

(Translation)

**Islands District Council**  
**Minutes of Meeting of**  
**Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries and Environmental Hygiene Committee**

Date : 26 March 2018 (Monday)  
Time : 2:00 p.m.  
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,  
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong.

**Present**

Ms LEE Kwai-chun (Chairman)  
Ms FU Hiu-lam, Sammi (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS  
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, JP  
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS  
Mr CHAN Lin-wai  
Mr CHEUNG Fu  
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken  
Mr FAN Chi-ping  
Mr LOU Cheuk-wing  
Mr WONG Man-hon  
Ms YU Lai-fan  
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy  
Mr CHOW Ho-ding, Holden  
Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine  
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric  
Mr WONG King-chuen  
Mr KWONG Kwok-kam, BH, JP  
Mr CHAN Ngai-chung  
Mr CHEUNG Ming-keung

**Attendance by Invitation**

Ms WONG Shuk-han, Diane	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food & Health (Food)2, Food and Health Bureau
Mr YEUNG Chun-hoi	Public Niche Allocation Officer, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Ms HO Pei-pei, Suzanne	Senior Health Inspector (Environmental Hygiene)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr CHAN Chi-kwong	Engineer / Consultants Management 6, Drainage Services Department

**In Attendance**

Mr AU Sheung-man, Benjamin	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Ms CHONG Yan-yee, Belinda	Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Mr LI Ming-yau	Senior Inspector of Works, Islands District Office
Mr KWAN Yau-kee	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr WONG Tat-ming	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr YUNG King-ho, Vic	Police Community Relations Officer (Marine Port District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr YAU Siu-sang	Lantau District Police Community Relations Team Community Liaison Officer, Hong Kong Police Force
Ms CHOI Siu-man, Sherman	Senior Transport Officer/Islands, Transport Department
Mr LI Kim-man	Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)5, Environmental Protection Department
Ms TONG Yee-fun, Pauline	Senior Conservation Officer/1 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr WU Tip-ming, Wilson	Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr Benny CHAN	Representative, New Lantau Bus Co., (1973) Ltd
Ms Sonja CHAN	Representative, New World First Ferry Services Limited

**Secretary**

Ms CHAN Nga-chi, Angie	Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office
------------------------	--

**Absent with Apology**

Mr KWONG Koon-wan	
Ms LUN Chui-uen, Janice	Fisheries Officer (Enforcement)1, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Ms Cardi CHUNG	Representative, Hong Kong Tourism Board

**Welcoming remarks**

The Chairman welcomed representatives of government departments and organisations as well as Members to the meeting. She then introduced the following representatives of government departments in attendance to the meeting:

- (a) Ms CHOI Siu-man, Sherman, Senior Transport Officer/Islands of Transport Department (TD) who succeeded Mr TO Chi-keung, Gary.

(b) Mr WU Tip-ming, Wilson, Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension) of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) who stood in for Ms WOO On-ting, Amy.

2. Members noted that Mr YEUNG Tsz-hei, Eric had resigned from his position as Co-opted Member of TAFEHC due to his busy work schedule, and Mr KWONG Koon-wan, Ms LUN Chui-uen, Janice and Ms Cardi CHUNG, Representative of Hong Kong Tourism Board were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I. Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 29.1.2018

3. The captioned minutes were confirmed unanimously without amendments.

(As some guests had not yet arrived, agenda items III and V were discussed first.)

III. Question on water seepage on road section of 44-48 Chung Hing Street, Cheung Chau  
(Paper TAFEHC 10/2018)

4. The Chairman welcomed Ms HO Pei-pei, Suzanne, Senior Health Inspector (Environmental Hygiene)<sup>2</sup> of Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of FEHD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

5. The Chairman presented the question.

6. Ms Suzanne HO presented the written reply of FEHD in detail.

7. The Chairman said that the complaint had been referred to the departments concerned for more than 5 months but the water seepage problem remained unsolved. As the seeped water was loaded with pollutants, environmental hygiene would be adversely affected. She suggested the works division of Islands District Office (IsDO) conduct road resurfacing after the water seepage problem was solved and urged FEHD to follow up with the departments concerned to address the problem promptly.

8. Mr KWAN Yau-kee added that FEHD had liaised with Environmental Protection Department (EPD) earlier and noted that the source of water seepage might be related to the breakage of a manhole in government land and the drainage pipes underground. FEHD had informed Lands Department (LandsD) for follow-up.

9. The Chairman asked if LandsD would only ascertain the owners of the land concerned but not be responsible for handling the seepage problem.

10. Mr WONG Tat-ming said that LandsD had checked the records but was unable to ascertain which party was liable for repairing the manhole and drainage facilities concerned. Therefore, LandsD had requested FEHD to expand the coverage of colour water tests in the hope of identifying the flat causing seepage. To his knowledge, FEHD would conduct colour water tests again in mid-April.

11. The Chairman asked how FEHD could identify the source of water seepage given that it failed to do so in the water colour tests conducted in March.

