

CONTRACT NO. HY/2012/07

**Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link
(Southern Connection Viaduct Section)
Dolphin Quarterly Monitoring**

*20th Quarterly Progress Report (September-November 2018)
submitted to Gammon Construction Limited*

Submitted by
Samuel K.Y. Hung, Ph.D., Hong Kong Cetacean Research Project

December 31, 2018

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL) comprises a 1.6 km long dual 2-lane viaduct section between the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF) and the North Lantau Highway and associated roads at Tai Ho. Gammon Construction Limited (hereinafter called the “Contractor”) was awarded as the main contractor of “Contract No. HY/2012/07 – Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link – Southern Connection Viaduct Section”.
- 1.2. According to the updated Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) Manual (for TM-CLKL), monthly line-transect vessel surveys for Chinese White Dolphin should be conducted to cover the Northwest (NWL) and Northeast Lantau (NEL) survey areas as in AFCD annual marine mammal monitoring programme. However, as such surveys have been undertaken by the HKLR03 and HKBCF projects in the same areas (i.e. NWL and NEL), a combined monitoring approach is recommended by the Highways Department, that the TM-CLKL EM&A project can utilize the monitoring data collected by HKLR03 or HKBCF project to avoid any redundancy in monitoring effort. Such exemption for the dolphin monitoring will end upon the completion of the dolphin monitoring carried out by HKLR03 contract as well as the TM-CLKL Northern Connection Sub-Sea Tunnel Section (HY/2012/08).
- 1.3. In November 2013, the Director of Hong Kong Cetacean Research Project (HKCRP), Dr. Samuel Hung, has been appointed by Gammon Construction Limited as the dolphin specialist for the TM-CLKL Southern Viaduct Section EM&A project. He is responsible for the dolphin monitoring study, including the data collection on Chinese White Dolphins during the construction phase (i.e. impact period) of the TM-CLKL project in Northwest Lantau (NWL) and Northeast Lantau (NEL) survey areas.
- 1.4. During the construction period of HKLR, the dolphin specialist would be in charge of

reviewing and collating information collected by the HKLR03 dolphin monitoring programme to examine any potential impacts of TM-CLKL construction works on the dolphins.

- 1.5. From the monitoring results, any changes in dolphin occurrence within the study area will be examined for possible causes, and appropriate actions and additional mitigation measures will be recommended as necessary.
- 1.6. This report is the 20th quarterly progress report under the TM-CLKL construction phase dolphin monitoring programme submitted to the Gammon Construction Limited, summarizing the results of the surveys findings during the period of September to November 2018, utilizing the survey data collected by HKLR03 impact phase monitoring project.

2. Monitoring Methodology

2.1. Vessel-based Line-transect Survey

- 2.1.1. According to the requirement of the updated EM&A manual, dolphin monitoring programme should cover all transect lines in NEL and NWL survey areas (see Figure 1) twice per month throughout the entire construction period. The co-ordinates of all transect lines are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Co-ordinates of transect lines conducted by HKLR03 project

| Line No. | | Easting | Northing | | Line No. | Easting | Northing | |
|----------|-------------|---------|----------|--|----------|-------------|----------|--------|
| 1 | Start Point | 804671 | 815456 | | 13 | Start Point | 816506 | 819480 |
| 1 | End Point | 804671 | 831404 | | 13 | End Point | 816506 | 824859 |
| 2 | Start Point | 805476 | 820800 | | 14 | Start Point | 817537 | 820220 |
| 2 | End Point | 805476 | 826654 | | 14 | End Point | 817537 | 824613 |
| 3 | Start Point | 806464 | 821150 | | 15 | Start Point | 818568 | 820735 |
| 3 | End Point | 806464 | 822911 | | 15 | End Point | 818568 | 824433 |
| 4 | Start Point | 807518 | 821500 | | 16 | Start Point | 819532 | 821420 |
| 4 | End Point | 807518 | 829230 | | 16 | End Point | 819532 | 824209 |
| 5 | Start Point | 808504 | 821850 | | 17 | Start Point | 820451 | 822125 |
| 5 | End Point | 808504 | 828602 | | 17 | End Point | 820451 | 823671 |
| 6 | Start Point | 809490 | 822150 | | 18 | Start Point | 821504 | 822371 |
| 6 | End Point | 809490 | 825352 | | 18 | End Point | 821504 | 823761 |
| 7 | Start Point | 810499 | 822000 | | 19 | Start Point | 822513 | 823268 |
| 7 | End Point | 810499 | 824613 | | 19 | End Point | 822513 | 824321 |
| 8 | Start Point | 811508 | 821123 | | 20 | Start Point | 823477 | 823402 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------|--------|--|----|-------------|--------|--------|
| 8 | End Point | 811508 | 824254 | | 20 | End Point | 823477 | 824613 |
| 9 | Start Point | 812516 | 821303 | | 21 | Start Point | 805476 | 827081 |
| 9 | End Point | 812516 | 824254 | | 21 | End Point | 805476 | 830562 |
| 10 | Start Point | 813525 | 821176 | | 22 | Start Point | 806464 | 824033 |
| 10 | End Point | 813525 | 824657 | | 22 | End Point | 806464 | 829598 |
| 11 | Start Point | 814556 | 818853 | | 23 | Start Point | 814559 | 821739 |
| 11 | End Point | 814556 | 820992 | | 23 | End Point | 814559 | 824768 |
| 12 | Start Point | 815542 | 818807 | | 24 | Start Point | 805476 | 815900 |
| 12 | End Point | 815542 | 824882 | | 24 | End Point | 805476 | 819100 |

