

COMPLAINT LOG

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
1	CIR-001	9 March 2009 at Outfall	Public through EPD	EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/04846-09) regarding to muddy effluent discharged from the outfall of the construction site from a public on 9 March 2009. Site investigation was also carried out by EPD with the Contractor on the same day.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      In the afternoon on 9 March 2009, the Contractor was carrying out regular maintenance for removing silt accumulated in the wastewater treatment plant. During the maintenance works, some residual silt inside the plant was accidentally leaked out to the outfall discharge outlet. The reason was that a flexible pipe for disposing silt was found connecting to the concrete platform of the outfall discharge outlet.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u>                      The complaint was valid and it was due to maintenance works at the wastewater treatment plant at the outfall area. The contractor had cleaned up the silt at discharge outlet and the channel at the outfall area on 12 March 2009 as shown in the attached photo. The ET will closely inspect the discharge outlet and the channel during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor. The Contractor was also advised to provide mitigation measures during any occasion of the maintenance work on the wastewater treatment plant.</p> <p>The discharge pipe of the treatment plant should be plugged and ensure not functioned when carrying out maintenance works on the wastewater treatment plant in order to prevent the discharge of silt or muddy water to the outlet.</p> <p>Flexible pipe for discharge of sludge should not be placed on the concrete platform under the outfall discharge outlet. For disposal of slit or sludge in the wastewater treatment plant, tanker should be used.</p>	Closed
2	CIR-002	8 May 2009 at Outfall	Public through EPD	EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/09755-09) regarding to construction dust from the outfall	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Regular 1-hour TSP monitoring, in accordance with EM&amp;A Manual, is performed by Environmental Team. The monitoring station concerned is ASR9 (i.e. at the podium level of Greenview Terrace facing to the construction site).</p> <p>The closest date for the 1-hour TSP concentration monitoring was on 6</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				<p>construction site on 8 May 2009. Site investigation was also carried out by EPD with the Contractor on 14 May 2009.</p>	<p>May 2009 and 12 May 2009 at Greenview Terrace, ASR9. Soil nailing works and loading &amp; unloading excavated materials were observed during monitoring. In accordance with the EM&amp;A Manual and the Baseline Monitoring Report, all 1-hour TSP concentrations at ASR9 were below the established Action and Limit Levels. No exceedance was recorded on 6 and 12 May 2009.</p> <p>The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. It was confirmed that the air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have been provided by the Contractor. The mitigation measures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water spraying was provided to the exposed surface.</li> <li>• Several automatic sprinklers were provided at the outfall construction site for water spraying of the haul road.</li> <li>• Water spraying was provided during dust generating works (e.g. rock breaking and soil nailing works).</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u></p> <p>Based on the site inspection and monitoring results, the complaint is considered not justifiable since no action &amp; limit level exceedance on construction dust are identified. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have been implemented in order to control and minimise the air quality impact and nuisance arising from the construction activities. Nevertheless, in view of the recent dry and sunny weather, the haul road and the exposed area would be dry very quickly. The Contractor was recommended to provide more frequent water spraying especially in the dry and sunny weather.</p>	
3	CIR-003	14 May 2009 at Outfall	Public through EPD	<p>EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP/RW/080206) regarding to daytime construction rock breaking at 7:15 am</p>	<p>The closest date to the complaint for the 1-hour TSP monitoring &amp; daytime construction noise monitoring was on 12, 18 and 27 May 2009 at Greenview Terrace, ASR9 and NSR9. Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking, loading and unloading the materials were observed during monitoring period. The measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. All 1-hour TSP concentrations at ASR9 were below the established Action and Limit Levels. No 1-hour TSP</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				<p>and dusty at the outfall construction site on 14 May 2009.</p>	<p>exceedance was recorded.</p> <p>The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have been implemented by the Contractor. However, noise mitigation measures could be further improved.</p> <p>Based on our site inspection and monitoring results, the complaint for dust is considered not justifiable since no action &amp; limit level exceedance on construction dust is identified. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have also been implemented in order to control and minimise the air quality impact arising from the construction activities. In view of the recent dry and sunny weather, the haul road and the exposed area would be dry very quickly. The Contractor was recommended to enhance water spraying especially in the dry and sunny weather.</p> <p>On the other hand, the complaint for noise is considered due to works and the Contractor was agreed to improve the on-site noise mitigation measures such as the following measures. ET's site inspection and the joint inspection with relevant parties was conducted on 29 May 2009 and 4 June 2009 respectively to confirm all the below measures have been implemented.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the idling plant, it should be switched off to reduce noise level generated.</li> <li>• The sound insulation sheets and noise insulation materials should be placed to enclose the breaking tip tightly and also aside or surrounding the breaking activities as recommended in the following photos 1-3 in noise mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Noise monitoring frequency was increased in order to check the effectiveness of the mitigation measures. The additional measurement was taken on 27 May, 8 June, 10 June and 12 June 2009 after all the measures implemented. The noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) were 70.9 dB (A), 70.5 dB (A), 70.3 dB (A) and 70.3 dB (A) respectively, which comply with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. Soil nailing, excavation and rock breaking were observed during monitoring period.</li> </ul>	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					The measures were well in place and seemed effective during the measurement.	
4	CIR-004	10 July 2009 at Outfall	Public through EPD	EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/15137-09) regarding to construction dust from the outfall construction site on 10 July 2009.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      1-hour TSP concentration monitoring was on 10 July 2009 at Greenview Terrace, ASR9. Soil nailing works, concrete breaking, excavation and loading &amp; unloading excavated materials were observed during monitoring. All 1-hour TSP concentrations at ASR9 were below the established Action and Limit Levels. No exceedance was recorded on 10 July 2009.</p> <p>The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. It was confirmed that the air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have been provided by the Contractor. The mitigation measures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water spraying was provided to the exposed surface.</li> <li>• Automatic sprinklers were provided at the outfall construction site for water spraying of the haul road.</li> <li>• Water spraying was provided during dust generating works (e.g. rock breaking and soil nailing works).</li> <li>• Tarpaulin was used for covering the dusty works in the Portal area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u>                      The complaint is considered not justifiable since no action &amp; limit level exceedance on construction dust are identified</p>	Closed
5 & 6	CIR-005	29 July 2009 & 11 August 2009 at Outfall	Public through SOR	SOR has received two complaints (SOR ref: (DC/2007/12)/M45/500/02480, 02500) from Greenview Terrace regarding to daytime construction noise exceedance	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in July and August 2009. According to the noise monitoring results from 6 July 2009 to 31 August 2009 at NSR 9, the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. All 1-hour TSP concentrations at ASR9 were below the established Action and Limit Levels from 6 July 2009 to 25 August 2009.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u>                      The dust complaint on 22 July 2009 was due to the soil nailing works. The</p>	Same Case with Complaint No. 11