12. Ms Suzanne HO said that FEHD conducted colour water tests in 2 flats adjacent to the manhole on 27 February. Having noticed that pipes in the manhole were facing upward, the department conducted tests in the 2 flats nearby after taking the pipe direction into account. However, the test results did not indicate any relation between the water seepage problem and the drainage systems of the flats. The department revisited the location concerned in March to review the results of the colour water tests but still did not see colour water seeping out. Therefore, the source of water seepage could not be ascertained. FEHD would conduct tests based on the direction of pipes in the manhole again to investigate if the seepage was related to another flat. LandsD was also asked to provide views on the source of water seepage.

13. Mr WONG Tat-ming said that the building records were checked but LandsD could not identify the flats where manholes or drainage pipes were constructed.

14. Mr YUNG Chi-ming suggested FEHD should also conduct water colour tests in other flats nearby apart from flats 44 and 48. If the source of water seepage still could not be identified, the department had to dig a trial pit outside the seepage area for further investigation.

15. Mr KWAN Yau-kee said that FEHD could not identify the source of water seepage after rounds of colour water tests so it was unable to continue its follow-up actions. He suggested FEHD, LandsD and EPD organise a meeting to discuss the investigation direction and define the scope of investigation with a view to identifying the cause of water seepage.

16. The Chairman asked which department would coordinate the inter-departmental meeting.

17. Mr KWAN Yau-kee said that FEHD could notify the departments concerned to discuss the case in a meeting. As FEHD could only trace the source of water seepage by conducting water seepage tests, it was hoped that other departments could provide technical support for investigating the cause of water seepage and identifying the owners of the land concerned.

18. The Chairman asked the departments concerned to arrange a meeting for follow-up after the meeting.

(Follow-up report of FEHD after the meeting: FEHD had deployed staff to inspect the location concerned for a number of times in April but there was no water seepage. FEHD staff paid a site visit to the location concerned later on 12 April with the representatives of IsDO, EPD, LandsD and Ms LEE Kwai-chun. The hygienic conditions were satisfactory in general. The representative of IsDO said that the top of the manhole concerned was found broken after the site visit and suspected that water seepage would occur when the water level was high in the manhole. The representative supplemented that IsDO would deploy staff for inspection after the top of the manhole was repaired and arrange road resurfacing works after the water seepage problem was confirmed to be solved.

FEHD deployed staff to inspect the location concerned again in early May and there was no water seepage. At the same time, the department noted that the occupant of a flat adjacent to the location concerned (50 Chung Hing Street) had repaired the manhole in late April. FEHD referred the case to IsDO and the departments concerned for follow-up on 15 May to expedite the arrangement of road surfacing works. FEHD staff had also informed Ms LEE Kwai-chun of the relevant conditions. The department would continue to monitor the situation and take appropriate actions.)

(Mr Holden CHOW joined the meeting at around 2:10 p.m.)

#### IV. Question on progress of “upgrading of Cheung Chau and Tai O sewage collection, treatment and

disposal facilities” project

(Paper TAFEHC 11/2018)

19. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHAN Chi-kwong, Engineer / Consultants Management 6 of Drainage Services Department (DSD) to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of DSD and EPD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

20. Mr KWONG Koon-wan was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments and had entrusted Ms Josephine TSANG to present the question on his behalf.

21. Mr CHAN Chi-kwong presented the written reply of DSD in detail.

22. Several Members raised their views as follows:

(a) The Chairman said the project would commence in 2019 at the earliest and a longer time for it was envisaged.

(b) Mr Randy YU asked when the project in Tai O would commence.

23. Mr CHAN Chi-kwong said that it would take over half a year to conduct public consultations, submit funding application to the Legislative Council (LegCo) and commence tender exercises even if resources were allocated within this year. Moreover, as rural areas in Cheung Chau were relatively densely populated and close to the existing public sewage collection system, the project in Cheung Chau would be prioritised and DSD would seek funds to implement the project in Tai O later.

24. Mr Randy YU said that the current project included work items in Cheung Chau and Tai O, and DSD would be asked to provide the specific timetable for the works in Tai O after the meeting.

25. Ms YU Lai-fan said that projects on sewage collection systems would be implemented at other locations in Islands District (such as Lamma Island and Peng Chau) apart from Cheung Chau and Tai O, and asked for the timetables for all those projects in Islands District. Sewage was discharged to roads chronically at various locations in Islands District and there were sewage problems in rural areas. She hoped DSD could seek more resources to solve the sewage problems in the district soon.

26. Mr Ken WONG said that the commencement time of the projects depended on the amount of resources allocated to the sewage systems in rural areas by DSD. Taking Peng Chau as an example, the project had been raised for years but the funding application was not submitted to the LegCo until this year. For the project in Cheung Chau, despite DSD estimated that the project could commence in 2019, the actual commencement date would depend on the priority of the project as determined by the department and the time. If project priorities were not amended, the funding application for the project in Cheung Chau might not be submitted to the LegCo even after a long time.

