

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Avg.) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the |
| X_W1 | 22-Mar-10 | Mid-ebb | WSD17 | DO (mg/L) | 5.00 | 3.66 | 3.28 | | baseline water quality range |
| | | | | | | | | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeat in-situ measurement and review the next consecutive data |
| | | | | Turbidity | 5.40 | 8.04 | 9.49 | | to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at WSD17 for the next mid-flood monitoring on 24 |
| | | | | Suspended Solid | 14 | 13.00 | 14.43 | | Mar 2010. It is concluded as non-project related exceedance. |
| | | | | | | | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the |
| X_W2 | 26-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | WSD17 | DO (mg/L) | 5.71 | 3.66 | | | baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity | 6.15 | 8.04 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at WSD17 for the next mid-ebb monitoring. It is |
| | | | | | | 40.00 | | | concluded as non-project related exceedance. |
| | | | | Suspended Solid | 14.5 | 13.00 | 14.43 | | |
| | | | | | | | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the |
| X_W3 | 17-May-10 | Mid-flood | WSD17 | DO (mg/L) | 4.94 | | | | baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity | 8.03 | 8.04 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at WSD17 for the next mid-ebb monitoring in the |
| | | | | | | | | | same day. Reviewed the nearest water monitoring stations C8 and |
| | | | | | | | | | C9, no exceedance was recorded. It can be concluded as the |
| | | | | Suspended Solid | 15.0 | 13.00 | 14.43 | | localized influence and non-project related exceedance. |



| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | | Measured | Action Level | | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------------|----------|--------------|-------|-----------------------------|---|
| X_10C001 | 19-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 4.34 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.15 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeat in-situ measurement and review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 20.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C8 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as non-project related exceedance. |
| X_10C002 | 22-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.42 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.33 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeat in-situ measurement and review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 16.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as non-project related exceedance. |
| X_10C003 | 28-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 5.00 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 6.80 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 29 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C8 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as invalid exceedance. |
| X 10C004 | 28-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 4.70 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 7.56 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 15.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as invalid exceedance. |
| X_10C005 | 30-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 3.86 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; value is within the tolerance of the baseline water quality range |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.30 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 19.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C8 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as invalid exceedance. |
| X_10C006 | 30-Mar-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 3.93 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 7.20 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 24.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as invalid exceedance. |
| X_10C007 | 5-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 4.29 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 11.10 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 18.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. In the course of monitoring, only C9 has the exceedance in S.S. The nearest monitoring station, C8 has no exceedance recorded. It is concluded that the exceedance was the localized influence and not due to the Project. |
| X_10C008 | 10-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 4.28 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 9.54 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 15.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the sar day. In the course of monitoring, only C9 has the exceedance in S.S. The nearest monitoring station, C8 had no exceedance recorded. It is concluded that the exceedance was not due to the Project. |



| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|
| X_10C009 | 12-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 4.03 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 9.45 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeat in-situ measurement and review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 11.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | Exceedance was still occurred in the next consecutive data. The finding is marked in the Ref no. X_C10 |
| X 10C010 | 12-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 3.68 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | Red tide was observed inside the screen only. No abnormal circumstance outside the silt screen |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 13.55 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeat in-situ measurement for the water samples from the inside and outside the silt screen. The range of the repeated turbidity and SS outside the silt screen are 13.0-14.0NTU and 10mg/L respectively. Corrective action of Contractor: Conduct daily maintenance of silt screen to remove trapped disharge Preventive action of Contractor: Reduce the silt screen |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 24.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | coverage to exclude the local discharge points. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. The water quality behind the silt screen was worse than outside the silt screen. Investigation was found that unknown local discharge points enclosed by silt screen were identified. It seems that the local discharge was accumulated and trapped inside the silt screen. It is concluded as no-project related exceedance. |
| X_10C011 | 7-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 4.85 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.93 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 19.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance was recorded on the next mid-flood monitoring. It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| X_10C012 | 7-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 4.73 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed; |
| | · | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.70 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 20.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance was recorded on the next mid-flood monitoring. It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| X_10C013 | 16-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 5.50 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom was observed during water monitoring; |
| | · · | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 13.18 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 19.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C8 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| X 10C014 | 16-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.61 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring: |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 13.80 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 25.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same day. It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| X_10C015 | 19-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.98 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 9.47 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 13.50 | 15.00 | | Remarks / Other Obs: | No exceedance at C9 for the next mid-ebb monitoring on the same |
| | | | | , | | | | | day. The nearest monitoring station, C8 has no exceedance recorded. |
| X_10C016 | 10-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 4.60 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.20 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 16.50 | 15.00 | | Remarks / Other Obs: | Unknown local discharge points were enclosed by silt screen. It seems that the local discharge was accumulated and trapped inside the silt screen. It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-------------|-------------|----------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------|---|---|
| X_10C017 | 10-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 4.86 | 3.36 | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring; |
| | · · | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 8.46 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 15.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | Unknown local discharge points were enclosed by silt screen. It |
| | | | | | | | | | seems that the local discharge was accumulated and trapped |
| | | | | | | | | | inside the silt screen. It is concluded as no project-related |
| | | | | | | | | | exceedance. |
| X_10C018 | 12-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 3.85 | 3.36 | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 7.98 | 9.10 | | Action taken / to be taken: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 24.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | Unknown local discharge points were enclosed by silt screen. It |
| | | | | | | | | | seems that the local discharge was accumulated and trapped |
| | | | | | | | | | inside the silt screen. It is concluded as no project-related |
| X 10C019 | 1111 | N 40 1 | 00 | DO (//) | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.70 | D | exceedance. |
| X_10C019 | 14-Apr-10 | Mid-ebb | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 3.41 | 3.36 | | Possible reason: | No muddy boom observed during water monitoring; |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) SS (mg/L) | 7.31 15.50 | 9.10 15.00 | | Action taken / to be taken: Remarks / Other Obs: | Review the next consecutive data to conclude the reasoning No exceedance was recorded at the nearest monitoring station, |
| | | | | SS (IIIg/L) | 15.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs. | C8 during the mid-ebb and at C9 in the next mid-flood monitoring |
| | | | | | | | | | on the same day. It is concluded as no project-related |
| | | | | | | | | | exceedance. |
| | 26-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 6.18 | 3.36 | 2 73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| X 10C020 | 20 / 10 | | | J G (g, _) | 00 | 0.00 | 20 | . 000,210 100,001,11 | , toodinalation of diminorini roodi disorial go cholosod by oil corosin |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 12.43 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the |
| | | | | | | | | | silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 19.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and |
| | | | | | | | | | outside the silt screen are 10.6-11.5 and 8.51-8.76NTU |
| | | | | | | | | | respectively. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. |
| | | | | | | | | | It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| | 26-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.68 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| X_10C021 | | | | T 1111 (11T11) | | 0.10 | 40.05 | | |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 13.98 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 00.50 | 15.00 | 00.40 | Remarks / Other Obs: | silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (IIIg/L) | 26.50 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs. | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and outside the silt screen are 14.1-14.6 and 7.39-8.09NTU |
| | | | | | | | | | respectively. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. |
| | | | | | | | | | It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| | 28-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 6.07 | 3.36 | 2 73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| X_10C022 | 20 / (p) 10 | Iviia iiooa | | 50 (mg/2) | 0.07 | 0.00 | 2.70 | r decisio reacon. | 7 toodinalation of difficient food algoritating officious by six outcome |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 18.55 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the |
| | | | | | | | | | silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 15.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and |
| | | | | | | | | | outside the silt screen are 17.8-18.1 and 7.20-8.01NTU |
| | | | | | | | | | respectively. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. |
| | | | | | | | | | It is concluded as no project-related exceedance. |
| | 28-Apr-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.90 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| X_10C023 | | | | T 1 1 11 (A 171 I) | | 0.10 | 40.05 | | |
| | 1 | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 11.73 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the |
| | 1 | | | SS (mg/L) | 27.00 | 15.00 | 22.42 | Pomarka / Other Ohs: | silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 21.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and outside the silt screen are 11.0-12.1 and 8.51-8.76NTU |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | respectively. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. |
| | 1 | | | | | | | | It is concluded as non project-related exceedance. |
| | 1 | | l | | 1 | | | | it is concluded as non project-related exceedance. |