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				<p>recorded at NSR9 on 8, 22, 23, 27 and 29 July 2009 and a large amount dust generated at the outfall construction site. The complaint dates were corresponded to 29 July and 11 August 2009.</p>	<p>Contractor was reminded enhance the dust mitigation measures during soil nailing works. A designated staff was provided to spray water continuously during soil nailing. A nylon bag was placed on the drilling hole and keeping wet to suppress dust. A sprinkler was added at the hillside of the site and water spraying was provided continuously during operation of drilling to suppress dust.</p> <p>The documented complaint for noise is considered to trigger the action level and the Contractor was also reminded to enhance the on-site noise mitigation measures continuously. The enhanced mitigation measures are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff from the Contractor was designated to take the reading of Leq (5mins) at the roof of Greenview Terrace. In case of the Leq (5min) exceed 73 dB(A), the Contractor would re-schedule the noisy plants to mitigate the escalation of noise level.</li> <li>• The designated staff was reminded to record all the weather condition including raining and wind speed.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for the Contractor's Team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as much as possible.</li> <li>• Movable noise barriers were placed on site and the movable noise barriers were also modified.</li> <li>• Existing 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the another breaker.</li> <li>• The breaking tap of the 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by another breaking tap.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall was installed at the vertical face of westbound to mitigate the noise rebound from the vertical face to high level of Greenview Terrace.</li> </ul> <p>From the additional monitoring data and monitoring data under regular EM&amp;A requirements, noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) between 6 July to 31 August 2009 was in the range of 71 to 74 dB(A) to the nearest integer. The noise monitoring frequency was maintained in twice per week to check whether the mitigation measures are effective. From the information of the Contractor, all the mitigation measures were implemented on 31 August</p>	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					2009. Noise levels ( $L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}$ ) were also re-measured after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Noise level ( $L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}$ ) from 4 Sep to 28 Sep 2009 was in the range of 70 to 73 dB(A) to the nearest integer after the implementation of the mitigation measures. In our investigation, there was no exceedance of the measured noise level at Greenview Terrace.	
7	CIR-006	12 August 2009 at Outfall	Public through SOR	SOR has received a complaint (SOR ref: (DC/2007/12)/M45/5 00/02527) from Greenview Terrace, via Apple Daily regarding to daytime construction noise level ( $L_{eq(30min)}$ ) was sometimes more than 80 dB(A) and a large amount dust generated at the outfall construction site. The complaint date was corresponded to 12 August 2009.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in July and August 2009. According to the noise monitoring results from 6 July 2009 to 31 August 2009 at NSR 9, the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. All 1-hour TSP concentrations at ASR9 were below the established Action and Limit Levels from 6 July 2009 to 25 August 2009.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u>                      The dust complaint was considered not justifiable since no action &amp; limit level exceedance on construction dust were identified. However, it was a recurrent case from Greenview Terrace. The Contractor was recommended to enhance water spraying continuously especially in rock breaking activities.                      On the other hand, there was no noise levels (<math>L_{eq(30min)}</math>) from the measurement taken from ET was more than 80 dB(A). However, it was a recurrent case from Greenview Terrace. The Contractor was reminded to enhance the on-site noise mitigation measures. The enhanced mitigation measures are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff from the Contractor was designated to take the reading of <math>L_{eq}</math> (5mins) at the roof of Greenview Terrace. In case of the <math>L_{eq}</math> (5min) exceed 73 dB(A), the Contractor would re-schedule the noisy plants to mitigate the escalation of noise level.</li> <li>• The designated staff was reminded to record all the weather condition including raining and wind speed.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for the Contractor's Team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as</li> </ul>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>much as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movable noise barriers were placed on site and the movable noise barriers were also modified.</li> <li>• Existing 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the another breaker.</li> <li>• The breaking tap of the 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by another breaking tap.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall was installed at the vertical face of westbound to mitigate the noise rebound from the vertical face to high level of Greenview Terrace.</li> </ul> <p>From the additional monitoring data and monitoring data under regular EM&amp;A requirements, noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 6 July to 31 August 2009 was in the range of 71 to 74 dB(A) to the nearest integer. The noise monitoring frequency was maintained in twice per week to check whether the mitigation measures are effective. From the information of the Contractor, all the mitigation measures were implemented on 31 August 2009. Noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) were also re-measured after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 4 Sep to 28 Sep 2009 was in the range of 70 to 73 dB(A) to the nearest integer after the implementation of the mitigation measures.</p>	
8	CIR-007	14 August 2009 at Outfall	Public through EPD	<p>EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/17978-09) from Greenview Terrace regarding to daytime construction noise from the outfall construction site. The complaint date was corresponded to 14 August 2009.</p>	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in July and August 2009. According to the noise monitoring results from 6 July 2009 to 31 August 2009 at NSR 9, the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Remedial Action</u>                      This was a recurrent case from Greenview Terrace. The documented complaint for noise is considered to trigger the action level and the Contractor was reminded to enhance the on-site noise mitigation measures continuously. The enhanced mitigation measures are proposed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff from the Contractor was designated to take the reading of <math>L_{eq}</math></li> </ul>	Same Case with Complaint No. 11