- 2.1.2. The HKLR03 survey team used standard line-transect methods (Buckland et al. 2001) to conduct the systematic vessel surveys, and followed the same technique of data collection that has been adopted over the last 20 years of marine mammal monitoring surveys in Hong Kong developed by HKCRP (see Hung 2018). For each monitoring vessel survey, a 15-m inboard vessel with an open upper deck (about 4.5 m above water surface) was used to make observations from the flying bridge area.
- 2.1.3. Two experienced observers (a data recorder and a primary observer) made up the on-effort survey team, and the survey vessel transited different transect lines at a constant speed of 13-15 km per hour. The data recorder searched with unaided eyes and filled out the datasheets, while the primary observer searched for dolphins and porpoises continuously through 7 x 50 *Fujinon* marine binoculars. Both observers searched the sea ahead of the vessel, between 270° and 90° (in relation to the bow, which is defined as 0°). One to two additional experienced observers were available on the boat to work in shift (i.e. rotate every 30 minutes) in order to minimize fatigue of the survey team members. All observers were experienced in small cetacean survey techniques and identifying local cetacean species.
- 2.1.4. During on-effort survey periods, the survey team recorded effort data including time, positions (latitude and longitude), weather conditions (Beaufort sea state and visibility), and distance traveled in each series (a continuous period of search effort) with the assistance of a handheld GPS (*Garmin eTrex Legend*).
- 2.1.5. Data including time, position and vessel speed were also automatically and continuously logged by handheld GPS throughout the entire survey for subsequent review.
- 2.1.6. When dolphins were sighted, the survey team would end the survey effort, and immediately record the initial sighting distance and angle of the dolphin group from the survey vessel, as well as the sighting time and position. Then the research vessel was diverted from its course to approach the animals for species identification, group size estimation, assessment of group composition, and behavioural observations. The perpendicular distance (PSD) of the dolphin group to the transect line was later calculated from the initial sighting distance and angle.

2.1.7. Survey effort being conducted along the parallel transect lines that were perpendicular to the coastlines (as indicated in Figure 1) was labeled as “primary” survey effort, while the survey effort conducted along the connecting lines between parallel lines was labeled as “secondary” survey effort. According to HKCRP long-term dolphin monitoring data, encounter rates of Chinese white dolphins deduced from effort and sighting data collected along primary and secondary lines were similar in NEL and NWL survey areas. Therefore, both primary and secondary survey effort were presented as on-effort survey effort in this report.

2.2. Photo-identification Work

2.2.1. When a group of Chinese White Dolphins were sighted during the line-transect survey, the HKLR03 survey team would end effort and approach the group slowly from the side and behind to take photographs of them. Every attempt was made to photograph every dolphin in the group, and even photograph both sides of the dolphins, since the colouration and markings on both sides may not be symmetrical.

2.2.2. A professional digital camera (*Canon EOS 7D* model), equipped with long telephoto lenses (100-400 mm zoom), were available on board for researchers to take sharp, close-up photographs of dolphins as they surfaced. The images were shot at the highest available resolution and stored on Compact Flash memory cards for downloading onto a computer.

2.2.3. All digital images taken in the field were first examined, and those containing potentially identifiable individuals were sorted out. These photographs would then be examined in greater detail, and were carefully compared to the existing Chinese White Dolphin photo-identification catalogue maintained by HKCRP since 1995.

2.2.4. Chinese White Dolphins can be identified by their natural markings, such as nicks, cuts, scars and deformities on their dorsal fin and body, and their unique spotting patterns were also used as secondary identifying features (Jefferson 2000).

2.2.5. All photographs of each individual were then compiled and arranged in chronological order, with data including the date and location first identified (initial sighting), re-sightings, associated dolphins, distinctive features, and age classes entered into a computer database.

2.3. Data Analysis

2.3.1. Distribution Analysis – The line-transect survey data was integrated with the Geographic Information System (GIS) in order to visualize and interpret different spatial and temporal patterns of dolphin distribution using sighting positions. Location data of dolphin groups were plotted on map layers of Hong Kong using a desktop GIS (ArcView[®] 3.1) to examine their distribution patterns in details. The dataset was also stratified into different subsets to examine distribution patterns of dolphin groups with different categories of group sizes, young calves and activities.

2.3.2. Encounter rate analysis – Encounter rates of Chinese white dolphins (number of on-effort

sightings per 100 km of survey effort, and total number of dolphins sighted on-effort per 100 km of survey effort) were calculated in NEL and NWL survey areas in relation to the amount of survey effort conducted during each month of monitoring survey. Only data collect under Beaufort 3 or below condition would be used for the encounter rate analyses. Dolphin encounter rates were calculated in two ways for comparisons with the HZMB baseline monitoring results as well as to AFCD long-term marine mammal monitoring results.