27. Mr Holden CHOW said that Islands District was in a unique condition that each island had different needs. In addition, it was remotely located with relatively less population so a number of projects could not be implemented. He asked DSD to provide the number of sewage projects which had obtained funding approval or were awaiting funding approval by the LegCo in different districts to facilitate Members' understanding of the progress of sewage projects in all districts.

28. Mr CHAN Chi-kwong made a consolidated response as follows:

(a) He would provide the timetable for the project in Tai O after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: If the project in Cheung Chau successfully obtained funding approval and commence this year, the project in Tai O could commence in 2020 at the earliest and be completed in 2025 based on the preliminary estimation. However, it would still depend on the funding and land resumption progress.

(b) With regard to the question raised by Mr Holden CHOW, he did not have the relevant information at the moment. DSD would seek resources for sewage system upgrading projects in rural areas across the territory but the priorities of projects depended on various factors, including policy objectives, number of projects and scale of works. There were different types of projects competing for resources every year so the department could not guarantee the commencement dates of the projects in Cheung Chau and Tai O.

29. Mr Holden CHOW asked whether DSD had preliminarily estimated the cost of the said project. To his understanding, projects with an expenditure of less than \$30 million could be

implemented under Capital Works Reserve Fund block allocation subheads. As submission of funding applications to the LegCo for vetting was unnecessary, the time involved could be shortened.

30. The Chairman said that a number of projects in Islands District had a relatively low priority. She hoped the department could adjust the project cost such as by splitting a project to facilitate early commencement.

31. Mr CHAN Chi-kwong said that the project cost concerned exceeded \$30 million and therefore a funding application should be submitted to the LegCo. In addition to the upward trend in project cost in recent years, the said project comprised not only construction of sewers, but also expansion of the sewage treatment plants in Cheung Chau and Tai O and improvement of the sewage treatment level, hence hefty cost was incurred. Moreover, the project was large in scale as it consisted of work items in Cheung Chau and Tai O, and was therefore split up.

32. Mr CHEUNG Fu said that the project was estimated, according to the timetable provided by DSD, to commence in 2019 and be completed in 2024 assuming that funding approval could be obtained this year.

33. Mr CHAN Chi-kwong said that the project timetable was a preliminary estimate by DSD on condition that funding approval was secured.

34. Mr Ken WONG said that DSD was responsible for implementing the project but not for deciding the project timetable. To his understanding, as DSD had to seek approval from ENB prior to the submission of a funding application to the LegCo, he had reservation about the accuracy of the project timetable provided by DSD. Resources would be wasted if the Government only built sewage treatment plants without providing relevant auxiliary facilities. He hoped ENB could better understand the situation in Islands District.

35. The Chairman hoped that DSD would consider the views of members to commence the projects earlier, and to provide and improve the relevant auxiliary facilities to tie in with the development of Islands District.

V. Question on dogs fouling around in Discovery Bay  
(Paper TAFEHC 12/2018)



36. The Chairman welcomed Ms HO Pei-pei, Suzanne/Senior Health Inspector (Environmental Hygiene)<sup>2</sup> of FEHD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of FEHD and the Discovery Bay Services Management Limited (DBSML) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

37. Ms Amy YUNG presented the question.

38. Ms Suzanne HO presented the written reply of FEHD in detail.

39. Ms Amy YUNG raised her views as follows:

(a) She expressed regret over the failure of DBSML to arrange representatives to the meeting and asked FEHD where the inspections were conducted in March this year. She pointed out that the construction site close to the reservoir was a hygiene black spot where faeces and disposable lunch boxes were frequently spotted by hikers and visitors. She had received a number of complaints from the residents and had provided photos as proof, and was therefore surprised that FEHD found the environmental hygiene conditions of the location satisfactory. She hoped FEHD could inspect the site with her. Moreover, some developers were constructing buildings at the location. As there were no toilet facilities nearby, the hygiene conditions were poor and she hoped FEHD could understand the situation.

(b) It was stated in the written reply of FEHD that the department was not liable for the environmental hygiene problems of private places. But according to paragraph 5 of Paper TAFEHC 13/2018, FEHD was authorised by law to prosecute in respect of offences in relation to mosquito and rodent problems at private places. She requested FEHD to explain why it only attached importance to mosquito and rodent problems while other hygiene problems at private places were under the responsibility of property management companies.

