

(Translation)

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

Date : 23 November 2020 (Monday)
Time : 10:30 a.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine (Chairman)	
Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman)	
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP	
Mr WONG Man-hon	(Arrived at around 10:55 a.m.)
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH	(Left at around 12:40 p.m.)
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH	
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH	
Mr HO Chun-fai	(Arrived at around 10:35 a.m.)
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy	(Arrived at around 10:50 a.m.)
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric	
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy	(Left at around 12:40 p.m.)
Mr FONG Lung-fei	
Ms LAU Shun-ting	(Left at around 12:40 p.m.)
Mr LEE Ka-ho	
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho	(Left at around 12:40 p.m.)

Attendance by Invitation

Ms LAM Lai-hang, Mable	Chief Engineer/Consultants Management (Acting), Water Supplies Department
Mr SY Kin-lik	Senior Engineer/Consultants Management 3, Water Supplies Department
Mr CHAN Ho-yan, James	Project Manager, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Mr CHAN Yun-fat, Louis	Mechanical Engineering Specialist, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Ms WONG Shuk-ling, Angela	Waterworks Specialist, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited
Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Islands 2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr HUANG Jialiang	District Engineer/General(4)A, Highways Department
Ms LAU Hoi-shan, Nelly	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Islands)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr YAN Man-chi, Robin
Dr XIAO Xinshan, Sharlet

Mr WAN Sze-yuen

Property Service Manager/S(HKI) 3, Housing Department
Agricultural Officer (Technical Services),
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Senior Field Officer (Pesticides Registration),
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

In Attendance

Mr LI Ho, Thomas
Ms LEUNG Tin-ye, Christy
Mr LI Ming-yau
Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy

Mr TSANG Wai-man

Mr LO Tim-fat, Frankie

Mr LAU Kuen-fung

Ms SIN Ka-wai, Marie
Mr LI Kim-man

Mr CHOW Man-lung, Andrew
Mr PEI Nien-jen, Gordon

Mr WU Tip-ming, Wilson

Mr TANG Wing-kai, Ricky

Mr Benny CHAN
Ms YUEN Suk-ling, Sylvia

Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Senior Inspector of Works, Islands District Office
District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands),
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands),
Lands Department
Police Community Relations Officer (Lantau District),
Hong Kong Police Force
Assistant Police Community Relations Officer
(Marine Port District), Hong Kong Police Force
Senior Transport Officer/Islands 2, Transport Department
Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)5,
Environmental Protection Department
Engineer/HK(Distribution 6), Water Supplies Department
Senior Engineer/6 (Lantau),
Civil Engineering and Development Department
Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension),
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Fisheries Officer (Enforcement) 1,
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Representative, New Lantau Bus Company (1973) Limited
New World First Ferry Services Limited

Secretary

Ms NG Ching-sum

Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken
Mr HO Siu-kei

Absent

Mr WONG Chun-yeung

Welcoming remarks

The Chairman welcomed representatives from government departments, organisations as well as Members to the meeting and said that in accordance with the guidelines of the Home Affairs Department (HAD), the number of meetings held each week was limited to two and the meetings should not exceed two hours each time in view of the epidemic. She proposed that today's meeting be held from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. so as to comply with the guidelines. She asked Members to be succinct and make good use of time to discuss the items on the agenda.

2. The Chairman introduced the following departmental representatives who attended the meeting:

(a) Mr LAU Kuen-fung, Assistant Police Community Relations Officer (Marine Port District) of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) who stood in for Mr LEONG Seong-iam, Sammy.

(b) Ms YUEN Suk-ling, Sylvia of the New World First Ferry Services Limited who succeeded Ms Sonja CHAN.

3. Members noted that Mr Ken WONG and Mr HO Siu-kei were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 28.9.2020

4. The Chairman said that the captioned minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by government departments and organisations and had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

5. The captioned minutes were endorsed unanimously without amendments.

(Mr HO Chun-fai arrived at around 10:35 a.m.; Ms Amy YUNG arrived at around 10:50 a.m.; Mr WONG Man-hon arrived at around 10:55 a.m.)

II. Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works extension – Main Works (Paper TAFEHCCC 74/2020)

6. The Chairman welcomed Ms LAM Lai-hang, Mable, Chief Engineer/Consultants Management (Acting) and Mr SY Kin-lik, Senior Engineer/Consultants Management 3 of the Water Supplies Department (WSD); Mr CHAN Ho-yan, James, Project Manager, Mr CHAN Yun-fat, Louis, Mechanical Engineering Specialist and Ms WONG Shuk-ling, Angela, Waterworks Specialist of Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited to the meeting to present the paper.

7. Ms Mable LAM and Mr SY Kin-lik briefly presented the PowerPoint.

8. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He noted that WSD had organised a briefing session in the previous week to present the works items. He said that Members were very concerned about the housing needs in Hong Kong. The population of Tung Chung increased by the day and the extension of Water Treatment Works was necessary. As such, he supported the relevant works. However, it appeared that WSD had not coordinated with Highways Department (HyD) and Transport Department (TD) about the peripheral works, in particular the pipe laying works in the South Lantau Road. He pointed out that Section 9 of the mainlaying works along South Lantau Road had to be conducted by excavation, each time for 40 metres. While WSD claimed that 40 metres would be excavated each time, in reality it might only excavate five to ten metres at a time, but 40 metres of road section would be occupied and daily traffic in both directions on South Lantau Road would be affected. Mr Eric KWOK, Mr HO Chun-fai and he had pointed out in the briefing session that there were problems with the relevant arrangements. He proposed that while the excavation of Section 9 of the mainlaying works along South Lantau Road was carrying out, road widening works should be conducted at the same time to a standard of two-lane two-way traffic. It would minimise road closure and improve road conditions in the long-term.
- (b) He said that the proposal of Driving on Lantau Island Scheme was discussed at the Traffic and Transport Committee in the previous week. As WSD planned to implement large-scale works project which involved long-term road closure, including pipe laying, TD should be informed of the project. The works would be completed in 2027 at the earliest. It was believed that by then road widening should be completed and closure of roads would no longer be necessary. He opined that the Driving on Lantau Island Scheme could be implemented in 2025.
- (c) He said that residents worried about the noises produced in the Pui O Raw Water Pumping Station (Pump House) under the extension project. They hoped that noise barriers would be set up to reduce nuisance caused to residents.

9. Mr Eric KWOK opined that WSD should invite representatives of the HyD, TD, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and the Police to attend the meeting to report particulars of the works project. He also opined that the departments should maintain communication with each other. He said that South Lantau residents had made sacrifices in areas such as fresh water and transport to tie in with development projects of the Government. He had raised the proposal at the briefing session that WSD and other departments, in connection with the laying of water pipes, should altogether study the feasibility of widening relevant road sections. There were many spaces along the road section from San Shek Wan to Shek Pik Reservoir

along Tung Chung Road where road widening works could be implemented. After the road had been widened, three-lane traffic could be accommodated, and the traffic of Tai O residents and tourists would not be affected by the laying of water pipes. In addition, there were many bends along the road to Mui Wo and Members of the previous term of Islands District Council (IDC) had pointed out that water pipes at the location hindered the road widening works. He enquired WSD whether the issue of bends had been taken into account in overall planning. There was a shortage of water supplies in farmlands outside Pui O, Lo Wai and San Wai due to upstream water interception. He hoped that WSD would study with departments concerned to re-direct the two creeks at Pui O Au to the farmlands.

10. Mr HO Chun-fai expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was very supportive of the various works implemented by WSD in South Lantau. However, these works had not properly taken into account the residents of the South Lantau district. At the briefing session, Members raised the proposal that problems left over from the previous works be resolved altogether, such as the “S”-shaped bend at San Shek Wan, which would require the collaboration of various departments to widen the road section. He welcomed WSD’s saying that the department had studied the feasibility of adopting trenchless excavation technology to lay water pipes at Road in Pui O, which could improve the blockage of river channels and alleviate the issue of flooding at the same time.
- (b) With regard to the Pump House, he said that although the relevant noise data was in line with standards, it was still causing nuisance in practice. As such, he proposed the installation of noise barriers to alleviate the noise problem. As for the laying of water pipes, he opined that the pipes and the bridge should be separated by at least ten metres apart, so that future road development would not be affected.
- (c) With regard to the issue that there were two sharp bends at Section 9 of mainlaying works at South Lantau Road and that many traffic accidents had occurred at the location, he proposed that departments should make use of the opportunity to widen the road section concerned.

11. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the current traffic situation at South Lantau Road was not satisfactory. Departments should take into account problems brought about by the works to avoid deterioration of the situation. She supported the improvement and widening of the entire length of South Lantau Road.

12. Ms Mable LAM made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) With regard to the excavation related to the mainlaying works, she said that before the implementation of road excavation works and laying of pipes, WSD would consult the local residents about the temporary traffic

options and seek approval from the Traffic Management Liaison Group (TMLG) set up by the TD, HyD and HKPF. The works would not commence arbitrarily before approval was given.

- (b) With regard to the possible noise nuisance problem created by the Pump House, WSD had made holistic considerations in the design stage and therefore all exhaust vent outlets would not face residences. The Pui O Pumping Station was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). The noise emitted was subject to the regulation of EIAO. The contractors had to abide by the relevant regulations during the works period.
- (c) Pui O Au River channel was not within the scope of the works. WSD would follow up with the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to understand the relevant situation.
- (d) With regard to the issue of flooding, as the pipes at Pui O section had been in use for more than 50 years, WSD would consider examining their condition during the works period. If necessary, diversion would be arranged to alleviate the blockage and flooding problem of the channel. As road widening was not under the purview of WSD, the department would reflect Members' requests to TD and HyD.

13. Mr Randy YU understood that road widening was not the duty of WSD and approval of TMLG had to be sought before project initiation could be conducted for a proposal. However, all Members agreed that there was a need to widen the South Lantau Road. There was a shortage of water supply in Hong Kong in the 1960s. WSD built roads on Lantau Island for the construction of Shek Pik Reservoir. However, the relevant works intercepted the water sources of Lantau Island and only a small amount of stream water was left for the use of residents of South Lantau and other places on Lantau Island. The amount of water was insufficient for irrigation and as such many residents moved out and many villages incurred decadence. The villagers thus made a sacrifice on their part for the greater good of the community. No improvement works were implemented at South Lantau Road ever since and it was 6.8 metres at its widest location, barely adequate for two vehicles to pass through. If two-lane two-way traffic was to be implemented, the road surface had to be widened to at least 7.2 or 7.3 metres to let two buses pass through at the same time. He stressed that it was not enough for WSD to only communicate with other departments. It should make use of the opportunity of the project to take the lead to improve the relevant roads. He said that at the briefing session, Members had stated clearly that if their request was not addressed, they might object to the extension of the Water Treatment Works. If road surface improvement works were to be implemented, the impact on vehicular traffic could be reduced during the works period. In the long-term, the South Lantau Road could also be enhanced. He repeatedly stressed that in the extension works, WSD had to take the leading role in the TMLG to coordinate the relevant works.

14. Mr Eric KWOK concurred with Mr Randy YU and said that DC Members had conveyed the request to the staff of WSD at the briefing session. Residents of South Lantau had suffered from the water shortage problem since 1960s. It was raised in the previous term of IDC that the widening of South Lantau Road was imminent. The issue had been delayed for more than ten years. He hoped that WSD should implement the works of widening South Lantau Road. He criticised that WSD's proposal was only concerned about the works' progress without taking into account the needs of South Lantau residents. Its representatives only said that they would reflect Members' views to the departments concerned and their response was perfunctory. He urged WSD to make use of the opportunity and convenience to widen the road surface altogether so that residents could be benefited. While WSD said that Pui O Au did not fall within the scope of the works, he opined that WSD should be responsible for intercepting water sources initially and should make use of the opportunity to introduce water sources so that local residents could reintroduce farming again.

15. Ms WONG Chau-ping was disappointed with the response of WSD. She said that many Members attended WSD's briefing session and much time was spent on the discussion of the widening of roads surface. She queried whether representatives of WSD had reported to the department and followed up on the matter.

16. Mr HO Chun-fai said that 60 years ago, villagers and fishermen were mobilised to build the South Lantau Road leading to Shek Pik Reservoir. They also paid the price for having their water source being intercepted. After 60 years, WSD planned to conduct mainlaying works in South Lantau Road and the needs of South Lantau's residents were ignored once again. He pointed out that Members were only requesting WSD to communicate with other departments which could save public funds on one hand and resolve issues brought about by inadequate width of roads on the other. He urged WSD to deal with the issue squarely and reiterated that he did not wish to see the laying of pipes on the road surface.

17. The Chairman said that WSD and the Consultant organised the briefing session in the previous week, during which Members expressed many views. Members hoped that WSD would provide a response and adequate justification for Members' support at the current meeting. However, the response of WSD was disappointing. It seemed that representatives of WSD had not relayed the relevant opinions to the department. She said WSD should make use of the opportunity of laying pipes to implement other measures of benefiting the people at the same time. She requested WSD to report the works progress regularly. If residents had any questions or came across any problems during the works period, WSD should deal with them squarely.

18. Ms Mable LAM apologised to Members and said that by saying previously that she would "reflect" Members' views to HyD and TD, she might have used the wrong word, as the word "reflect" might give people the impression of not shouldering responsibility. She clarified and promised that WSD would take the initiative to liaise with TD and HyD and relay Members' views. With regard to the issue of interception of water source of farmland a long time before, WSD would try to understand the issue from AFCD. In addition, WSD noted that Members requested the regular reporting of

the progress of works concerned.

19. Mr Eric KWOK opined that Ms Mable LAM, Chief Engineer of WSD, did not understand the impact of the works on residents of South Lantau. Her response just now was only sophistry. He said that the building of roads for construction of reservoirs in those days was the same as that of laying pipes nowadays. He proposed to invite TD, HyD, CEDD, the Police and AFCD to the following meeting and not to determine whether to support the works until there was a concrete proposal. He reiterated that WSD had to formulate the outline of the entire works project with other departments first. He also pointed out that there were no facilities such as flyovers, tunnels and traffic lights in Islands District and their works costs were less than other districts.

20. Mr Randy YU said that although the representative of WSD changed the wording “reflect” to “take the initiative to liaise with”, he opined that it was still inadequate. He reiterated that WSD should take the leading role in the Water Treatment Works project and communicate with other departments proactively. That would allow them to compensate the residents of Lantau who sacrificed their water sources when South Lantau Road was built. He opined that the construction of the Water Treatment Works was necessary, but he could not give it full support. He did not want to vote opposed or abstained. As such, he proposed to give it conditional support, such as organising special working meeting or setting up TMLG, or requesting WSD to endeavour its best to widen the road surface of Section 9 of South Lantau Road where water pipes were to be laid. If land resumption was involved, the matter would be resolved separately.

21. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that he also attended the briefing session in the previous week. However, the paper presented today did not depart much from that presented on the day of the briefing. He enquired WSD about the purpose of holding the briefing session to listen to the views of Members. He agreed that there was need to construct the Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works but the works would create many problems. He therefore hoped to move an impromptu motion as follows: “Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee (TAFEHCCC) urges WSD that before advancing the Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works extension, road widening works at South Lantau Road must be implemented, and the progress of work should be regularly reported to the TAFEHCCC.” He urged WSD to listen to Members’ views and implemented them effectively.

22. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that WSD seemed unable to grasp Members’ views, no matter it was at the briefing session or the current meeting. WSD was responsible for matters of the Water Treatment Works, whereas Members were concerned about traffic problems which were affairs outside of the Water Treatment Works. As such, they hoped that WSD would take the lead and co-operate with other departments to deal with the issue. He proposed that the Secretariat should hand over the audio recording to WSD after the meeting as soon as possible, so that it could listen to Members’ views clearly and discuss the matter again in the following IDC meeting. He criticised that in every discussion of works projects, relevant departments would only introduce

matters within the scope of the projects, but not concerned about the peripheral matters. He said that while the works seemed to be imperative, many details had yet met requirements. As such, he could not support the works.

23. Mr Sammy TSUI said that as the works would affect residents who used the roads for access, WSD should be responsible. He opined that WSD should seek information from TD and HyD, such as the road occupancy, vehicular flow and impact on traffic during construction, etc. More information should be provided to Members for reference, or else the works would not be supported.

24. The Chairman said that representatives of TD, CEDD, Environmental Protection Department (EPD), AFCD and HKPF also attended the meeting. He hoped representatives of various departments would respond.

25. Ms Mable LAM responded to Mr Sammy TSUI's views and said that WSD had completed the Traffic Impact Assessment Study, which had also been approved by TD and HKPF. As such, the impact of the works on traffic was slight.

26. The Chairman once again requested the representatives of departments to provide a response or reflect the views of the departments.

