Relevant extract of the draft minutes of the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee meeting held on 15 June 2026

EIA report on "Water Recreation and Yacht Bay Development"

****

Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)

Marine Ecology

1. Noting that the monitoring data on CWD mainly covered the western waters, a Member enquired if additional information was available to support the claim of fewer CWDs in the east to relieve public concerns. Mr Peter Lee replied that historical data showed that there were less sightings of CWD in the eastern waters. For the three-runway project, AAHK had been conducting passive acoustic monitoring of dolphins at seven locations near the North Lantau Marine Park (NLMP). While the monitoring would end in 2030, he said that the arrangement could be extended as an extra precautionary measure for the protection of CWD.

2. A Member considered that it would be difficult to restrict access of vessels from the western waters where more CWD were recorded. He was worried that growing marina business would imply higher collision risks for the dolphins. He highlighted that concrete measures should be worked out to address public concerns on the potential impacts to CWD.

3. To ensure the monitoring effects, a Member suggested that the requirement of activating the Automatic Identification System (AIS) trackers for incoming vessels should be cleared indicated. Mr Peter Lee confirmed that all incoming vessels must keep the AIS on for monitoring under the booking system. Any undetectable vessels would be regarded as non-compliant cases which would trigger penalty points.

4. Although maintenance dredging would be limited to a maximum of 59 ha, a Member sought to have details on the frequency as it would have an impact on the seabed and marine ecology. Mr Peter Lee explained that dredging works would be conducted when there was sedimentation siltation in the navigation zones and the frequency would be subject to the siltation rate in the areas concerned. He shared that such works were also conducted in other navigable routes in Hong Kong.

5. A Member asked if additional enhancement works could be delivered to create positive marine environmental outcomes even though impacts on the marine ecology and corals were assessed to be minor. Mr Peter Lee said that, on top of the planned eco-shorelines, AAHK would explore other ecological enhancement options, such as artificial reef and fish stocking. If artificial reef in the local waters was

unviable, deeper offshore locations would be explored.

6. The Chairman held the view that ecological seawall structures should be built on all breakwaters as an effort to enhance marine biodiversity. He indicated that the additional cost would be minimal if precast eco-designs were adopted. Mr Peter Lee said that AAHK was ready to install more ecological seawall features on all breakwaters, if it was confirmed technically viable.

Marine Traffic

7. While the estimated traffic was at 7 vessels per hour on average, a Member was worried that a maximum of 23 vessels per hour would create undesirable cumulative effects such as water pollution. Noting that onshore power supply would be provided to reduce emissions from berthed vessels, she enquired if there would be regulation on the types and quality of the fuel to be used by vessels or mandatory adoption of onshore power. Mr Peter Lee remarked that all berthing vessels would be required to switch off their main engine while their auxiliary engine could use onshore power provided by the marina. The air quality impact assessment showed that emissions from those diesel-fueled vessels would be at an acceptable level as Hong Kong had been enforcing strict marine fuel regulations. Mr Chris Wong added that onshore power supply was in fact a financial incentive to help berthing vessels save fuel costs.

8. A Member noted that the 500 berths were expected to be taken up by local and visiting yachts on a half-half basis. He was worried that the average hourly flow of 7 vessels could be underestimated as there was limited data on the travel patterns of visiting vessels.

9. Mr Peter Lee explained that the marine traffic impact assessment had adopted the "worst-case scenario" assuming full occupancy of the 500 berthing spaces which had been approved by the Marine Department (MD). Among the 7 vessels, only half of them would be departing via NLMP. Mr Chris Wong added that unlike local vessels which were mainly sailing on summer weekends and stayed docked on weekdays, visiting yachts would mostly remain in the berthing place for different reasons such as their larger size and high running costs, purpose of the trip being for re-provision of supply, replacement of crew members, hosting of corporate events which could be done at berth etc.

