

(Translation)

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

Date : 29 March 2021 (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 CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH (Left at around 12:40 p.m.)
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH
Mr HO Chun-fai
Mr HO Siu-kei
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting
Mr LEE Ka-ho
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho

Attendance by Invitation

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Ms CHUI Yuk-ying | Chief Health Inspector (Islands)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald | Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control)Islands 2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department |
| Ms CHENG Wai-yee, Angela | Deputy District Leisure Manager (Islands)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department |
| Mr IP Sai-yau | Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department |
| Mr LEUNG Siu-chee | Marine Manager/Licensing & Port Formalities (3), Marine Department |
| Ms KWAN Mei -ki, Tina | Senior Assistant Shipping Master/South, Marine Department |

Dr NG Wai-chuen

Mr WONG Yui-him, Tim

Mr YIU Men-yeung

Marine Conservation Officer (A)2,
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Engineer /Islands 1, Transport Department
Division Commander (Marine and Diving),
Fire Services Department

In Attendance

Mr LI Ho, Thomas

Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy

Mr LI Ming-yau

Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy

Mr TSANG Wai-man

Mr LAW Hoi-ming

Mr LI Kim-man

Mr CHOW Man-lung, Andrew

Mr PEI Nien-jen, Gordon

Ms CHUNG Lai-kuen, Venus

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
District Commander Lantau District (Administration),
Hong Kong Police Force
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)1(Acting),
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Fisheries Officer (Enforcement) 1,
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Representative, New Lantau Bus Company (1973) Limited
Sun Ferry Services Company Limited

Secretary

Ms NG Ching-sum

Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Mr WONG Man-hon

Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken

Absent

Mr WONG Chun-yeung

Welcoming remarks

The Chairman welcomed representatives from government departments and organisations as well as Members to the meeting and introduced the following representatives of departments/organisations who attended the meeting: Ms CHUNG Lai-kuen, Venus, Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension)1(Acting) of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), who succeeded Mr WU Tip-ming, Wilson. The company name of New World First Ferry Services Limited had been changed to Sun Ferry Services Company Limited (Sun Ferry).

2. Members noted that Mr WONG Man-hon and Mr Ken WONG were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I. Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 23.11.2020

3. The Chairman said that the above minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by government departments and organisations and had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.

4. The captioned minutes were confirmed unanimously without amendments.

II. Construction of Refuse Collection Point at Area 57B, Tung Chung New Town Extension (Paper TAFEHCCC 14/2021)

5. The Chairman welcomed Ms CHUI Yuk-ying, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)1 and Mr LI Cheuk-ho, Ronald, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Islands 2 of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to the meeting to present the paper.

6. Mr Ronald LI briefly presented the paper.

7. Mr Sammy TSUI noted that the proposed Refuse Collection Point (RCP) was a negative pressure facility. He enquired whether it would be used for collection of refuse/food waste or whether only tools and staff facilities would be provided. As there were many residential premises near Area 57, he was concerned about the odour problem which might arise and adversely affect the environmental hygiene if the RCP would be used for collection of food waste.

8. Mr Eric KWOK commended that the design of RCP had given consideration to the needs of the staff such as the provision of staff changing rooms and storage facilities, toilets and bathrooms. He proposed to consider installing air-conditioning system at the facility so that frontline cleaners could work more comfortably during the hot and wet summer. He said that a waste compaction mechanism was provided in

Yat Tung Estate for handling food waste which, upon compaction, would be transported for further treatment with specialised transport services arranged by FEHD. He enquired whether the RCP would perform the function of separating recyclable waste.

9. Mr LEE Ka-ho supported the project and the provision of facilities inside the RCP for improving the working environment of the staff. He enquired when the RCP would be completed. As the RCP would be used to provide service for the whole area of Tung Chung (except the New Town Extension), it was anticipated that refuse collection vehicles would access and leave the RCP along Ying Tung Road. The vehicular traffic on Ying Tung Road was heavy already, so he was concerned about whether completion of the RCP would cause even greater congestion at the location.