Firstly, for the comparison with the HZMB baseline monitoring results, the encounter rates were calculated using primary survey effort alone. The average encounter rate of sightings (STG) and average encounter rate of dolphins (ANI) were deduced based on the encounter rates from six events during the present quarter (i.e. six sets of line-transect surveys in North Lantau), which was also compared with the one deduced from the six events during the baseline period (i.e. six sets of line-transect surveys in North Lantau).

Secondly, the encounter rates were calculated using both primary and secondary survey effort collected under Beaufort 3 or below condition as in AFCD long-term monitoring study. The encounter rate of sightings and dolphins were deduced by dividing the total number of on-effort sightings (STG) and total number of dolphins (ANI) by the amount of survey effort for the present quarterly period.

- 2.3.3. Quantitative grid analysis on habitat use – To conduct quantitative grid analysis of habitat use, positions of on-effort sightings of Chinese White Dolphins collected during the quarterly impact phase monitoring period were plotted onto 1-km² grids among NWL and NEL survey areas on GIS. Sighting densities (number of on-effort sightings per km²) and dolphin densities (total number of dolphins from on-effort sightings per km²) were then calculated for each 1 km by 1 km grid with the aid of GIS. Sighting density grids and dolphin density grids were then further normalized with the amount of survey effort conducted within each grid. The total amount of survey effort spent on each grid was calculated by examining the survey coverage on each line-transect survey to determine how many times the grid was surveyed during the study period. For example, when the survey boat traversed through a specific grid 50 times, 50 units of survey effort were counted for that grid. With the amount of survey effort calculated for each grid, the sighting density and dolphin density of each grid were then normalized (i.e. divided by the unit of survey effort).

The newly-derived unit for sighting density was termed SPSE, representing the number of on-effort sightings per 100 units of survey effort. In addition, the derived unit for actual dolphin density was termed DPSE, representing the number of dolphins per 100 units of survey effort. Among the 1-km² grids that were partially covered by land, the percentage of sea area was calculated using GIS tools, and their SPSE and DPSE values were adjusted accordingly. The following formulae were used to estimate SPSE and DPSE in each 1-km² grid within the study area:

$$\text{SPSE} = ((S / E) \times 100) / \text{SA}\%$$
$$\text{DPSE} = ((D / E) \times 100) / \text{SA}\%$$

where S = total number of on-effort sightings

D = total number of dolphins from on-effort sightings
E = total number of units of survey effort
SA% = percentage of sea area

- 2.3.4. Behavioural analysis – When dolphins were sighted during vessel surveys, their behaviour was observed. Different activities were categorized (i.e. feeding, socializing, traveling, and milling/resting) and recorded on sighting datasheets. This data was then input into a separate database with sighting information, which can be used to determine the distribution of behavioural data with a desktop GIS. Distribution of sightings of dolphins engaged in different activities and behaviours would then be plotted on GIS and carefully examined to identify important areas for different activities of the dolphins.
- 2.3.5. Ranging pattern analysis – Location data of individual dolphins that occurred during the 3-month impact phase monitoring period were obtained from the dolphin sighting database and photo-identification catalogue. To deduce home ranges for individual dolphins using the fixed kernel methods, the program Animal Movement Analyst Extension, was loaded as an extension with ArcView[®] 3.1 along with another extension Spatial Analyst 2.0. Using the fixed kernel method, the program calculated kernel density estimates based on all sighting positions, and provided an active interface to display kernel density plots. The kernel estimator then calculated and displayed the overall ranging area at 95% UD level.

3. Monitoring Results

3.1. *Summary of survey effort and dolphin sightings*

- 3.1.1. During the period of September to November 2018, six sets of systematic line-transect vessel surveys were conducted under the HKLR03 monitoring works to cover all transect lines in NWL and NEL survey areas twice per month.
- 3.1.2. From these HKLR03 surveys, a total of 797.27 km of survey effort was collected, with 93.8% of the total survey effort being conducted under favourable weather conditions (i.e. Beaufort Sea State 3 or below with good visibility). Among the two areas, 291.60 km and 505.67 km of survey effort were conducted in NEL and NWL survey areas respectively.
- 3.1.3. The total survey effort conducted on primary lines was 576.22 km, while the effort on secondary lines was 221.05 km. Survey effort conducted on both primary and secondary lines were considered as on-effort survey data. A summary table of the survey effort is shown in Appendix I.
- 3.1.4. During the six sets of HKLR03 monitoring surveys from September to November 2018, six groups of 13 Chinese White Dolphins were sighted. All six dolphin sightings were made during on-effort search in this quarter, and five of the six on-effort dolphin sightings were made on primary lines. A summary table of dolphin sightings is shown in Appendix II.

3.1.5. In this quarterly period, all dolphin groups were sighted in NWL, while no dolphin was sighted at all in NEL. In fact, since August 2014, only two sightings of two lone dolphins were made respectively in NEL during HKLR03 monitoring surveys.

3.2. *Distribution*

3.2.1. Distribution of dolphin sightings made during the HKLR03 monitoring surveys from September to November 2018 is shown in Figure 1. All sightings were made at the northwestern portion of the North Lantau region, with the main concentration surrounding Lung Kwu Chau (Figure 1). As consistently recorded in previous monitoring quarters, the dolphins were completely absent from the central and eastern portions of North Lantau waters (Figure 1).