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>(5mins) at the roof of Greenview Terrace. In case of the Leq (5min) exceed 73 dB(A), the Contractor would re-schedule the noisy plants to mitigate the escalation of noise level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The designated staff was reminded to record all the weather condition including raining and wind speed.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for the Contractor's Team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as much as possible.</li> <li>• Movable noise barriers were placed on site and the movable noise barriers were also modified.</li> <li>• Existing 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the another breaker.</li> <li>• The breaking tap of the 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by another breaking tap.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall was installed at the vertical face of westbound to mitigate the noise rebound from the vertical face to high level of Greenview Terrace.</li> </ul> <p>From the additional monitoring data and monitoring data under regular EM&amp;A requirements, noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 6 July to 31 August 2009 was in the range of 71 to 74 dB(A) to the nearest integer. The noise monitoring frequency would be maintained in twice per week to check whether the mitigation measures are effective. From the information of the Contractor, all the mitigation measures were implemented on 31 August 2009. Noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) were also re-measured after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 4 Sep to 28 Sep 2009 was in the range of 70 to 73 dB(A) to the nearest integer after the implementation of the mitigation measures.</p>	
9	CIR-008	17 August 2009 at Portion D of the Site	Public through SOR	SOR has received a complaint (SOR ref:(DC/2007/12)/M4 5/500/02546) from Long Bench Garden	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u></p> <p>Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in August 2009. The monitoring results from 3 August 2009 to 31 August 2009 at NSR 8 showed the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. The contractor and the environmental</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				regarding to noise nuisance generated from the daytime construction work (rock-breaking) in Portion D of the Site. The complaint date was corresponded to 17 August 2009.	team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. Noise mitigation measures should be enhanced continuously due to this complaint. <u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u> The documented complaint for noise is considered to trigger the action level and the Contractor was reminded to enhance the on-site noise mitigation measures continuously. The enhanced mitigation measures are recommended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Movable noise barriers had been placed towards the direction of Long Bench Garden, particular for the pipe pile works in the portal.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for construction team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as much as possible.</li> <li>• The existing noisy 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the other breaker.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall had been fixed on the vertical face of west bound to absorb the noise generated towards Long Beach Garden.</li> </ul> Noise monitoring frequency was increased twice per week by ET due to this complaint. The measured noise levels were complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. No further complaint was received from Long Bench Garden within the reporting month.	
10	CIR-009	22 August 2009 at Outfall	Public through SOR	A complaint (SOR ref: (DC/2007/12)/M45/500/02628) was received from Greenview Terrace regarding to daytime construction noise level (Leq(30min)) was sometimes exceeded 75 dB(A)	<u>Findings/ Observations</u> Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in July and August 2009. The monitoring results from 6 July 2009 to 31 August 2009 at NSR 9 showed the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. Noise mitigation measures should be enhanced continuously due to this complaint. <u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u> The documented complaint for noise is considered to trigger the action level and the Contractor was reminded to enhance the on-site noise	Same Case with Complaint No. 11

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				<p>at the outfall construction site. The complaint date was corresponded to 22 August 2009.</p>	<p>mitigation measures continuously. The enhanced mitigation measures are recommended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff from the Contractor was designated to take the reading of Leq (5mins) at the roof of Greenview Terrace. In case of the Leq (5min) exceed 73 dB(A), the Contractor would re-schedule the noisy plants to mitigate the escalation of noise level.</li> <li>• The designated staff was reminded to record all the weather condition including raining and wind speed.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for the Contractor's Team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as much as possible.</li> <li>• Movable noise barriers were placed on site and the movable noise barriers were also modified.</li> <li>• Existing 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the another breaker.</li> <li>• The breaking tap of the 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by another breaking tap.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall was installed at the vertical face of westbound to mitigate the noise rebound from the vertical face to high level of Greenview Terrace.</li> </ul> <p>From the additional monitoring data and monitoring data under regular EM&amp;A requirements, noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 6 July to 31 August 2009 was in the range of 71 to 74 dB(A) to the nearest integer. The noise monitoring frequency was maintained in twice per week to check whether the mitigation measures are effective. From the information of the Contractor, all the mitigation measures were implemented on 31 August 2009. Noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) were also re-measured after the implementation of the mitigation measures. Noise level (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) from 4 Sep to 28 Sep 2009 was in the range of 70 to 73 dB(A) to the nearest integer after the implementation of the mitigation measures. In our investigation, there was no exceedance of the measured noise level at Greenview Terrace.</p>	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
11	CIR-010	24 September 2009 at Outfall	Public through SOR	A complaint (SOR ref: (DC/2007/12)/M45/500/02749) was received from Greenview Terrace regarding to daytime construction noise level (Leq(30min)) was sometimes exceeded 75 dB(A) at the outfall construction site.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Soil nailing, excavation, rock breaking and drilling, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in July and September 2009. The monitoring results from 6 July 2009 to 29 October 2009 at NSR 9 showed the measured noise levels complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to the complaint. Noise mitigation measures have been enhanced continuously due to this complaint.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u>                      The documented complaint for noise is considered to trigger the action level and the Contractor was reminded to enhance the on-site noise mitigation measures continuously. The enhanced mitigation measures were implemented as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A staff from the Contractor was designated to take the reading of Leq (5mins) at the roof of Greenview Terrace. In case of the Leq (5min) exceed 73 dB(A), the Contractor would re-schedule the noisy plants to mitigate the escalation of noise level.</li> <li>• The designated staff was reminded to record all the weather condition including raining and wind speed.</li> <li>• Tools box talk for the Contractor's Team was carried out for reminding that the movable barrier should be placed to the breaking activities as much as possible.</li> <li>• Movable noise barriers were placed on site and the movable noise barriers were also modified.</li> <li>• Existing 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by the another breaker.</li> <li>• The breaking tap of the 25 ton rock breaker had been replaced by another breaking tap.</li> <li>• A joint filler wall was installed at the vertical face of westbound to mitigate the noise rebound from the vertical face to high level of Greenview Terrace.</li> </ul>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>From the additional monitoring data above and the regular monitoring under EM&amp;A requirements, the measured noise levels were complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. From the noise level on 25 September 2009 and 2 October 2009, the trend of noise level seemed to be increased since the decoration work at 14/F Greenview Terrace was the domain noise source during the monitoring. The noise level during that time would be considered for reference only. There was no exceedance of the measured noise level at Greenview Terrace in our investigation.</p>	
12	CIR-011	2 October 2009 at I-3	Public through EPD	<p>EPD has received a complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/22016-09) regarding to construction dust at the Intake-3 on 2 October 2009.</p>	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u></p> <p>There is no representative air monitoring location as stated in the EM&amp;A Manual. The contractor and the environmental team were undertaken site investigation on the subject area at 08-Oct-09 in response to the complaint. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have been implemented by the Contractor. However, the dust impact by exposed area could be further improved. The mitigation measures during the site investigation were observed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water spraying was provided to the exposed surface.</li> <li>• Wheel washing facilities for dump trucks was provided at the site exit.</li> <li>• Water spraying was provided during excavation and loading/unloading works</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u></p> <p>Based on our site inspection, the complaint for dust is considered justifiable as it is due to windy erosion on the exposed surface. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA have also been implemented in order to control and minimise the air quality impact arising from the construction activities. In view of the recent dry season, the haul road and the exposed area would be dry very quickly. The Contractor was recommended to provide water spraying more frequently especially in the dry season.</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
13	(DC/2007/12)/M45/500/2923 & email on 11 November 2009 from MCSJV	9 November 2009 at Outfall	Greenview Terrace through EPD	Movable noise barrier was not placed close enough to the piling machine.	<p><u>Immediate Action</u>                      The rig was re-orientated and the barrier was placed closed to the drilling head.</p> <p><u>Follow-up Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training was conducted to the operator to ensure that the workers aware that the barrier should be placed closed not the drilling head not the machine itself.</li> <li>• In order to prevent future occurrence, a permit to dig system was adopted. It should be checked by the Contractor and endorsed by the SOR before starting the drilling rig.</li> </ul> <p>The follow up action was checked and a permit to dig system has been implemented.</p>	Closed
14	(DC/2007/12)/M45/500/2978 & email on 19 November 2009 from MCSJV	18 November 2009 at Outfall	Greenview Terrace through EPD	Rock-breaking activity carried out in the eastern area of Portion D, closest to Greenview Terrace, was not totally screened and line of sight of the breaker was observed from the NSR.	<p><u>Follow up Action</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bamboo scaffold was extended further away from stage 3 scaffold to further screen off the activities to the Greenview. The length of the extension was about 8 to 10 m.</li> <li>• A strong reminded was given to the relevant staff and sub-contractor and the barrier should be placed in the right orientation before breaking.</li> <li>• The mitigation measures were strictly followed as stated in the proposal.</li> </ul> <p>The follow up action and relevant records was checked.</p>	Closed
15.	CIR-12	19 January 2010 at Intake-3 construction site	Public through EPD	EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/01270-10) regarding effluent discharge at Intake-3 construction site on 19 January 2010.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      The effluent discharge on 19 January 2010 was due to the leakage of Gabion wall at I3. The water from the rock drilling work was flowing through the gap of the Gabion Wall to the watercourses at I3.</p> <p><u>Immediate Action</u>                      The contractor had sealed the gap at the Gabion Wall immediately after the incident.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u>                      Based on our site inspection, the complaint was due to leakage of Gabion</p>	Closed.