10. Mr Sammy TSUI enquired about the size of the RCP. He pointed out that since some of the old RCPs in urban areas were not so large, there would not be much space left after placing a few refuse containers for use in these facilities. As a result, residents would need to dispose of their old furniture outside the RCPs instead of putting them inside, thus causing negative impact on the streetscape. He suggested that the design of RCPs prepared by FEHD should be as spacious as possible to meet the needs of residents.

11. Mr Ronald LI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The area of the new RCP was about 590m², which belonged to the largest type under the standard of FEHD.
- (b) As RCPs would be provided in most housing estates of the New Town Extension to facilitate residents to dispose of domestic waste, it was believed that there would be sufficient space in the new RCP to meet daily operational needs.
- (c) The new RCP would not be used for collection of food waste.
- (d) The new RCP would provide the staff with common room and dining space while installation of air-conditioning system was under consideration.
- (e) The new RCP would not perform the function of waste separation.
- (f) The project was still in the preliminary stage and the completion date was anticipated to be in 2026 at the earliest. It was believed that it could tie in with the development of the new housing estates.
- (g) FEHD would have close liaison with the Transport Department (TD) for making arrangement of suitable itineraries and schedules for refuse collection to avoid causing negative impact on the traffic of the surrounding areas.

12. Ms CHUI Yuk-ying added that FEHD worked out a preliminary estimated completion date of the new RCP after an initial assessment. It was in discussion with the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) on the design and would follow up on Members' suggestions. With the endorsement of the project by the Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee (TAFEHCCC), FEHD would submit the funding application in accordance with the established procedures.

13. Mr Eric KWOK pointed out that the Government was implementing an initiative called "GREEN@COMMUNITY" which encouraged the use of recyclable waste. He proposed that the FEHD and Environmental Protection Department (EPD) should jointly study the possibility of reserving space at the proposed RCP for recovering recyclable waste. Moreover, he cited a recycling activity of glassware previously held in Mui Wo as an example, indicating that it was necessary to temporarily vacate some space in the RCP at Silvermine Bay Ferry Pier for storage of glass bottles collected. He therefore proposed to FEHD to consider providing an additional recycling system to tie in with the Government's recycling policy in addition to implementing the project.

14. Mr Sammy TSUI recommended the adoption of a green or novel design for the proposed RCP, which would be adjacent to the MTR Tung Chung East Station where pedestrian patronage was high, so that the streetscape would not be adversely affected.

15. Ms CHUI Yuk-ying said that FEHD would study with EPD the addition of a recycling system prior to the construction of the new RCP. Understanding that there was a housing estate in the vicinity of the RCP, FEHD had previously requested ArchSD to improve the appearance of and implement greening project for the facility. FEHD would also remind ArchSD once again to follow up on the design of the RCP's appearance when the project entered the stages of detailed study and implementation of the plans.

16. The Chairman invited Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they supported the project.

17. Members unanimously supported the above project.

III. Question on conservation of climbers at Pui O Beach and riverside mangroves (Paper TAFEHCCC 3/2021)

18. The Chairman welcomed Ms CHENG Wai-yee, Angela, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Islands)¹ of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Mr IP Sai-yau, Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Islands (DLO/Is)) of the Lands Department to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of the LCSD and DLO/Is had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

