn the knob at SENS ADJ position to insert the light scattering plate.
- (vi) Leave the equipment for 1 minute upon "SPAN CHECK" is indicated in the display.
- (vii) Push "START/STOP" switch to perform automatic sensitivity adjustment. This measurement takes 1 minute.
- (viii) Pull out the knob and return it to MEASURE position.
- (ix) Push the "TIME SETTING" switch the time set in the display to 3 hours.
- (x) Lower down the air collection opening cover.
- (xi) Push "START/STOP" switch to start measurement.

(b) Maintenance and Calibration

- (i) The 1-hour TSP meter was calibrated at 1-year intervals against a continuous particulate TEOM Monitor, Series 1400ab. Calibration certificates of the Laser Dust Monitors are provided in Appendix E.
- (ii) 1-hour validation checking of the TSP meter against HVS is carried out on half-year basis at the air quality monitoring locations.

2.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month

2.6.1 The schedule for air quality monitoring in January 2014 is provided in Appendix F.

2.7 Results and Observations

2.7.1 The monitoring results for 1-hour TSP and 24-hour TSP are summarized in Table 2.4 and 2.5 respectively. Detailed impact air quality monitoring results are presented in Appendix G.

Table 2.4 Summary of 1-hour TSP Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period

	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Range ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Action Level ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Limit Level ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
AMS2	83	79 – 86	374	500
AMS3A	84	81 – 88	368	500
AMS7	83	81 – 85	370	500

Table 2.5 Summary of 24-hour TSP Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period

	Average ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Range ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Action Level ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Limit Level ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
AMS2	110	66 – 185	176	260
AMS3A	259	154 – 502	167	260
AMS7	132	82 – 207	183	260

2.7.2 The major dust source in the reporting period included construction activities from the Project, construction activities by other contacts, as well as nearby traffic emissions.

2.7.3 All 1-hour TSP results were below the Action and Limit Level at all monitoring locations in the reporting month. Four (4) 24-hour TSP results recorded at AMS2, AMS3A and AMS7 exceeded the Action Level. And Two (2) 24-hour TSP recorded at AMS3A exceeded the Limit Level in the reporting month.

- 2.7.4 For the 24Hr TSP Limit Level exceedance recorded at AMS3A, a result of $502\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 07 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP).
- 2.7.7.1 According to information provided by the Contractor, land-based construction activity such as stitching and transloading of Type 2 geotextile were being undertaken at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period.
- 2.7.7.2 Functional checking on HVS at AMS3A was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS3A. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.7.3 Photo records shows fugitive dust were generated by vehicle activities observed inside an area at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA2. (Please also see photo and layout map attached for reference of site conditions (View A.))

View A (fugitive dust were observed at the parking lot of the nearby construction site which do not belongs to this Contract)



- 2.7.7.4 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 06 and 07 Jan 14 (as attached) Southeast wind was prevailing during the monitoring period. Traffic activities at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA 2 may contribute to the measured dust levels at the monitoring station AMS3A.
- 2.7.7.5 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on 7 Jan 14, which are within the monitoring period of the 24-hr TSP, were $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.7.6 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS7 (which are closer to the marine-based works areas) on the same monitoring date was $133\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which are below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.7.7 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on next monitoring date were $154\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which was below the Action and Limit Level.
- 2.7.7.8 The following dust mitigation measures have been implemented at Works Area WA2:
1. Works Area WA2's surface was hard-paved, compacted or hydro-seeded (Please refer to


- attached layout map and photo record (View B))
- 2. Vehicle washing facility was provided at vehicle exit points,
- 3. Measures for preventing fugitive dust emission are provided, e.g. canvas/tarpaulin covers.

2.7.7.9 The Contractor was recommended to continue implementing existing dust mitigation measures.

View B (Hard paved surface observed at Works Area WA2)




The following figure is the General Layout of Works Area WA2




- 2.7.5 For the 24Hr TSP Action Level exceedance recorded at AMS7, a result of $185\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 08 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP).
- 2.7.5.1 According to information provided by the Contractor during the monitoring period. Marine-based construction activity such as band drain, stone column installation and cellular structure installation was being undertaken at C2a, C2c, C1a, C1b, D, E1, E2, A and B.
- 2.7.5.2 Stone column was being installed at the seabed therefore it is considered that stone column installation at Portion E1, E2 and Portion B is unlikely to contribute to the recorded 24hr-TSP exceedance.
- 2.7.5.3 Both band drain or cellular structure installation conducted at C2a, C2b, C2c, C1a, C1b, E1, E2, A and B are unlikely to contribute to the recorded 24hr-TSP exceedance due to no significant fugitive dust was expected to be generated in the process.
- 2.7.5.4 Checking record of Jan 14 shows that plant engine is operated by ULSD.
- 2.7.5.5 With reference to the weekly joint site inspection records of 2, 9, 16, 22 and 29 of Jan 14, no dark smoke of was observed and this indicates that plant engines are properly maintained.
- 2.7.5.6 Excavators and generators were operated by ultra low sulphur diesel (ULSD) to minimize the possibility of air pollution have been implemented at throughout the construction site.
- 2.7.5.7 Functional checking on HVS at AMS2 was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS2. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.5.8 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS2 on 7 Jan 14, were $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $85\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.5.9 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS7 (which is located closer to active works than AMS2) on 7 Jan 14 was $133\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which was below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.5.10 On the other hand, according to observation made at the monitoring station AMS2, there was no non-project potential cause/activity at the surrounding of monitoring station AMS2 which might potentially contribute to the dust action level exceedance.
- 2.7.5.11 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 7 and 8 Jan 14 (as attached), East-southeast winds were prevailing during the monitoring period. Construction works carried out by this Contract are unlikely to cause dust exceedance at AMS2 under the abovementioned prevailing wind directions.
- 2.7.5.12 The dust exceedance was therefore considered not to be due to the Project works.
- 2.7.5.13 The Contractor was recommended to continue implementing existing dust mitigation measures and the Contractor was reminded ensure to undertake watering at least 8 times per day on all exposed soil within the Project site and associated work areas throughout the construction phase.

- 2.7.6 For the 24Hr TSP Action Level exceedance recorded at AMS3A, a result of $175\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 18 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP).
- 2.7.6.1 According to information provided by the Contractor, land-based construction activities such as transloading land based equipment, accessories and installed sand bags were being undertaken at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period.
- 2.7.6.2 Functional checking on HVS at AMS3A was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS3A. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.6.3 Photo records shows vehicle parking activities were observed inside an area at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA2. (Please also see photo and layout map attached for reference of site conditions (View A.))



View A (parking lot observed at nearby construction site which do not belongs to this Contract)




- 2.7.6.4 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 17 and 18 Jan 14 (as attached) South-southeast winds was prevailing during the monitoring period. Traffic activities at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA 2 may contribute to the measured dust levels at the monitoring station AMS3A.
- 2.7.6.5 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on 18 Jan 14, which are within the monitoring period of the 24-hr TSP, were $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $85\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.6.6 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS2 (which are closer to the marine-based works areas) on the same monitoring date were $124\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which are below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.6.7 The following dust mitigation measures have been implemented at Works Area WA2:
1. Works Area WA2's surface was hard-paved, compacted or hydro-seeded (Please refer to attached layout map and photo record (View B))
 2. Vehicle washing facility was provided at vehicle exit points,
 3. Measures for preventing fugitive dust emission are provided, e.g. canvas/tarpaulin covers.

View B (Hard paved surface observed at Works Area WA2)



- 2.7.6.8 The dust exceedance was therefore considered not to be due to the Project works.

- 2.7.7 For the 24Hr TSP Action Level exceedance recorded at AMS7, a result of $207\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 18 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP).
- 2.7.7.1 According to information provided by the Contractor during the monitoring period. Marine-based construction activity such as band drain, stone column installation and cellular structure installation was being undertaken at all area except Portion D.
- 2.7.7.2 Stone column was being installed at the seabed therefore it is considered that stone column installation at Portion C2a, Portion E2 and Portion B are unlikely to contribute to the recorded 24hr-TSP exceedance. For active works carried out on 18 Jan 14, please refer to the below layout map.



- 2.7.7.3 Both band drain or cellular structure installation which was conducted during the monitoring period are considered unlikely to contribute to the recorded 24hr-TSP exceedance due to no significant fugitive dust was expected to be generated in the process.
- 2.7.7.4 Excavators and generators were operated by ultra low sulphur diesel (ULSD) to minimize the possibility of air pollution have been implemented at throughout the construction site.
- 2.7.7.5 Checking record of Jan 14 shows that plant engine is operated by ULSD.
- 2.7.7.6 With reference to the weekly joint site inspection records of 2, 9, 16, 22 and 29 of Jan 14, no dark smoke of was observed and this indicates that plant engines are properly maintained.
- 2.7.7.7 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 23 and 24 Jan 14, South-southeast winds was prevailing during the monitoring period. However, photo record attached shows that dust control measures was implemented by the Contractor.