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					wall. The area would be checked and maintained continuously to avoid recurrence case. The above identified mitigation measures have been implemented by the Contractor on 22 January 2010 and ET has also checked the implementation on 31 January 2010. The ET will closely inspect the watercourses during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor.	
16	CIR-13	19 January 2010 at Intake-3 construction site	Public through EPD	EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/01319-10) regarding daytime construction noise at Intake-3 construction site on 19 January 2010.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u></p> <p>The monitoring station concerned is NSR6 (i.e. at Squatter facing to the construction site). Excavation, soil nailing, rock drilling and breaking, loading and unloading the materials were generally observed during monitoring period in mid-January 2010. The measured noise levels in January 2010 complied with the limit level in accordance with the EM&amp;A Manual. These cases would also be treated as two action level exceedances on noise. The Contractor and the Environmental Team were also undertaken site investigation on the subject area in response to complaint. The noise mitigation measures during the site investigation were recommended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound insulation sheets were installed covering the working area during breaking and rock drilling in order to block the line of sight to the NSR.</li> <li>• Noise insulation materials were used to enclose the drilling rig tightly.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u></p> <p>Based on the site inspection and monitoring results, the complaint was due to noise generated by rock breaking work. The identified mitigation measures have been discussed with the Contractor and the Contractor has submitted the remedial proposal. The proposal was implemented by the Contractor on 25 January 2010 and ET has also checked the implementation on 31 January 2010. The Contractor was also advised to review the mitigation measures from time to time near the NSR at I3. The ET will closely inspect the area during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor.</p>	Closed.
17	CIR-13	21 January 2010 at Intake-3	Public through	EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref:	Refers to Investigation /Mitigation Action for Complaint No. 16.	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
		construction site	EPD	EP3/N22/RW/01444-10) regarding daytime construction noise at Intake-3 construction site on 21 January 2010.		
18	CIR-14	27 August 2010 near Intake-2 construction site	Public through DSD	DSD has received a public complaint regarding choked sewage manhole (MH1) at Lo Wai Road construction site on 27 August 2010.	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      During DSD inspection on 30 August 2010, improper discharge from the site to manhole, MH3, which is located downstream of MH1 was observed. ET had received those information from the Contractor on 09 September 2010. Site investigation was also carried out by SOR's representative with the Contractor on 01 September 2010. Checking with the site log, the construction activity at Lo Wai on 27 August 2010 was pipe jacking only. No site formation works was undertaken. The contractor and SOR's representative have undertaken site investigation on the subject area on 01 September 2010. On-site flow test at Portion G had conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Maeda works area is located at the lower section of Lo Wai Road and manhole MH3 is adjacent to the works area. MH1 (choked sewage manhole) is located at the upper section of Lo Wai Road. MH2 manhole is located middle section of Lo Wai Road. MH1 and MH2 are outside the works area.</li> <li>● Water flow test for manhole MH2 and MH3 and no blockage was observed.</li> <li>● Sewage overflow was found at MH1 during the joint site inspection on 01 September 2010</li> <li>● It was reported that there were water pipes connected between the site and the MH3. Discharge was found in MH3 during DSD inspection.</li> <li>● The contractor claimed that the purpose of the water pipes was to direct the storm water and underground water inside the concrete pipe "pipe jacking".</li> <li>● There was no discharge license for that portion. The Contractor had stopped on 01 September 2010 the water pumping to MH3 and</li> </ul>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>apply the discharge license for the Lo Wai site.</p> <p><u>Conclusion/Proposed Action</u>                      Based on the joint site inspection, the choked manhole MH1 was not due to works activities. The Contractor had clean up the choked manhole MH1 and no sewage overflow from MH1 was observed. The Contractor was requested to divert the storm water to desilting system prior to discharge while no such discharge can be made until a valid discharge license is granted. The ET will closely inspect the vicinity area during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor as necessary.</p>	
19&20	CIR-15	17 November 2010 at outfall construction site	Public through EPD	<p>EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/24002-10 and EP3/N22/RW/24006-10) regarding daytime construction noise about derrick barge squeaking and rock breaking at Outfall construction site on 17 November 2010.</p>	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u>                      Drilling, excavation, marine mud dredging, rock breaking, mucking-out process and crane operation were observed during site inspections on 2 and 17 December 2010. The monitoring results measured on 15 November 2010 and 25 November at NSR 9 showed that the measured noise levels complied with the limit level (75 dB(A)) in accordance with the EIAO-TM. As part of the investigation of the noise complaints, the Contractor and the ET conducted additional site inspections and reviewed and audited the current noise mitigation practices and the Contractor's environmental performance on-site.</p> <p><u>Conclusion / Proposed Action</u>                      The documented complaints for noise triggered the action level of the noise monitoring. The Contractor had implemented the following on-site noise mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Erection of temporary noise insulation sheet at the rim of the spiral ramp construction site;</li> <li>● Moveable barriers for rock breaker;</li> <li>● Wrapping noise absorptive material at the rock breaker head;</li> <li>● Tailor made noise enclosure for drilling rig;</li> <li>● Semi-enclosed muck out process at muck hopper;</li> <li>● Use of rock splitter (which is a relatively quieter method in contrast to rock breaker); and</li> <li>● Noise insulation blanket enclosing the crane engine of derrick barge.</li> </ul> <p>Noise monitoring was increased to twice per week and the results were</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>reported in the Complaint Investigation Report submitted on 24 December 2010. The measured noise level after implementation of the noise mitigation measures ranged from 69 to 73 dB(A) to the nearest integer and complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. The results showed that noise mitigation measures were effective. The contractor was advised to review the mitigation measures from time to time near the NSR 9. The ET would closely inspect the area during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor.</p>	
21	CIR-16	10 January 2011 at outfall construction site	Public through EPD	<p>EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/00484-11) regarding dark smoke emission from derrick barge and construction noise and dust at Outfall construction site on 10 January 2011.</p>	<p><u>Findings/ Observations</u></p> <p>1. <u>Dark Smoke Emission from Derrick Barge</u>                      Dark smoke emitted from the derrick barge was promptly investigated after the receipt of the complaint. The issue was found specific to the mechanical operation of the barge working at the site at that moment. The derrick barge being complained was then replaced by another barge without the relevant mechanical issue. No further complaint was received since then.</p> <p>2. <u>Construction Dust</u>                      Regular 1-hour TSP monitoring, in accordance with EM&amp;A Manual, was carried out by the Environmental Team (ET). The monitoring station concerned is ASR 9, located at the podium level of Greenview Terrace facing the construction site. In January, 1 hour TSP concentration monitoring had been conducted on 4, 10, 14, 20 and 26 January 2011 at Greenview Terrace (ASR). Rock breaking, drilling and excavation were observed during monitoring. No exceedance was recorded.</p> <p>The contractor and the environmental team were also undertaken site investigation at the subject area on 21 January 2011 in response to the complaint. It was confirmed that the air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA had been provided by the Contractor. The mitigation measures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Water spraying surrounding the spiral ramp;</li> <li>● Water spraying for rock drilling and rock breaking;</li> <li>● Water spraying for C&amp;D material before loading and unloading to</li> </ul>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>derrick barge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Water spraying for the exposed surface and the haul road;</li> <li>● Water spraying for trucks and vehicles at the site exit.