10. As the peak traffic at 23 vessels per hour accounted for about 5 percent of the total berths, a Member asked if stress tests would be carried out for higher turnover because more environmental violations would likely be spotted with an increase in the traffic. Apart from the point-deduction system, he asked if there were liaisons with the law enforcement bodies on handling violation cases. The Chairman said that the point-deduction penalty system might not have sufficient deterrent effect and suggested AAHK to share the relevant data with AFCD for taking legal enforcement actions against vessels violating the speed limit in marine parks.

11. Mr Peter Lee explained that various factors including traffic loading during normal and busy days, the proportion of local and visiting vessels, the usual turnaround time of different vessels etc. had been taken into consideration in working out the estimated traffic. He shared that 23 vessels per hour was already the highest traffic loading acceptable to MD and the presence of breakwaters at the exist points would also create a bottleneck for additional vessel movement. Mr Lee said that AAHK would maintain close communication with AFCD and submit relevant records to facilitate their enforcement actions against illegal activities in marine parks.

12. A Member opined that it would be difficult to control the number of vessels in movement. As many captains were living on the yachts, she asked if onshore accommodation facilities would be available near the marina. Mr Peter Lee replied that auxiliary amenities including hotel, food and beverage were available at the Hong Kong Port South Berthing Facility. Mr Chris Wong added that the proposed marina would be supported by comprehensive onshore facilities including restaurants, retail outlets and hotels under the wider Airport City master plan.

13. In response to a Member's questions on the implementation of the designated routes for vessels, Mr Peter Lee said that the proposed marina would encourage vessels with a draft of 3 m or less to take the eastern route while vessels with deeper drafts must use the northern route. He confirmed that all northbound vessels must follow a 10-knot speed limit and take the shortest permitted path inside marine parks. The vessels would be tracked to ensure compliance and any violation would be recorded in the point-deduction system. Mr Lee assured that the relevant requirements would be outlined in the formal management plan.

14. The Chairman remarked that the projected some 130 vessel trips per day would create substantial disturbances to the marine park in particular if the traffic was concentrated at peak hours. He highlighted the importance of working out effective measures to divert vessels to the eastern and western waterways. The Chairman suggested that long-term marine traffic monitoring should be conducted to verify the proportion of northbound vessels the details of which should be included in the EM&A programme. Other than general water quality monitoring, he considered that the EM&A should also track toxic pollutants in sediments including copper, organotin, zinc pyrithione etc. which were anti-fouling booster biocide chemicals found in vessel paints.

15. Mr Peter Lee said that their consultants would review the EM&A framework to work out a comprehensive set of monitoring including sediment and water quality as suggested by the Chairman.

Heritage Conservation and Other Considerations

16. Having regard to the Chairman's questions on the conservation and exhibition plans for the ancient shipwreck, Mr Peter Lee remarked that AAHK would continue to liaise with Antiquities and Monuments Office to work out the proper conservation measure when the condition of the shipwreck could be confirmed after the pre-

construction surveys. He said that an exclusion zone would be established before a long-term conservation plan was in place.

17. Noting that 27 deep-water berths were available to host large yachts, two Members enquired whether the project had taken into consideration yacht sailing competitions for broader yacht economy and to boost tourism. Mr Peter Lee stated that the current project had not been designed to host large-scale sailing regattas as the depth of the local water could not support such events.

Conclusion

18. The Chairman aspired that the project proponent could take the opportunity of the project to deliver concrete measures for the enhancement of marine environment which needed not to be confined to the project site. Mr Lee confirmed that the planned off-site marine ecological enhancement measures would be fully implemented upon project approval.

(The project proponent team left the meeting after the session.)

Internal Discussion Session (Closed-door Session)

19. Dr Jim Chu was glad to note AAHK's commitment to share information with AFCD to facilitate enforcement actions against vessels violating marine park rules. As indicated in the EIA report, vessel operators would be required to take the route outside the marine parks or take the route with the shortest travel distance through the marine parks if entering the marine parks was inevitable due to navigation safety constraints. Dr Chu expected that AAHK would provide corresponding details in the final management plan.