Photo record showed that the Contractor implemented dust control measures on pelican barge loaded with rock/sand. The Contractor was reminded to continue to provide dust control measures on pelican barge loaded with rock/sand.



Photo record showed that the Contractor implemented dust control measures such as wind-board installed on pelican barge. The Contractor was reminded to continue to provide such dust control measure.




- 2.7.7.8 Functional checking on HVS at AMS7 was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS3A. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.7.9 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS7 on 18 Jan 14, which are within the monitoring days of the 24-hr TSP, were $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.7.10 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS2 and AMS3A on the same monitoring date were $93\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $160\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively, which are below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.7.11 On the other hand, according to observation made at the monitoring station AMS7, there was no non-project potential cause/activity at the surrounding of monitoring station AMS7 which might potentially contribute to the dust action level exceedance.

Photo shows the conditions of the surrounding near the monitoring station AMS7:



2.7.7.12 The dust exceedance was therefore considered not to be due to the Project works.

- 2.7.8 For the 24Hr TSP limit Level exceedance recorded at AMS3A, a result of $374\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 24 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP).
- 2.7.8.1 According to information provided by the Contractor, land-based construction activities such as transloading band drain material, sand bags and tidy up and clearance of site area were being undertaken at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period.
- 2.7.8.2 Functional checking on HVS at AMS3A was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS3A. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.8.3 Photo records shows vehicle parking activities were observed inside an area at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA2. (Please also see photo and layout map attached for reference of site conditions (View A.))



View A (parking lot observed at nearby construction site which do not belongs to this Contract)



- 2.7.8.4 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 23 and 24 Jan 14 (as attached) Southeast winds was prevailing during the monitoring period. Traffic activities at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA 2 may contribute to the measured dust levels at the monitoring station AMS3A.
- 2.7.8.5 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on 24 Jan 14, which are within the monitoring period of the 24-hr TSP, were $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $82\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $81\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.8.6 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS2 and AMS7 (which are closer to the marine-based works areas) on the same monitoring date were $66\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $109\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which are below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.8.7 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on next monitoring date were $183\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which exceeded the Action Level (The dust exceedance were considered not to be due to the Project works after investigation).
- 2.7.8.8 The following dust mitigation measures have been implemented at Works Area WA2:
1. Works Area WA2's surface was hard-paved, compacted or hydro-seeded (Please refer to attached layout map and photo record (View B))
 2. Vehicle washing facility was provided at vehicle exit points,
 3. Measures for preventing fugitive dust emission are provided, e.g. canvas/tarpaulin covers.

View B (Hard paved surface observed at Works Area WA2)



- 2.7.8.9 The dust exceedance was therefore considered not to be due to the Project works.

- 2.7.9 For the 24Hr TSP Action Level exceedance recorded at AMS3A, a result of $183\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ was recorded on 28 Jan 14 (24-hr TSP). And the 24hr-TSP results received on 4 Feb 14.
- 2.7.9.1 According to information provided by the Contractor, land-based construction activity such removing batch/rolls of materials off site area was being undertaken at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period.
- 2.7.9.2 Functional checking on HVS at AMS3A was done. Air flow of the HVS was checked and the flow was steady during the 24-hr TSP sampling at AMS3A. The filter paper was re-weighted by the assigned HOKLAS laboratory and the result was reconfirmed.
- 2.7.9.3 Photo records shows vehicle parking activities were observed inside an area at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA2. (Please also see photo and layout map attached for reference of site conditions (View A.))

View A (parking lot observed at nearby construction site which do not belongs to this Contract)



- 2.7.9.4 As refer to the wind data collected at wind station at Works Area WA2 during the monitoring period on 28 and 29 Jan 14 (as attached) South-southeast winds was prevailing during the monitoring period. Traffic activities at construction sites of nearby private development project which are close to the monitoring station AMS3A but beyond the site boundary of Works Area WA 2 may contribute to the measured dust levels at the monitoring station AMS3A.
- 2.7.9.5 The 1-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on 29 Jan 14, which are within the monitoring period of the 1-hr TSP, were $83\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, $84\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $82\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively. All measured values are well below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.9.6 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS2 and AMS7 (which are closer to the marine-based works areas) on the same monitoring date were $106\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and $129\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which are below the Action and Limit Levels.
- 2.7.9.7 The measured 24-hr TSP values recorded at AMS3A on next monitoring date were $79\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, which did not exceed the Action or Limit Level.
- 2.7.9.8 The following dust mitigation measures have been implemented at Works Area WA2:
1. Works Area WA2's surface was hard-paved, compacted or hydro-seeded (Please refer to attached layout map and photo record (View B))
 2. Vehicle washing facility was provided at vehicle exit points,
 3. Measures for preventing fugitive dust emission are provided, e.g. canvas/tarpaulin covers.

View B (Hard paved surface observed at Works Area WA2)



2.7.9.9 The dust exceedance was therefore considered not to be due to the Project works.

2.7.10 The event action plan is annexed in Appendix L.

2.7.11 Meteorological information collected from the wind station during the monitoring periods on the monitoring dates, as shown in Figure 2, including wind speed and wind direction, is annexed in Appendix H.

3 NOISE MONITORING

3.1 Monitoring Requirements

3.1.1 In accordance with the Project Specific EM&A Manual, impact noise monitoring was conducted for at least once per week during the construction phase of the Project. The Action and Limit level of the noise monitoring is provided in Appendix D.

3.2 Monitoring Equipment

3.2.1 Noise monitoring was performed using sound level meter at each designated monitoring station. The sound level meters deployed comply with the International Electrotechnical Commission Publications (IEC) 651:1979 (Type 1) and 804:1985 (Type 1) specifications. Acoustic calibrator was deployed to check the sound level meters at a known sound pressure level. Brand and model of the equipment is given in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Noise Monitoring Equipment

Equipment	Brand and Model
Integrated Sound Level Meter	Rion NL-31 & B&K2238
Acoustic Calibrator	Rion NC-73

3.3 Monitoring Locations

3.3.1 Monitoring locations NMS2 was set up at the proposed locations in accordance with Project Specific EM&A Manual. However, for monitoring location NMS3 (Ho Yu College), as proposed in the Project Specific EM&A Manual, approval for carrying out impact monitoring could not be obtained from the principal of the school. Permission on setting up and carrying out impact monitoring works at nearby sensitive receivers, like Caribbean Coast and Coastal Skyline, was also sought. However, approvals for carrying out impact monitoring works within their premises were not obtained. Impact noise monitoring was conducted at site boundary of the site office area in Works Area WA2 (NMS3A) respectively. Same baseline noise level (as derived from the baseline monitoring data recorded at Ho Yu College) and Limit Level were adopted for this alternative noise monitoring location.

3.3.2 Figure 2 shows the locations of the monitoring stations. Table 3.2 describes the details of the monitoring stations.

Table 3.2 Locations of Impact Noise Monitoring Stations

Monitoring Station	Location	Description
NMS2	Seaview Crescent Tower 1	Free-field on the rooftop of the premise
NMS3A	Site Boundary of Site Office Area at Works Area WA2	Free-field on ground at the area boundary.

3.4 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration

3.4.1 Table 3.3 summarizes the monitoring parameters, frequency and duration of impact noise monitoring.

Table 3.3 Noise Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration

Parameter	Frequency and Duration
30-mins measurement at each monitoring station between 0700 and 1900 on normal weekdays (Monday to Saturday). L_{eq} , L_{10} and L_{90} would be recorded.	At least once per week

3.5 Monitoring Methodology

3.5.1 Monitoring Procedure

- (a) The sound level meter was set on a tripod at a height of 1.2 m above the ground for free-field measurements at NMS2. A correction of +3 dB(A) shall be made to the free field measurements.
- (b) All measurement at NMS3A were free field measurements in the reporting month at NMS3A. A correction of +3 dB(A) shall be made to the free field measurements.
- (c) The battery condition was checked to ensure the correct functioning of the meter.
- (d) Parameters such as frequency weighting, the time weighting and the measurement time were set as follows:-
 - (i) frequency weighting: A
 - (ii) time weighting: Fast
 - (iii) time measurement: $L_{eq(30\text{-minutes})}$ during non-restricted hours i.e. 07:00 – 1900 on normal weekdays.
- (e) Prior to and after each noise measurement, the meter was calibrated using the acoustic calibrator for 94dB(A) at 1000 Hz. If the difference in the calibration level before and after measurement was more than 1 dB(A), the measurement would be considered invalid and repeat of noise measurement would be required after re-calibration or repair of the equipment.
- (f) During the monitoring period, the L_{eq} , L_{10} and L_{90} were recorded. In addition, site conditions and noise sources were recorded on a standard record sheet.
- (g) Noise measurement was paused during periods of high intrusive noise (e.g. dog barking, helicopter noise) if possible. Observations were recorded when intrusive noise was unavoidable.
- (h) Noise monitoring was cancelled in the presence of fog, rain, wind with a steady speed exceeding 5m/s, or wind with gusts exceeding 10m/s. The wind speed shall be checked with a portable wind speed meter capable of measuring the wind speed in m/s.