27. Ms Marie SIN said that she would relay the views to the Traffic Engineering Division, including the works' impact on local traffic, and study the feasibility of road improvement works.

28. Mr Gordon PEI said that he would relay the views to the groups concerned.

29. Mr LI Kim-man said that he had no relevant information for the time being. He would relay the views to the groups concerned after understanding the situation.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had relayed the views to the groups concerned after the meeting.)

30. Mr Wilson WU said that he would report the relevant issue to the department. He said that if water sources could be improved, it would be very beneficial to the rehabilitation of farmland.

31. Mr LAU Kuen-fung said that if WSD convened a meeting, the Police would be pleased to attend and participate in the discussion.

32. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho understood that departments could only supplement briefly at the current stage. He hoped that various departments would communicate and collate relevant information with WSD before the following meeting. He pointed out that representatives of WSD recently said that the Traffic Impact Assessment Study was completed with the Police and TD. However, he queried whether TD and HKPF conducted the study at a suitable time and in a suitable manner. He said all Lantau Members opined that the works would produce a serious impact on traffic, but the

departments said that the impact was slight. He therefore hoped that WSD would provide the Traffic Impact Assessment Study Report to Members for perusal.

33. The Chairman approved the moving of the impromptu motion by Mr LEE Ka-ho.

34. Mr Eric KWOK said that the current major works would take seven to eight years to complete and there was no haste to decide within one or two months. He proposed that WSD should communicate with HyD, TD, CEDD, the Police and AFCD seriously, and then briefly present the relevant works to IDC. He proposed that voting on whether to support the works be postponed, and if postponement was not possible, he strongly requested Members to object to the works.

35. Mr HO Chun-fai agreed with Mr Eric KWOK's proposal and opined that voting should be conducted only after the implementation of works project was confirmed.

36. Mr Sammy TSUI said that if Members did not support the works, the works' progress would be affected. As such, he proposed that arrangements should be made for Members to conduct an on-site inspection to understand the actual impact on residents.

37. The Chairman requested Mr LEE Ka-ho to read out the impromptu motion.

38. Mr LEE Ka-ho read out the impromptu motion as follows: "The TAFEHCCC urges WSD that before advancing the Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works extension, road widening works at South Lantau Road must be implemented, and the progress of work should be regularly reported to the TAFEHCCC". The impromptu motion was seconded by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.

39. Mr Randy YU opined that the scope covered by the impromptu motion moved by Mr LEE Ka-ho was too broad, whereas the area of works to be excavated included only Section 9. He therefore proposed to amend the motion as follows: "The TAFEHCCC urges WSD that before advancing the Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works extension, road widening works of the excavation area within the works areas (i.e., Section 9 of South Lantau Road) must be implemented, and the progress of work should be regularly reported to the TAFEHCCC". The relevant amendment was seconded by Ms WONG Chau-ping.

40. Mr Eric KWOK enquired whether Section 9 was the section from Pui O Tunnel to Shek Pik Reservoir.

41. Mr Randy YU said that Section 9 had to be excavated in the works, as such he requested the straightening and widening of the road section. He cited the PowerPoint to point out that Sections 2 to 5 and Sections 7 to 8 needed no excavation.

42. Mr Eric KWOK enquired whether the works area covered San Shek Wan

Bridge, as it was mentioned in the previous term of the IDC that water pipes hindered the straightening of the Bridge.

43. Mr Randy YU said that the works should not cover the relevant road section. He proposed to further amend his amendments, which read as “The road widening works of South Lantau Road in the excavation area within the works areas must be implemented”, without mentioning Section 9, which would make it clearer and more reasonable.

44. Ms Mable LAM clarified that Section 6 was situated inside the Pump House and would not affect carriageways.

45. Mr Randy YU enquired whether the road surface to be excavated in the works covered only Section 9.

46. Ms Angela WONG said that the intersection of Section 2 and 3 needed to be closed to build a work shaft, whereas the works on the road mainly occurred in Section 9.

47. Mr Randy YU said that it would take 20 months each to excavate the work shafts from Sections 2 to 8 and each time the excavation of Section 9 would be 40 metres. As such, the entire road section would be riddled with holes and openings during the works period and it would obstruct traffic. He opined that it would just be a waste of time no matter how the motion would be amended. As the works were very important for the development of Tung Chung, he proposed that WSD be tasked with organising a working meeting within six weeks and all departments concerned should be invited to attend and participate in the discussion, and no voting would be conducted that day.

48. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the Chairman had approved the moving of the impromptu motion. As such, voting should be conducted according to the Standing Orders. It should not be cancelled because of the views of Mr Randy YU or Mr Eric KWOK. He requested the Chairman to handle the matter in accordance with the Standing Orders.

49. The Chairman reiterated that she had approved Mr LEE Ka-ho’ motion and enquired Mr Randy YU whether he still wished to raise amendments to the motion.

50. Mr Randy YU said that if voting was conducted according to the old motion, he worried that its constraint on the relevant departments would be even less. As such, he hoped to continue amending the motion. He proposed to amend the motion as follows: “The TAFEHCCC urges WSD that before advancing the Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works extension, road widening works must be implemented in all road sections that required excavation within the works areas, and the progress of work should be regularly reported to the TAFEHCCC”.

51. The Chairman requested Members to vote on the amendment raised by

Mr Randy YU by a show of hands.

52. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was 13 votes in favour, 0 against and two abstentions. The amendment was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms Josephine TSANG (Chairman), Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman), Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho; Ms Amy YUNG and Mr Sammy TSUI abstained.)

53. The Chairman requested Members to vote on the above amended motion by a show of hands. The relevant amended motion was seconded by Ms WONG Chau-ping.

54. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the impromptu motion should be submitted in writing.

55. The Chairman consolidated Members' views and said that it would be difficult to conduct voting on whether the works were supported today. She urged WSD, after collating the views at the meeting, to hold a Special Meeting within six weeks so that Members could conduct voting at the meeting on whether to approve the works project.

56. Mr Sammy TSUI said that Members were concerned about the impact of works at Section 9 on traffic, and the works at other road sections were not controversial. As such, the entire project should not be delayed because of Section 9. He enquired WSD whether the works at other road sections should be implemented first and pledged that discussion on the works of Section 9 would be conducted in the future.

57. Mr Eric KWOK opined that Mr Sammy TSUI misunderstood the impact of the works. He clarified that the entire project caused impact on residents of South Lantau, but the impact of the works of Sections 6 and 9 was most serious because the whole road would be closed. He said that the works would not be endorsed if voting was conducted that day and the postponement of six weeks would not produce a great impact on the works. As such, it was requested that discussions would be conducted at the following meeting after the views of other departments had been listened to. He opined that it was fair and reasonable.

58. Ms Mable LAM said that the implementation of the Tung Chung New Town Scheme was in full swing. WSD therefore hoped to advance the Water Treatment Works extension as soon as possible. She requested Members to consider endorsing the works first, while the pipe works of South Lantau could be implemented after a consensus was reached.

59. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the impact of the entire project on residents of South Lantau did not last for only six months, but for six years or more. Members had stated clearly at the meeting that the public works development and the needs of local

residents should strike a balance. If WSD considered that there was an urgent need for the works, it should arrange for a meeting to discuss as soon as possible. She said that Members were very supportive of the implementation of public works. However, the problems brought about by the works should be resolved first.

60. Mr HO Chun-fai appreciated Members for their understanding of the works and their views raised. He said that he supported the public works in general but could not support the works at issue because the departments concerned had reneged on their promises many times after works were carried out in South Lantau. As such, he hoped to communicate and resolve the problem with other departments before proceeding to vote on whether to support the works. He agreed that a special meeting should be arranged as soon as possible and that the plan should be incorporated into the scope of the works in order to avoid WSD reneging on its promises, rendering Members unable to explain to residents.

61. The Chairman requested Members to vote on the above amended motion by a show of hands. The relevant amended motion was seconded by Ms WONG Chau-ping.

62. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was ten votes in favour, 0 against and five abstentions. The amendment was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman), Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei and Ms LAU Shun-ting; Ms Josephine TSANG (Chairman), Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho abstained.)

63. The Chairman proposed that a special meeting or Working Group meeting should be held to conduct further discussions on the works, and the voting on the works should be postponed to a later date.

64. Mr Randy YU proposed that the remaining matters be discussed in detail at the Working Group meeting. In that case, WSD would have time to liaise with other departments to make sufficient preparations. After the meeting, the paper concerned with the works projects could be arranged for circulation for Members to vote. It would allow all Members to vote on the project.