40. Mr Eric KWOK said that the dog fouling problem had been plaguing Yat Tung Estate. Since last year, there had been dog excreta not cleaned up by dog owners from time to time around Yu Tung Road next to Yat Tung Estate, Sheung Ling Pei Village and Chek Lap Kok New Village. FEHD cleaned up some locations under the District-led Actions Scheme last year. He had requested

FEHD to step up publicity and enforcement work but no concrete actions had been taken so far. Since dog owners mainly walked the dogs outside office hours in the early morning and in the evening, he asked whether FEHD had arranged a task force to carry out inspections and institute prosecutions outside office hours (i.e. in the early morning and in the evening). As for publicity, he noticed that there was only a dilapidated promotional banner on Yu Tung Road and suggested the provision of additional banners and conspicuous notices on Yu Tung Road to raise the awareness of dog owners. In addition, he hoped the department could distribute leaflets and institute prosecutions in the early morning and in the evening.

41. Mr FAN Chi-ping agreed with the views of Mr Eric KWOK. He had also reflected to FEHD that the vicinity of Yu Tung Road, the footbridge in Ma Wan New Village and the junction outside Pa Mei were frequented by the stray dogs. However, the department pointed out that the dogs concerned were guide dogs and there were only a few of them, about which he expressed doubt. He found FEHD's past practice of putting up promotional banners and posters to appeal to dog owners to handle dog excreta properly effective, but at present, fewer relevant promotional materials were provided. He said that he discovered a lot of dog excreta in front of his residence in the morning. He hoped FEHD could strengthen its publicity efforts (such as hanging banners) and institute prosecutions which he believed could improve the situation. Moreover, he asked whether it was correct for dog owners to wrap up dog faeces with newspaper and then discard it into rubbish bin.

42. Ms Josephine TSANG opined that it was hard for FEHD to arrange extra plain-clothes officers to carry out inspection and prosecute offending dog owners. She suggested FEHD advise on responsibility of dog owners by banners. For the situation in Islands District, self-discipline of dog owners, such as taking care of their dogs properly and clearing up dog excreta was crucial to the mitigation of the dog fouling problem. She opined that stray dogs fouling was serious in Islands District. Therefore, controlling the number of stray dogs was an important work but it was unsatisfactorily conducted. In addition, as a number of people did morning exercise along Nam Wan in Peng Chau, she suggested the cleaning staff of FEHD clean up the dog faeces there first in the morning.

43. Mr KWAN Yau-kee made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Apart from the enforcement actions of FEHD, improving environmental hygiene relied on the cooperation of citizens. Dog owners had to fulfill their civic responsibility by

handling dog faeces properly.

- (b) With regard to the locations where dog faeces were constantly found as mentioned by Members, FEHD would refer the case to the relevant staff for follow-up after obtaining detailed information of the locations concerned after the meeting. At present, FEHD deployed staff to carry out inspections during office hours. The department could also arrange plain-clothes officers or officers from the Intelligence Unit to take enforcement actions but it must obtain information about the locations and time concerned in advance.
- (c) As for whether dog faeces could be discarded in rubbish bins, FEHD had provided dog excreta collection bins and dog owners were recommended to discard dog faeces in the collection bins instead of rubbish bins. However, FEHD was unable to deploy staff to constantly monitor whether dog owners discarded dog faeces in rubbish bins. This matter did not only involve enforcement work, but also health education.
- (d) FEHD would follow up on the situation in Nam Wan, Peng Chau and strengthen the cleaning work.

44. Mr FAN Chi-ping said that the dog excreta collection bins were insufficient and they often overflowed. He hoped FEHD could provide additional dog excreta collection bins.

45. Ms YU Lai-fan said that the dog fouling problem was quite serious across Islands District. It was necessary for FEHD to strengthen the promotion of civic education and dog owners had to be self-disciplined. She said that warm reminders were posted in all villages on Lamma Island to remind dog owners to clean up properly after their dogs fouled the roads. Villagers would also remind irresponsible dog owners to exercise self-discipline so as not to affect environmental hygiene and cause nuisances to passers-by. She pointed out that the situation improved after FEHD stepped up prosecutions on Lamma Island, and therefore suggested the department enforce the law rigorously. Moreover, improper handling of the dog fouling problem might lead to serious animal abuse such as dog poisoning. FEHD had carried out a considerable amount of publicity work and Members had produced promotional leaflets and posters in different languages. Enforcement power was conferred on various departments by the existing legislation so she reiterated her suggestion for FEHD of enforcing the law rigorously on dog fouling.

46. Mr LOU Cheuk-wing said that the enforcement work of FEHD in Tai O was not effective. He saw dog faeces, which were believed to be left by stray dogs, on Tai Chung Pedestrian Footbridge every morning. He agreed with the views of Ms Josephine TSANG and opined that controlling the number of stray dogs would be an effective measure to mitigate the dog fouling problem. Also, stray dogs made noise at night, causing nuisance to residents. He complimented FEHD staff for washing the road after cleaning up dog faeces.

47. Ms Amy YUNG asked whether FEHD representatives would pay a site visit to the hygiene black spots in Discovery Bay with her again and hoped FEHD could send her the promotional leaflets by email so she could print and help distribute them to the residents.

48. Ms Suzanne HO said that she would follow up on the requests of Ms Amy YUNG.

49. The Chairman asked FEHD to arrange staff to follow up on the dog fouling problem across Islands District to prevent the situation from deteriorating.