19. Mr Eric KWOK briefly introduced the question.
20. Ms Angela CHENG expounded on LCSD's written reply.
21. Mr IP Sai-yau expounded on DLO/Is's written reply.
22. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:
- (a) The climbers mentioned in the question were grown within an area under the purview of LCSD, where camping was prohibited. According to the photo attached to LCSD's written reply, the climbers had withered this January. He thought it was related to the life cycle of the plants and it was not appropriate to uproot the climbers. He thanked LCSD for stopping the removal of the climbers on the beach at his request, so that the plants could grow again at present. As regards the issue of refuse on the beach, users of the beach should clean up by themselves. He proposed to erect signs reminding visitors not to litter. In the past year, marine sand loss outside the storeroom on Pui O Beach was serious, resulting in exposure of tree roots. Therefore, it was necessary to expeditiously arrange restoration works by horticulturists to protect the tree roots and prevent the storeroom from collapsing. He requested LCSD to jointly conduct site inspection to the location with Mr HO Chun-fai, the Chairman of South Lantau Rural Committee, and other Members.
 - (b) The problem of illegal camping at the location had been in existence for five years and the location was within the purview of DLO/Is. Despite the erection of notice boards by DLO/Is, which indicated that the site concerned was government land, the result was not so satisfactory and the number of camping tents kept on increasing, adversely affecting the environmental hygiene and damaging the ecological environment. He urged DLO/Is to follow it up and request the relevant departments to assist in law enforcement when necessary.
23. Mr HO Chun-fai opined that it was not appropriate to overgrow climbers on the beach. The location mentioned in the question was an area designated as campsite. In the case of excessive growth of climbers, there might be accumulation of refuse and arrangement of cleansing work was thus needed. He also opined that the problem of marine sand loss at Pui O Beach was not a serious problem, and the sand washed to the river bank by storm water had raised the river bed by half a metre each year instead.
24. Ms Angela CHENG said that at the request of Mr Eric KWOK, cleaners working at the venue had immediately stopped cutting the climbers. LCSD had monitored the growth of plants in the past to ensure no excessive cutting of them. Regarding the problem of marine sand loss at Pui O Beach, LCSD had always been concerned about the situation. The site records showed that marine sand recovery in

winter was satisfactory. Regarding the exposure of some tree roots near the temporary lockers as mentioned by some Members just now, LCSD would conduct site inspection to the location and welcomed Members to join if necessary. As regards the arrangement of refuse clearance operations on the beach, LCSD would try to retain the climbers as far as possible depending on the situation.

25. Mr IP Sai-yau said that a tent was identified on the government land outside the designated campsite during a recent inspection. Staff of DLO/Is had given verbal advice to the people involved. If they were street sleepers, DLO/Is would liaise with the relevant department for follow up.

26. Mr Randy YU proposed, as stated by LCSD, to make arrangement of site inspection to Pui O Beach for the relevant Members. He agreed that the problem of marine sand loss at Pui O Beach was not a serious problem and enquired whether there would be blockage of the river channel if sand loss occurred at the location where the climbers grew. He believed that a site inspection would help Members understand the situation. Moreover, since mangroves had grown on Lantau Island extensively, he did not only object to the cultivation of mangroves on Pui O Beach but also proposed to consider growing other plants to maintain biodiversity. If necessary, the Conservancy Association could be consulted.

27. Mr Eric KWOK requested LCSD to arrange a site inspection for Members having concern over the issue. He agreed that the problem of marine sand loss at Pui O Beach was not a serious problem, pointing out that the passage of Super Typhoon Mangkhut in 2018 did not cause marine sand loss at Pui O Beach due to the growing of many plants thereat for soil consolidation. He mentioned that the location, situated at the end of Pui O Beach near the estuary was not a designated campsite, the preservation of the climbers could help prevent visitors from camping illegally. As stated in the question, the Government's Greening Policy was to uplift the quality of people's living environment through active planting, proper maintenance and preservation of trees together with other vegetation. The target was to extend urban greenery, beautify existing green areas, and promote greening work. Therefore, it was not advisable to remove the existing plants and give up greening for the convenience of management.

28. Mr HO Chun-fai pointed out that the greening policy cited by Mr Eric KWOK was only applicable to urban areas, but not to beaches. The citation was thus somewhat misleading. Moreover, he opined that raised river bed was caused by pipeline blockage and the consequential failure of washing the soil away by river water, rather than by decelerating marine sand loss due to soil consolidation by climbers.

29. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that wild climbers such as *Mikania micrantha* and morning glory might even cover a whole tree which would thus wither due to failure of photosynthesis. So, he suggested that climbers should be removed properly and palm trees should be planted to consolidate the sand at coast and contribute to the landscaping of the area.