65. Mr Thomas LI said that Working Groups or ad-hoc Working Groups could be set up in accordance with the IDC Standing Orders. However, the Secretariat would need to invite Members to join a Working Group, and the logistics arrangements of the meeting would also take time. It was therefore uncertain whether a meeting could be held in two weeks' time. As the next IDC meeting would be held in mid-December, he suggested that consideration could be given to further discussing this issue at the next IDC meeting or a Committee meeting.

66. Mr Eric KWOK concurred with Assistant District Officer's proposal that

discussion could be conducted at the IDC meeting in mid-December. It was because if voting was conducted in the form of circulation paper, other departments might not be able to respond adequately. He opined that Members were reasonable and if WSD had endeavoured its best, they would understand its difficulties.

67. Mr Randy YU said he kept an open mind to the proposal of conducting discussion at the IDC meeting. Due to the epidemic, a meeting would be held for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon, and there were many issues to be discussed. He said that he would discuss with the Chairman and the Secretariat on the arrangement of a special meeting to discuss the issue and there might be no need to set up a Working Group.

68. The Chairman agreed to hold a special meeting to discuss the works and the voting on whether to support the works should be conducted after the special meeting.

69. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that a voting should be made first to decide on whether the subject voting should be postponed.

70. The Chairman requested Members to vote on whether to postpone the voting on their decision to support the works by a show of hands.

71. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was 14 votes in favour, 0 against and one abstention. The postponement on voting on the works was endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms Josephine TSANG (Chairman), Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman), Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho; Ms LAU Shun-ting abstained.)

III. Question on construction waste on carriageways in Tung Chung North
(Paper TAFEHCCC 70/2020)

X. Question on problems relating to construction vehicles and machine operations of reclamation project in Tung Chung North
(Paper TAFEHCCC 81/2020)

72. The Chairman said that the contents of Agenda III and X were related and he proposed that they be discussed together. She welcomed Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald, Senior Health Inspector (Cleaving & Pest Control) Islands 2 of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD); Mr HUANG Jialiang, District Engineer/General (4)A of HyD and Mr PEI Nien-jen, Gordon, Senior Engineer/6 (Lantau) of CEDD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of FEHD, HyD, CEDD and EPD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

73. Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr Sammy TSUI briefly presented the question respectively.

74. Mr HUANG Jialiang responded as follows:

- (a) With regard to the question on Agenda III, HyD had arranged to conduct regular road inspections about once-a-week in the vicinity of Tung Chung North including Ying Hei Road, Ying Tung Road and Tung Chung East Interchange. If construction waste was found during inspections or by some other means in the area under its charge, HyD would timely arrange for its clearance.
- (b) Up till then, HyD had discovered construction waste 15 times in the entire Tung Chung area in 2020, including carriageways and pavements under its charge. In all these 15 cases, HyD completed the clearance work in a short time.
- (c) With regard to advising works contractors to make improvements, HyD had reflected the relevant problems to CEDD in early August and learnt that CEDD had implemented improvement measures. Representative of CEDD would explain in details about the actual situation in due course.

75. Mr Ronald LI presented the written reply of FEHD.

76. Mr Gordon PEI presented the written reply of CEDD.

77. Mr LEE Ka-ho thanked the responses of various departments and their follow-up actions to improve the situation. However, he continued to receive relevant complaints recently. He said that although the tyres had been cleaned and the hoods were covered before the vehicles left the construction sites, and there were staff who cleared bulky refuse, and staff were deployed by FEHD to wash the streets regularly, there were still complaints that gravel and sand were left behind on the surface of Ying Hei Road. Some people even said that gravel caused tyres to burst and caused inconvenience to vehicles running on the road. He asked, regarding the regular street cleansing mentioned by FEHD, how many times a day would the cleansing services would be provided. Apart from giving advice, whether there were other concrete measures to stop the gravel carried by construction vehicles from falling off the road. He further enquired whether data about dump trucks entering and leaving construction sites could be provided.

78. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Ever since the reopening of Area 103, there were many dump trucks entering and leaving petroleum stations nearby. He thanked FEHD for assisting to clear the sand and gravel at Ying Tung Road and Ying Hei Road, and arranging contractors to clean the streets by street washing vehicles.

- (b) Large scale reclamation works gave rise to many problems, such as dump trucks leaving behind sands and gravels which scattered on roads after they left construction sites. Although contractors washed vehicles and would immediately clean the road surface after complaints were received, the problem persisted. He said that it was very dangerous to drive behind dump trucks. If stones fell from dump trucks unexpectedly, accidents would occur if the vehicle behind failed to turn away in time. He said that there was a time a stone fell from a dump truck, causing the front tyre of the private car behind to burst. The driver of the private car took photographs and intended to hold the driver accountable. However, he later found that the vehicle involved had left and he was not able to take photograph of the vehicle and its license number. As such, holding someone's accountable would be difficult. As far as he understood it, there was no successful claim for compensation for such a situation. In this connection, he hoped that such matters could be prevented, or else complaints would still continue to be received.
- (c) With regard to the monitoring and supervision of contractors, the written reply of EPD said that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report was approved in April 2016. The report said that after mitigation measures were implemented, there would be no adverse impact on the environment. He said that works had been carrying on in the four years since the approval of the report in 2016. He enquired whether departments had made reviews and improvements.
- (d) Apart from gravel and sand being left behind on the roads, the issue of dust in the reclamation area was also very serious. He said that when gravel and sand were left in open air without nets or other coverings, dust would be floating in the air when the wind blew, and residents of Central Link or The Visionary to its opposite would be affected. He said that the construction site was very close to residences and a higher standard should be adopted in the handling of gravel and sand, such as the covering of artificial turf or canvas to minimise dust floating in the air. At present, the contractor would spray water onto the gravel and sand. However, when the temperature was high, the water would be dried up one hour after it was sprayed and the effect was little. He said that the whole project would last for eight to ten years and the impact on nearby residents was not small. The issue should not be treated lightly.
- (e) Some residents complained that at around 12 midnight, floodlights of the construction site would be turned on and shone into residences, causing a nuisance. Some machines would operate early in the morning and cause noise nuisance. He urged government departments to conduct supervision. Apart from surprise inspections, they should also pay attention to whether cases of complaints were on the rise. Contractors should then be advised to follow up and make improvements. He urged

EPD and CEDD to strike a balance between public works and the interests of residents and enhance supervision on contractors. The written reply of CEDD mentioned that the Environmental Team (ET) and Independent Environmental Checker (IEC) were commissioned to conduct supervision. He enquired whether IEC was employed by the contractor, and if so, whether the IEC would evade serious issues and refuse giving priority to public interests.

79. The Chairman reminded Members that the time was running short, and asked Members to be succinct.

80. Mr FONG Lung-fei said residents reflected that in the morning hours, there were nearly 10 to 20 dump trucks driving through Ying Tung Road every hour. He enquired whether the figure was correct. He had conducted an on-site inspection in the daytime and found that there would be much dust in the air whenever dump trucks passed by.

81. Mr Eric KWOK said he noticed that there were dump trucks dumping inert construction materials at Shek Mun Kap. He enquired CEDD whether alarm systems had been installed to detect dump trucks entering South Lantau illegally for dumping inert construction materials.

82. Mr Gordon PEI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Apart from issuing instructions to contractors, CEDD would regularly hold meetings to follow up on issues of various sorts. Engineers and resident site staff would also closely monitor the work of the contractors. If problems were found, corresponding measures would be adopted, such as the giving of warnings, etc.
- (b) The Tung Chung New Town Extension Project was an important land provision measure of the Government. The EIA Report of the Project was approved by EPD in April 2016, whereas environmental permit was also approved in August of the same year. Apart from resident site staff conducting daily monitoring of the project, CEDD also had ET and IEC to conduct on-site inspections. Environmental monitoring data were also measured regularly which included noise nuisance, seawater and air quality, etc. He said that IEC was not employed by contractors. They were independently commissioned by CEDD. ET and IEC would ensure that the environment would not be adversely affected by the works and the requirements in the environmental permit were complied with. Professional advice would also be provided to minimise the impact of the works on the surrounding environment.
- (c) While outdoor lighting did not fall within the area of environmental surveillance, engineering staff had requested contractors to make suitable adjustments and avoid shining the light into residences. CEDD would

reflect the views to the staff concerned and remind contractors that they should pay attention to the direction of lights when they were turned on at night.