(Follow-up report of FEHD after the meeting: Regarding the dog faeces matter of item V, FEHD had stepped up inspection and prosecution at locations in the district where dog faeces were constantly found. In parallel, FEHD officers would provide additional dog excreta collection bins as necessary and strengthened publicity work, including putting up banners, posters and distributing leaflets to remind dog owners and dog walkers to fulfill their civic responsibilities by cleaning up dog excreta. FEHD had also strengthened the washing work and improved the hygiene conditions of the roads concerned. Moreover, FEHD had notified Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department for follow-up on the stray dog issue.

In addition, FEHD sent representatives to inspect with Ms Amy YUNG the vicinity of Discovery Valley Road and the reservoir indicated by her on 2 May. The hygiene conditions therein were generally satisfactory but a small amount of dog faeces was found at some road sections. FEHD staff immediately requested the staff of DBSML to clean up to prevent adversely affecting environmental hygiene. In parallel, FEHD staff had passed promotional leaflets to Ms Amy YUNG

and the staff of the management company concerned for their assistance in distributing the leaflets to residents in the vicinity, thereby reminding dog walkers not to allow their dogs fouling any place as it created nuisance. Since Discovery Bay was a private place managed by its management company, FEHD had sent a letter to the management company concerned reminding them to strengthen the cleaning work at the locations concerned and keep the environment clean. FEHD would continue to monitor the situation and take appropriate actions.)

(Mr Ken WONG left the meeting at around 2:50 p.m.)

## II. Extendable Allocation Arrangement for Public Niches

(Paper TAFEHC 9/2018)

50. The Chairman welcomed Ms WONG Shuk-han, Diane, Principal Assistant Secretary for Food & Health (Food)2 of Food and Health Bureau (FHB), and Mr YEUNG Chun-hoi, Public Niche Allocation Officer of FEHD to the meeting to present the paper.

51. Ms Diane WONG presented the paper.

52. Mr YUNG Chi-ming agreed with the suggestion of FHB of posting notices on the wall of the niches concerned within one and a half year after the expiry of time limit (straddling the Ching Ming Festival and Chung Yeung Festival) to remind people to make the renewal applications. He also asked if a fee was required for renewal of niches.

53. Ms Josephine TSANG asked whether the renewal arrangement of the public niches already allocated would be the same as those allocated under the new allocation arrangement proposed to be implemented at the end of 2018.

54. Mr Eric KWOK raised his views as follows:

- (a) It was stated in paragraph 13 of the paper that FEHD would contact the nominated representatives of niche allocatees by SMS and email, etc. one year and half a year

before the expiry of deposit period. He suggested FEHD issue letters to the related persons as well.

- (b) According to paragraph 14 of the paper, if the related persons could not be contacted after the expiry of the deposit period, FEHD would follow the appropriate procedures and arrange removal of ashes in the niches. He asked when the niche resumption process would be activated after the expiry date, and whether the niche resumption process could stand legal challenge if relatives of the deceased turned up to claim the ashes concerned after completion of the niche resumption process.

55. Ms Amy YUNG recognised that green burial could alleviate the situation. She considered that the department concerned should clearly specify the renewal arrangement and conditions on the niche contract and agreed to the suggestion of Mr Eric KWOK. She also suggested the use of registered mail to protect the department in respect of their legal responsibilities.

56. The Chairman asked if a reference number could be assigned to each niche to enable the descendants to make enquiries and follow up, and how FEHD would deal with the renewal of niches allocated before the implementation of the new arrangement.

57. Ms Diane WONG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) For the renewal fee, the renewal arrangement of public niches would be set out in the subsidiary legislation which was subject to the “negative vetting” procedure of the LegCo. Therefore, the public would be informed of the new proposed fee levels. The current fees for a standard niche and a large niche were \$2,800 and \$3,600 respectively and FEHD would set the fees taking into account the duration of the deposit period. Announcement would be made when the relevant details were finalised.
- (b) Consultation with the LegCo and the 18 District Councils on the newly proposed allocation arrangement for public niches was underway and views were gathered from the District Councils. The current proposal of the Government was only applicable to niches to be allocated starting from the end of 2018. Niches currently in use would not be affected. If the technical and legal problems involved were resolved, and considering the social acceptance level, the handling of niches allocated prior to the

implementation of the extendable niche allocation arrangement could be explored in the future.