30. Mr Randy YU said that the direction of the discussion had deviated from the

subject matter. He proposed to arrange a site visit first to examine whether it was suitable to plant climbers at the location concerned. He recalled that serious landslide had taken place in Tai O during the strike of typhoon “Hagupit” in 2008, and the underlying cause was climbers, which had resulted in soil erosion and accelerated tree collapse. Regarding the cause of marine sand loss at Pui O Beach, although LCSD believed that sand and soil were carried away by sea water, Mr Eric KWOK queried whether it was the cause of sand loss since there was a distance between the beach and the coastline. He proposed that LCSD should arrange a site inspection and submit a report to the District Council (DC) afterwards.

31. The Chairman suggested that Members should conduct site inspection before holding further discussion on the matter.

32. In response to Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr Eric KWOK remarked that the climbers growing at Pui O Beach would not affect the growth of other plants. Regarding the blockage of river channel in Pui O as mentioned by Mr HO Chun-fai, he held that it was not caused by climbers. However, as the problem might have caused flooding at Ham Tin Tsuen, it was necessary to discuss the solutions.

33. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to write to the relevant department to make arrangement of site inspection for Members.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had relayed the views of TAFEHCCC to LCSD.)

IV. Question on “Emergency Action Plan for the Pearl River Delta Population of the Chinese White Dolphin”
(Paper TAFEHCCC 6/2021)

34. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)5 of EPD; Mr LEUNG Siu-chee, Marine Manager/Licensing & Port Formalities (3) and Ms KWAN Mei-ki, Tina, Senior Assistant Shipping Master/South of the Marine Department (MD); as well as Dr NG Wai-chuen, Marine Conservation Officer (A)2 of AFCD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of the EPD and AFCD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

35. Mr Eric KWOK briefly introduced the question.

36. Mr LI Kim-man expounded on EPD’s written reply.

37. Dr NG Wai-chuen expounded on AFCD’s written reply.

38. Mr LEUNG Siu-chee made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) MD had an established mechanism in place to process applications for changing the course of high speed crafts. The applicant had to first

submit a marine traffic impact assessment (MTIA) report for MD's examination. The report was required to include details such as the feasibility of changing the course concerned, safety of navigation, impact on the waters for navigation and the actual situation of operation, etc. After examining the report, MD would submit its recommendation to the relevant advisory committee and consult the industry and relevant stakeholders in accordance with the existing mechanism.

- (b) As regards applications for course-changing submitted by operators of high speed crafts, MD would follow the procedure of issuing the statutory Permit to Operate High Speed Craft by examining whether the applications had met the requirements regarding navigation safety of high speed crafts as well as the relevant legislation of shipping and port control, etc.

39. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho noted that the movement of *Neophocaena phocaenoides* (finless porpoise) would follow a seasonal pattern. He therefore suggested that changing the course of high speed crafts should tie in with the pattern as much as possible. Remarking that there would be complicated procedures for changing the course of high speed crafts, he requested MD to prepare a consolidated timetable for reference. Moreover, owing to the suspended service of high speed crafts plying to and from Macao caused by the coronavirus epidemic, the data was inadequate to reflect the actual situation. After resumption of service on high speed crafts in the future, the number of Chinese white dolphins might reduce alongside a possible increase in the number of dolphin injuries. He requested MD to explore solutions of the problem.

40. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) AFCD's reply stated that the proposal of changing the course of high speed crafts southward and the implementation of speed limits were beyond its policy area, and the MD replied that it was necessary to submit a MTIA report to MD first. He enquired which department was responsible for the issues of changing the course southward and the implementation of speed limit, and wanted to learn about the progress of MD's consultation with the shipping industry, fishermen's organisations and other stakeholders.
- (b) He said that the course at Lantau Island had also been changed to tie in with the reclamation works for construction of the Three-Runway System by the Airport Authority (AA). It only took one year or so to complete the procedure from approving the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to implementing the arrangement of changing the course. He suggested making reference to this practice, but found it difficult to understand why no department was responsible to handle the

proposals and why MD acted in this way.

- (c) Being a supporting organisation of the “Emergency Action Plan for the Pearl River Delta Population of the Chinese White Dolphin (Action Plan)” released by World Wide Fund for Nature International and partners, AFCD should be more proactive in following up the issue.

41. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that the Islands District Council (IDC) had always been concerned about the conservation of Chinese white dolphins. Regarding the inclusion of underwater noise pollution in EIA, EPD’s written reply stated that it would consult AFCD on it and, if necessary, would require the inclusion of underwater noise assessment in EIA. In addition, AFCD’s written reply stated that it had been using the underwater acoustic monitoring method to record the activities of Chinese white dolphins and finless porpoises at specific survey areas and collect the recordings of noise created by finless porpoises to the south of Lantau Island since 2018. Despite Members’ request to AFCD for detecting underwater noise, AFCD recorded the vocalisations of finless porpoises instead, which seemed to be illogical. He held that various departments should enhance communication among themselves and ensure the accuracy of EIAs.

42. Mr LI Kim-man said that EPD would require the proponents of designated projects to conduct underwater noise assessments when necessary after consulting the relevant departments and the Advisory Council on the Environment. Some of the existing projects were also required to conduct underwater noise assessments.

43. Dr NG Wai-chuen made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) To supplement AFCD’s line transect boat survey at sea that had been used for many years, AFCD started to collect the recordings of noise created by finless porpoises on the southern side of Lantau Island with the underwater acoustic monitoring method which was a relatively new method of collecting data on dolphin activities. Having conducted the feasibility tests, AFCD installed equipment for collection of acoustic data since 2018 to monitor the recordings of noise created by Chinese white dolphins and finless porpoises for compilation of ecological baseline information and research. The study was not related to the underwater noise assessment in EIAs.
- (b) As the movement of finless porpoises in the Southern waters of Hong Kong showed a fluctuating pattern, AFCD had all along been monitoring the impact of high speed craft’s traffic volume on finless porpoises but did not have adequate data to arrive at a clear conclusion so far. Besides, there was a significant drop in the traffic volume of high speed crafts in the southern waters of Hong Kong since February 2020 due to the epidemic. AFCD therefore included the item as a research study in the long-term monitoring of marine mammals in Hong Kong waters for understanding the impact of high speed craft’s traffic

volume on the abundance and distribution of Chinese white dolphins and finless porpoises. The data were being analysed and the findings were expected to be published in AFCD's monitoring report of 2020-2021.

44. Mr LEUNG Siu-chee said that MD's purview included regulating marine traffic and ensuring marine safety. In case an application for course-changing including the relevant marine traffic impact assessment report was received, MD would examine the application carefully.

45. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho thanked AFCD for providing additional information in this respect, but considered the replies of EPD and MD to be bureaucratic. He reiterated that he wanted to know which party should be appropriate to submit the application for changing the course, and the roles of various departments. He hoped that the concerned departments would jointly explore the feasibility of changing the course southward.

46. Mr LI Kim-man said that although changing the course southward was not within the statutory purview of EPD, he believed that the staff of EPD would participate in the work if necessary and if it involved long-term changes.

47. Mr Eric KWOK was disappointed with the response given by various departments, considering that the departments really had no intention of assisting in the conservation of the endangered Chinese white dolphins. He requested the departments concerned to take action without further delay, stating that there should be a lead department for the task of conducting the consultation exercise.

48. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to the relevant departments requesting their replies to Mr Eric KWOK's follow-up questions.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had relayed the views of TAFEHCCC to EPD, AFCD and MD.)

V. Question on human-cow coexistence in society
(Paper TAFEHCCC 7/2021)

49. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)5 of EPD; Mr WONG Yui-him, Tim, Engineer/Islands 1 of TD; as well as Ms CHUI Yuk-ying, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)1 and Mr Ronald LI, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing & Pest Control) Islands 2 of FEHD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of the EPD, AFCD, TD, Highways Department, Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) and FEHD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