- (d) With regard to the issue of dust, from the beginning of the project up till now, around 90% of reclamation materials were transported to the construction site by barges. The relevant mitigation measures mainly included spraying water and cleaning the construction site, washing of vehicles' tyres at the entrance and exits of the construction site, etc., in order to reduce dust. ET would follow up and investigate each case of environmental nuisance. An Inspection of the construction site would be conducted with resident site staff to monitor the effects of measures adopted. CEDD would request staff concerned to enhance the cleaning work at the entrance and exit of the construction site. Before leaving the construction site, vehicles would have the tyres washed and the hoods covered properly to avoid gravel and sand from falling off the road.
- (e) With regard to the number of dump trucks entering and leaving the construction site, he was not able to provide data for the time being.

(Post-meeting note: According to the traffic flow investigation conducted by resident site staff of CEDD in mid-December, on average around 520 dump trucks entered or left the entrance and exit of the construction site at the intersection of Ying Hei Road and Ying Tung Road every day, which included the dump trucks using the entrance and exit to go to the public housing construction site of Housing Authority (HA). However, the number of vehicles entering or leaving the construction site would vary depending on the works progress and procedures.)

83. Mr LI Kim-man made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) With regard to the monitoring work, EPD would, after the approval of EIA Report, implement an environmental monitoring and audit programme, and conduct monitoring regularly, such as patrols and surprise inspections. IEC would report to EPD directly and if necessary, it would provide information or assist in conducting monitoring work and surprise inspections, etc.
- (b) With regard to the dust issue mentioned by Mr TSUI, he would reflect it to the staff concerned. If necessary, EPD would request contractors to cover the soil or sward it with artificial turf.
- (c) With regard to the issue of noise nuisance, if contractors needed to conduct works before 8 a.m. or in the evening, they had to apply for construction noise permits before noise-producing procedures could be

carried out. EPD would follow up on the issue.

- (d) With regard to the follow-up of complaints, no matter whether they were from residents or referred by Members, EPD staff would proactively follow up upon receiving them. Law enforcement actions would be taken if irregularities were found.
- (e) With regard to the issue of light pollution, although there was no regulation regarding light pollution caused by contractors, the EPD would remind contractors or resident site staff to make improvements after receiving complaints or suggestions, such as adjusting the direction and intensity of lights, avoiding shining into residences, shortening the time of lighting and turning on lights only when necessary.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD had reflected the views on the dust issue to the staff concerned after the meeting.)

84. Mr Sammy TSUI said that there were many piles of sand at the construction site stored for reclamation purposes. If water was not sprayed on them persistently, a lot of dust would be generated. He reiterated that he only saw the contractors spraying water onto carriageways, but not on piles of sand. He enquired whether there were measures or equipment that could prevent the dust from flying.

85. Mr Eric KWOK said that representative of EPD did not respond to Mr Sammy TSUI's enquiry about the dumping of inert construction waste, i.e. the question on where to dump inert construction waste. He reiterated that dump trucks were found entering Shek Mun Kap to dump inert construction waste. He enquired once again whether the department had monitoring system which could detect dump trucks entering South Lantau illegally. He requested the department to make a response.

86. Mr Gordon PEI responded that so-called "mud debris" belonged to inert construction waste, such as rocks, concrete, mud and stones. Such inert construction waste would be used for the main landfill materials in Tung Chung East reclamation works. They were not deserted materials. Dump trucks of contractors of Tung Chung East reclamation works were installed with positioning system of CEDD to monitor whether there were illegal activities. As such, it was very unlikely that the dump trucks mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK belonged to those of reclamation works. However, if further leads were provided, CEDD would follow up and investigate the matter.

87. Mr Eric KWOK proposed that CEDD should enquire relevant contractors and said that he would request members of the public to take photographs and provide information should they come across similar situations in the future.

88. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that representative of CEDD previously said that CEDD's vehicles had been installed with the positioning system. He queried why it failed to provide the frequency of dump trucks entering and leaving the construction site, which

seemed contradictory.

89. Mr Gordon PEI responded that he would provide the relevant data after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: Dumping trucks of the contractors of Tung Chung East reclamation works had been installed with positioning system for real time tracking and monitoring to prevent illegal dumping of waste. However, the construction site also received construction waste from other construction sites, which were transported by dump trucks of the contractors concerned, and these trucks did not belong to the contractors of the construction site of reclamation works. In addition, dumping trucks of HA would also use the entrance and exit of the construction site to access public housing construction sites. As such, traffic flow investigation had to be conducted in order to provide the figures of dump trucks entering and leaving the construction site. As for relevant data information, please refer to the “post-meeting note” in paragraph 82(e).)

(Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr Sammy TSUI, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho left at 12:40 p.m.)

IV. Question on sea pollution caused by black plastic pellets
(Paper TAFEHCCC 71/2020)

90. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)⁵ of EPD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of EPD, HKR International Limited (HKRI) and The Discovery Bay Transit Services Limited (DBTSL) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

91. Ms Amy YUNG presented the question.

92. Mr LI Kim-man presented the written reply of EPD.

93. Ms Amy YUNG thanked the EPD and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for handling the issue in a proactive manner, and thanked them for their efforts to prevent similar situations from happening in the future. She regretted that the HKRI did not attend the meeting to respond as usual. She was puzzled by the sudden appearance of 2.5 tons of plastic pellets on the shore of Discovery Bay and the inability to identify their origin. She said on 19 November, a large amount of magenta liquid appeared in an open channel leading to the sea on Discovery Bay's North Hill. The liquid flowed into the sea from the open channel, turning the water purplish-red. She wrote to the management company immediately after receiving the complaint, but received no reply. Even when she raised questions at the meeting, the management

company did not attend to respond, but only provided evasive replies, which she wished to place on record. She pointed out that the quality of the residents of Discovery Bay was good and many of them volunteered to clean up the area. She believed that the management company should also provide quality service and the developer should have conscience.

94. Mr Eric KWOK said EPD responded that synthetic rubber would disintegrate into minute plastic pellets. However, there was literature suggesting that these minute plastic pellets would be devoured by marine life, which if eaten by human beings would pose certain risks to their health. In addition, EPD said that all artificial turf systems (including filling materials) met the requirements of the Federation Internationale de Football Association. However, meeting those requirements did not mean that it was harmless to human beings, and caution had to be exercised. He also queried the reason for not being able to locate the source of over two tonnes of plastic pellets. He said it was learnt that the International School nearby had replaced its ball court's materials. He enquired whether EPD would set up a Task Force to conduct investigation after receiving complaints. He opined that EPD had to identify the source in order to resolve the issue, or else there was suspicion of being perfunctory and unprofessional by simply responding that relevant materials were harmless to human beings.

95. Mr LI Kim-man said that he would relay Mr Eric KWOK's views to the relevant groups. He pointed out that EPD did conduct investigation. However, as the material was waste rubber tyre granules, they were hard to identify. Moreover, they were similar to the materials used in laying artificial turf pitches. After the investigation conducted by EPD, it was not 100% confirmed that the plastic pellets came from the relevant artificial turf pitches. The reply of the Management Company also could not confirm that the plastic pellets came from the relevant artificial turf pitches. The EPD had conducted clearance as soon as possible after the incident to prevent the plastic pellets from entering the ocean. The EPD had also studied with the Management Company on installing mesh screens to the surface drains to avoid the plastic pellets from flowing into the sea with the rain. Pitches of LCSD had also adopted such relevant measures.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had reflected Mr Eric KWOK's views to the groups concerned after the meeting.)

96. Ms Amy YUNG enquired whether prosecution could be instituted in accordance with the law if similar cases occurred in the future and it was confirmed by the department's investigation that some groups were causing pollution that endangered aquatic or other lives.

97. Mr LI Kim-man responded that generally speaking, if pollutants flowed into the sea, the EPD would collect evidence and confirm the source, and then conduct law enforcement action.

98. Ms Amy YUNG said she mentioned just now that on 19 November a substantial amount of magenta liquid was found flowing into the sea and she had lodged

a complaint to the Marine Department. She hoped that EPD would follow up on the matter seriously.

99. Mr LI Kim-man responded that upon receiving Ms Amy YUNG's notification, the EPD arrived at the scene as quickly as possible. When they arrived, the water of the open channel had resumed normal while a large area of the sea surface was in magenta colour. The EPD had carried out follow up work, such as conducting seepage investigation jointly with the Management Company. The EPD would provide the relevant information to Ms YUNG after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD had provided the relevant information of the magenta liquid flowing into the sea to Ms Amy YUNG after the meeting.)