- (c) The Government's plan was to commence the niche resumption process one and a half year after the expiry of the deposit period. Proper records on the removal of ashes would be kept by FEHD. As the extendable arrangement was concerned with newly allocated niches, FEHD would consider inviting applicants to indicate in the application form their preferred way of handling ashes if the deposit period was not extended.
- (d) FEHD would contact the related persons by SMS and email, etc. at the first phase (i.e. one year and half a year before the expiry of time limit) since electronic communication was the most direct and fastest means without geographical restrictions. At subsequent phases, the related persons would be contacted by mail or other means set out in the paper. She noted Members' suggestions on enhancing the means of contact.
- (e) FEHD would regularly remind the persons concerned to update their contact information. At present, electronic communication was relatively more convenient. With the rapid development of technology, the department would keep pace with the development and explore other possible communication means. The means and location of final disposal of the removed ashes would be properly documented by FEHD.
- (f) The Government was actively promoting green burial to boost its popularity. The number of green burial cases handled by FEHD in 2017 accounted for about 12.9% of the total number of deaths in Hong Kong. Apart from FEHD, Gardens of Remembrance were also provided by the Hong Kong Chinese Christian Churches Union and the Board of Management of the Chinese Permanent Cemeteries. It was hoped that green burial could be gradually promoted as a mainstream way of handling ashes.

58. Mr YUNG Chi-ming asked whether fewer niches would be constructed after the implementation of the new allocation arrangement and whether construction of niches would continue in Cheung Chau due to a lack of niches there. He said that the public did not accept

cremation in the past but it was no longer the case in recent years, so the Government now had to introduce the renewal arrangement for public niches. He hoped FEHD could seriously consider the arrangement of renewal fee as excessively high fees would create problems.

59. Ms Diane WONG supplemented that the Government adopted a three-pronged strategy to cope with the pressing public demand for niches, i.e. increasing the supply of public niches, regulating private columbaria and promoting green burial. Regarding the district-based columbarium development scheme, some of the 24 sites identified were located in Islands District. FHB thanked Islands District Council for supporting the district-based scheme and increasing columbarium facilities. The Cheung Chau Columbarium Extension project would provide some 1 000 niches in addition to the original 1 000 niches, and more public niches would be provided on Lamma Island through minor works programme. The department welcomed views of the District Council.

60. Mr WONG Man-hon said that the Mui Wo Lai Chi Yuen Cemetery Extension had been endorsed by the Committee and was expected to be completed in 2019 but the works had not yet commenced.

61. Ms Diane WONG said that the departments concerned completed the traffic and environmental assessments of the Mui Wo Lai Chi Yuen Cemetery Extension project, and obtained funds for the project at the cost of over \$23 million. However, it still took time to arrange works contractors to commence construction after obtaining funds. According to the timetable, the project shall commence in the third quarter of 2018 and was expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2020, and FEHD was actively following up on the matter.

64. The Chairman asked what assistance could be provided to descendants if they were unable to pay the renewal fees due to financial difficulties.

65. Ms Diane WONG said that the current fees of public niches were affordable to the majority of the public. In addition, eligible persons could apply for burial grant under the relevant schemes of Social Welfare Department and hence assistance was available to persons in need.

(Mr Holden CHOW left the meeting at around 3:00 p.m.)



VI. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department District Action Plan

(Paper TAFEHC 13/2018)

66. The Chairman welcomed Mr KWAN Yau-kee, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) of FEHD to the meeting to present the paper.

67. Mr KWAN Yau-kee presented the paper.

68. Ms Amy YUNG said that according to the paper, the work priorities of FEHD next year would be on the local community and public places, and opined that the department had ignored non-locally transmitted epidemics. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) broke out in Hong Kong in 2003. The epidemic was imported and Amoy Garden was hardly hit by it. Several hundreds of people in Hong Kong were infected and over 300 of them died eventually. She opined that FEHD should establish an epidemic notification mechanism with the Mainland so that actions such as promotion through Hong Kong Tourism Board as well as distributing leaflets and stepping up quarantine checks at ports of entry and the airport could be taken immediately. SARS taught Hong Kong a hard lesson so she suggested FEHD include prevention of another local outbreak of epidemics in its future commitments.

69. Mr YUNG Chi-ming said that the streets in Cheung Chau were clean at present and the dog fouling situation had been improved. However, the rodent infestation deteriorated recently. A number of residents complained about the increase in number of rodents and Tung Tai San Tsuen and Pak She Back Street were frequented by rodents in particular. He hoped FHHD could monitor and follow up on the problem concerned.

70. Mr WONG Man-hon said that the refuse collection vehicles of FEHD constantly parked at the Tung Chung Road section near the fort in Sheung Ling Pei, Tung Chung and caused traffic congestion. The housing estates there would be ready for intake at the end of this year. If there were no traffic arrangement measures, accidents might occur easily and would pose hazards to the staff and motorists. In addition, the same situation occurred at a road section outside Pui O Lo Wai Tsuen. There were a number of vehicles using the road section concerned so he hoped FEHD could follow up and make improvements.