3.5.2 Maintenance and Calibration

- (a) The microphone head of the sound level meter was cleaned with soft cloth at regular intervals.
- (b) The meter and calibrator were sent to the supplier or HOKLAS laboratory to check and calibrate at yearly intervals.
- (c) Calibration certificates of the sound level meters and acoustic calibrators are provided in Appendix E.

3.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month

3.6.1 The schedule for construction noise monitoring in January 2014 is provided in Appendix F.

3.7 Monitoring Results

3.7.1 The monitoring results for construction noise are summarized in Table 3.4 and the monitoring data is provided in Appendix I.

Table 3.4 Summary of Construction Noise Monitoring Results in the Reporting Period

	Average, dB(A), L_{eq} (30 mins)	Range, dB(A), L_{eq} (30 mins)	Limit Level, dB(A), L_{eq} (30 mins)
NMS2	67	65 – 67*	75
NMS3A	64	61 – 67*	70^

*+3dB(A) Façade correction included

^ Daytime noise Limit Level of 70 dB(A) applies to education institutions, while 65dB(A) applies during school examination period.

3.7.2 No Action or Limit Level Exceedance of construction noise was recorded in the reporting month.

3.7.3 Major noise sources during the noise monitoring included construction activities of the Project, construction activities by other contracts and nearby traffic noise.

3.7.4 The event action plan is annexed in Appendix L.

4 WATER QUALITY MONITORING

4.1 Monitoring Requirements

4.1.1 Impact water quality monitoring was carried out to ensure that any deterioration of water quality was detected, and that timely action was taken to rectify the situation. For impact water quality monitoring, measurements were taken in accordance with the Project Specific EM&A Manual. Appendix D shows the established Action/Limit Levels for the environmental monitoring works.

4.2 Monitoring Equipment

4.2.1 Table 4.1 summarises the equipment used in the impact water quality monitoring programme.

Table 4.1 Water Quality Monitoring Equipment

Equipment	Brand and Model
Dissolved Oxygen (DO) and Temperature Meter, Salinity Meter and Turbidimeter	YSI Model 6820
pH Meter	YSI Model 6820 or Thermo Orion 230A+
Positioning Equipment	JRC DGPS 224 Model JLR-4341 with J-NAV 500 Model NWZ4551
Water Depth Detector	Eagle Cuda-168
Water Sampler	Kahlsio Water Sampler (Vertical) 2.2 L with messenger

4.3 Monitoring Parameters, Frequency and Duration

4.3.1 Table 4.2 summarises the monitoring parameters, frequency and monitoring depths of impact water quality monitoring as required in the Project Specific EM&A Manual.

Table 4.2 Impact Water Quality Monitoring Parameters and Frequency

Monitoring Stations	Parameter, unit	Frequency	No. of depth
<p><i>Impact Stations:</i> IS5, IS(Mf)6, IS7, IS8, IS(Mf)9, IS10, IS(Mf)11, IS(Mf)16, IS17</p> <p><i>Control/Far Field Stations:</i> CS(Mf)3, CS(Mf)5, CS4, CS6, CSA</p> <p><i>Sensitive Receiver Stations:</i> SR3-SR7, SR10A&SR10B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depth, m • Temperature, °C • Salinity, ppt • Dissolved Oxygen (DO), mg/L • DO Saturation, % • Turbidity, NTU • pH • Suspended Solids (SS), mg/L 	<p>Three times per week during mid-ebb and mid-flood tides (within ± 1.75 hour of the predicted time)</p>	<p>3 (1 m below water surface, mid-depth and 1 m above sea bed, except where the water depth is less than 6 m, in which case the mid-depth station may be omitted. Should the water depth be less than 3 m, only the mid-depth station will be monitored).</p>

4.4 Monitoring Locations

4.4.1 In accordance with the Project Specific EM&A Manual, twenty-one stations (9 Impact Stations, 7 Sensitive Receiver Stations and 5 Control/Far Field Stations) were designated for impact water quality

monitoring. The nine Impact Stations (IS) were chosen on the basis of their proximity to the reclamation and thus the greatest potential for water quality impacts, the seven Sensitive Receiver Stations (SR) were chosen as they are close to the key sensitive receives and the five Control/ Far Field Stations (CS) were chosen to facilitate comparison of the water quality of the IS stations with less influence by the Project/ ambient water quality conditions.

- 4.4.2 Due to safety concern and topographical condition of the original locations of SR4 and SR10B, alternative impact water quality monitoring stations, naming as SR4 (N) and SR10B (N), were adopted, which are situated in vicinity of the original impact water quality monitoring stations (SR4 and SR10B) and could be reachable.
- 4.4.3 Same baseline and Action Level for water quality, as derived from the baseline monitoring data recorded, were adopted for these alternative impact water quality monitoring stations.
- 4.4.4 The locations of these monitoring stations are summarized in Table 4.3 and depicted in Figure 3.

Table 4.3 Impact Water Quality Monitoring Stations

Station	Description	East	North
IS5	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	811579	817106
IS(Mf)6	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	812101	817873
IS7	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	812244	818777
IS8	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	814251	818412
IS(Mf)9	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	813273	818850
IS10	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	812577	820670
IS(Mf)11	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	813562	820716
IS(Mf)16	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	814328	819497
IS17	Impact Station (Close to HKBCF construction site)	814539	820391
SR3	Sensitive receivers (San Tau SSSI)	810525	816456
SR4(N)	Sensitive receivers (Tai Ho)	814705	817859
SR5	Sensitive receivers (Artificial Reef in NE Airport)	811489	820455
SR6	Sensitive receivers (Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park)	805837	821818
SR7	Sensitive receivers (Tai Mo Do)	814293	821431
SR10A	Sensitive receivers (Ma Wan FCZ)1	823741	823495
SR10B(N)	Sensitive receivers (Ma Wan FCZ)2	823683	823187
CS(Mf)3	Control Station	809989	821117
CS(Mf)5	Control Station	817990	821129
CS4	Control Station	810025	824004
CS6	Control Station	817028	823992
CSA	Control Station	818103	823064

4.5 Monitoring Methodology

4.5.1 Instrumentation

- (a) The in-situ water quality parameters, viz. dissolved oxygen, temperature, salinity, turbidity and pH, were measured by multi-parameter meters (i.e. Model YSI 6820 CE-C-M-Y) and pH meter (i.e. Thermo Orion 230A+) respectively.

4.5.2 Operating/Analytical Procedures

- (a) Digital Differential Global Positioning Systems (DGPS) were used to ensure that the correct location was selected prior to sample collection.
- (b) Portable, battery-operated echo sounders were used for the determination of water depth at each designated monitoring station.
- (c) All in-situ measurements were taken at 3 water depths, 1 m below water surface, mid-depth and 1 m above sea bed, except where the water depth was less than 6 m, in which case the mid-depth station was omitted. Should the water depth be less than 3 m, only the mid-depth station was monitored.
- (d) At each measurement/sampling depth, two consecutive in-situ monitoring (DO concentration and saturation, temperature, turbidity, pH, salinity) and water sample for SS. The probes were retrieved out of the water after the first measurement and then re-deployed for the second measurement. Where the difference in the value between the first and second readings of DO or turbidity parameters was more than 25% of the value of the first reading, the reading was discarded and further readings were taken.
- (e) Duplicate samples from each independent sampling event were collected for SS measurement. Water samples were collected using the water samplers and the samples were stored in high-density polythene bottles. Water samples collected were well-mixed in the water sampler prior to pre-rinsing and transferring to sample bottles. Sample bottles were pre-rinsed with the same water samples. The sample bottles were then be packed in cool-boxes (cooled at 4°C without being frozen), and delivered to ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. for the analysis of suspended solids concentrations. The laboratory determination work would be started within 24 hours after collection of the water samples. ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. is a HOKLAS accredited laboratory and has comprehensive quality assurance and quality control programmes. For QA/QC procedures, one duplicate samples of every batch of 20 samples was analyzed.
- (f) The analysis method and reporting and detection limit for SS is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Laboratory Analysis for Suspended Solids

Parameters	Instrumentation	Analytical Method	Reporting Limit	Detection Limit
Suspended Solid (SS)	Weighting	APHA 2540-D	0.5mg/L	0.5mg/L

- (g) Other relevant data were recorded, including monitoring location / position, time, water depth, tidal stages, weather conditions and any special phenomena or work underway at the construction site in the field log sheet for information.