20. Based on Members' discussion, Mr Gary Tam indicated that the project proponent could be requested to explore eco-shoreline installation at each of the proposed breakwaters. In response to Members' queries, Ms Marlene Ho shared that the project proponent had cited operational constraints for full eco-shoreline installation. Dr Samuel Chui considered that AAHK should be requested to give a full technical explanation at the subsequent ACE meeting.

21. For monitoring the effectiveness of the marine traffic management plan, Mr Gary Tam said that project proponent could be requested to provide annual update to the ACE for the first two operational years.

22. A Member was worried about the potential time gap for supervision if reporting cycle was on an annual basis whereas a Member was concerned about the possible follow-up actions if the approved marine traffic management measures were proved to be ineffective.

23. As a safeguard measure, the Chairman considered that the project proponent could be requested to submit vessel data to EPD and AFCD on a bi-monthly basis for monitoring purpose. Mr Gary Tam indicated that the matter could be handled upon the submission of the marine traffic management plan which should be approved by EPD in consultation with AFCD. He said that the EC would be responsible for both formulating the management plans and reviewing their implementation effectiveness.

24. The Chairman advised Members that the EIASC could make one of the following recommendations to the ACE on the EIA report –

(i) endorse the EIA report without condition; or
(ii) endorse the EIA report with condition(s); or
(iii) reject the EIA report and inform the project proponent of the right to go to the full Council.

If the EIASC cannot reach a consensus during the meeting, it may –

(i) ask for a 2nd submission to the EIASC; or
(ii) defer the decision to the full Council and highlight issues or reasons for not reaching a consensus for the full Council's deliberation.

25. The Chairman proposed and Members agreed to endorse the EIA report with conditions.

Conditions

26. Based on the discussions at the meeting, Members agreed that the following six conditions could be proposed for the full Council's consideration.

(a) Brief Introduction

(i) Eco-shoreline would be provided at the breakwaters under this Project. As stated in the EIA report (EIA S.7.7.2.4 and S.7.7.2.5), an eco-shoreline study report, including recommendations on the types of eco-shoreline, design plans, and the implementation programme would be prepared and submitted to the authority for agreement prior to commencement of construction works. **Condition (1)** was proposed in specifying the types of the eco-shoreline and the implementation plan.

(ii) Other potential ecological enhancement features, such as artificial reefs, oyster shell reefs, restocking of fish fries / shellfishes and translocation of corals, would also be explored to further enhance the marine ecological resources and support ecological functions during the detailed design, taking into account the marine conditions, exposure of wave and storm surge, bathymetry, substrate and adjacent usage and activities (EIA S.7.7.3.1). **Condition (2)** was proposed in specifying the types of ecological enhancement features to be adopted and the implementation plan.

(iii) According to EIA S.7.7.2.2, smart initiatives would be adopted to monitor the travel speed and travel routes of the visiting yachts with an aim to minimise the interaction with the adjacent marine parks so as to minimise disturbance to marine mammals. S.7.4.1.4 and S.7.7.2.2 of the EIA also stated that a prebooking and registration arrangement that linked booking priority with compliance performance on relevant environmental practices including vessel speed control, vessel travel routes to reduce footprint within marine parks would be implemented. **Condition (3)** was proposed in specifying the relevant controls accordingly.

(iv) As stated in EIA S.2.11.1.1, the project proponent had conducted a series of consultation activities to collate comments from different stakeholders. For continuing the public engagement, **Condition (4)** was proposed for setting up an EC to advise on the preparation of the Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan (ESIP) (Condition 1), Ecological Enhancement Plan (EEP) (Condition 2) and Marine Traffic Management Plan (MTMP) (Condition 3).