71. Mr Eric KWOK raised his views as follows:

- (a) He complimented FEHD for adopting the suggestion of Members to install a closed circuit television (CCTV) system at Pa Mei, Tung Chung.
- (b) Regarding rodent control, there were news reports that some dogs and sparrows died of suspected food poisoning which might be rodent baits in Ma Wan Chung Village, Tung Chung on 26 January this year. He asked FEHD if guidelines were drawn up on the setting of rodent baits and if its outsourced workers had received trainings on the handling of rodent baits.
- (c) With regard to the Government's plan of implementing the levy of domestic waste at the end of this year or early next year, he asked whether FEHD would discuss how to enforce the waste levy measures effectively with EPD or other departments concerned, and expected that some citizens would discard refuse improperly to evade the levy. Concerning that residents might discard refuse on other floors or at the staircase, he had discussed the relevant measures with the mutual aid committees of public housing estates for a number of times. He hoped FEHD would explore carefully the appropriate ways of handling it.

72. Ms YU Lai-fan asked if FEHD would only implement the measures against dog fouling as stated in paragraph 8 of the annex to the paper in Tung Chung. She had repeatedly reflected that some dog owners allowed their dogs to foul the streets and had provided the usual dog walking time of the dog owners concerned to FEHD. She asked when the department would take enforcement actions.

73. Mr LOU Cheuk-wing said that the street hygiene and refuse collection conditions at Tai O were quite satisfactory at daytime, but were poor at night and even worse in the early morning. He opined that it was due to the insufficient publicity and education work of FEHD such that the way of handling refuse and correct locations for discarding refuse were not adequately publicised. The litter containers of FEHD were used for collecting smaller refuse but they were often misused as rubbish bins. Moreover, overflowing and refuse being discarded at the side of litter containers were common. There were warning notices on litter containers reminding the public that discarding refuse at the side of a litter container might be liable to a fine of \$1 500 but it seemed like FEHD had never taken enforcement action in this regard. He suggested the department launch publicity work

first, followed by enforcement actions. Apart from that, there were 2 litter containers in the plaza outside Tai O Rural Committee (TORC). They were fully loaded with refuse every morning and there were fruit carton boxes discarded at their side. Since the plaza was a tourist attraction, he suggested FEHD install CCTV to monitor the offenders who discarded refuse improperly and make prosecutions.

74. Ms Sammi FU said that the streets in Tung Chung were clean basically but rubbish was found accumulating at the grassland and in the shrubs on Wai Tung Road and Man Tung Road from time to time. She had requested FEHD to deploy staff to clean certain locations earlier and hoped FEHD could pay more attention to it and remove the refuse in the shrubs.

75. Mr KWAN Yau-kee made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding prevention of outbreak of serious epidemics in the community, a relevant mechanism established by Department of Health (DH) would be activated when unforeseen incidents occurred and the Centre for Health Protection under DH was responsible for coordinating all departments to handle the incident. FEHD would enforce work within its purview and its staff would promote the importance of maintaining personal and environmental hygiene from time to time.
- (b) As for the rodent infestation problem raised by Mr YUNG Chi-ming, FEHD would understand and follow up on the situation concerned. FEHD implemented anti-rodent campaigns of different scales every year and it conducted anti-rodent operations in designated target areas in recent years. Anti-rodent operations were in progress in the vicinity of Cheung Chau Pier and fruitful results had been achieved. If the rodent infestation problem deteriorated, FEHD would arrange staff to pay a site visit again and handle the issue.
- (c) FEHD would study improvement measures after understanding the refuse collection situation in Sheung Ling Pei Village, Tung Chung, such as adjusting the refuse collection time or location to minimise the effects on the residents.
- (d) Regarding the use of rodent baits, all workers of outsourced service contractors had to undergo relevant trainings. Assistance could be sought from the pest control experts of the Pest Control Advisory Section of FEHD. FEHD staff had received relevant

trainings. They would set rodent baits following the guidelines and post notices to warn the public that rodent baits were set in the vicinity. Therefore, dog owners could avoid walking their dogs there to prevent their dogs from consuming rodent baits by accident. However, possibility of intake of rodent baits by stray dogs could not be completely eliminated. FEHD staff would set rodent baits at strategic locations following the guidelines such as maintaining a specific distance between the locations where baits were set.

- (e) As for the dog fouling problem, the black spots of dog faeces mainly concentrated in Tung Chung, such as the vicinity of Ying Tung Road, Ying Hong Street and Ying Hei Road. FEHD would deploy staff to follow up on the situation on Lamma Island.
- (f) Regarding the refuse collection situation in Tai O, there had been a shortage of manpower earlier but FEHD already deployed additional staff to Tai O recently to carry out cleaning duties at night, including inspecting streets and monitoring the environmental hygiene conditions. As for publicity, FEHD conducted publicity work through Health Education Exhibition and Resource Centre and its staff would promote the importance of maintaining environmental hygiene during inspections. The department could also arrange officers from the Intelligence Unit to assist in prosecutions at night at locations where littering was common. In addition, FEHD would deploy staff to inspect the plaza at TORC and follow up on the condition of the litter containers.
- (g) Upon receipt of the letter from Ms Sammi FU about the refuse problem on Wai Tung Road and Man Tung Road, FEHD followed up on it and improved the environmental hygiene there.
- (h) The Government would implement arrangements for the waste levy in 2019 and FEHD understood Members' concerns about the arrangements and their potential problems. There was a task force at the headquarters of FEHD dedicated to handle matters related to waste levy and problems encountered by FEHD when enforcing work including littering. The task force would have meetings with EPD frequently to discuss ways of cooperation. The department would report the relevant information to Members in due course.