3.2.2. All dolphin sightings were located far away from the TM-CLKL alignment as well as the HKLR09 alignment and HKBCF/HKLR03 reclamation sites (Figure 1).

3.2.3. Sighting distribution of dolphins during the present impact phase monitoring period (September-November 2018) was drastically different from the one during the baseline monitoring period (Figure 1). In the present quarter, dolphins have disappeared from the NEL region, which was in stark contrast to their frequent occurrence around the Brothers Islands, near Shum Shui Kok and in the vicinity of HKBCF reclamation site during the baseline period (Figure 1). The nearly complete abandonment of NEL region by the dolphins has been consistently recorded in the past 22 quarters of HKLR03 monitoring, which has resulted in zero to extremely low dolphin encounter rates in this area.

3.2.4. In NWL survey area, dolphin occurrence was also drastically different between the baseline and impact phase periods. During the present impact monitoring period, dolphins were seldom sighted here, and mainly at the northwestern portion of the North Lantau region, which was in stark contrast to their frequent occurrences throughout the area during the baseline period (Figure 1).

3.2.5. Another comparison in dolphin distribution was made between the six quarterly periods of autumn months in 2013-18 (Figure 2). Among the six autumn periods, dolphins were regularly sighted in NWL waters in 2013, but such usage there was dramatically reduced in the five subsequent autumn periods, with their only occurrences mostly concentrated in the waters surrounding Lung Kwu Chau in the past four autumn periods (Figure 2).

3.3. *Encounter rate*

3.3.1. During the present quarterly period, the encounter rates of Chinese White Dolphins deduced from the survey effort and on-effort sighting data from the primary transect lines under favourable conditions (Beaufort 3 or below) for each set of the HKLR03 surveys in NEL and NWL are shown in Table 2. The average encounter rates deduced from the six sets of HKLR03 surveys were also compared with the ones deduced from the baseline monitoring period (September-November 2011) (Table 3).

HK CETACEAN RESEARCH PROJECT

香港鯨豚研究計劃

Table 2. Dolphin encounter rates (sightings per 100 km of survey effort) during September-November 2018

| SURVEY AREA | DOLPHIN MONITORING DATES | Encounter rate (STG) (no. of on-effort dolphin sightings per 100 km of survey effort) | Encounter rate (ANI) (no. of dolphins from all on-effort sightings per 100 km of survey effort) |
|------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | Primary Lines Only | Primary Lines Only |
| Northeast Lantau | Set 1 (4 & 17 Sep 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 2 (20 & 26 Sep 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 3 (4 & 11 Oct 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 4 (16 & 18 Oct 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 5 (1 & 6 Nov 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 6 (8 & 13 Nov 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Northwest Lantau | Set 1 (4 & 17 Sep 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 2 (20 & 26 Sep 2018) | 1.62 | 3.24 |
| | Set 3 (4 & 11 Oct 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | Set 4 (16 & 18 Oct 2018) | 1.63 | 3.27 |
| | Set 5 (1 & 6 Nov 2018) | 5.81 | 9.69 |
| | Set 6 (8 & 13 Nov 2018) | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 3. Comparison of average dolphin encounter rates from impact monitoring period (September – November 2018) and baseline monitoring period (September – November 2011) (Note: encounter rates deduced from the baseline monitoring period have been recalculated based only on survey effort and on-effort sighting data made along the primary transect lines under favourable conditions; ± denotes the standard deviation of the average encounter rates)

| | Encounter rate (STG) (no. of on-effort dolphin sightings per 100 km of survey effort) | | Encounter rate (ANI) (no. of dolphins from all on-effort sightings per 100 km of survey effort) | |
|------------------|--|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | September – November 2018 | September – November 2011 | September – November 2018 | September – November 2011 |
| Northeast Lantau | 0.0 | 6.00 ± 5.05 | 0.0 | 22.19 ± 26.81 |
| Northwest Lantau | 1.51 ± 2.25 | 9.85 ± 5.85 | 2.70 ± 3.78 | 44.66 ± 29.85 |

3.3.2. To facilitate the comparison with the AFCD long-term monitoring results, the encounter rates were also calculated for the present quarter using both primary and secondary survey effort. The encounter rates of sightings (STG) and dolphins (ANI) in NWL were 1.29 sightings and 2.79 dolphins per 100 km of survey effort respectively, while the encounter rates of sightings (STG) and dolphins (ANI) in NEL were both nil for this quarter.

3.3.3. In NEL, the average dolphin encounter rates in the present three-month impact monitoring period were both zero with no on-effort sighting being made, and such extremely low occurrence of dolphins in NEL have been consistently recorded in the past 21 quarters of HKLR03 monitoring (Table 4). This is a serious concern as the dolphin occurrence in NEL in the past few years have remained exceptionally low when

compared to the baseline period (Table 4). Dolphins have been virtually absent from NEL waters since January 2014, with only three groups of six dolphins sighted there since then despite consistent and intensive survey effort being conducted in this survey area.