4.5.3 Maintenance and Calibration

- (a) All in situ monitoring instruments would be calibrated and calibrated by ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. before use and at 3-monthly intervals throughout all stages of the water quality monitoring programme. Calibration details are provided in Appendix E.
- (b) The dissolved oxygen probe of YSI 6820 was calibrated by wet bulb method. Before the calibration routine, the sensor for dissolved oxygen was thermally equilibrated in water-saturated air. Calibration cup is served as a calibration chamber and it was loosened from airtight condition before it is used for the calibration. Calibration at ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. was carried out once every three months in a water sample with a known concentration of dissolved oxygen. The sensor was immersed in the water and after thermal equilibration, the known mg/L value was keyed in and the calibration was carried out automatically.
- (c) The turbidity probe of YSI 6820 is calibrated two times a month. A zero check in distilled water was performed with the turbidity probe of YSI 6820 once per monitoring day. The probe will be calibrated with a solution of known NTU at ALS Technichem (HK) Pty Ltd. once every three months.

4.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month

- 4.6.1 The schedule for impact water quality monitoring in January 2014 is provided in Appendix F.
- 4.6.2 As informed by the Contractor, marine works was conducted at HKBCF on 1 Feb 14, the impact water quality monitoring work scheduled on 31 Jan 14 at mid Flood tide 08:04 and Mid-ebb 13:36 was rescheduled to 1 Feb 14 mid Flood tide 08:43 and Mid-ebb tide 14:19. The monitoring results recorded on 1 Feb 14 will be reported in the EM&A report for Feb 14.

4.7 Results and Observations


- 4.7.1 Impact water quality monitoring was conducted at all designated monitoring stations in the reporting month. Except Impact water quality monitoring at sampling location IS(Mf)9. Sampling location IS(Mf)9 was found enclosed by silt curtain during the reporting month. Samples were taken about 140 meters away from IS(Mf)9. The sampling location's coordination (East 813226, North 818708) was recorded. The Contractor was advised to take corrective actions to the temporary arrangement of the perimeter silt curtain as soon as possible.
- 4.7.2 Impact water quality monitoring results and graphical presentations are provided in Appendix J.
- 4.7.3 Six (6) Action Level exceedances and one (1) Limit Level Exceedances were recorded at measured suspended solids (SS) values (in mg/L) in the reporting month. The number of exceedances recorded in the reporting month at each impact station is summarized in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Summary of Water Quality Exceedances

Station	Exceedance Level	DO (S&M)		DO (Bottom)		Turbidity		SS		Total	
		Ebb	Flood	Ebb	Flood	Ebb	Flood	Ebb	Flood	Ebb	Flood
IS5	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1) 10Jan14	0	1
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS(Mf)6	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS7	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS8	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1) 06Jan14	0	1
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS(Mf)9	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2) 03Jan14, 15 Jan 14	0	2
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1) 17 Jan 14	0	1
IS10	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS(Mf)11	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS(Mf)16	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IS17	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR3	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1) 10Jan14	0	1
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR4(N)	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR5	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR6	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1) 03Jan14	0	1
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR7	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR10A	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR10B (N)	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	
	Limit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	

Note: S: Surface; and
M: Mid-depth.

4.7.4 One (1) Action Level exceedance at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L) was recorded on 03 Jan 2014 at monitoring station SR6 at Mid-flood tide. For Action Level exceedances at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L), 23.9 mg/L was recorded at Monitoring Station SR6.



4.7.4.1 For locations and type of active works carried out on 03 Jan 14, please refer to the above layout map.

4.7.4.2 When impact water quality monitoring was carried out during mid flood tide at monitoring location IS10, SR5 and SR6 on 3 Jan 14, no silty plume were observed to flow from the inside of the northwestern part of the perimeter silt curtain.

4.7.4.3 IS10, SR5 (located outside northwest part of the perimeter silt curtain) and IS(Mf)11 (located outside north part of the perimeter silt curtain) which are closer to the active works than monitoring station SR6. Depth Averaged Suspended Solids (SS) values (in mg/L) recorded during the flood tide on the same day at IS10, SR5 and IS(Mf)11 were below the Action and Limit Level which shows that the water quality closer to active works was not adversely affected.




4.7.4.4 Turbidity level (NTU) results recorded on 03 Jan 14 at SR6, SR5, IS10 and IS(Mf)11 during flood tide are 20.8 NTU, 18.6 NTU, 17.8 NTU and 17.3 NTU which are below the Action and Limit Level, this indicates turbidity level of the area nearby was not adversely affected.

4.7.4.5 The exceedance was likely due to local effects in the vicinity of SR6.

4.7.5 Two (2) action level exceedances at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L) were recorded on 06 Jan 2014 at monitoring station IS(Mf)9 and at monitoring station IS8 at Mid-flood tide. For Action Level exceedance at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L), 24.4mg/L were recorded at Monitoring Station IS(Mf)9 and 25.4mg/L were recorded at Monitoring Station IS8.

4.7.5.1 For works activities carried out on 06 Jan 14, please refer to the attached layout map.



4.7.5.2 The Depth averaged turbidity (in NTU) and depth averaged SS (in mg/L) of nearby monitoring station, such as IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were below the action and limit level, indicating the water quality at area nearby IS(Mf)9 and IS8 was not adversely affected.


4.7.5.3 The turbidity level (in NTU) at IS(Mf)9, IS8, IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were below the action and limit level and no silt plume was observed when monitoring was conducted IS(Mf)9 and IS8, this indicates that the turbidity level (in NTU) at IS(Mf)9, IS8, IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were not adversely affected.



- 4.7.5.4 Also, with refer to the silt curtain condition on 06 Jan 14, no defects of the perimeter silt curtain was observed at south and southeast of the construction site.
- 4.7.5.5 The exceedances were likely due to local effects in the vicinity of IS(Mf)9 and IS8.
- 4.7.5.6 As such, the exceedances recorded at IS(Mf)9 and IS8 are considered non-project related.
- 4.7.5.7 The Contractor was reminded to ensure provision of ongoing maintenance to the silt curtains and to carry out maintenance work once defects were found.
- 4.7.5.8 Maintenance work of the silt curtain was carried out by the Contractor on a daily basis except Sunday and public holiday.

4.7.6 Two (2) action level exceedances at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L) were recorded on 10 Jan 2014 at monitoring station IS5 and at monitoring station SR3 at Mid-flood tide. For Action Level exceedances at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L), 25.1 mg/L was recorded at Monitoring Station IS5 and 24.8 mg/L was recorded at Monitoring Station SR3.

4.7.6.1 For site activities carried out on 10 Jan 14, please refer to the below layout map.



4.7.6.2 Suspended solids values recorded at Impact Station IS(Mf) 6, IS(Mf)9 and IS7 located downstream and closer to active work than SR3 and IS5 were below the Action and Limit Level during the same tide on the same day. As such, active works is unlikely to cause exceedance to IS5 and SR3.

4.7.6.3 Same type of works was carried out at the same locations on 8, 10 and 13 Jan 14 but Suspended Solids values recorded at SR3 and IS5 on 8 and 13 Jan 14 are all below the Action and Limit Level during the same tide on the these days. As such, active works conducted on 10 Jan 14 is unlikely to cause exceedance to IS5 and SR3.


4.7.6.4 Turbidity level recorded at IS7, IS(Mf)6 and IS(Mf)9 were below the action and limit level. This indicated that area closer to active works was not adversely affected.

4.7.6.5 The exceedances were likely due to local effects in the vicinity of IS5 and SR3.

4.7.6.6 The Contractor was reminded to ensure provision of ongoing maintenance to the silt curtains and to carry out maintenance work once defects were found.

4.7.6.7 Maintenance work of the silt curtain was carried out by the Contractor on a daily basis except Sunday and public holiday.

4.7.7 One (1) Action Level exceedance at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L) was recorded on 15 Jan 2014 at monitoring station IS(Mf)9 at Mid-flood tide. For action exceedance at measured Suspended Solids (mg/L), 26.6 mg/L was recorded at Monitoring Station IS(Mf)9.



4.7.7.1 The Depth averaged turbidity (in NTU) and depth averaged SS (in mg/L) of nearby monitoring station, such as IS8, IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were below the action and limit level, indicating the water quality at area nearby IS(Mf)9 was not adversely affected.

4.7.7.2 Since the turbidity level (in NTU) at IS(Mf)9, IS8, IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were below the action and limit level and no silt plume was observed when monitoring was conducted at IS(Mf)9, this indicates that the turbidity level (in NTU) at IS(Mf)9, IS8, IS7 and IS(Mf)16 were not adversely affected. Please refer to the photo record attached for sea condition recorded on 15 Jan 14 at southeast vessel entrance of the perimeter silt curtain (near monitoring station IS(Mf)9).



- 4.7.7.3 Also, with refer to the silt curtain condition on 15 Jan 14, no defects of the perimeter silt curtain was observed at south and southeast of the construction site.
- 4.7.7.4 The exceedance was likely due to local effects in the vicinity of IS(Mf)9.
- 4.7.7.5 As such, the action level exceedance recorded at IS(Mf)9 is considered non-project related.
- 4.7.7.6 The Contractor was reminded to ensure provision of ongoing maintenance to the silt curtains and to carry out maintenance work once defects were found.
- 4.7.7.7 The Contractor was reminded that, with reference to EM&A manual Clause 9.1.1, the vessel access opening of the perimeter silt curtain would be formed by two piece of silt-curtain with overlapping length of 150 minimum and a separation distance of about 50m.