50. Mr Eric KWOK briefly introduced the question.

51. Mr LI Kim-man expounded on EPD's written reply.
52. Ms CHUI Yuk-ying expounded on FEHD's written reply.
53. Mr Tim WONG expounded on TD's written reply.
54. Mr Eric KWOK said that Members had planned to establish a working group on cattle in South Lantau and the arrangement undertaken by Mr Randy YU was underway. He thanked FEHD for the enhanced cleaning of village access roads and carriageways in village areas. Although AFCD had planned to recruit more "staff hired for implementing the Herdsman Program (Herdsmen)", the recruitment was difficult due to undesirable working hours. He requested AFCD to improve the working hours of the "Herdsmen" with a view to increasing the number of "Herdsmen" in Mui Wo and South Lantau and reducing the nuisance caused by cattle to residents.
55. Mr HO Chun-fai said that the issue had been under discussion for more than ten years. Nevertheless, Members had reached a consensus at a special meeting convened earlier, considering that the establishment of a platform was needed for coordination between cattle lovers and residents to solve the problem. He indicated that despite Mr Eric KWOK's good intention of raising the question, the wording used in the question might easily lead to conflict between environmentalists and residents. For other DC Members who did not understand the real situation of South Lantau and learnt the matter simply from the meeting materials, they might mistakenly perceive that the home-grown residents were accusing cattle of damaging the crops. However, this was not the case, hence he hoped that Mr KWOK would correct the wording.
56. Mr Randy YU understood that residents on Lantau Island started to abandon farmlands from the end of the 1950s when water rationing was implemented. When the Government constructed Shek Pik Reservoir in the early 1960s, the entire South Lantau became a catchment area under the planning, preventing most of the natural water from flowing into the farmlands. As the farmers were not affluent at that time, they could not afford to install water pipes for main water supply to solve the problem of irrigation. Residents on Lantau Island therefore had to abandon their farmlands. They were forced to sacrifice the means of livelihood due to the problem of water supply for farming rather than the Government's particular emphasis placed on housing development. Simultaneously, urbanisation had resulted in the rapid development of the economy outside of the district, making it easier for residents to earn money in other districts and causing fewer people to make a living by farming.
57. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the agenda item had been discussed repeatedly at different meetings. At the last follow-up meeting, both sides understood that the departments concerned did not have proper management of cattle which consequently had caused various kinds of problems. As stated in the question, "some home-grown residents had forgotten that cattle were once contributive to their ancestors for making a living and were their ancestors' treasured companions". She thought it seemed to be accusing the residents of being forgetful of the lives and the contributions of cattle in the past. She could not agree with the remarks and indicated that residents

in the district affirmed the importance of cattle. She also thought the wording used in the question would lead to conflicts in the society and should be avoided if they wanted to promote harmony in the community.

58. Ms Amy YUNG opined that Members needed not be so rigid as to the wording used in the question, and Mr Eric KWOK was merely expressing his feelings about cattle since, in his observations, the contribution of cattle in farming had aided the development of Lantau Island in the past few decades. She hoped that the departments concerned would try their best to foster human-animal integration so as to achieve harmonious co-existence between humans and animals.

59. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho noted that, as stated in the remarks raised by Ms WONG Chau-ping and Mr Randy YU, it was the government policy that had made residents on Lantau Island abandon farming and most home-grown residents had not forgotten their roots. He said that he understood this. However, he remarked that if the whole paper was read carefully, it would be understood that the emphasis was on the handling of the relationship between cattle and humans, and therefore the focus should not simply be on the wording and with the original intention of the paper ignored. He understood that the agenda item had been discussed for a long time and follow-up meetings had been held, and the responses were very good. He hoped that Members who had concerns over the issue would convene another meeting to address it. The problem remained unsolved for more than ten years because the government departments were unable to tackle it and the relevant legislation had not been updated. Another reason had to do with the way Members dealt with matters. For example, several Members were peculiar with words instead of focusing on the agenda item for discussion.

60. Mr Eric KWOK reiterated that the question was raised at the last meeting and the setting up of a working group on the issue was being planned, hence he did not want to discuss it in detail at the meeting. As regards the wording of the question, he advised other Members to gather more information first for understanding its original meaning.

61. Mr HO Siu-kei said that Members had discussed the issue and set a direction for handling it. He therefore considered that it was unnecessary to have a hostile attitude towards one another due to wording, and Members should focus on solving the problem instead since cattle were really affecting the lives of residents.

