

**COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE CONSTRUCTION WORKS
AT AND NEAR THE HUNG HOM STATION EXTENSION
UNDER THE SHATIN TO CENTRAL LINK PROJECT APPOINTED
PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF THE COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY
ORDINANCE (CHAPTER 86) ON 10 JULY 2018**

4TH WITNESS STATEMENT OF LOK PUI FAI

I, LOK PUI FAI, Senior Structural Engineer/Railway Development, Kowloon and Rail Section, New Buildings Division 2, Buildings Department (“BD”), 8/F, 14 Taikoo Wan Road, Taikoo Shing, Hong Kong, do say as follows:

1. I am a Senior Structural Engineer in BD and have been seconded to the Railway Development Office (“RDO”) of the Highways Department (“HyD”) for this position since 12 January 2016. I am a member of the Buildings Ordinance Team (“BO Team”) in RDO to handle matters relating to the Instrument of Exemption (“IoE”) issued by the Building Authority (“BA”) [H7/2220-2233] and Instrument of Compliance (“IoC”) issued by HyD [H7/2416-2431] for the Shatin to Central Link (“SCL”) Project. I am the same Lok Pui Fai who gave a statement dated 13 September 2018 (“my 1st Witness Statement”) [H7/2187-2213] to the Commission of Inquiry into the Construction Works at and near the Hung Hom Station (“HUH”) Extension under the SCL Project (“the Commission”).

2. I make this 4th Witness Statement pursuant to the request of the Commission set out in the letter from Messrs. Lo & Lo to the Department of Justice (“DoJ”) dated 4 April 2019 regarding the works of the Hung Hum Stabling Sidings (“HHS”) (“HHS Letter”). Save where otherwise specified, the facts referred to in this witness statement are within my personal knowledge or are derived from office files and records and sources to which I have access and are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Save as otherwise specified, this witness statement adopts the same abbreviations and nomenclature used in the HHS Letter.

3. I have also made two other witness statements (i.e. my 2nd and 3rd Witness Statements) pursuant to the request of the Commission set out in two

other letters from Messrs. Lo & Lo to DoJ dated 4 April 2019 (“NAT Letter” and “SAT Letter” respectively) regarding the works of the North Approach Tunnels (“NAT”) and South Approach Tunnels (“SAT”) respectively which are subject to the control mechanism of IoC and IoE respectively.

4. This witness statement addresses the following questions in the HHS Letter (“Questions”) and is divided into the following parts:

- (1) Part A provides the required updates and supplemental information in relation to the reply by DoJ on 13 March 2019 [DD1/38.4-38.12] in response to Questions 1 to 4 and 6;
- (2) Part B explains the role and work of PYPUN-KD & Associates Limited (“PYPUN”) in response to Questions 7 to 9;
- (3) Part C deals with the issues of lack of RISC forms, inspection and supervisory records and deviations at HHS (“Issue 3 at HHS”) in response to Questions 11 to 16; and
- (4) Part D covers other matters under the expanded terms of reference (“TOR”) relating to HHS in response to Questions 17 and 18.

A. Updates and supplemental information (answer to Questions 1 to 4 and 6)

5. I would like to elaborate and provide supplemental information to the reply by DoJ dated 13 March 2019 [DD1/38.4-38.12] as follows.

6. A consolidated chronology of events setting out the involvement of the relevant government departments, including that of BO Team in Issue 3 at HHS has been provided in response to the letter from Messrs. Lo & Lo to DoJ dated 6 March 2019 and an updated chronology of events (up to 8 May 2019) was provided by the Government (“Chronology”) on 10 May 2019. For the purpose of this witness statement, I rely on the Chronology.

7. Besides, insofar as BO Team is concerned, a brief account of the development of Issue 3 at HHS is set out at paragraphs 7 to 9 of Part A of my 3rd Witness Statement in response to the SAT Letter.

B. Role and work of BSRC Team of PYPUN (answer to Questions 7 to 9)

8. I refer to Part B of my 2nd Witness Statement in response to the NAT Letter.

C. Deviations at HHS (Issue 3 at HHS) (answer to Questions 11 to 16)

9. As regards the issue of deviations at HHS, although the extent and details of the deviations are still unknown, I will try to describe and explain the issue of deviations on the basis of my understanding from the presentation given by MTRCL on 30 January 2019 [DD3/1182-1196]. On this note, I would like to clarify that RISC form is neither a requirement under the Buildings Ordinance, Cap. 123 (“BO”) nor a required document specified in the acceptance letters issued by BO Team. However, I understand that RISC form is an important quality control document under the Project Integrated Management System of MTRCL used for recording the details of inspection at various hold points devised by MTRCL.

10. The structural design of the works of HHS submitted by MTRCL for consultation under IoE covers the following types of the works: Foundation (Raft Footing), Foundation (Socketed Steel H-pile), Pile Cap, Substructure, Superstructure, and Excavation and Lateral Support Works. The submissions were made in ten design packages for works in different areas of HHS, namely:

Packages 1 & 2:	Back of House
Packages 3 & 4:	Underpinning with Consultant Agreement C1106 ¹
Package 5:	Other Underpinning
Packages 6 & 7:	Other Underpinning – Coliseum – Foundation & Superstructure
Package 8:	Track Slab and Underpass Corridor
Package 9:	Demolition Works
Package 10:	Noise Enclosure – Foundation and Superstructure

11. A copy of all the latest relevant accepted design drawings of HHS is contained in **Annexes LPF-27 to LPF-31**. A copy of all the relevant

¹ Consultancy Agreement No. C1106 – Detailed Design for Hung Hom Station and Associated Tunnels

acceptance letters can be found in **Annexes LPF-32 to LPF-36**.

12. According to the splicing method specified in the accepted drawings for HHS, the continuity of rebar should be provided by lapping of the two rebars concerned. As informed by MTRCL during the presentation on 30 January 2019, the splicing method was changed from lapping of rebars to coupler connection.

13. Coupler is an alternative splicing method to the lapping of steel bars, and both methods are stipulated in the Code of Practice for Structural Use of Concrete Code 2004 as acceptable methods subject to their respective requirements. Although lapping of rebars and couplers are both accepted method of splicing, the use of coupler is subject to additional quality assurance, quality control and testing requirements, which have been explained in detail in paragraphs 10 to 15, 24 & 25 of my 1st Witness Statement [H7/2192-2196].

14. Therefore, prior to the commencement of the splicing works concerned, a consultation submission should be made in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix 9 of the Project Management Plan [H7/2498] for acceptance by BO Team to effect any change of splicing method. According to BO Team's records, no consultation for such changes at HHS was ever made by MTRCL.

15. As to the reference made by MTRCL in its PowerPoint presentation on 30 January 2019 that "*no coupler was used for the standalone SER, TER & CER rooms and associated E&M rooms*²" (referred to in Question 12b of the HHS Letter), my understanding is that it is a confirmation from MTRCL that as per the design drawings, lapping of rebars was provided in those structures. This understanding is in line with paragraph 3.19.12 of the minutes of 75th meeting of the Project Supervision Committee held on 1 February 2019 [DD3/1177.116], where representative of MTRCL mentioned "*would not involve design change of lapped bars to couplers and completion of structural works would not be affected*".

² SER, TER & CER rooms and associated E&M rooms are the abbreviated name of plant rooms at HHS.

D. Other matters under the expanded TOR (answer to Questions 17 and 18)

16. I refer to Part D of my 3rd Witness Statement in response to the SAT Letter.

17. I confirm that the contents of this witness statement are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Dated this 14th day of May 2019



LOK PUI FAI