Table 4. Comparison of average dolphin encounter rates in Northeast Lantau survey area from all quarters of HKLR03 impact monitoring period and baseline monitoring period (September-November 2011) (Note: encounter rates deduced from the baseline monitoring period have been recalculated based only on survey effort and sighting data made along primary transect lines under favourable conditions; the encounter rates in **autumn** months were highlighted in **blue**; ± denotes standard deviation of average encounter rates)

| | Encounter rate (STG) (no. of on-effort dolphin sightings per 100 km of survey effort) | Encounter rate (ANI) (no. of dolphins from all on-effort sightings per 100 km of survey effort) |
|---|---|---|
| September-November 2011 (Baseline) | 6.00 ± 5.05 | 22.19 ± 26.81 |
| December 2012-February 2013 (Impact) | 3.14 ± 3.21 | 6.33 ± 8.64 |
| March-May 2013 (Impact) | 0.42 ± 1.03 | 0.42 ± 1.03 |
| June-August 2013 (Impact) | 0.88 ± 1.36 | 3.91 ± 8.36 |
| September-November 2013 (Impact) | 1.01 ± 1.59 | 3.77 ± 6.49 |
| December 2013-February 2014 (Impact) | 0.45 ± 1.10 | 1.34 ± 3.29 |
| March-May 2014 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| June-August 2014 (Impact) | 0.42 ± 1.04 | 1.69 ± 4.15 |
| September-November 2014 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| December 2014-February 2015 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| March-May 2015 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| June-August 2015 (Impact) | 0.44 ± 1.08 | 0.44 ± 1.08 |
| September-November 2015 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| December 2015-February 2016 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| March-May 2016 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| June-August 2016 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| September-November 2016 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| December 2016-February 2017 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| March-May 2017 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| June-August 2017 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| September-November 2017 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| December 2017-February 2018 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| March-May 2018 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| June-August 2018 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| September-November 2018 (Impact) | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 5. Comparison of average dolphin encounter rates in Northwest Lantau survey area from all quarters of HKLR03 impact monitoring period and baseline monitoring period (September-November 2011) (Note: encounter rates deduced from the baseline monitoring period have been recalculated based only on survey effort and on-effort sighting data made along the primary transect lines under favourable conditions; the encounter rates in **autumn** months were highlighted in **blue**; ± denotes the standard deviation of the average encounter rates)

| | Encounter rate (STG) (no. of on-effort dolphin sightings per 100 km of survey effort) | Encounter rate (ANI) (no. of dolphins from all on-effort sightings per 100 km of survey effort) |
|---|---|---|
| September-November 2011 (Baseline) | 9.85 ± 5.85 | 44.66 ± 29.85 |
| December 2012-February 2013 (Impact) | 8.36 ± 5.03 | 35.90 ± 23.10 |
| March-May 2013 (Impact) | 7.75 ± 3.96 | 24.23 ± 18.05 |
| June-August 2013 (Impact) | 6.56 ± 3.68 | 27.00 ± 18.71 |
| September-November 2013 (Impact) | 8.04 ± 1.10 | 32.48 ± 26.51 |
| December 2013-February 2014 (Impact) | 8.21 ± 2.21 | 32.58 ± 11.21 |
| March-May 2014 (Impact) | 6.51 ± 3.34 | 19.14 ± 7.19 |
| June-August 2014 (Impact) | 4.74 ± 3.84 | 17.52 ± 15.12 |
| September-November 2014 (Impact) | 5.10 ± 4.40 | 20.52 ± 15.10 |
| December 2014-February 2015 (Impact) | 2.91 ± 2.69 | 11.27 ± 15.19 |
| March-May 2015 (Impact) | 0.47 ± 0.73 | 2.36 ± 4.07 |
| June-August 2015 (Impact) | 2.53 ± 3.20 | 9.21 ± 11.57 |
| September-November 2015 (Impact) | 3.94 ± 1.57 | 21.05 ± 17.19 |
| December 2015-February 2016 (Impact) | 2.64 ± 1.52 | 10.98 ± 3.81 |
| March-May 2016 (Impact) | 0.98 ± 1.10 | 4.78 ± 6.85 |
| June-August 2016 (Impact) | 1.72 ± 2.17 | 7.48 ± 10.98 |
| September-November 2016 (Impact) | 2.86 ± 1.98 | 10.89 ± 10.98 |
| December 2016-February 2017 (Impact) | 3.80 ± 3.79 | 14.52 ± 17.21 |
| March-May 2017 (Impact) | 0.93 ± 1.03 | 5.25 ± 9.53 |
| June-August 2017 (Impact) | 2.20 ± 2.88 | 6.58 ± 8.12 |
| September-November 2017 (Impact) | 3.12 ± 1.91 | 10.35 ± 9.66 |
| December 2017-February 2018 (Impact) | 4.75 ± 2.26 | 15.73 ± 15.94 |
| March-May 2018 (Impact) | 2.88 ± 4.81 | 11.12 ± 22.46 |
| June-August 2018 (Impact) | 1.16 ± 1.39 | 2.87 ± 3.32 |
| September-November 2018 (Impact) | 1.51 ± 2.25 | 2.70 ± 3.78 |

3.3.4. On the other hand, the average dolphin encounter rates (STG and ANI) in NWL during the present impact phase monitoring period (reductions of 84.7% and 94.0% respectively) were only tiny fractions of the ones recorded during the three-month baseline period,

indicating a dramatic decline in dolphin usage of this survey area as well during the present impact phase period (Table 5).

