(Planning Application No: A/H3/449)

### **RESPONSE-TO-COMMENT TABLE**

Cor	nments	Response
Comments from Environmental Protection Department: (Contact Person: Mr Kelvin CHOI; Tel: 2835 1594)		
1.	Section 4.1.1. Suggest to remove "surrounding" in Line 3.	Noted. Section 4.1.1 has been revised accordingly.
2.	Section 4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.6.1 to 4.6.2, 4.6.14, 4.7.28, 4.7.30 to 4.7.31, 4,8,1, 4,8,6, Table 4.2, and R-t-c 1. Please be reminded that PATH v3.0 model and the year 2019 WRF meteorological data have been released on 31 Jan 2024 and the use of CALINE4 for assessment in Hong Kong has been obsoleted since 31 Jan 2024. The consultant shall update these Sections in the text and in the modelling accordingly. Please be reminded that these updates are mandatory if the report cannot be finalized by 31 July 2024.	Noted. PATH v3.0 and the year 2019 WRF meteorological data have been adopted in the assessment. All relevant sections have been revised.
3.	Section 4.3.2, 4.6.2, 4.8.6, and R-t-c 3. Please be reminded that the adjustments for RSP and FSP will not be necessary if PATH v3.0 is adopted in the assessment. Please be reminded that these updates are mandatory if the report cannot be finalized by 31 July 2024.	Noted. PATH v3.0 have been adopted in the assessment. All relevant sections have been revised.
4.	Section 4.4.3 and R-t-c 5  (a) For construction sites at 27-33 Gage Street, 1-13 Gage Street, 120 Wellington Street, 7-11 Jervois Street and 92 Wellington Street, please supplement the commencement year of these projects to confirm that construction at these sites would be completed/ almost completed when the construction works of the Proposed Development is commenced and provide source of information.	The commencement year of these construction sites cannot be provided as the information is not available. According to the observation during site survey, it is expected that the construction works of those construction sites have been largely completed. Therefore, it is anticipated that the construction works of those construction sites would likely be completed before the commencement of the construction works of the Proposed Development and cumulative air quality impact would not be expected. Section 4.4.3 has been revised accordingly.

Comi	ments	Response
	(b) For 16-20 Gage Street, 118-120 Queen's Road Central, 9-19 Lyndhurst Terrace, 47-59 Staunton Street, 15-19 Hollywood Road, 7-13 Hillier Street, 64-66 Wellington Street, 94-98 Bonham Strand, 29 Des Voeux Road Central, 62E Robinson Road, and 3-6 Glenealy, please clarify whether these sites will have concurrent construction activities with the proposed development and address whether the concurrent construction activities would cause any adverse cumulative air quality impact.	It is anticipated that the construction works of those construction sites will be carried out concurrently with the construction works of the Proposed Development. However, as it is anticipated that mitigation measures for fugitive dust emission would be implemented at those construction sites to reduce the impact generated as a general practice, adverse cumulative air quality impact would not be anticipated. Section 4.4.3 has been revised accordingly.
	(c) Please fix the typo: 4-3dentified in Line 9.	Noted. Section 4.4.3 has been revised accordingly.
	Section 4.6.1, 4.7.28, and R-t-c 6. Please be reminded that the capped values for minimum wind speed and mixing height and the 2015 meteorological data need to be updated if PATH v3.0 is adopted in the assessment. Please be reminded that these updates are mandatory if the report cannot be finalized by 31 July 2024.	Noted. PATH v3.0 has been adopted in the assessment. All relevant sections have been revised.
	Section 4.6.9 and R-t-c 13. Suggest adding a remark in Figure 4.4 that both M36 to M39, and M99 to M106 are departure routes from the Macau Ferry Terminal.	The remark has been supplemented in Figure 4.4.
	Section 4.6.12  (a) Apart from 2018 and 2019 data from Port of Hong Kong Statistical Tables, please review the data from more recent years to confirm that the number of cross-boundary ferries are decreasing	Due to COVID-19, the number of cross boundary ferry in Year 2020 to 2023 are very low. Therefore, the data in 2021 to 2023 Port of Hong Kong Statistical Tables cannot be referred to. Section 4.6.12 has been revised to mention the data in 2018 Port of Hong Statistical Tables, 2019 Port of Hong Statistical Tables and 2020 Port of Hong Statistical Tables is referred.

Comments		Response
	(b) (Line 18-19) and R-t-c 15 (5-th bullet point). For the idling emissions of the fast ferry, please clarify whether 1 ferry is assumed at each berth is at maximum. Otherwise, please justify whether assuming 1 ferry at each berth would cause any under-estimation of the emission rates.	Noted. Section 4.6.12 has been revised accordingly.
	(c) Suggest to delete "and Berth No. 5 to Berth No. 8" in 5th last line if they are not included in the assessment.	Noted. Section 4.6.12 has been revised accordingly.
	(d) Please show the route of arrival within 500m assessment area in a map to support that the statement of "only a short distance of route for the arrival of the fast ferry would be within the 500m Assessment Area".	The travelling route has been provided in the Figure 4.4.
8.	Section 4.6.15. Please supplement a Figure of the identified Heavy good vehicle (HGV)/coach parking sites to support that these parking sites are located relatively far from the Proposed Development	Noted. Figure 4.8 has been provided to show the location of the parking sites.
9.	Section 4.6.16. Please supplement the date of site visits by traffic consultant to confirm that the information is up-to-date.	Section 4.6.16 has been revised accordingly.
10.	Section 4.6.17. Suggest to remove "Therefore" and "and underestimation would not be anticipated with this assumption" in the last sentence. Please also revise the footnotes in Appendix 4-6.	Noted. Section 4.6.17 and Appendix 4-6 have been revised accordingly.
11.	Section 4.6.19. Suggest to delete the 2nd sentence completely.	Noted. Section 4.6.19 has been revised accordingly.
12.	Section 4.7.7, 4.7.15, and R-t-c 10. Please follow up with TD to obtain endorsement of the Traffic data.	Noted. TD's endorsement has been provided in Appendix 4-13.