62. Mr Sammy TSUI indicated that Mr Eric KWOK had grave concern over the agenda item. Nevertheless, Members did not focus on the content of the question for discussion, thereby causing deviation from the direction of discussion. Moreover, the response given by the department concerned was not positive. He had conducted site inspection and identified many cattle, the number of which was as high as several dozens. It was the aspiration of residents to allocate more resources to manage cattle by the Government so as to prevent cattle from wandering and causing nuisance. However, the Government had shirked its responsibility, causing conflicts among cattle, cattle lovers and residents. Proposals of providing additional posts of “Herdsman”

and designating some areas in wetlands for relocating cattle had been put forward but had not yet been implemented. The Government did not only lack new policies to help the cattle and residents but also refused to provide support to those who were eager to provide assistance. So, he enquired whether the government policy was to let cattle fend for themselves. Despite Members' repeated discussion on the issue at meetings, the Government still failed to give a proper response and the problem was thus left unsolved. He questioned which department was responsible for the issue, and why AFCD did not implement the initiative of hiring "Herdsmen" in the district while it had hired additional "Herdsmen" in other districts.

63. Ms Amy YUNG held that Mr Eric KWOK had always been diligent in raising agenda items and had spent a lot of time on data collection. She had been a DC Member for some time, thinking that government departments did not give serious and accurate responses most of the time, and therefore some agenda items could not be resolved. To cite the problem in Discovery Bay as an example, she opined that the developer was unwilling to respond to the questions in the light of the facts. She said that if the Government did not take the issue seriously and the developer and management company concerned continued to evade Members' questions, it was certain that problems at district level would arise ceaselessly. She said that drafting a question was no easy job since the Member concerned had to spend time on data collection and extensive reading of documents. She noticed that many Members focused on drafting questions and motions while some would only move amended motions by making slight changes in wording. She opined that the Council should think from the macroscopic point of view about the ways of having full cooperation with the Government and stakeholders and do something that was really beneficial to people's livelihoods.

64. Mr Randy YU said that this item had affected Islands District for as long as 20 years, but the department concerned had tried to evade it when making the response. As he recalled, a working group had once been established to deal with the cattle problem in an Area Committee for one term, but it failed to resolve the problem at last after putting in efforts to take follow-up action for two years. He opined that IDC was duty-bound to tackle the problem. Seeing that all questions raised were recorded as public documents which were available for public access over the Internet, there was nothing wrong with Members who wanted to clearly explain individual words therein. This was like the clarification he had just made in that the "abandonment of farming" on Lantau Island was not caused by property development. Some Members had also pointed out that indigenous residents of the district were not forgetful to the contribution of cattle to their living in the past. As these explanations would be recorded in the minutes, he hoped that Members would accept other Members' explanations of the background of or supplementary information on the issue. When he presided over a meeting, he would allow Members to continue to speak even if their remarks might sometimes be deviating from the topic on condition that the deviation was not so serious, thereby providing more information for discussion.

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

- (a) He had seen cattle lying in the middle of a carriageway, causing vehicles to drive slowly to stay away from them. He therefore understood the long-term impact of the problem on local residents. In his opinion, the Government should tackle the problem and should not shirk its responsibility to residents or conservation groups.
- (b) He suggested that the relevant departments should “revitalise” cattle instead of simply relocating them. If cattle lived in wetlands, it might balance the ecology, attract migratory birds to come for food, and promote ecological development. As the Government owned a lot of land on Lantau Island, it would be able to set up community cattle sheds in various areas for cattle management by residents of the respective areas. Apart from creating job opportunities, the arrangement would promote eco-tourism and boost the local community’s economy. He enquired whether the Government could instruct the department concerned to coordinate the work and invite the Hong Kong Tourism Board to participate in the study. He also proposed to follow the practices adopted in the mainland such as the setting up of holiday villages.