- 4.7.8.3 Also, with refer to the silt curtain condition on 17 Jan 14, no defects of the perimeter silt curtain was observed at south and southeast of the construction site.
- 4.7.8.4 The exceedance was likely due to local effects in the vicinity of IS(Mf)9.
- 4.7.8.5 As such, the limit level exceedance recorded at IS(Mf)9 is considered non-project related.
- 4.7.8.6 The Contractor was reminded to ensure provision of ongoing maintenance to the silt curtains and to carry out maintenance work once defects were found.
- 4.7.8.7 Maintenance work of the silt curtain was carried out by the Contractor on a daily basis except Sunday and public holiday.
- 4.7.9 The event action plan is annexed in Appendix L.

5 DOLPHIN MONITORING

5.1 Monitoring Requirements

- 5.1.1 Vessel based surveys for the Chinese White Dolphin (CWD), *Sousa chinensis*, are to be conducted by a dedicated team comprising a qualified marine mammal ecologist and experienced marine mammal observers (MMOs). The purpose of the surveys are to evaluate the impact of the HKCBF reclamation and, if deemed detrimental, to take appropriate action as per the EM&A manual.
- 5.1.2 This 'Impact Monitoring' follows several months of 'Baseline Monitoring' so similar survey methodologies have been adopted to facilitate comparisons between datasets. Further, the data collected are compatible with, and are available for, incorporation into the data set managed by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) as part of Hong Kong's long term Marine Mammal Monitoring Programme.

5.2 Monitoring Equipment

- 5.2.1 Table 5.1 summarises the equipment used for the impact dolphin monitoring.

Table 5.1 Dolphin Monitoring Equipment

Equipment	Model
Commercially licensed motor vessel	15m in length with a 4.5m viewing platform
Global Positioning System (GPS) x2	Integrated into T7000 Garmin GPS Map 78C
Computers (T7000 Tablet, Intel Atom)	Windows 7/MSO 13 Logger
Camera	Nikon D90 300m 2.8D fixed focus Nikon D90 20-400m zoom lens
Laser Rangefinder	Infinitor LRF1000/ Kings 950
Marine Binocular x3	Nexus 7 x 50 marine binocular with compass and reticules Fujinon 7 x 50 marine binocular with compass and reticules

5.3 Monitoring Frequency and Conditions

- 5.3.1 Dolphin monitoring is conducted twice per month in each survey area.
- 5.3.2 Dolphin monitoring is conducted only when visibility is good (e.g., over 1km) and the sea condition is at a Beaufort Sea State of 4 or better.
- 5.3.3 When thunder storm, black rain or typhoon warnings are in force, all survey effort is stopped.

5.4 Monitoring Methodology and Location

- 5.4.1 The impact dolphin monitoring is vessel-based and combines line-transect and photo-ID methodology. The survey follows pre-set and fixed transect lines in the two areas defined by AFCD as:
- 5.4.2 Northeast Lantau survey area; and
- 5.4.3 Northwest Lantau survey area.
- 5.4.4 The co-ordinates for the transect lines and layout map have been provided by AFCD and are shown in Table 5.2 and Figure 4.

Table 5.2 Impact Dolphin Monitoring Line Transect Co-ordinates (Provided by AFCD)

ID	HK Grid System		Long Lat in WGS84	
	X	Y	Long	Lat
1	804671	814577	113.870308	22.269741
1	804671	831404	113.869975	22.421696
2	805475	815457	113.878087	22.277704
2	805477	826654	113.877896	22.378814
3	806464	819435	113.887615	22.313643
3	806464	822911	113.887550	22.345030
4	807518	819771	113.897833	22.316697
4	807518	829230	113.897663	22.402113
5	808504	820220	113.907397	22.320761
5	808504	828602	113.907252	22.396462
6	809490	820466	113.916965	22.323003
6	809490	825352	113.916884	22.367128
7	810499	820690	113.926752	22.325043
7	810499	824613	113.926688	22.360464
8	811508	820847	113.936539	22.326475
8	811508	824254	113.936486	22.357241
9	812516	820892	113.946329	22.326894
9	812516	824254	113.946279	22.357255
10*	813525	818270	113.956156	22.303225
10*	813525	824657	113.956065	22.360912
11	814556	818449	113.966160	22.304858
11	814556	820992	113.966125	22.327820
12	815542	818807	113.975726	22.308109
12	815542	824882	113.975647	22.362962
13	816506	819480	113.985072	22.314192
13	816506	824859	113.985005	22.362771
14	817537	820220	113.995070	22.320883
14	817537	824613	113.995018	22.360556
15	818568	820735	114.005071	22.325550
15	818568	824433	114.005030	22.358947
16	819532	821420	114.014420	22.331747
16	819532	824209	114.014390	22.356933
17	820451	822125	114.023333	22.338117
17	820451	823671	114.023317	22.352084
18	821504	822371	114.033556	22.340353
18	821504	823761	114.033544	22.352903
19	822513	823268	114.043340	22.348458
19	822513	824321	114.043331	22.357971
20	823477	823402	114.052695	22.349680
20	823477	824613	114.052686	22.360610
21	805476	827081	113.877878	22.382668
21	805476	830562	113.877811	22.414103
22	806464	824033	113.887520	22.355164
22	806464	829598	113.887416	22.405423
23	814559	821739	113.966142	22.334574
23	814559	824768	113.966101	22.361920

*Remark: Due to the presence of deployed silt curtain systems at the site boundaries of the Project, some of the transect lines shown in Figure 5 could not be fully surveyed during the regular survey. Transect 10 is reduced from 6.4km to approximately 3.6km in length due to the HKBCF construction site. Therefore the total transect length for both NEL and NWL combined is reduced to approximately 111km.

5.5 Monitoring Procedures

- 5.5.1 The study area incorporates 23 transects which are to be surveyed twice per month. Each survey day lasts approximately 9 hours.
- 5.5.2 The survey vessel departs from Tung Chung Development Pier, Tsing Yi Public Pier or the nearest safe and convenient pier.
- 5.5.3 When the vessel reaches the start of a transect line, “on effort” survey begins. Areas between transect lines and traveling to and from the study area are defined as “off effort”.
- 5.5.4 The transect line is surveyed at a speed of 6-8 knots (11-14 km/hr). For the sake of safety, the speed was sometimes a bit slower to avoid collision with other vessels. During some periods, tide and current flow in the survey areas exceeds 7 knots which can affect survey speed. There are a minimum of four marine mammal observers (MMOs) present on each survey, rotating through four positions, observers (2), data recorder (1) and ‘rest’ (1). Rotations occur every 30 minutes or at the end of dolphin encounters. The data recorder records effort, weather and sightings data directly onto the programme Logger and is not part of the observer team. The observers search with naked eye and binoculars between 90° and 270° abeam (bow being 0°).
- 5.5.5 When a group of dolphins is sighted, position, bearing and distance data are recorded immediately onto the computer and, after a short observation, an estimate made of group size. These parameters are linked to the time-GPS-ships data which are automatically stored in the programme Logger throughout the survey period. In this manner, information on heading, position, speed, weather, effort and sightings are stored in a format suitable for use with DISTANCE software for subsequent line transect analyses.
- 5.5.6 Once the vessel leaves the transect line, it is deemed to be “off effort”. The dolphins are approached with the purpose of taking high resolution pictures for proper photo-identification of individual CWD. Attempts to photograph all dolphins in the group are made. Both the left and right hand sides of the dorsal fin area of each dolphin in the group are photographed, if possible. On finishing photographing, the vessel will return to the transect line at the point of departure and “on effort” survey is resumed.
- 5.5.7 Sightings which are made while on the transect line are referred to as “on effort sightings”, while not on the actual transect line are referred to as an “opportunistic sightings” (e.g. another group of dolphins is sighted while travelling back to the transect line). Only “on effort sightings” can be used in analyses which require effort or rate quantification, e.g., encounter rate per 100km searched. This is also how “on effort sightings” are treated in the baseline report. “Opportunistic sightings” provide additional information on individual habitat use and population distribution and they are noted accordingly.
- 5.5.8 As time and GPS data are automatically logged throughout the survey and are linked to sightings data input, start and end times of encounters and deviation from the transect lines are recorded and can be subsequently reviewed.

5.6 Monitoring Schedule for the Reporting Month

- 5.6.1 The schedule for dolphin monitoring in January 2014 is provided in Appendix F.

5.7 Results and Observations

- 5.7.1 Dolphin surveys were conducted on 6, 7, 9 and 10 January 2014. In summary, a total of 220.3km of survey was conducted. All 100% of “on effort” survey was conducted under favourable conditions (Beaufort Sea State 3 or better). The details are shown below:-

5.7.2 The effort summary and sightings data are shown in Tables 5.3 and 5.4, respectively. The survey efforts conducted in January 2014 are plotted in Figure 5a-c. For Table 5.3, only on-effort information is included. Transects conducted in all Beaufort Sea State are included. Compared to previous monthly reports, the whole number Beaufort Sea State scale is used so as to ease comparison with other dolphin monitoring reports.

