

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

WITNESS STATEMENT OF WONG WING WAH

I, WONG WING WAH, also known as Edward WONG, Structural Engineer/Railway Development 1, Kowloon and Rail Section, New Buildings Division 2, Buildings Department, 8/F Cityplaza Three, 14 Taikoo Wan Road, Taikoo Shing, Hong Kong, do say as follows:-

1. I am a Structural Engineer in the Buildings Department (“**BD**”) and have been seconded to the Railway Development Office (“**RDO**”) of the Highways Department (“**HyD**”) for this position since 8 August 2016.
2. I am a member of the Institution of Structural Engineers, U.K., the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers and Registered Professional Engineer, HK. I joined BD in 2011.
3. I make this Witness Statement on behalf of the Building Authority (“**BA**”) pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules of Procedure and Practice made at the Preliminary Hearing on 24 September 2018. Save where otherwise appears, the facts deposed hereto 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 Statement adopts the same abbreviations and nomenclature as in the other statements served by the BA/BD for the present inquiry.
4. This Witness Statement is made in response to paragraph 40 of Ma Ming Ching Derek’s Witness Statement [**B1/B367**] where it was stated that the coupler checklists prepared by MTRCL retrospectively were shown to BD’s representatives during the site visits in June 2018. I would now like to set out what happened in the site visits which were conducted in June 2018. In fact, most of the details set out below have already been referred to in my statement to the police dated 7 August 2018 [**H14/H35013-35092**] and I confirm that the contents of that statement are true and correct.

5. I visited MTRCL's temporary site office at HUH Extension on 6 and 25 June 2018.

6. The purpose of the visit on 6 June 2018 was to collect and review:

- (1) the Contractor's and MTRCL's Inspection Forms/Records; and
- (2) the Quality Supervision Report ("QSR") in respect of coupler installation.

7. On that day, I met Simon Ho and Jerry Chan of Pypun-KD & Associates Ltd, James Fung of HyD and MTRCL's representative, Ben Chan (Construction Engineer). I requested to review and collect the documents as mentioned in paragraph 6 above. Ben Chan provided files containing Leighton's inspection records, including the inspection records for our review. These documents were mainly inspection records regarding concreting works. We requested to make photocopy of these documents for record. Ben Chan said that these documents could be provided for us to read and make copies. Afterward, Ben Chan provided other files for Leighton's inspection records. These documents were the inspection record for mechanical coupler installation (i.e. coupler checklists). We requested to photocopy these documents for record. However, Ben Chan said that documents about mechanical couplers could not be provided to us to make copies for the time being because there were newspaper reports about the couplers on that day and such documents became sensitive, so documents related to the couplers had to be reviewed before they could be provided to us to make copies.

8. My colleague, Mr. FAN Tak-pun, received copies of some Leighton's site inspection records for the concreting works [H14/35036-35049] which were provided by MTRCL. In order to better understand the content of those records and acceptance criteria of the coupler inspection work for the purpose of reporting the matter to my seniors, I used my personal phone to take photos of some documents, such as an e-mail dated 15 December 2015 from MTRCL to Leighton regarding MTRCL's concern of the workmanship of coupler installation, MTRCL's checklist and Leighton's checklists and photos record related to the coupler installation at certain site areas including Slab Area HKC1, HKC2 & C3 [H14/35050-35083]. Take H14/35055 as an example, this form is a coupler inspection checklist for contractors to inspect the coupler

installation works, mainly for reflecting the satisfactory level for different aspects of the Coupler installation. “S” stands for Satisfactory; “NS” stands for Not Satisfactory.

9. At the time, MTRCL’s staff explained to us that the “Checklist for On Site Assembly of EWL Slab to D-Wall/ Slab Couplers” (i.e. coupler checklist) [e.g. H14/H35055] did not need to be endorsed by anyone because this form should be read in conjunction with the corresponding “Cast in-situ Concrete Quality Control Checklist” (i.e. quality control checklist) [e.g. H14/35077]. The quality control checklist is an inspection checklist signed by Leighton’s representatives to confirm that the completed works achieved the required quality. Item 6 on the quality control checklist (i.e. Starter bar boxes and couplers) was already confirmed and signed by Leighton’s representative that the works as stated in item 6 achieved the required quality. Therefore, endorsement is not required for the individual coupler checklists.