(Follow-up report of FEHD after the meeting on item VI: Regarding the refuse collection problem in Sheung Ling Pei Village, Tung Chung, apart from the said improvement measures, FEHD was liaising with TD for discussion on the feasibility of providing lay-bys at a section of Tung Chung Road near the fort in Sheung Ling Pei, Tung Chung and a road section outside Pui O Lo Wai Tsuen in order to facilitate refuse collection by FEHD and reduce the impact on traffic imposed by it. As for the rodent infestation problem in Cheung Chau, FEHD staff had inspected the black spots of rodent infestation in Cheung Chau and step up rodent control measures. The department also reminded staff to monitor the hygiene conditions of streets and step up cleansing work. Please refer to the follow-up report by FEHD in paragraph 49 above for matters on dog fouling.)

76. The Chairman hoped FEHD could set rodent baits properly to ensure their effectiveness and prevent wrong intake of baits by birds. She complimented outsourced cleaning workers for cleaning up the rubbish in their surrounding environment meticulously. Since Islands District was a popular tourist spot, she hoped FEHD could increase manpower and the frequency of cleaning in view of the number of tourists and hygiene conditions of each area to step up clearing of refuse.

VII. First Batch of Proposed Projects under District Minor Works of Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries and Environmental Hygiene Committee for 2018/2019  
(Paper TAFEHC 14/2018)

77. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Ming-yau, Senior Inspector of Works of IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

78. Mr LI Ming-yau presented the paper.

79. Ms YU Lai-fan asked which department was responsible for the provision of additional fire breaks and fire beaters. Some citizens reflected that the fire beaters in Islands District were old and some were even missing. She suggested the relevant department to inspect the fire breaks and provide additional fire beaters during the Spring and Autumn Ancestral Worship of Clans.

80. Mr LI Ming-yau said that IsDO was responsible for the repairing and maintaining the fire breaks and would conduct inspection regularly. The old ones would be replaced if necessary.

81. The Committee approved the allocation of \$2,800,000 for the implementation of 6 District

Minor Works projects.

VIII. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects

(Paper TAFEHC 15/2018)

82. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Ming-yau, Senior Inspector of Works of IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

83. Mr LI Ming-yau presented the paper.

84. Members and the guests discussed the projects below. The main points were as follows:

- (a) Constructing storm water channels in Pak Ngan Heung Village (Construction of drainage channels in Pak Ngan Heung Village, Mui Wo) (IS-DMW-609)
- (b) Improvement to footpath near 1 Lung Mei Tsuen, Mui Wo (IS-DMW-643)

Mr WONG Man-hon hoped that the 2 said projects could commence earlier, before the approaching rainy season.

Mr LI Ming-yau said that a layout plan was being formulated for project IS-DMW-609 and the project was expected to be completed in February 2019. The site investigation work for project IS-DMW-643 was completed in December 2016. The District Office was drawing a layout plan for the project which was expected to be completed within 2018.

- (c) Improvement to road pavements at Shing Cheong Lane and 68-106 Sang Hing Street, Cheung Chau (IS-DMW-562)

The Chairman said the road sections concerned had an uneven surface but were used by many pedestrians. Since peak travel season was approaching, she hoped the road surface could be repaired as soon as possible to prevent accidents to pedestrians.

Mr LI Ming-yau said that the project was at the preparation stage at present and would be taken forward expeditiously.

IX. Report by Working Group

(i) Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries and Environmental Hygiene Committee Activities Working Group

85. The Chairman said that the report of the working group (see Reference 1 for details) had been sent to Members for perusal by fax or email before the meeting. Members were welcome to make comments.

86. Members had no comment and endorsed the above working group report.

(ii) Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group

87. The Chairman said that 10 Members declared interests under Tier-1 for their posts as honorary consultants of Hong Kong Outlying Islands Women's Association prior to the meeting, with regard to the proposals of community organisations put forward by the working group for the "Quit to Win" Smoke-free Community Campaign. For Tier-1 declarations, the Members concerned could remain in the meeting and take part in the discussion, decision-making and voting.

88. Mr Randy YU said that the report of the working group (see Reference 2 for details) had been sent to Members for perusal by fax or email before the meeting. Members were welcome to make comments.

89. Members had no comment and endorsed the above working group report, which included the activity proposal for the "Quit to Win" Smoke-free Community Campaign.

X. Any Other Business

90. There was no other business.

XI. Date of Next Meeting

91. The meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:00 p.m. on

28 May 2018 (Monday).

-END-