Table 5.3 Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Effort Summary, Effort by Area and Beaufort Sea State

Survey	Date	Area	Beaufort	Effort (km)	Total Distance Travelled (km)
1	1/6/2014	NWL	2	27.6	51.5
	1/6/2014	NWL	3	23.9	
	1/7/2014	NWL	2	10.6	59.6
	1/7/2014	NWL	3	12.5	
	1/7/2014	NEL	1	1.7	
	1/7/2014	NEL	2	33.1	
	1/7/2014	NEL	3	1.7	
2	1/9/2014	NEL	1	20	59.2
	1/9/2014	NEL	2	15.5	50.0
	1/9/2014	NWL	2	23.7	
	1/10/2014	NWL	2	40.6	
	1/10/2014	NWL	3	9.4	
TOTAL in January 2014					220.3

*Remark: Surveys conduct under Beaufort Sea State 3 or below are considered as under favourable condition.

Table 5.4 Impact Dolphin Monitoring Survey Details in January 2014

Date	Location	No. Sightings "on effort"	No. Sightings "opportunistic"
06/01/14	NW L	5	1
	NEL	0	0
07/01/14	NW L	0	0
	NEL	0	0
09/01/14	NW L	1	0
	NEL	1	0
10/01/14	NW L	2	0
	NEL	0	0
TOTAL in January 2014		9	1

Table 5.5 The Encounter Rate of Number of Dolphin Sightings & Total Number of Dolphins per Area[^]

Encounter Rate of Number of Dolphin Sightings (STG)[*]						
Date	NEL Track	NWL Track	NEL Sightings	NWL Sightings	NEL Encounter Rate	NWL Encounter Rate
6 & 7/01/2014	34.8 km	74.6 km	0	5	0.0	6.7
9 & 10/01/2014	35.5km	73.7 km	1	3	2.8	4.1
Encounter Rate of Total Number of Dolphins (ANI)^{**}						
Date	NEL Track	NWL Track	NEL Dolphins	NWL Dolphins	NEL Encounter Rate	NWL Encounter Rate
6 & 7/01/2014	34.8 km	74.6 km	0	26	0.0	34.9
9 & 10/01/2014	35.5km	73.7 km	1	7	2.8	9.5

* Encounter Rate of Number of Dolphin Sightings (STG) presents encounter rates in terms of groups per 100km.

** Encounter Rate of Total Number of Dolphins (ANI) presents encounter rates in terms of individuals per 100km. And the encounter rate is not corrected for individuals, calculation may represent double counting.

[^]The table is made only for reference to the quarterly STG & ANI, which were adopted for the Event & Action Plan.

- 5.7.3 A total of ten dolphin sightings were recorded during the two surveys, six on 6 January 2014; two were made on 9 and 10 January 2014. No sightings were recorded on the 7 January 2014. Of the ten sightings, nine were “on effort” (which are all under favourable condition) and one was “opportunistic”. A total of thirty six individuals were sighted from the two impact dolphin surveys in the reporting period. Sighting details are summarised and plotted in Appendix K and Figure 5c, respectively.
- 5.7.4 Behaviour: Of the ten sightings made, three sightings were recorded as ‘multiple’ behavior (one of which was feeding and travelling and the other two sightings were feeding and “surface active”); three sightings were recorded as feeding; one in association with a small purse seiner/trawler; three was recorded as travelling and one sighting was recorded as “unknown”. Both of the “milling” groups contained calves and close approaches were not made. The locations of sighting with different behaviour are mapped in Figure 5d.
- 5.7.5 Photo ID analyses for December 2013 is presented in Appendix K.
- 5.7.6 Noteworthy Observation: Three mother and calf pairs were observed during three separate encounters. One mother was identified as HZMB 050 with a large calf (sighting 888 and sighting 900). HZMB 050 was first seen with a new born calf in September 2012. The large size of the calf photographed with her this month is consistent with an individual that is more than a year old. The second calf sighted was not closely approached and its mother was not able to be identified (sighting 900). The location of sightings and images available are provided in Figure 5e.
- 5.7.7 The southern parts of lines 1 and 2 are being affected by other projects and the end of those lines could not be completed on all surveys. Eleven dredging barges were active across the north of lines 1, 2, 20, 21 and 4 on one survey day and sections of those lines could not be completed. The northern section of line 11 was diverted slightly at the HKBCF Project. Thus there were 1.9km of trackline that could not be conducted in January; “transect traveled” + “transect missed” = “Total transect length” (220.3 km + 1.9 km = 222.2km).
- 5.7.7.1 Route travelled shifted slightly to the east at the northern end of transect line 11 due works at HKBCF in Jan 2014. Survey will be taken as close to transect 11 as possible.
- 5.7.7.2 According to the review provided by the dolphin specialist which are mentioned in the attached revised investigation, the shift in the transect line is insignificant and will not affect the overall dolphin survey,

analysis or dolphin behaviour. For investigation on shifted dolphin transect lines by temporary silt curtain, please refer to Appendix K.

5.7.8 The event action plan is annexed in Appendix L.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE INSPECTION AND AUDIT

6.1 Site Inspection

6.1.1 Site Inspections were carried out on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of proper environmental pollution control and mitigation measures for the Project. In the reporting month, 5 site inspections were carried out on 2, 9, 16, 22 and 29 January 2014.

6.1.2 Particular observations during the site inspections are described below:

Air Quality

6.1.3 Dry sand surface was observed on works area of Portion A. The Contractor was reminded to provide sufficient dust control measures. The Contractor provided dust control measures. The Contractor was reminded to continued to provide dust control measures on works area of Portion A. (Reminder)

Noise

6.1.4 Insufficient acoustically decoupling measure was observed from a generator and two water pumps on barge FTB19, two generators on SHB 210 and 2 generators on FTB 21. The Contractor was advised to provide sufficient acoustic decoupling measure(s) such as acoustic mat to noisy equipments. The Contractor was reminded that insufficient/inadequate mitigation measures must be swiftly rectified. Contractor provided acoustic decoupling measures to generators on Barge FTB19 and FTB210. (Closed)

Water Quality

6.1.5 Turbid water was observed at the southwestern silt curtain entrance area. Refer to the photo taken and site observations, sources of impact likely due to the turbine activities and/or movement of vessel at shallow water (at near the entrance at southwestern of the Construction site and/or when vessel's propeller was turn on at shallow water). The dispersion of turbid water from the inside of the perimeter silt curtain to the outside of the perimeter silt curtain is potentially due to defects of perimeter silt curtain at certain sections and/or insufficient overlapping at entrance/exit of the perimeter silt curtain. The Contractor was advised to regularly evaluate the integrity of the perimeter silt curtain by reviewing the results obtained from daily checking or/and monthly diver inspections specified by the Silt Curtain Deployment Plan. The Contractor was advised to provide sufficient mitigation measures and swiftly carry out maintenance once defects of the perimeter silt curtain are found during the above mentioned daily checking and/or monthly diver inspection. (Reminder)

6.1.6 During site inspection audit, sandfilling seem to be conducted at one end of the temporary rock bund. The Contractor was reminded to conduct sandfilling behind at least 200m leading temporary rock bund/seawall. (Reminder)

6.1.7 Disconnected silt curtain was observed at the western side of the silt curtain. The Contractor was advised to provide sufficient mitigation measures and swiftly carry out maintenance once defects of the perimeter silt curtain are found during the daily checking and/or monthly diver inspection. With referred to the silt curtain checking record of 4 January 13, the disconnected silt curtain was rectified. (Closed)

6.1.8 Water and hole was observed accumulated inside the drip tray. The Contractor was reminded to regularly clear the water accumulated in inside the drip tray. The Contractor cleared the water accumulated inside the drip tray. (Closed)

6.1.9 Generators were observed not properly decoupled. The Contractor was reminded to provide mitigation measures such as to properly decouple generators. The Contractor properly decoupled the generators on barge SHB209. (Closed)

6.1.10 Localised silt curtain was not observed when stone column installation. The Contractor was reminded to provide mitigation measures such as localized silt curtain to active stone column installation points. (Pending to Contractor's rectification)