V. Question on environmental protection in Tung Chung
(Paper TAFEHCCC 76/2020)

100. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)⁵ of EPD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of EPD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

101. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

102. Mr LI Kim-man presented the written reply of EPD.

103. Mr FONG Lung-fei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He said that the contractor only listed the opening hours on the Facebook page of the "Islands Community Green Station" ("Islands CGS"), but did not promote via other channels. He queried the contractor of the poor publicity and said that he could assist in publicity. According to his observation, there was no direct relation between the contractor's quantity of recovered recyclable materials and charges, which was seemingly a waste of resources. He asked the contractor how to calculate the charges. He said many people in the neighborhood did not know the services hours and the scope of the "Islands CGS".
- (b) He enquired whether EPD had plans to repair the used electrical appliances and deliver them to relevant organisations for onward donation to those in need, such as ethnic minority families in Yat Tung Estate, which would achieve the aim of recycling. He pointed out that there was a large amount of waste electrical appliances stockpiled in the two refuse rooms of Yat Tung Estate, such as televisions and washing machines. He enquired whether EPD would require the contractor to conduct recycling.
- (c) He noted that there were recycle bins at the Public Transport Interchange.

However, it was an area for passengers to board/alight and it was around 100 metres away from residences. As such, the usage rate of the recycle bins was low. He enquired whether recycle bins could be moved to Mei Tung Street.

104. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He noted that the contractor would announce the operating hours of the stall on the Facebook page of “Islands CGS”. However, there were people in the neighbourhood who said that they were not aware of the relevant information.
- (b) According to the timetable, the “Islands CGS” opened only from Monday to Friday in the morning in November. He enquired whether it would be open in other time sessions in order to provide service to people who had to go to work. He also enquired whether the department would specify the opening time such as requiring it to open during weekends.
- (c) He enquired EPD that apart from the implementation of the plastic recycling scheme and the “Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment” (“WEEE”) Scheme, whether collection of foodwaste would be considered, and how waste would be handled after it was collected.

105. Mr Eric KWOK said that his views were broadly similar to those of Mr LEE Ka-ho, and he did not know how EPD monitored the “Islands CGS”. He supported the project and opined that it was helpful to advance waste recycling, educating members of the public on waste classification and waste reduction at source. However, he pointed out that if only resources were allocated without monitoring the operation of facilities, members of the public might opine that its effects were limited. He said that many residents of Mun Tung Estate did not understand the services of the “Islands CGS”. He urged EPD to closely monitor the contractor to ensure that pledges were met.

106. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She supported the “Islands CGS”. She also uploaded the timetable of the station and publicity leaflets on social platform for residents’ information. She opined that the contractor had not actively promoted the “Islands CGS”. She had to lead residents to visit the facilities and teach them how to use the service. As such, she suggested the contractor to get her involved and she would assist in promoting the facilities.
- (b) She concurred with Mr FONG Lung-fei’s view on the “WEEE” Scheme and said that one or two recycling exercises a year in the area were too few. Recently, there were many households moving away and much WEEE was abandoned, of which many component parts could be recycled and reused. Sometimes even the entire set of computers could

be reused. She proposed that the department should increase the frequency of recycling to reduce waste and donate the used electrical appliances to those in need.

- (c) A large amounts of bulky waste electrical appliances such as refrigerators were piled up along the coast of Nim Shue Wan. She had witnessed the outsourcing workers carrying debris but they failed to move it. She hoped the department would follow up on the waste problem there. On many occasions, she suggested in meetings that the department should request the contractors to increase the collection frequency or arrange for vehicles to remove bulky items in order to improve the city's appearance.

107. Mr LI Kim-man made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) With regard to the inadequate publicity of the "Islands CGS", the contractor's lack of initiative and the problems in operation, he would reflect them to the relevant groups.
- (b) With regard to the proposals of reusing electrical appliances and recycling computers in Yat Tung Estate, he would reflect them to the groups concerned.
- (c) With regard to the relocation of the recycling bins from the Public Transport Interchange to Mei Tung Street, he would reflect the proposal to the groups concerned.
- (d) Food waste recycling which was involved in other recycling process was not related to the topic this time.

108. Mr FONG Lung-fei proposed that the contractor should update information of its activities every month so that DC Members could assist in the publicity. He also proposed that the contractor should provide incentives or small gifts to attract people in the neighbourhood to join in recycling. In addition, he had enquired EPD two months before whether the recycling bins could be moved to Mei Tung Street, but no reply had been received yet.

109. Mr LI Kim-man said that EPD rolled out an incentive scheme for redeeming small gifts. It would continue to step up publicity to raise members of the public's awareness of the scheme. He said that there was dedicated staff for monitoring the operation of the "Islands CGS" and other community green stations. With regard to the issue of the accumulation of refuse at Nim Shue Wan as mentioned by Ms Amy YUNG, the EPD would take note of it and explore improvement options.

110. Ms Amy YUNG said that she participated in EPD's recycling schemes and was given small gifts such as small towels. The schemes were well received.

111. Mr LEE Ka-ho thanked EPD for relaying Members' views. He enquired

whether there would be penalties under the existing monitoring mechanism if contractors failed to fulfil their obligations.

112. Mr LI Kim-man said that he would give a reply to Mr LEE Ka-ho after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had relayed Members' views to the groups concerned after the meeting and it had provided supplementary information to the relevant Members about the "Islands CGS", public recycling bins or recycling/rehabilitating of waste electrical and electronic appliances.)

VI. Question on noise nuisance in Yat Tung Estate
(Paper TAFEHCCC 77/2020)

113. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)⁵ of EPD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of HyD, EPD and the Link Asset Management Limited (LINK) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

114. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

115. Mr LI Kim-man presented the written reply of EPD.

116. Mr FONG Lung-fei enquired how EPD measured whether the noise nuisance level exceeded 70 decibels, whether it was by calculating average value or by spot check. He said that recently some residents complained that many dump trucks entered the housing estate area at 3:00 a.m. It was not certain whether they were related to the Tung Chung North Development Works. He enquired whether the Police would set up road blocks to enhance the deterrence effect. He also hoped that the Police would step up enforcement and patrol to deal with the noise nuisance caused by taxi drivers "shift changing" at the Yat Tung Street Roundabout.

117. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that he received complaints from the Caribbean Coast's residents about noise nuisance caused by vehicles driving on the North Lantau Highway at high speed at night, which by the residents' own measurements exceeded 75 decibels. He said that the noise was sporadic and that taking law enforcement action would be difficult. He enquired EPD about the criteria for noise assessment, such as whether there needed to be a certain number of vehicles emitting noise within one hour, or whether noise level had to be maintained at a high level continuously before the department would take action.

118. Mr Eric KWOK said that residents of Yat Tung Estate were disturbed by noise created by large trucks late in the night. He had already conducted an on-site inspection jointly with the Police at around 4:00 a.m. in the previous term of DC and found that there were cross-boundary trucks loading and unloading goods at the

roundabout junction leading to the entrance of the market. After the inspection, cross-boundary trucks changed to unload goods at the middle of the market entrance under the footbridge of LINK. However, one week later, they returned to load and unload goods at the aforesaid roundabout junction again. Noise was emitted and residents complained again. The Police would take action only when they conducted patrol and witnessed such happenings at late night. The problem kept disturbing residents for a long time and remained unresolved.

119. Mr Frankie LO said that upon receiving Mr FONG's question, the Police immediately conducted a check on past records and found that there were no similar complaints in the past three months. The Police had also conducted an on-site inspection and till then they found no issue of noise nuisance caused by trucks loading and unloading goods. He said that Yat Tung Street and Chung Yan Road were restricted areas and no loading and unloading of goods was allowed. The Police would continue to conduct patrol and step-up law enforcement.

120. Mr LI Kim-man said that he could not provide detailed explanations about the criteria of noise measurement at the moment. He would provide relevant information to Members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD had provided the supplementary information of the criteria of noise measurement to Mr FONG Lung-fei after the meeting.)

121. Mr Eric KWOK said that he was not referring to Chung Yan Road. Rather, it was the roundabout junction leading to the entrance of the market. At the location, cross-boundary trucks would load and unload goods to the markets at around 4:00 a.m. every morning. He said that he would conduct an on-site inspection with the Police at around 4:00 a.m. He said the problem was caused by improper planning. It was a pity that LINK did not attend the meeting to respond to the question. He opined that the only solution depended on the Police's advice.

122. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that there were always one to two nights every week when someone intentionally challenged the Police by driving past the police station and the hospital at high speed from Yat Tung Street to the highway. He enquired whether "silent zones" could be set up to limit car speed at late night. He understood that truck drivers needed to make a living, but he only hoped that the Police would step up giving advice. He discovered that some cross-boundary trucks did not load and unload goods in the unloading area, possibly because the vehicles were too large to drive in. They then unloaded outside the unloading area and caused noise nuisance to residents. He understood that it might not be feasible to implement the proposal of installing acoustic wall. Therefore, he hoped that the Police would endeavour their best to help solve the problem.

123. Mr LI Kim-man asked whether the "silent zones" proposed by Mr FONG referred to the amendments to the legislation.

124. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that on Hong Kong Island, the road section outside the Queen Mary Hospital was designated as a “silent zone” with a speed limit of 30 km/h. There were other “silent zones” at other hospitals. He hoped that the same measure could be implemented at Yat Tung Street.

125. Mr LI Kim-man said that he would try to understand the relevant legislations and information from the colleagues concerned.

126. Mr FONG Lung-fei proposed that restriction on car speed in “silent zone” should be implemented only at late night.

127. The Chairman requested the EPD to respond to Mr FONG Lung-fei after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The EPD had responded to Mr FONG Lung-fei on the proposal of setting up a “silent zone” after the meeting.)

VII. Question on request for use of solar-powered public lighting systems
(Paper TAFEHCCC 78/2020)

128. The Chairman welcomed Mr CHOW Man-lung, Andrew, Engineer/HK (Distribution 6) of WSD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of HyD, Housing Department (HD) and AFCD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

129. Mr FONG Lung-fei briefly presented the question.

130. Mr Andrew CHOW said that WSD would respond to the question on the installation of road lights at the Wong Lung Hang Country Trail. The written reply of AFCD clearly stated that the Wong Lung Hang Country Trail was under the purview of the department. He added that Wong Lung Hang Road linked the Chek Lap Kok New Village and Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site and it was used by WSD to maintain and inspect waterworks facilities, where there were gates and locks. The width of some sections of the Wong Lung Hang Road was just adequate for the department’s patrol vehicles to pass through. If other departments wished to install road lights at the road sections concerned, they should consider using the location outside the road to avoid hindering departmental vehicles from entering or leaving.

131. Mr FONG Lung-fei enquired which department was responsible for the management of the area outside the road. He noticed that there were ten light posts at Wong Lung Hang Road, which marked “Wong Lung Hang New Village and Number”. He said that solar-powered lights were very common and inexpensive, and needed no special management. He hoped that the department would consider installing solar-powered lights.

132. Mr Andrew CHOW said that the location outside the maintenance road, if not

allocated to other departments for management, should fall under the purview of the Lands Department (LandsD). He believed that the Member was referring to the light posts in front of the gate of the Chek Lap Kok New Village in the direction of Tung Chung.

133. Mr FONG Lung-fei corrected that it was at the back of the gate.

134. Mr Andrew CHOW said that the light posts at the back of the gate were not under the purview of the WSD. According to some unofficial past records, the light posts were the facilities of the “village lighting” project, which was built with the assistance of HyD and with the coordination conducted by another department.

135. Mr Eric KWOK said that the issue of inadequate lighting facilities at Wong Lung Hang was discussed at the previous meeting. It seemed to have mentioned that the AFCD was responsible for it. He said that the installation of solar-powered lights did not involve advanced technology. Many villagers and he himself had purchased them via “Taobao” and installed them on their own which was very simple. Difficulties might arise only during the installation of the light post. He requested the representative of the HAD to respond to the question.

136. Mr Randy YU said that although the road section was located inside the Park, it should be under the purview of the LandsD while WSD was only responsible for the maintenance of the facilities. He proposed that Mr FONG should submit a works proposal at the TAFEHCCC Meeting and HAD should then submit an application to LandsD, which could avoid departments from shirking responsibilities among themselves.

137. The Chairman noted Mr Randy YU’s proposal.

138. Ms Christy LEUNG added that at present, villagers could apply for the installation of village lights near residences, and some were installed at the Tai Po New Village. The road section mentioned by Members mainly led to the Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site and WSD facilities. There were no villages and residences nearby. As such, it did not fall within the project of village lights. With regard to the lighting issue in picnic sites, it was understood that the Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site was mainly used for day-time picnicking and there were no lighting facilities in the site.

139. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that there were ten wooden light posts marked with the wording “Wong Lung Hang New Village” and there were several houses. He was not certain whether it belonged to the village area or not. He explained that as early as 4 or 5 a.m., villagers would pass by the place and he was concerned about the poor lighting. At night some people would stroll past for relaxation. He proposed that departments’ staff should conduct an on-site inspection at 5 or 6 a.m. He estimated that around 1 000 people would pass through there every day and so would visitors who went to Sunset Peak. He believed that many people would welcome the installation of road lights.

VIII. Question on request for regular pruning of weeds and brushwood at Yu Tung Road and erection of fence at refuse collection point at Yat Tung Estate
(Paper TAFEHCCC 79/2020)

140. The Chairman welcomed Ms LAU Hoi-shan, Nelly, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Islands)2 of LCSD; Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Islands 2 of FEHD; Mr YAN Man-chi, Robin, Property Service Manager/S(HKI)3 of HD; Mr HUANG Jialiang, District Engineer/General (4)A of HyD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of LCSD, FEHD and HyD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

141. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

142. Ms Nelly LAU presented the written reply of LCSD.

143. Mr Ronald LI presented the written reply of FEHD.

144. Mr Robin YAN said that with regard to the refuse collection point at the location outside Fuk Yat House adjacent to the temporary furniture collection point, the carriageway of the estate and the location where estate maintenance contractors collected inert construction waste, the HD, after receiving Members' questions and proposals, had proactively studied the feasibility of installing facilities such as a temporary fence at the location concerned. However, due to environmental constraints, the installation of temporary fence might not be able to resolve the issue effectively. However, HD had managed to make improvements, details were as follows:

- (a) Since September, the HD had increased the frequency of clearing the collection point according to the actual situation. If there were too many miscellaneous items, clearance assistance would be sought from relevant departments;
- (b) After clearing miscellaneous items by the Estate Office, the HD would deploy Task Force to clear sewage and refuse left behind to maintain environmental hygiene;
- (c) The HD found that the collection point concerned was easily full compared with other collection points at Yat Tung Estate. As such, the HD would arrange refuse collection vehicles to conduct clearance at that collection point first; and
- (d) There was a fenced space beside the refuse collection points opposite Fuk Yat House. The HD had cleared the location concerned for placing waste electrical appliances.

145. Mr HUANG Jialiang said that HyD had arranged to clear the weeds between

the cracks of the pavement on Yu Tung Road.

146. Mr FONG Lung-fei thanked LCSD for proactively clearing the weeds at the location. He said that there were rodent holes at Chung Yan Road beside the Yat Tung Estate and there were rodents scuttling around. He hoped the department would study the removal of brushwood and fill up the road surface to prevent rodent infestation.

147. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thanked LCSD, FEHD and HD for their responses and follow-ups. However, follow up actions were taken only after Members wrote to make requests, which was a waste of time. He hoped that follow up actions could be taken regularly. He pointed out that after the weeds were removed, the anti-mosquito and anti-rodent work of FEHD would become more effective, and therefore the coordination of various departments was necessary.
- (b) There was a relatively large piece of open space behind Fuk Yat House. It was estimated to be used by outsourcing contractors for collection of construction waste. According to his observation, as Yat Tung Estate had been completed for some time and there were not many renovation works, the utilisation rate of the location was low. He enquired whether HD could assign half of the space for members of the public to dispose of their furniture and miscellaneous items. He opined that if the space was enlarged, there was no need for HD to deploy staff to clear up the site every day.
- (c) There were two pieces of deserted land overgrown with weeds at the back of the Mun Tung Estate bus terminus, and the weeds on both sides of the bus terminus were very tall. He hoped that HyD and HD would arrange contractors to clear the weeds.
- (d) Area 107 behind JoysMark had been abandoned since the construction of Mun Tung Estate. The weeds had grown to the waist's height. He did not know under which department's purview it was, but noted that Sports Centre, Community Hall and Library would be built there. He hoped the department responsible would follow up on the issue of weeds.