</li> </ul> <p>3. <u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>The documented complaints for noise triggered the action level of the noise monitoring. The Contractor had implemented the following on-site noise mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Extension of Temporary noise insulation barrier (made of noise blanket) at the rim of the spiral ramp construction site facing Greenview Terrace;</li> <li>● Movable noise barriers to surround the rock breaking activities at the spiral ramp where it is in safe ground condition;</li> <li>● Tailor made noise enclosure for rock drilling machine;</li> <li>● Semi-enclosed muck out process at muck hopper (with noise curtain underneath);</li> <li>● Use of temporary noise enclosure for piling work at Castle Peak Road;</li> <li>● Noise insulation blanket enclosing the crane engine of derrick barge;</li> <li>● Additional noise blanket along the railings of the spiral ramp; and</li> <li>● Use of rock splitter (which is a relatively quieter method in contrast to rock breaker).</li> </ul> <p>Noise monitoring has been increased to twice per week and the results will be reported in the Complaint Investigation Report to be submitted in mid-February 2011. The measured noise level after implementation of the noise mitigation measures ranged from 71 to 74 dB(A) to the nearest integer and complied with the limit level in accordance with the EIAO-TM. The results showed that noise mitigation measures were effective. The contractor was advised to review the mitigation measures from time to time near the NSR 9. The ET would closely inspect the area during the routine site inspections and provide advice to the Contractor.</p> <p><u>Conclusion / Proposed Action</u></p> <p>1. <u>Dark Smoke Emission from Derrick Barge</u>                      Dark smoke emitted from the derrick barge was considered a stand-alone</p>	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>incident and was specific to the derrick barge being complained. No further complaint was received after the barge was replaced by another.</p> <p>2. <u>Construction Dust</u>                      Based on our site inspection and monitoring results, the complaint was considered not justifiable since no action and limit level exceedance on construction dust were identified. Air quality mitigation measures as recommended in EIA were implemented in order to control and minimize the air quality impact and nuisance arising from the construction activities. Nevertheless, the Contractor was reminded to enhance the air quality mitigation measures such as increasing the water spraying frequency and ensure proper functioning of the automatic sprinklers at the Outfall construction site.</p> <p>3. <u>Construction Noise</u>                      Noise measurement results between 10 and 28 January 2011 were below the limit level (75 dB(A)) and complied with the noise criterion. The Contractor had implemented various mitigation measures on site to alleviate the construction noise impact. The ET will remind the Contractor to enhance and maintain the normal functioning of the measures continuously to minimize the impact. The Contractor should also closely liaise with the nearby residents and inform the progress of the construction and the implementation of the environmental mitigation measures at the Outfall construction site.</p>	
22	CIR-17	30 June 2011 at Intake-3 construction site	Public through EPD	EPD has received a public complaint (EPD ref: EP3/N22/RW/12759-11) regarding construction dust and daytime construction noise from the Intake-3 construction site on 30 June	<p>1. <u>Findings / Observations</u>                      Checking with the site log, construction activities conducted at I-3 were breaking / mucking out and rock splitting inside the shaft, curing of planter wall, backfilling at tree pit, slope reinstatement and backfilling at PB wall, monitoring of de-deformation monitoring point, and general site cleaning and housekeeping. The Contractor and ET undertook site investigations on the subject area on 8 and 20 July 2011. The following dust and noise mitigation measures were implemented during site investigations:  <u>Dust Mitigation Measures (implemented prior to the complaint)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All the main haul road was paved;</li> </ul>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
				2011.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Material transported by a dump truck was covered with impervious sheeting;</li> <li>● Exposed soil slope surface near the PB wall was covered by tarpaulin sheets;</li> <li>● Hoardings (with 2.4 m high) were provided along the site boundary next to the access road;</li> <li>● Regular watering on haul roads by sprinklers was observed;</li> <li>● Vehicle speed limit of 5 km per hour was implemented within the construction site;</li> <li>● Water spraying for dust suppression of on-going “dusty” activities (essentially including drilling and rock breaking within the shaft of about 16.5 m below ground) was observed;</li> </ul> <p><u>Construction Noise Mitigation Measures (implemented prior to the complaint)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Temporary noise barriers (about 4 m high) were erected on the shaft concrete block wall;</li> <li>● Quiet plant (rock splitter) was employed for shaft excavation;</li> <li>● Noise from generator was screened by a temporary noise barrier; and</li> <li>● Breaker heads of rock breaking machine were wrapped with sound insulating materials.</li> </ul> <p>2. <u>Conclusion / Proposed Action</u></p> <p>As there are no substantial noise sources at I-3 other than the project construction activities, it is considered that the noise complaint is project-related. In accordance with the Event / Action Plan for Construction Noise specified in the EM&amp;A Manual, noise monitoring frequency at the squatters (NSR 6) near I-3 were increased to twice per week (from 11 July 2011 to 30 July 2011) due to this complaint. The measured noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ min}}</math>) are shown in the following table. The measured noise levels, ranged from 60.0 dB(A) to 68.9 dB(A), are well below the limit level (75 dB(A)) in accordance with the EIAO-TM. During the site investigations on 8 and 20 July 2011, the above noise mitigation measures were continuously implemented. No further noise complaint was received in July 2011. Thus, with the consideration of the noise measurement results</p>	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status																																																
					<p>and implementation of the above noise mitigation measures, the construction noise is considered acceptable. The Contractor will maintain the noise mitigation measures mentioned above to minimise noise nuisance.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Start Time</th> <th>End Time</th> <th>L<sub>eq</sub>, dB(A)</th> <th>Limit Level, dB(A)</th> <th>Major Construction Noise Sources</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6-Jul-11</td> <td>11:17</td> <td>11:47</td> <td>60.0</td> <td>75</td> <td>Crane operation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>14-Jul-11</td> <td>16:00</td> <td>16:30</td> <td>67.0</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and rock breaking</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15-Jul-11</td> <td>17:00</td> <td>17:30</td> <td>68.9</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and rock breaking</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18-Jul-11</td> <td>13:30</td> <td>14:00</td> <td>65.7</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and crane operation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20-Jul-11</td> <td>13:10</td> <td>13:40</td> <td>68.1</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and rock breaking</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28-Jul-11</td> <td>13:35</td> <td>14:05</td> <td>64.9</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and excavation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30-Jul-11</td> <td>09:10</td> <td>09:40</td> <td>63.6</td> <td>75</td> <td>Drilling and crane operation</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Remark:                      The location of powered mechanical equipment (PME) will change occasionally and the utilization time for each PME may not be constant.</p> <p>As observed during the site investigation on 8 July 2011, dust suppression measures aforementioned were implemented on site. Additional dust control measures have been implemented at I-3 by the Contractor in early July 2011 to further suppress dust emission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Tailor-made frame with blankets has been installed for the drilling rig;</li> <li>2) Water hoses have been installed to the drilling rig within the tailor-made frame during drilling; and</li> <li>3) Water smog device installed at the edge of intermediate platform of</li> </ol>	Date	Start Time	End Time	L <sub>eq</sub> , dB(A)	Limit Level, dB(A)	Major Construction Noise Sources	6-Jul-11	11:17	11:47	60.0	75	Crane operation	14-Jul-11	16:00	16:30	67.0	75	Drilling and rock breaking	15-Jul-11	17:00	17:30	68.9	75	Drilling and rock breaking	18-Jul-11	13:30	14:00	65.7	75	Drilling and crane operation	20-Jul-11	13:10	13:40	68.1	75	Drilling and rock breaking	28-Jul-11	13:35	14:05	64.9	75	Drilling and excavation	30-Jul-11	09:10	09:40	63.6	75	Drilling and crane operation	
Date	Start Time	End Time	L <sub>eq</sub> , dB(A)	Limit Level, dB(A)	Major Construction Noise Sources																																																	
6-Jul-11	11:17	11:47	60.0	75	Crane operation																																																	
14-Jul-11	16:00	16:30	67.0	75	Drilling and rock breaking																																																	
15-Jul-11	17:00	17:30	68.9	75	Drilling and rock breaking																																																	
18-Jul-11	13:30	14:00	65.7	75	Drilling and crane operation																																																	
20-Jul-11	13:10	13:40	68.1	75	Drilling and rock breaking																																																	
28-Jul-11	13:35	14:05	64.9	75	Drilling and excavation																																																	
30-Jul-11	09:10	09:40	63.6	75	Drilling and crane operation																																																	