- 3.3.5. Notably, when comparing the quarterly periods in autumn months, the quarterly encounter rates in the autumn of 2018 dropped to the lowest among all autumn periods during the HKLR03 construction phase. The dramatic drop in dolphin occurrence during this quarter should raise serious concerns, and such temporal trend should be closely monitored in the upcoming monitoring quarters as the construction activities of HZMB works continue to diminish in coming months.
- 3.3.6 A two-way ANOVA with repeated measures and unequal sample size was conducted to examine whether there were any significant differences in the average encounter rates between the baseline and impact monitoring periods. The two variables that were examined included the two periods (baseline and impact phases) and two locations (NEL and NWL).
- 3.3.7. For the comparison between the baseline period and the present quarter (24th quarter of the impact phase being assessed), the p-values for the differences in average dolphin encounter rates of STG and ANI were 0.0029 and 0.0143 respectively. If the alpha value is set at 0.05, significant differences were detected between the baseline and present quarters in both the average dolphin encounter rates of STG and ANI.
- 3.3.8. For the comparison between the baseline period and the cumulative quarters in impact phase (i.e. the first 24 quarters of the impact phase being assessed), the p-values for the differences in average dolphin encounter rates of STG and ANI were 0.000000 and 0.000000 respectively. Even if the alpha value is set at 0.00001, significant differences were still detected in both the average dolphin encounter rates of STG and ANI (i.e. between the two periods and the locations).
- 3.3.9. As indicated in both dolphin distribution patterns and encounter rates, dolphin usage has been significantly reduced in both NEL and NWL survey areas during the present quarterly period, and such low occurrence of dolphins has also been consistently documented in previous quarters of the past few years.
- 3.3.10. The dramatic decline in dolphin usage of North Lantau region raises serious concern, as the timing of the decline in dolphin usage in North Lantau waters coincided well with the construction schedule of the HZMB-related projects (Hung 2018). Apparently there was very little sign of recovery of dolphin usage, even though almost all marine works associated with the HZMB construction have been completed.
- 3.4. *Group size*
- 3.4.1. Group size of Chinese White Dolphins ranged from one to four individuals per group in North Lantau region during September to November 2018. The average dolphin group sizes from these three months were compared with the ones deduced from the baseline period in September to November 2011, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of average dolphin group sizes from impact monitoring period (September – November 2018) and baseline monitoring period (September – November 2011) (Note: \pm denotes the standard deviation of the average group size)

| | Average Dolphin Group Size | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | September – November 2018 | September – November 2011 |
| Overall | 2.17 \pm 0.98 (n = 6) | 3.72 \pm 3.13 (n = 66) |
| Northeast Lantau | --- | 3.18 \pm 2.16 (n = 17) |
| Northwest Lantau | 2.17 \pm 0.98 (n = 6) | 3.92 \pm 3.40 (n = 49) |

- 3.4.2. The average dolphin group size in NWL waters during September to November 2018 was much lower than the one recorded during the three-month baseline period, but it should be noted that the sample size of six dolphin groups in the present quarter was only a small fraction of the sample size of 66 dolphin groups sighted during the baseline period (Table 6).
- 3.4.3. Notably, with the exception of one medium-sized group with four animals, the other five dolphin groups were very small with 1-2 individuals per group only (Appendix II).
- 3.5. *Habitat use*
- 3.5.1. From September to November 2018, only six grids recorded dolphin occurrence. The only grid with moderately high dolphin density was located adjacent to Lung Kwu Chau, while the other grids recorded low to very low DPSE values (Figures 3a and 3b)
- 3.5.2. Notably, all grids near TM-CLKL alignment as well as HKLR09 alignment and HKLR03/HKBCF reclamation sites did not record any presence of dolphins at all during on-effort search in the present quarterly period (Figures 3a and 3b).
- 3.5.3. It should be emphasized that the amount of survey effort collected in each grid during the three-month period was fairly low (6-12 units of survey effort for most grids), and therefore the habitat use pattern derived from the three-month dataset should be treated with caution. A more complete picture of dolphin habitat use pattern should be examined when more survey effort for each grid is collected throughout the impact phase monitoring programme.
- 3.5.4. When compared with the habitat use patterns during the baseline period, dolphin usage in NEL and NWL has drastically diminished in both areas during the present impact monitoring period (Figure 4). During the baseline period, many grids between Siu Mo To and Shum Shui Kok in NEL recorded moderately high to high dolphin densities, which was in stark contrast to the complete absence of dolphins there during the present impact phase period (Figure 4).
- 3.5.5. The density patterns were also drastically different in NWL between the baseline and impact phase monitoring periods, with high dolphin usage recorded throughout the area during the baseline period, especially around Sha Chau, near Black Point, to the west of the airport, as well as between Pillar Point and airport platform. In contrast, only several

grids with low to moderate dolphin densities were located at the northwestern portion of North Lantau waters during the present impact phase period (Figure 4).