148. Mr FONG Lung-fei enquired whether HD would re-launch the scheme to encourage reuse of used furniture. According to his observation, most abandoned furniture was only slightly damaged and sometimes residents would pick it up for reuse. He proposed that residents should place furniture that was still in good shape at a prescribed location for needy residents' pick-up and reuse. He said that a similar scheme had been implemented and was met with very favourable response, but it was suspended because of the epidemic. He urged HD to consider his proposal to reduce waste.

149. Mr Robin YAN made a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) With regard to the location enclosed with metal hoarding mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK, it was where the housing estate maintenance contractors placed construction waste from maintenance and unit renovation works. He would proactively monitor the utilisation rate of the location and study the feasibility of Mr KWOK's proposal.
 - (b) He said that he could conduct an on-site inspection with Mr FONG Lung-fei and study the feasibility of his proposal.
150. Mr Eric KWOK enquired again which department was responsible for the place with overgrown weeds.
151. Mr TSANG Wai-man said that the LandsD was responsible for grass cutting near the JoysMark bus terminus at Mun Tung Estate. After receiving the letter from Mr Eric KWOK at the end of August, the LandsD deployed staff to clear weeds at the beginning of November and would reflect the relevant requests to the groups concerned.
152. Ms Nelly LAU said that LCSD would follow up the concern of Mr Eric KWOK about the roadside flower beds near the bus terminus at Mun Tung Estate which were maintained by the department. If necessary, she would make an appointment with Mr Eric KWOK to conduct an on-site inspection after the meeting.
- (Post-meeting note: On 28 November, the LCSD had conducted regular planting maintenance work at the roadside flower beds near the bus terminus at Mun Tung Estate which was maintained by the department. Mr Eric KWOK's assistant was informed of the above-mentioned arrangement on the same day.)
153. Mr HUANG Jialiang said that HyD would deploy staff to conduct an on-site inspection again and would remove weeds grown between paving blocks.
154. Mr Ronald LI said that FEHD would discuss the process of waste clearing with HD regularly and would increase clearing frequencies if necessary.
155. Ms Amy YUNG said that the issue of second-hand furniture and electrical appliances was also mentioned during the discussion of other issues. She hoped that the EPD would consider members' suggestions and invite social enterprises to cooperate in collecting the items for repair, and then sell them at a low price. She believed that in the current economic downturn, the arrangement would benefit those in need.
156. The Chairman said she discovered that some waste furniture at estate refuse collection point was only slightly worn. Owners might have abandoned them because the size did not fit, but their usability and recyclability were as high as 70%. Some residents damaged the furniture for the convenience of disposal, which would affect

recycling and reuse. She proposed that EPD recycled furniture that was in good condition to benefit needy families and promote environmental protection.

157. Mr LI Kim-man noted Members' views and would relay them to the groups concerned for follow up.

IX. Question on request for not using pesticides in non-agricultural land
(Paper TAFEHCCC 80/2020)

158. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)5 of EPD; Dr XIAO Xinshan, Sharlet, Agricultural Officer (Technical Services) and Mr WAN Sze-yuen, Senior Field Officer (Pesticides Registration) of AFCD; Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Islands 2 of FEHD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of EPD and FEHD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

159. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

160. Mr Ronald LI clarified that FEHD and service contractors did not use herbicides to conduct weeding work. What was shown in the photographs was pesticide. According to the departmental guidelines, FEHD and service contractors had to use pesticides registered under AFCD for pest control.

161. Dr Sharlet XIAO said AFCD only registered pesticides that were classified as slightly or moderately hazardous by the World Health Organization (WHO) and would not register highly hazardous pesticides. All registered pesticides for supply and sale were required to bear proper labels in both Chinese and English, including information such as Hong Kong Pesticide Registration Number, active ingredients (A.I.), concentration of A.I., and the wording "Poison 毒藥" and "Keep out of reach of children 遠離孩童", the directions for use and relevant preventive measures, which had to be adhered to when in use. In addition, the toxicity of the insecticides in the photographs was calculated based on the concentration of the technical grade A.I., i.e., the concentration of the technical grade A.I. was over 90% w/v while the actual concentration of the A.I. of the product was only 2% w/v. According to the label instructions, further dilution was required before the insecticide was properly applied. In other words, its toxicity would be 1 000 times lowered and poisoning was rather unlikely.

162. Mr Eric KWOK enquired whether FEHD used the pesticides as listed in the paper when they conducted regular anti-mosquito exercises. He worried that Members participating in the relevant operations might more or less inhale some pesticides. The Islands District Office (IsDO) would employ contractors to cut grass and spray mosquito larvicidal/oil to ditches. He enquired whether contractors had used herbicides.

163. Mr Ronald LI said that the anti-mosquito work of FEHD was categorised into physical and chemical aspects. On chemical aspect it was the use of drugs (i.e. pesticide), while on physical aspect it was the clearing of stagnant water and fomented utensils of mosquitoes/other insects breeding in order to minimise places for mosquito laying eggs. If necessary, FEHD could provide information such as medicine name and ingredient, etc. after the meeting.

164. Mr Eric KWOK said that he did not know the names and ingredients of medicines, but hoped that FEHD would use pesticides which were harmless to human beings and animals. He also said that there was insecticidal water labelled harmless in the market.

165. Ms Winsy LAI added that the pesticide in the photograph contained ingredients which included “pyrethroids”, which was recommended by WHO as an active ingredient which could control adult mosquitos and could naturally decompose with low impact on human beings and the environment. As mentioned in the written reply, FEHD would conduct an on-site inspection before using pesticides in designated places, and suitable pesticides would be selected according to the place and target of use. Staff would dilute pesticides at the site according to the directives on the labels. As mosquito’s survival and breeding week was seven days and thus generally pesticides would be used in no less than seven days. The FEHD would arrange staff to remind the public to stay away from the spraying area before and after spraying pesticides. Spraying would be conducted subject to the prevailing wind conditions and actual situation in order to minimise the impact of pesticides. She thanked Members for their proposals and said that FEHD would constantly review and keep abreast of the latest information on mosquito control in different countries and AFCD’s information on the cancellation of pesticide registration, so as to study anti-mosquito methods suitable for Hong Kong.

166. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that he had observed a significant reduction in the number of mosquitoes/insects after grass cutting work at Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site, Yu Tung Road and Chung Yan Road. He enquired whether mosquito could be eliminated by the natural way of cutting grass.

XI. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects
(Paper TAFEHCCC 82/2020)

167. The Chairman welcomed Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy, Assistant District Officer (Islands)² and Mr LI Ming-yau, Senior Inspector of Works of IsDO to the meeting to present the paper.

168. Ms Christy LEUNG briefly presented the paper.

169. The Chairman requested Members to vote on the works proposal of Annexes 2 to 5 and the allocation of funds for implementing the relevant works by a show of

hands.

170. Members voted by a show of hands. The proposals were endorsed unanimously.

XII. Report by Working Group

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

171. The Chairman said that the report of the Working Group (see Reference 1 for details) had been distributed to Members for perusal by email before the meeting. Members were requested to approve in principle to apply to IDC for a reserve allocation of \$93,750 in 2020-2021 for organising tourism promotion projects of the current year. If the proposal was supported by Members, it would be submitted to IDC for approval. Members were requested to express their views on the report.

172. Members had no comments and endorsed the contents of the above-mentioned Working Group report, and endorsed in principle the application of reserve allocation of funds in 2020-2021 to IDC.

173. Mr Randy YU said that at the Working Group meeting, Members enquired whether the souvenir (crutch straight umbrella) mentioned in the report was safe. He enquired whether the Secretariat had taken follow-up action.

174. Mr Eric KWOK said that at the Working Group meeting, it had agreed that starting from the following year, promotion would be conducted on social platforms instead of on webpages. He hoped the Secretariat would take note of Members' views and follow up on the matter.

175. Ms Amy YUNG proposed to refer to the Towngas for the design of the crutch straight umbrella.

176. The Secretary said that she would relay Members' views to the convenor of the Working Group concerned.

177. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the contents and the allocation of funds proposal as contained in the captioned Working Group Report.

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

178. Mr Randy YU said that the report of the Working Group (see Reference 2 for details) had been distributed to Members for perusal by fax or by email before the meeting. Members' views on the report were welcomed.

179. Members made no comments and voted by a show of hands unanimously to endorse the contents as contained in the captioned Working Group Report.

XIII. Any Other Business

180. Members did not raise other business.

XIV. Date of Next Meeting

181. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 10:30 a.m. on 25 January 2021 (Monday).

- END -