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>the shaft.</p> <p>The Contractor have continuously applied all the above mentioned dust suppression measures to minimise airborne dust generation, as observed during the site investigation on 20 July 2011. No dust dispersion from the construction site was observed during the site investigations on 8 and 20 July 2011. In addition, no further construction dust complaint is received in July 2011. As such, it is considered that the dust suppression measures implemented on site are adequate to minimise dust nuisance. The Contractor will maintain these measures on site for construction dust control.</p> <p>3. <u>Follow Up Action(s)</u></p> <p>For this complaint, the Contractor has implemented adequate mitigation measures for construction dust and noise control. As no further complaint is received in July 2011, it is considered that the complaint is closed. Nevertheless, the ET will continuously review the condition of the site during the routine site inspections, inspect proper functioning of the aforementioned construction dust and noise mitigation measures, and provide advice to the Contractor to be vigilant and tailor mitigation measures in advance of future planned site work activities.</p>	
23	CIR-18	2 September 2011 at Sheung Kok Shan near Intake 2	Mr. Cheung through EPD	EPD have received a complaint from Mr. Cheung, who lived in Sheung Kok Shan, concerning construction noise arising from the use of the TBM at night time. He alleged that the noise emanated from the tunnelling works had caused	<p>1. <u>Findings / Observations</u></p> <p>According to the approved EIA Report, it is recommended to restrict the tunnel boring machine (TBM) operation in the non-restricted period for tunnel section from chainage 1295 m to 1449 m. Checking with the site log, the Contractor has strictly followed the EIA recommendation for the TBM operation within the non-restricted period between the chainage 1295 m to 1449 m. TBM moved from CH1449 on 11 August 2011 and passed through CH1295 on 23 August 2011, and the Contractor resumed night time TBM operation afterwards. TBM was operating at night time (from 01:10 to 07:00) on 26 August 2011 (about 55 m away from the EIA restricted zone and about 22 m away from Mr. Cheung's house, which is located near CH1218).</p>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status																		
				nuisance to him since 26 August 2011.	<p>First verbal complaint from Mr. Cheung was received in the morning of 26 August 2011 by the Contractor. The Contractor had stopped TBM night time operation from 26 August to 01 September 2011 accordingly. On 01 September 2011, TBM was located 38 m away from Mr. Cheung's house and the Contractor attempted to resume the night time operation.</p> <p>Second verbal complaint from Mr. Cheung was received on 02 September 2011 by EPD. The Contractor took immediate measure to stop the night time operation from 02 to 07 September 2011. On 08 September 2011, TBM moved 109 m away from Mr. Cheung's house. The Contractor attempted to resume night time operation and no further complaint was received after that.</p> <p>2. <u>Mitigation Measure Implemented after Receiving the Complaints</u></p> <p>Night time operation of the TBM was restricted as shown in the following table:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>Night Time Operation<sup>1</sup></th> <th>Remark</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25 - 26 Aug 2011</td> <td>From 01:10 to 07:00 (26 Aug)</td> <td>The Contractor received a verbal complaint in the morning (26 Aug 2011). The Contractor began to stop night time TBM operation. TBM was located about 22 m away from Mr. Cheung's house.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>26 - 27 Aug 2011</td> <td>-</td> <td>No night time TBM operation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>27 - 28 Aug 2011</td> <td>-</td> <td>No night time TBM operation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>28 - 29 Aug 2011</td> <td>-</td> <td>No night time TBM operation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>29 - 30 Aug 2011</td> <td>-</td> <td>No night time TBM operation</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Period	Night Time Operation <sup>1</sup>	Remark	25 - 26 Aug 2011	From 01:10 to 07:00 (26 Aug)	The Contractor received a verbal complaint in the morning (26 Aug 2011). The Contractor began to stop night time TBM operation. TBM was located about 22 m away from Mr. Cheung's house.	26 - 27 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	27 - 28 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	28 - 29 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	29 - 30 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
Period	Night Time Operation <sup>1</sup>	Remark																						
25 - 26 Aug 2011	From 01:10 to 07:00 (26 Aug)	The Contractor received a verbal complaint in the morning (26 Aug 2011). The Contractor began to stop night time TBM operation. TBM was located about 22 m away from Mr. Cheung's house.																						
26 - 27 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation																						
27 - 28 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation																						
28 - 29 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation																						
29 - 30 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation																						