Chemical and Waste Management

- 6.1.11 Movable lighting machineries were observed to be placed on bare ground of Portion D without the provision of drip trays. Drip trays were observed to be provided to movable lighting machineries at temporary rock bund and at works area at portion A. The contractor was advised to continue to provide drip tray or equivalent measures to retain potential oil leakage to movable lighting machineries. An ineffective leakage preventive measure for movable lighting machineries at Portion D was pending for Contractor's rectification. The contractor provided drip tray to retain potential oil leakage to movable lighting machineries at Portion D, (Closed)
- 6.1.12 General refuse was scattered on sea water and along the shore near Portion D and on temporary rock bund and works area at Portion A. The Contractor was reminded to clear the refuse in timely manner and keep site clean and tidy. The Contractor cleared the refuse scattered on sea water and along the shore near Portion D and works area at Portion A. (Closed)
- 6.1.13 Rubbish bin was observed without being covered; the Contractor was reminded to properly store general waste and covers all rubbish bins. The Contractor covered the rubbish bin and the Contractor reminded to provide sufficient waste storage on site. (Reminder)
- 6.1.14 Defect was observed within a bunding and waste oil water mixture was observed on the barge surface. The Contractor was reminded to rectify the defects observed and cleared the oil waste using chemical absorbent material and dispose the chemical absorbent material as chemical waste. The Contractor rectified the defects observed and cleared the oil waste using chemical absorbent material and dispose the chemical absorbent material as chemical waste. (Closed)
- 6.1.15 Oil stain was observed on temporary rock bund, The Contractor was reminded to clear the oil stain on temporary rock bund. The oil stain was cleared by the Contractor (Closed)
- 6.1.16 Generator was observed not entirely contained enclosed by drip tray or bunding. The Contractor was reminded to provide effective mitigation measures such that generator should be totally enclosed by bunding or trip tray to effectively prevent potential oil leakage/runoff. The Contractor provided effective mitigation measures such that generator should be totally enclosed by bunding or trip tray to effectively prevent potential oil leakage/runoff. (Closed)
- 6.1.17 Litter and general refuse was observed on sea and land at works area of Portion D. The Contractor was reminded to regularly clear the litter and general refuse at this area. The Contractor cleared the general refuse observed on land at area near Portion D. The Contractor was advised to clear the rubbish observed on sea area at near works area of Portion D. (Closed)
- 6.1.18 Oil drum were observed without drip tray. The Contractor was reminded to provide drip tray to all oil drum to contain potential oil leakage. The Contractor provided drip tray to oil drums as a mitigation measures to contain potential oil leakage. (Closed)
- 6.1.19 Construction waste such as band drain was observed along the northern edge of works area at Portion A and on edge of temporary rock bund. The Contractor was advice to properly store and dispose construction waste such as band drain. The Contractor properly store and dispose construction waste such as band drain at works area at Portion A. (Closed) The Contractor was advised to properly stored and dispose Construction waste such as band drain observed at the edge of the temporary rock bund. (Pending to Contractor's rectification)

Landscape and Visual Impact

- 6.1.20 No relevant works was carried out in the reporting month.

Others

- 6.1.21 Rectifications of remaining identified items are undergoing by the Contractor. Follow-up inspections on the status on provision of mitigation measures will be conducted to ensure all identified items are mitigated properly.

6.2 Advice on the Solid and Liquid Waste Management Status

- 6.2.1 The Contractor had registered as a chemical waste producer for this Project. Receptacles were available for general refuse collection and sorting.
- 6.2.2 As advised by the Contractor, 1,158,982.8 m³ of fill were imported for the Project use in the reporting period. 0.168 tonnes of paper/cardboard packaging, 2 tonnes of chemical waste and 32.5 m³ of general refuse were generated and disposed of in the reporting period. Monthly summary of waste flow table is detailed in Appendix M.
- 6.2.3 The Contractor is advised to properly maintain on site C&D materials and wastes storage, collection, sorting and recording system, dispose of C&D materials and wastes at designated ground and maximize reuse / recycle of C&D materials and wastes. The Contractor is reminded to properly maintain the site tidiness and dispose of the wastes accumulated on site regularly and properly.
- 6.2.4 The Contractor is reminded that chemical waste should be properly treated and stored temporarily in designated chemical waste storage area on site in accordance with the Code of Practice on the Packaging, Labeling and Storage of Chemical Wastes.

6.3 Environmental Licenses and Permits

6.3.1 The environmental licenses and permits for the Project and valid in the reporting month is summarized in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Summary of Environmental Licensing and Permit Status

Statutory Reference	License/ Permit	License or Permit No.	Valid Period		License/ Permit Holder	Remarks
			From	To		
EIAO	Environmental Permit	EP-353/2009/G	06/08/2012	N/A	HyD	Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities
		EP-354/2009/B	28/01/2014	N/A		Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link (TMCLKL Southern Landfall Reclamation only)
APCO	NA notification	--	30/12/2011	--	CHEC	Works Area WA2 and WA3
APCO	NA notification	--	17/01/2012	--	CHEC	Works Area WA4
WDO	Chemical Waste Producer Registration	5213-951-C1186-21	30/3/2012	N/A	CHEC	Chemical waste produced in Contract HY/2010/02
WDO	Chemical Waste Producer Registration	5213-974-C3750-01	31/10/2012	--	CHEC	Registration as Chemical Waste Producer at To Kau Wan(WA4)
WDO	Chemical Waste Producer Registration	5213-839-C3750-02	13/09/2012	--	CHEC	Registration as Chemical Waste Producer at TKO 137(FB)
WDO	Billing Account for Disposal of Construction Waste	7014181	05/12/2011	N/A	CHEC	Waste disposal in Contract HY/2010/02
NCO	Construction Noise Permit	GW-RW0888-13	27/12/2013	26/06/2014	CHEC	Works Area WA4 in Contract HY/2010/02
NCO	Construction Noise Permit	GW-RS0012-14	11/01/2014	10/04/2014	CHEC	Reclamation Works in Contract HY/2010/02
NCO	Construction Noise Permit	GW-RE1345-13	31/12/2013	30/06/2014	CHEC	Section of TKO Fill Bank under Contract HY/2010/02

6.4 Implementation Status of Environmental Mitigation Measures

6.4.1 In response to the site audit findings, the Contractors carried out corrective actions.

6.4.2 A summary of the Implementation Schedule of Environmental Mitigation Measures (EMIS) is presented in Appendix C. Most of the necessary mitigation measures were implemented properly.

6.4.3 Training of marine travel route for marine vessels operator was given to relevant staff and relevant records were kept properly.

6.4.4 Regarding the implementation of dolphin monitoring and protection measures (i.e. implementation of Dolphin Watching Plan, Dolphin Exclusion Zone and Silt Curtain integrity Check), regular checking

were conducted by the experienced MMOs within the works area to ensure no dolphin was trapped by the enclosed silt curtain systems. Any dolphin spotted within the enclosed silt curtain systems was reported and recorded. Relevant procedures were followed and measures were well implemented. Silt curtain systems were also inspected timely in accordance to the submitted plan. All inspection records were kept properly.

- 6.4.5 Acoustic decoupling measures on noisy plants on construction vessels were checked regularly and the Contractor was reminded to ensure provision of ongoing maintenance to noisy plants and to carry out improvement work once insufficient acoustic decoupling measures were found.

6.5 Summary of Exceedances of the Environmental Quality Performance Limit

- 6.5.1 All 1-Hour TSP results were below the Action and Limit Level in the reporting month. For 24-Hour TSP results, four (4) Action Level Exceedances and two (2) Limit level Exceedance were recorded in the reporting month. Investigation results showed that all 24-hour TSP Exceedance were not related to project.
- 6.5.2 For construction noise, no exceedance was recorded at all monitoring stations in the reporting period.
- 6.5.3 All 1-Hour TSP results were below the Action and Limit Level in the reporting month. Six (6) Action Level Exceedances and one (1) Limit Level Exceedances were recorded at measured 24-hour TSP results in the reporting month. Investigation results showed that the Six (6) Action Level Exceedances and one (1) Limit Level Exceedances were not related to project.
- 6.5.4 Cumulative statistics on exceedance is provided in Appendix N.

6.6 Summary of Complaints, Notification of Summons and Successful Prosecutions

- 6.6.1 The Environmental Complaint Handling Procedure is annexed in Figure 6.
- 6.6.2 As informed by the Contractor on 6 Jan 14. A complaint involves barges loaded with sand material without properly covered was blown to the inside of the residential area of Tuen Mun Pierhead Garden which caused disturbance to residence. With refer to available information provided, it cannot indicate that the water quality impact and air quality impact were caused by the vessel of this Contract and therefore the complaint could not be concluded as related to this Contract.
- 6.6.2.1 Site visit was conducted on 9 Jan 14 and it was observed during the site investigation that watering equipment was provided on pelican barge loaded with sand for watering of sand filling material to keep the surface of sand material wet. This is consistent with HyD's reply to Oriental Daily Newspaper that the Contractor would water the sand material to keep the sand material wet to prevent generation of fugitive dust.
- 6.6.2.2 During the follow-up site visit conducted on 9 Jan 14, after interview with the skipper of the pelican barge, it was noted that pelican barge is designated with a regular marine travel route to the site, however the regular travel route plan of this project does not specify the travel route passing through the at area at sea near Tuen Mun Pierhead Garden.
- 6.6.2.3 Therefore it is considered the complaint is unlikely to be related to this project.
- 6.6.3 EPD referred a complaint from complainant who advised that blackish mud was found along the edge of the construction site of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Project near the airport in the morning of 18 January 2014
- 6.6.3.1 With refer to the site daily of 16, 17 and 18 Jan 14 provided by the Contractor (China Harbour Engineering Company Ltd), no excavation and dredging activities were conducted on site. This indicates that the blackish mud found along the edge of the construction site of this contract near the airport in the morning of 18 January 2014 was unlikely related to this project.