10. In addition, upon reading the relevant documents, I recall we requested MTRCL to provide the completed QSR from the contractors as well as MTRCL. Ben Chan said that the QSR from MTRCL was not available at that moment. I asked whether the responsible quality control supervisor could be invited to the site office. Afterwards, Kobe Wong, the Inspector of Works (“IoW”) of MTRCL who claimed to be the quality control supervisor for coupler works, came to the site office. He showed me a document entitled “1112 Coupler Installation Checklist” [H14/35070], which was a one-page summary setting out the date of inspection, location and “pass/fail”. He told me this one-page summary was the coupler checklist of MTRCL as required in the QSP. I told him that, under the QSP, the MTRCL’s coupler inspection records should be in the same form as the sample checklist set out in the appendix to the QSP (which was meant to be an on-site checklist for coupler inspection). I also referred Kobe Wong to Leighton’s coupler inspection checklists [e.g. H14/35055] and told him that MTRCL’s checklists should be in the same form, but the frequency of inspection referred to in the 2 sets of checklists should be different. That was because Leighton was required to provide full time and continuous supervision for all coupler installation works while MTRCL was only required to inspect 20% of the couplers installed (or 50% if the couplers are used at the top of pile cap or transfer plate). I also informed Kobe Wong that there was no date of signature on the “1112 Coupler Installation Checklist”. I told him that the said “checklist” looked like an inspection summary instead

of a proper on-site inspection checklist/record. Kobe Wong did not respond to my questions. Thereafter, Mr. FAN Tak-pun and I managed to put copies of the documents collected and photos taken into BD's file under reference BD RAIL/30SCL/02-1112(S).Pt21.

11. On 7 June 2018, I saved a total of 34 photos of the documents and pictures related to the couplers which I took on 6 June 2018 onto the government's computer at the office of the BD [H14/35050-35083].

12. On 25 June 2018, my senior Mr. LOK Pui Fai instructed me and my colleague Mr. FAN Tak Pun to attend MTRCL's temporary site office at the HUH Extension to identify the number of "Mechanical Couplers" used in the whole EWL slab of HUH Extension. On that day, I met Jerry Chan of Pypun-KD & Associates Ltd, James Fung of the Highways Department and MTRCL's representative, Ben Chan. Ben Chan provided us with some documents related to couplers, including the "Request for Inspection / Survey Check Form" (also known as RISC form). These documents are prepared by contractors and mentioned that the works of an area are properly completed, its quality had achieved the required standard and have been inspected. It was then sent to the MTRCL for confirmation. After that, the responsible MTRCL personnel will re-confirm the inspection results. I used my mobile phone to take 8 photos of a set of RISC forms together with the coupler checklist prepared by "Leighton", and MTRCL's letter dated 12 August 2013 for the submission of Quality Supervision Plan for Coupler and Site Safety Supervision Plan summary prepared by Pypun-KD & Associates Ltd. See reference [H14/35085-35092]. I did not join in the exercise of calculating the number of "Mechanical Couplers" used in the whole EWL slab of Hung Hom Station Extension and left the site office in the afternoon of 25 June 2018. As far as I knew, my colleague Mr. FAN Tak-pun attended the MTRCL temporary office on 25 June and 29 June 2018 and placed the result of the document review together with those 8 photos taken by me on 25 June 2018 into BD's file with reference BD RAIL/30SCL/02-1112(S).Pt21 [H14/35084].

13. On 26 June 2018, I saved a total of 8 photos of the documents as mentioned in paragraph 10 above which I took on 25 June onto the government's computer at BD's office [H14/35085-35092].


14. On 31 July 2018, I saved the above-mentioned photos of the

documents related to the couplers which I had taken by my phone to a disc. I passed the disc to the Detective Police Constable for investigation.

15. During the aforesaid visits, I was not told by anyone from MTRCL that the coupler checklists were retrospective records or for internal record only.

16. I confirm that the contents of this Witness Statement are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Dated this 18th day of October 2018



WONG WING WAH
Structural Engineer
Buildings Department