3.6. *Mother-calf pairs*

3.6.1. During the present quarterly period, no young calf was sighted at all among the seven groups of dolphins.

3.7. *Activities and associations with fishing boats*

3.7.1. Only one of the six dolphin groups was engaged in feeding and socializing activities (with both activities occurred during the same sighting), while no group was engaged in traveling or milling/resting activity during the three-month study period.

3.7.2. Distribution of dolphins engaged in various activities during the present three-month period and baseline period is shown in Figure 5. The only dolphin group engaged in both feeding and socializing activities was sighted to the north of Lung Kwu Chau (Figure 5). In comparison, the distribution of various dolphin activities during the present impact phase monitoring period was very different from the baseline period with a much more restricted area of occurrence (Figure 5).

3.7.3. Notably, none of the six dolphin groups was found to be associated with any operating fishing vessel during the present impact phase period.

3.8. *Summary of photo-identification works*

3.8.1. From September to November 2018, about 300 digital photographs of Chinese White Dolphins were taken during the impact phase monitoring surveys for the photo-identification work.

3.8.2. In total, six individuals sighted 10 times altogether were identified (see summary table in Appendix III and photographs of identified individuals in Appendix IV). All of these re-sightings were made in NWL. Four of the six individuals (NL136, NL182, NL261 and NL328) were re-sighted twice, while the other two individuals (NL272 and NL286) were re-sighted once during the three-month period (Appendix III).

3.8.3. Notably, one of these six individuals (NL136) was also sighted in NWL waters during the HKBCF monitoring surveys under the same three-month period. However, none of them was sighted in WL waters during the HKLR09 monitoring surveys from the September to November 2018, which implied their limited movements across different survey areas during this quarterly monitoring period.

3.9. *Individual range use*

3.9.1. Ranging patterns of the six individuals identified during the three-month study period were determined by fixed kernel method, and are shown in Appendix V.

3.9.2. All identified dolphins sighted in the present quarter were utilizing NWL waters only, but have completely avoided NEL waters where many of them have utilized as their core areas in the past (Appendix V). This is in contrary to the extensive movements between NEL and NWL survey areas observed in the earlier impact monitoring quarters as well as

the baseline period.

- 3.9.3. On the other hand, in contrary to previous monitoring quarters, none of the six individuals have extended their range use to WL waters during the same autumn quarter of 2018, while none of the individuals that consistently utilized WL waters in the past have extended their range use to NWL waters either during the present quarter.
- 3.9.4. In the upcoming quarters, individual range use and movements should be continuously monitored to examine whether there has been any consistent shifts of individual home ranges from North Lantau to West or Southwest Lantau (and vice versa), as such shift could possibly be related to the HZMB-related construction works.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1. During this quarter of dolphin monitoring, no adverse impact from the activities of the TMCLKL construction project on Chinese White Dolphins was noticeable from general observations.
- 4.2. Although the dolphins infrequently occurred along the alignment of TMCLKL southern connection viaduct in the past and during the baseline monitoring period, it is apparent that dolphin usage has been significantly reduced in NEL, and many individuals have shifted away from the important habitat around the Brothers Islands.
- 4.3. It is critical to monitor the dolphin usage in North Lantau region in the upcoming quarters, to determine whether the dolphins are continuously affected by the various construction activities in relation to the HZMB-related works, and whether suitable mitigation measure can be applied to revert the situation.

5. References

- Buckland, S. T., Anderson, D. R., Burnham, K. P., Laake, J. L., Borchers, D. L., and Thomas, L. 2001. Introduction to distance sampling: estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford University Press, London.
- Hung, S. K. 2018. Monitoring of marine mammals in Hong Kong waters: final report (2017-18). An unpublished report submitted to the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department of Hong Kong SAR Government, 174 pp.
- Jefferson, T. A. 2000. Population biology of the Indo-Pacific hump-backed dolphin in Hong Kong waters. Wildlife Monographs 144:1-65.





Figure 1. Distribution of Chinese white dolphin sighting in Northwest and Northeast Lantau during HKLR03 impact phase (top) and baseline monitoring surveys (bottom)









Figure 2. Distribution of Chinese white dolphin sightings in Northwest and Northeast Lantau during the past six autumn quarters (September-November) of HKLR03 impact phase in 2013-18




Figure 3a. Sighting density of Chinese white dolphins with corrected survey effort per km² in Northeast and Northwest Lantau survey areas, using data collected during HKLR03 impact monitoring period monitoring period (Sep-Nov 18) (SPSE = no. of on-effort sightings per 100 units of survey effort)




Figure 3b. Density of Chinese white dolphins with corrected survey effort per km² in Northeast and Northwest Lantau survey areas, using data collected during HKLR03 impact monitoring period (Sep-Nov 18) (DPSE = no. of dolphins per 100 units of survey effort)




Figure 4. Comparison of density of Chinese white dolphins with corrected survey effort per km² in Northwest and Northeast Lantau survey area between the impact monitoring period (September - November 2018) and baseline monitoring period (September - November 2011) (DPSE = no. of dolphins per 100 units of survey effort)





Figure 5. Distribution of Chinese white dolphins engaged in feeding (purple dots), socializing (pink dots) and traveling (green dots) activities during HKLR03 impact phase (top) and baseline monitoring surveys (bottom)