(v) An Environmental Management Plan for Water Park (EMPWP) would be developed prior to the operation to control activities in the Water Park, covering operation guidelines and details such as demarcation of Water Park boundary, provision of positioning devices for water sports vessels, vessel speed control, code of conduct on marine mammal encounter, no wastewater discharge, promotion of use of biodegradable and ocean friendly sunscreen, and Special Events arrangement at Water Park and its preventive measures, etc. (EIA S.2.3.1.5). **Condition (5)** was proposed in specifying the environmental practices to be implemented in the Water Park.

(vi) As stated in EIA S.7.5.2.14, with the implementation of good site practice following the prevailing regulations, impacts due to antifouling agents or paints from the yachts and marine vessels would be minor. To safeguard the impact to marine life from the potential release of antifouling agents or paints from marine vessels during operation, **Condition (6)** was proposed in specifying sediment monitoring requirement.

(b) Conditions of Endorsement

The Project Proponent should –

(i) no later than 3 months before commencement of construction of the eco-shoreline, submit an ESIP to the DEP for approval. The ESIP should include recommendations on the types, design and extent of eco-shoreline to be implemented at each proposed breakwater (i.e. the proposed three breakwaters at Hong Kong Port South Berthing Facility and the proposed vertical breakwater at Tung Chung East Marina) and the implementation programme;

(ii) no later than 3 months before commencement of construction of the Project, submit an EEP to the DEP for approval. The EEP should provide (i) the types of ecological enhancement features to be adopted, including artificial reefs, oyster shell reefs, restocking of fish fries / shellfishes; (ii) the design, location and quantity of the ecological enhancement features; and (iii) the implementation programme of the ecological enhancement features;

(iii) no later than 3 months before commencement of operation of the proposed Marina, in consultation with the AFCD, submit a MTMP, to the DEP for approval. The MTMP should include (i) the imposition of speed limit for the vessels under the Project and the visiting yachts, (ii) the suggested vessel travel routes; (iii) the set-up of the real-time vessel tracking system including data integrity measures and the smart initiatives to be adopted; (iv) the mechanism to alert the concerned vessels in case of deviation; and (v) the implementation arrangement of the compliance performance linked booking and registration system with a view to minimising disturbance to the adjacent marine parks. The Project Proponent should review the marine traffic movement data and submit the data bi-monthly to the EPD and the AFCD and also report annually to the ACE on the effectiveness of the MTMP for the first two years of operation of the Project;

(iv) set up an EC no later than 4 months before the commencement of construction of the Project. The EC should be consulted to advise on the preparation of the ESIP, the EEP and the MTMP and review the effectiveness of implementation of the proposed requirements and ecological enhancement / preventive measures of the Project according to the EIA report and the approved ESIP, EEP and MTMP. The EC should have a wide representation including representatives of relevant government departments (including the AFCD), green groups and academics. The list of members and terms of reference of the EC should be submitted to the DEP for approval;

(v) no later than 3 months before commencement of operation of the Project, submit an EMPWP, to the DEP for approval. The EMPWP should include the environmental practices to be implemented in the Water Park, including the demarcation of Water Park boundary, area for motorised water sports and means to track the position of the motorised water sport vessels, vessel speed control, promotion of use of biodegradable and ocean friendly sunscreen, and the arrangement, types of Special Events to be held at Water Park and the preventive measures; and

(vi) no later than 3 months before commencement of operation of the Project, in consultation with the AFCD, submit a Sediment Monitoring Plan (SMP), to the DEP for approval. The SMP should identify appropriate locations for sediment monitoring, propose sampling methods, monitoring parameters and frequency and mechanism of reporting monitoring results to the EPD and the AFCD, with a view to monitoring any potential impacts on sediment

quality of the seabed arising from anti-fouling agents or paints released from marine vessels during the operation of the Project.

(A Member left the meeting during the Internal Discussion Session.)

(Post-meeting notes: The draft conditions were circulated to Members for comment before the ACE meeting on 13 July 2026.)

EIA Subcommittee Secretariat
July 2026