Con	nments	Response
13.	Section 4.7.12 and 4.7.14. It is suggested that 2019 WRF meteorological data shall be adopted for calculating the EMFAC composite emission factors and model runs. Please be reminded that this update is necessary if the report cannot be finalized by 31 July 2024.	Noted. The year 2019 WRF meteorological data has been adopted in the assessment. All relevant sections have been revised.
14.	Section 4.8.6. Suggest to remove ""latest" in Line 1 since the PATH v2.1 is not the latest version of the PATH model.	Noted. PATH v3.0 has been adopted in the assessment and section 4.8.6 has been revised.
15.	Appendix 4.5. Please state in the footnote that the detailed calculations of emission rates of helicopter are shown in Appendix 4.10.	Noted. The footnote in Appendix 4.5 has been revised accordingly.
16.	Appendix 4.7. Please label what the four Tables in the Appendix refer to and supplement the meaning of footnote [1].	Noted. The label has been supplemented for the four tables in Appendix 4.7, and the typo of [1] has been removed.
17.	Appendix 4.8. suggest to revise the remark as: Engine type of Medium Speed Diesel (MSD) and use of marine diesel oil with 0.5% sulphur content are <u>made reference to</u>	Noted. Appendix 4.8 has been revised accordingly.
18.	Appendix 4.8 and R-t-c 15 (last bullet point). It is still unclear how only the sections of "Travel Distance" for each route within 500m Assessment Area are shown in Figure 4.4. Please clarify and show clearly the travel distance in Figure 4.4. Please also clarify which are the R1 and R2 route in the last Table of Appendix 4.8. Please also revise footnotes 2 and 3 under the last table to clarify	The sections of "Travel Distance" for Route 1 and Route 2 within 500m Assessment Area are shown in the revised Figure 4.4.  Route 1 and Route 2 are shown in the revised Figure 4.4, which tallies with the naming in Appendix 4.8.
	if the travel distance is the longest distance amongst the 4 berths to the boundary of the 500m assessment area and the time of cruising is calculated by the speed and the longest travel distance.	Distance travel is shown in the revised Figure 4.4.  The "Distance Travel" is the total distance of the route identified in the

Com	ments	Response
		approved EIA report. Footnotes 2 and 3 have been revised accordingly.
19.	Appendix 4.11. Please revise remarks 7 and 8 (i.e. [7] The no. of trips are based on the information provided by traffic consultant based on information collected by traffic surveys. [8] The idling times are based on the information provided by traffic consultant based on information collected by traffic surveys.) since the meanings are unclear.	Noted. The remarks 7 and 8 in Appendix 4.11 have been revised.
20.	Please highlight all the changes/amendments in the upcoming submission.	Noted.
Furti	her comments received on 18 June 2024	
<u>In P7</u>	II Emission Calculation Excel "PTI Assessment WEL v1.1": In Worksheets "IdlingEFs", calculation of hot idling emission factors of PLB (LPG). Please note that since the consultant used cold idling emission factors as the hot idling emission factors, it is not required to apply AC factor in the calculation.	Noted. The hot idling emission factors for NOx of PLB (LPG) have been revised accordingly.
2.	In Worksheets "HKS(PLB)" and "ES(PLB)":  a. For Calculation of total start emission of PLB (LPG) in cells U123:Y146, the frequencies are multiplied by the start emission factors of PLB (diesel). Please rectify.	Noted. The calculation for total start emission of PLB (LPG) has been rectified.
	b. For Calculation of bypass PLB (LPG) hot idling emission in cells S256:W279, the frequencies of PLB (diesel) are adopted in the multiplication. Please rectify.	Noted. The calculation of bypass PLB (LPG) hot idling emission has been rectified.
3.	Rtc #4 (ii), the calculation is still incorrect. If spread distance is	Noted. The calculation of adjusted start emission has been rectified.

#### (Planning Application No: A/H3/449)

Cor	nments	Response
	larger than 150m for LPG vehicles, Adjusted start emission within bus terminus should be equal to: Total start emission – Idling emission for start emission adjustment.	
Rep	ort:	
4	RtC #12 and the formula in section 4.7.23. Please revise VMT to VKT.	Noted. Section 4.7.23 has been revised accordingly.
5.	RtC #13. Please revise "VKT travelled" to "VKT" in Section 4.7.26 and in the formula in section 4.7.25 and 4.7.26.	Noted. Section 4.7.26 and the formula in section 4.7.25 and 4.7.26 have been revised.
6.	Appendix 4-15:  a. Discrepancies of sensitivity test results are found. Inconsistencies have been observed between the hourly traffic flow provided in the template and those in the calculation spreadsheets for certain road links, e.g. link number L4H at 0900 - 1300 and 1900 - 2000. Please check and ensure consistency in all calculation.	Noted. Appendix 4-15 has been updated.
	b. Please update the annual minimum RH adopted in the assessment.	Noted. The temperature and RH assumptions have been supplemented in the Appendix 4-15.

Consolidated by: KTA Planning Limited

Date: 28 June 2024

### **List of Appendices**

Appendix I Revised Environmental Assessment