| Ref no. | Date | Tidal | Location | Parameters (Unit) | Measured | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|
| X_10C024 | 10-May-10 | Mid-ebb | C8 | DO (mg/L) | 5.57 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 10.27 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 8.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and outside the silt screen are 10.6-11.3 and 5.07-5.17NTU respectively. No exceedance was recorded outside the silt screen. It is concluded as non project-related exceedance. |
| X_10C025 | 14-May-10 | Mid-flood | C9 | DO (mg/L) | 5.02 | 3.36 | 2.73 | Possible reason: | Accumulation of unknown local discharge enclosed by silt screen |
| | | | | Turbidity (NTU) | 10.60 | 9.10 | 10.25 | Action taken / to be taken: | Repeated to conduct in-situ measurement inside and outside the silt screen to conclude the reasoning; |
| | | | | SS (mg/L) | 16.00 | 15.00 | 22.13 | Remarks / Other Obs: | The range of the repeated turbidity measurement inside and outside the silt screen are 10.2-10.5 and 9.78-9.80 NTU respectively. The limit level exceedances were recorded inside and outside the screen. Reviewed the nearest water monitoring station C8, the turbidity and SS level are 7.84NTU and 9.0mg/L, which is below the action and limit level. It seems that particle was accumulated from the numerous local outfall around the C9. It is concluded as non project-related exceedance. |



| Ref. No. | Date | Time | Location | Construction Noise Leve | Unit | Action Level | Limit Level | Follow-up action | |
|----------|----------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 8-Apr-10 | 14:40 | SPCA | 78.5 | Leq(30-min) | | 75 | Possible reason: | Concrete breaking from the Contract no.HK/2009/02 was undertaken during the noise monitoring; Multi-site construction activities were noted during the noise monitoring; No baseline noise level correction was applied to the measured nois elevel |
| | | | | | | | | Action taken / to be taken: Remarks / Other Obs: | Contractor was recommended to reduct the percentage on-time of breaking work to 50%; To implement with the planned noise mitigation measures. Follow-up action is needed and next monitoring will be conducted on 13 April 2010. |
| X_10N001 | 8-Apr-10 | 21:50 | Causeway Bay Community Centre | 72.5 | Leq(5-min) | when one documented | 70 | Possible reason: | Noisy traffic noise from Island Eastern Corridorwas noted during the noise monitoring. |
| | | | | | | complaint was received. | | Action taken / to be taken: | Analysis of contractor's working procedure during monitoring; and review next restricted hour monitoring |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | Well work practical of the dredging work was complied with the conditions under valid Construction Noise Permit no. GW-RS0119-10 during the measurement; No exceedance was recorded in the |
| X_10N002 | 4-May-10 | particular the hours | Causeway Bay Community Centre | N/A (One complaint was received) | Leq(5-min) | when one documented | 70 | Possible reason: | N/A |
| | | 1900-0800 | | | | complaint was received. | | Action taken / to be taken: | Analysis of contractor's working procedure; Investigated with RSS and Contractor. |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | Valid CNP no. GW-RS0119-10 for the dredging works during 1900-2300 normal week days. No construction works have been conducted between 2300 and 0700. According to RSS's record, there was no dredging works conducted in the daytime and evening time during period between 29 April and 5 May 2010. It is considered as invalid exceedance. |
| X_10N003 | 4-May-10 | 19:53 | Causeway Bay Community Centre | 70.6 | Leq(5-min) | when one documented | 70 | Possible reason: | Noisy traffic noise from Island Eastern Corridorwas noted during the noise monitoring. |
| | | | | | | complaint was received. | | Action taken / to be taken: | Analysis of contractor's working procedure; Investigated with RSS and Contractor. |
| | | | | | | | | Remarks / Other Obs: | Valid CNP no. GW-RS0119-10 for the dredging works during 1900-2300 normal week days. According to RSS's record, there was no dredging works conducted in the daytime and evening time during period between 29 April and 5 May 2010. It is considered as invalid exceedance. |