Appendix I. HKLR03 Survey Effort Database (September-November 2018)

(Abbreviations: BEAU = Beaufort Sea State; P = Primary Line Effort; S = Secondary Line Effort)

| DATE | AREA | BEAU | EFFORT | SEASON | VESSEL | TYPE | P/S |
|-----------|-----------|------|--------|--------|----------------|------|-----|
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 1 | 7.70 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 24.60 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 3.00 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 1 | 4.20 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 7.80 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 1.30 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 34.10 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 4 | 1.10 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 2.50 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 13.40 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 3.50 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 17.73 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 3.97 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 4.10 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 5.90 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 20-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 21.14 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 20-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 6.75 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 20-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 7.28 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 20-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 2.01 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 26-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 33.45 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | P |
| 26-Sep-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 11.25 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | S |
| 26-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 13.12 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | P |
| 26-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 20.65 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | P |
| 26-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 10.51 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | S |
| 26-Sep-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 2.62 | AUTUMN | STANDARD138716 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 19.20 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 12.68 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 0.62 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 6.10 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 5.60 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 19.33 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 15.44 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 4-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 8.06 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 4-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 5.07 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 11-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 15.31 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 11-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 12.41 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 11-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 4.07 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 11-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 9.41 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 16-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 23.58 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 16-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 5.15 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 16-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 10.36 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 16-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 2.11 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 32.45 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Oct-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 11.05 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 18-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 34.26 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 2.27 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 18-Oct-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 11.07 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 1-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 10.78 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 1-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 19.78 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 1-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 4 | 6.85 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |

Appendix I. (cont'd)

(Abbreviations: BEAU = Beaufort Sea State; P = Primary Line Effort; S = Secondary Line Effort)

| DATE | AREA | BEAU | EFFORT | SEASON | VESSEL | TYPE | P/S |
|-----------|-----------|------|--------|--------|---------------|------|-----|
| 1-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 4.88 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 1-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 7.41 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 32.12 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 19.50 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 6.80 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 17.37 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 7.91 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 6-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 2.70 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 9.12 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 16.42 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 5 | 1.50 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 5.80 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 4 | 5.75 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 5 | 1.40 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 21.83 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 13.92 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 4 | 1.30 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 2 | 7.10 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 3 | 5.64 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 8-Nov-18 | NE LANTAU | 4 | 0.81 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 13-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 18.07 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 13-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 14.72 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | P |
| 13-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 6.80 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |
| 13-Nov-18 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 1.71 | AUTUMN | STANDARD36826 | HKLR | S |

Appendix II. HKLR03 Chinese White Dolphin Sighting Database (September-November 2018)

(Abberviations: STG# = Sighting Number; HRD SZ = Dolphin Herd Size; BEAU = Beaufort Sea State; PSD = Perpendicular Distance; BOAT ASSOC. = Fishing Boat Association; P/S: Sighting Made on Primary/Secondary Lines)

| DATE | STG # | TIME | HRD SZ | AREA | BEAU | PSD | EFFORT | TYPE | NORTHING | EASTING | SEASON | BOAT ASSOC. | P/S |
|-----------|-------|------|--------|-----------|------|-----|--------|------|----------|---------|--------|-------------|-----|
| 26-Sep-18 | 1 | 1433 | 2 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 258 | ON | HKLR | 826241 | 806517 | AUTUMN | NONE | P |
| 11-Oct-18 | 1 | 1222 | 4 | NW LANTAU | 3 | 362 | ON | HKLR | 826265 | 805415 | AUTUMN | NONE | S |
| 18-Oct-18 | 1 | 1232 | 2 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 145 | ON | HKLR | 824310 | 808501 | AUTUMN | NONE | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | 1 | 1107 | 1 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 364 | ON | HKLR | 825486 | 807443 | AUTUMN | NONE | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | 2 | 1119 | 2 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 221 | ON | HKLR | 827280 | 807456 | AUTUMN | NONE | P |
| 6-Nov-18 | 3 | 1202 | 2 | NW LANTAU | 2 | 84 | ON | HKLR | 828546 | 805451 | AUTUMN | NONE | P |

Appendix III. Individual dolphins identified during HKLR03 monitoring surveys in September-November 2018

| ID# | DATE | STG# | AREA |
|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| NL136 | 11/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| | 18/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| NL182 | 26/09/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| | 11/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| NL261 | 11/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| | 06/11/18 | 3 | NW LANTAU |
| NL272 | 11/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| NL286 | 06/11/18 | 2 | NW LANTAU |
| NL328 | 18/10/18 | 1 | NW LANTAU |
| | 06/11/18 | 3 | NW LANTAU |

Appendix IV. Six individual dolphins that were identified during September to November 2018 under HKLR03 impact phase monitoring surveys



Appendix IV. (cont'd)



Appendix V. Ranging patterns (95% kernel ranges) of six individual dolphins that were sighted during HKLR03 impact phase monitoring period (note: yellow dots indicate sightings made in September-October 2018 during HKLR03 monitoring surveys; the yellow dots with the red circles indicate the ones made during HKBCF monitoring surveys)