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action			Status
					30 - 31 Aug 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					31 Aug - 01 Sep 2011	--	No night time TBM operation. TBM was located about 38 m away from Mr. Cheung's house.	
					01 - 02 Sep 2011	From 23:00 (01 Sep) to 04:50 (02 Sep)	The Contractor attempted to resume night time TBM operation on 01 Sep 2011. ET received a complaint via EPD in the morning (2 Sep 2011). The Contractor began to stop night time TBM operation on 02 Sep 2011.	
					02 - 03 Sep 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					03 - 04 Sep 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					04 - 05 Sep 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					05 - 06 Sep 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					06 - 07 Sep 2011	-	No night time TBM operation	
					07 - 08 Sep 2011	From 06:00 to 07:00 (08 Sep 2011)	TBM was located about 109 m away from Mr. Cheung's house. The Contractor attempted to resume TBM night time operation and no further complaint was received.	
					Remark: 1. "Night Time" refers to 23:00 to 07:00 of the following day. 3. <u>Conclusion / Proposed Action</u> Having reviewed the timing of the complaints and periods of TBM operation during the night time on 25 - 26 August 2011 and 1 - 2			


Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					<p>September 2011, it is believed that the complaints are related to the TBM operation during the night time. The Contractor has undertaken swift and appropriate action in response to Mr. Cheung's complaints. The night time operation of the TBM was restricted following the complaint. As the TBM continues to operate during the day time and moves further away from Mr. Cheung's house, the ground-borne noise nuisance upon Mr. Cheung gradually fades away. It is considered that the nuisance caused by TBM night time operation is then imperceptible from the complainant. No further complaint is received after 2 September 2011. As such, no further action is required.</p> <p>4. <u>Follow Up Action(s)</u></p> <p>For this complaint, the Contractor has implemented adequate mitigation measure (that is, restricting the TBM to operate during the day time only) for ground-borne noise control. The TBM has moved further away from Mr. Cheung's house and no further complaint is received after the Contractor resumed the TBM night time operation (08 September 2011). Thus, it is considered that the complaint is closed.</p>	
24	CIR-19	8 February 2012 at Intake-3 Construction Site	Mr. Cheng through SOR	SOR has received a public complaint regarding daytime construction noise from the Intake-3 construction site on 8 February 2012.	<p>1) <u>Findings / Observations</u></p> <p>Checking with the site log, construction activities conducted at I-3 in that morning was rock breaking by hydraulic breaker at the proposed access road. The Contractor and ET undertook site investigations on the subject area on 9 February 2012. The following noise mitigation measures were implemented during site investigations:</p> <p><u>Construction Noise Mitigation Measures (implemented prior to the complaint)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Noise barrier on the top of vortex shaft was maintained;</li> <li>2) Silent type breaker tip was utilized; and</li> <li>3) Breaker tip was wrapped by acoustic insulating material.</li> </ol>	Closed