- 6.6.3.2 A follow up joint site inspection with the representatives of the Contractor, Residential Engineer and IEC/ENPO was conducted on 22 Jan 2014. Excavation and dredging activities were not observed within the site boundary of HKBCF during the joint site inspection audit.
- 6.6.3.3 Therefore in accordance with the abovementioned observations, the complaint is therefore considered as not related to contract HY/2010/02.
- 6.6.4 No notification of summons and successful prosecutions was received in the reporting period.
- 6.6.5 Statistics on complaints, notifications of summons and successful prosecutions are summarized in Appendix N.

7 FUTURE KEY ISSUES

7.1 Construction Programme for the Coming Months

7.1.1 As informed by the Contractor, the major works for the Project in Feb 2014 and Mar 2014 will be:-

Marine-based Works

- Cellular structure installation
- Connecting arc cell installation
- Laying geo-textile
- Sand blanket laying
- Sand filling
- Maintenance of silt curtain & silt screen at sea water intake of HKIA
- Stone column installation
- Band drain installation
- Backfill cellular structure
- Geotechnical Instrumentation works
- Construction of temporary seawall
- Ground investigation
- Construction of conveyors for public fill
- Surcharge laying
- Precast Yard setup
- Construction of temporary pier at Portion A
- Sand Drain
- Construction of temporary access from Portion D to Portion A

Land-based Works

- Maintenance works of Site Office at Works Area WA2
- Maintenance works of Public Works Regional Laboratory at Works Area WA3
- Geo-textile fabrication at Works Area WA2
- Installed sand bag at Works Area WA2
- Silt curtain fabrication at Works Area WA4
- Maintenance of Temporary Marine Access at Works Area WA2

7.2 Key Issues for the Coming Month

7.2.1 Key issues to be considered in the coming months:-

- Site runoff should be properly collected and treated prior to discharge;
- Minimize loss of sediment from filling works;
- Regular review and maintenance of silt curtain systems, drainage systems and desilting facilities;
- Exposed surfaces/soil stockpiles should be properly treated to avoid generation of silty surface runoff during rainstorm;
- Regular review and maintenance of wheel washing facilities provided at all site entrances/exits;
- Conduct regular inspection of various working machineries and vessels within works areas to avoid any dark smoke emission;
- Suppress dust generated from work processes with use of bagged cements, earth movements, excavation activities, exposed surfaces/soil stockpiles and haul road traffic;
- Quieter powered mechanical equipment should be used;
- Provision of proper and effective noise control measures for operating equipment and machinery on-site, such as erection of movable noise barriers or enclosure for noisy plants;
- Closely check and replace the sound insulation materials regularly;
- Better scheduling of construction works to minimize noise nuisance;
- Properly store and label oil drums and chemical containers placed on site;
- Proper chemicals, chemical wastes and wastes management;
- Maintenance works should be carried out within roofed, paved and confined areas;
- Collection and segregation of construction waste and general refuse on land and in the sea should be carried out properly and regularly; and
- Proper protection and regular inspection of existing trees, transplanted/retained trees.

7.3 Monitoring Schedule for the Coming Month

7.3.1 The tentative schedule for environmental monitoring in February 2014 is provided in Appendix F.

8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Conclusions

- 8.1.1 The construction phase and EM&A programme of the Project commenced on 12 March 2012.
- 8.1.2 All 1-Hour TSP results were below the Action and Limit Level in the reporting month. Four (4) Action Level Exceedances and two (2) Limit Level Exceedances were recorded at measured 24-hour TSP results in the reporting month. Investigation results showed that all Exceedances were not related to project.
- 8.1.3 For construction noise, no exceedance was recorded at all monitoring stations in the reporting period.
- 8.1.4 Six (6) Action Level and one (1) Limit Level Exceedances recorded at measured suspended solids (SS) values (in mg/L) in the reporting month. Investigation results shows that all Action Level Exceedance recorded were not related to project.
- 8.1.5 A total of ten dolphin sightings were recorded during the two surveys, six on 6 January 2014; two were made on 9 and 10 January 2014. No sightings were recorded on the 7 January 2014. Of the ten sightings, nine were “on effort” (which are all under favourable condition) and one was “opportunistic”. A total of thirty six individuals were sighted from the two impact dolphin surveys in the reporting period. Sighting details are summarised and plotted in Appendix K and Figure 5c, respectively.
- 8.1.6 Behaviour: Of the ten sightings made, three sightings were recorded as ‘multiple’ behavior (one of which was feeding and travelling and the other two sightings were feeding and “surface active”); three sightings were recorded as feeding; one in association with a small purse seiner/trawler; three was recorded as travelling and one sighting was recorded as “unknown”. Both of the “milling” groups contained calves and close approaches were not made. The locations of sighting with different behaviour are mapped in Figure 5d.
- 8.1.7 Environmental site inspection was carried out 5 times in January 2014. Recommendations on remedial actions were given to the Contractors for the deficiencies identified during the site audits.
- 8.1.8 As informed by the Contractor on 6 Jan 14. A complaint involves barges loaded with sand material without properly covered was blown to the inside of the residential area of Tuen Mun Pierhead Garden which caused disturbance to residence. With refer to available information provided. It is considered the complaint is unlikely to be related to this project.
- 8.1.9 EPD referred a complaint from complainant who advised that blackish mud was found along the edge of the construction site of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Project near the airport in the morning of 18 January 2014. After receipt of the complaint, site daily was reviewed and follow-up investigation has been conducted and excavation and dredging activities were not observed within the site boundary of HKBCF during the joint site inspection audit. Therefore in accordance with the investigation results, the complaint is considered as not related to contract HY/2010/02.
- 8.1.10 No notification of summons and successful prosecution was received in the reporting period.

8.2 Recommendations

8.2.1 According to the environmental site inspections performed in the reporting month, the following recommendations were provided:

Air Quality Impact

- All working plants and vessels on site should be regularly inspected and properly maintained to avoid dark smoke emission.
- All vehicles should be washed to remove any dusty materials before leaving the site.
- Haul roads should be sufficiently dampened to minimize fugitive dust generation.
- Wheel washing facilities should be properly maintained and reviewed to ensure properly functioning.
- Temporary exposed slopes and open stockpiles should be properly covered.
- Enclosure should be erected for cement debagging, batching and mixing operations.
- Water spraying should be provided to suppress fugitive dust for any dusty construction activity.

Construction Noise Impact

- Quieter powered mechanical equipment should be used as far as possible.
- Noisy operations should be oriented to a direction away from sensitive receivers as far as possible.
- Proper and effective noise control measures for operating equipment and machinery on-site should be provided, such as erection of movable noise barriers, enclosure for noisy plants or enhancement works to provide sufficient acoustic decoupling measure(s). Closely check and replace the sound insulation materials regularly
- Vessels and equipment operating should be checked regularly and properly maintained.
- Noise Emission Label (NEL) shall be affixed to the air compressor and hand-held breaker operating within works area.
- Acoustic decoupling measures should be properly implemented for all existing and incoming construction vessels with continuous and regularly checking to ensure effective implementation of acoustic decoupling measures.

Water Quality Impact

- Regular review and maintenance of silt curtain systems, drainage systems and desilting facilities in order to make sure they are functioning effectively.
- Construction of seawall should be completed as early as possible.
- Regular inspect and review the loading process from barges to avoid splashing of material.
- Silt, debris and leaves accumulated at public drains, wheel washing bays and perimeter u-channels and desilting facilities should be cleaned up regularly.
- Silty effluent should be treated/ desilted before discharged. Untreated effluent should be prevented from entering public drain channel.
- Proper drainage channels/bunds should be provided at the site boundaries to collect/intercept the surface run-off from works areas.
- Exposed slopes and stockpiles should be covered up properly during rainstorm.

Chemical and Waste Management

- All types of wastes, both on land and floating in the sea, should be collected and sorted properly and disposed of timely and properly. They should be properly stored in designated areas within works areas temporarily.
- All chemical containers, batteries and oil drums should be properly stored and labelled.
- All plants and vehicles on site should be properly maintained to prevent oil leakage. Proper measures, like drip trays and/or bundings, should be provided for retaining leaked oil/chemical from plants.
- All kinds of maintenance works should be carried out within roofed, paved and confined areas.
- All drain holes of the drip trays utilized within works areas should be properly plugged to avoid any oil and chemical waste leakage.
- Oil stains on soil surface, accumulated oil mixture and empty chemical containers should be cleared and disposed of as chemical waste.
- Regular review should be conducted for working barges and patrol boats to ensure sufficient measures and spill control kits were provided on working barges and patrol boats to avoid any spreading of leaked oil/chemicals.

Landscape and Visual Impact

- All existing, retained/transplanted trees at the works areas should be properly fenced off and regularly inspected.