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status																								
					<p>2) <u>Conclusion / Proposed Action</u></p> <p>As there are no substantial noise sources at I-3 other than the project construction activities, it is considered that the noise complaint is project-related. In accordance with the Event / Action Plan for Construction Noise specified in the EM&amp;A Manual, noise monitoring frequency at the squatters (NSR 6) near I-3 were increased to twice per week (from 10 February 2012 to 29 February 2012) due to this complaint. The measured noise levels (<math>L_{eq, 30 \text{ minutes}}</math>) are shown in the following table. The measured noise levels, ranged from 59.5 dB(A) to 68.1 dB(A), are well below the limit level (75 dB(A)) in accordance with the EIAO-TM. During the site investigations on 9 and 23 February 2012, the above noise mitigation measures were continuously implemented. No further noise complaint was received in February 2012. Thus, with the consideration of the noise measurement results and implementation of the above noise mitigation measures, the construction noise is considered acceptable. The Contractor will maintain the noise mitigation measures mentioned above to minimise noise nuisance.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Date</th> <th>Start Time</th> <th>End Time</th> <th><math>L_{eq}</math>, dB(A)</th> <th>Limit Level, dB(A)</th> <th>Major Construction Noise Sources</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>7-Feb-2012</td> <td>13:28</td> <td>13:58</td> <td>60.2</td> <td>75</td> <td>Crane operation and rock breaking</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10-Feb-2012</td> <td>15:15</td> <td>15:45</td> <td>62.1</td> <td>75</td> <td>Crane operation and excavation works</td> </tr> <tr> <td>13-Feb-2012</td> <td>13:35</td> <td>14:05</td> <td>68.1</td> <td>75</td> <td>Crane operation and rock breaking</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Date	Start Time	End Time	$L_{eq}$ , dB(A)	Limit Level, dB(A)	Major Construction Noise Sources	7-Feb-2012	13:28	13:58	60.2	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	10-Feb-2012	15:15	15:45	62.1	75	Crane operation and excavation works	13-Feb-2012	13:35	14:05	68.1	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	
Date	Start Time	End Time	$L_{eq}$ , dB(A)	Limit Level, dB(A)	Major Construction Noise Sources																									
7-Feb-2012	13:28	13:58	60.2	75	Crane operation and rock breaking																									
10-Feb-2012	15:15	15:45	62.1	75	Crane operation and excavation works																									
13-Feb-2012	13:35	14:05	68.1	75	Crane operation and rock breaking																									

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action						Status
					17-Feb-2012	16:20	16:50	60.2	75	Crane operation and excavation works	
					20-Feb-2012	13:33	14:03	66.4	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	
					23-Feb-2012	14:30	15:00	64.3	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	
					27-Feb-2012	11:10	11:40	63.4	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	
					29-Feb-2012	13:26	13:56	59.5	75	Crane operation and rock breaking	
					<p>Remark:                      The location of powered mechanical equipment (PME) will change occasionally and the utilization time for each PME may not be constant.</p> <p>Additional noise mitigation measures have been implemented at I-3 by the Contractor to further reduce the construction noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise barrier comprised of acoustic blankets installed close to the rock breaking area was erected on the site.</li> </ul> <p>The Contractor have continuously applied all the above mentioned noise mitigation measures to minimise construction noise, as observed during the site investigation on 9 and 23 February 2012. No further construction noise complaint was received in February 2012. As such, it is considered that the noise mitigation measures implemented on site are adequate to minimise construction noise nuisance. The Contractor will maintain these measures on site for construction noise control.</p>						

Complaint No.	Log Ref.	Date/Location	Complainant	Details of Complaint	Investigation / Mitigation Action	Status
					3) <u>FOLLOW UP ACTION(S)</u> For this complaint, the Contractor has implemented adequate mitigation measures for construction noise control. As no further complaint is received in February 2012, it is considered that the complaint is closed. Nevertheless, the ET will continuously review the condition of the site during the routine site inspections, inspect proper functioning of the aforementioned construction noise mitigation measures, and provide advice to the Contractor to be vigilant and tailor mitigation measures in advance of future planned site work activities. This case will be reported as an action level exceedance on noise and also in the complaint log in the monthly EM&A Report (February 2012).	

Signed by Environmental Team Leader:



Date:

31 March 2012