66. The Chairman said that IDC had held follow-up meetings with the relevant departments and spent a lot of time discussing the ways of collaboration. She opined that further follow-up meetings could be held and the relevant departments would be invited to attend the meetings for further discussion on proper handling of the “stray cattle” problem and the promotion of human-cow coexistence.

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

- (a) Members should have further discussion on the issue at follow-up meetings in an unbiased manner. He agreed that Members needed to gather a lot of information before drafting questions. Mr Eric KWOK was a diligent man with a loving heart. Nevertheless, he thought things could be done only after both sides had reached a consensus. Since the question included the wording such as “a tragic case of exterminating a cattle family of eight” and “home-grown residents”, it could easily mislead the public to think that the death of the cattle concerned was related to villagers. He thanked the Police for solving the case within two days, proving the villagers innocent in the end.
- (b) He believed that the AFCD had been wrong in its direction and policy of tackling the cattle problem. Cattle were able to identify suitable habitats for themselves and should have enough food because most of the land on Lantau Island was Country Park. He also believed that the problem originated from visitors who fed the cattle straying at areas around the youth club at Cheung Sha, San Shek Wan and Pui O, etc. This led to a change in habits of the cattle which would often gather in

the vicinity of the above locations and cease to forage around.

68. The Chairman considered that the discussion should come to a close and a follow-up meeting would be convened for further discussion.

69. Mr Eric KWOK opined that the Council should focus on discussing agenda items concerning the disappearance of the ecological environment and the harmony of human-cow coexistence, and hoped that the “Sustainable Lantau Office” could attend the follow-up meeting as well.

VI. Question on waste charging
(Paper TAFEHCCC 15/2021)

70. 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.

71. Ms Amy YUNG briefly introduced the question.

72. Mr LI Kim-man expounded on EPD’s written reply.

73. Ms Amy YUNG understood that the progress of the Plastic Recycling Pilot Scheme (Pilot Scheme) was affected by the epidemic. However, the handling of plastic waste demanded immediate attention due to substantial increase in the use of plastic products in the catering industry during the implementation of the “no dine-in” restriction. She hoped that after the epidemic situation subsided, EPD would strengthen the implementation of the Pilot Scheme for waste reduction and environmental protection. As mentioned by EPD, the Pilot Scheme would be implemented in all districts in the territory in a gradual manner. She opined that the Pilot Scheme should cover Islands District because many environmentalists in the district were concerned about the issue of waste reduction.

74. Mr FONG Lung-fei opined that the AA had good performance in waste separation and recycling. The AA would distribute garbage bags of different colours to the food premises in the airport for separation of waste aluminum cans, glass bottles and paperboard, etc. He understood that the AA would sell the separated waste to recyclers and procure garbage bags with the proceeds for distribution to shops operating at its venue. He said that the waste including paperboard, aluminum cans and so on would have value when they were sold. He therefore did not understand why the Government had to implement the waste charging on them. He queried the Government’s failure to recycle properly by disposing of waste at landfills, which may involve substantial human resources and costs. He opined that the Government did not necessarily have to impose levy on the public for promoting environmental protection and should consider using other methods such as the implementation of incentive measures.

75. Mr LI Kim-man made a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) Although the Pilot Scheme did not cover Islands District at this stage, it would further extend to all districts in the territory including Islands District.
 - (b) To achieve the objective of waste reduction, EPD would not only implement the waste charging but also promote waste separation and recycling. Having reviewed the experience of other cities which had implemented waste charging, EPD considered that “quantity-based waste charging” could create incentives to reduce waste generation and enhance the public awareness of waste separation and recycling.
76. Mr Sammy TSUI enquired about the difference in operation between the Pilot Scheme and “GREEN@ISLANDS”.
77. Mr Eric KWOK supported the initiative of the waste charging and was disappointed with the Government’s shelving of the policy. Besides, EPD had planned to implement a “deposit system”, that is, producers of glass bottles and plastic bottles would charge deposit from users and return the deposit to them when the users returned these containers. He enquired whether EPD had commenced the relevant work.
78. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that people in the 1960s to 1980s would bring their own containers to buy some daily necessities such as soy sauce and rice. He enquired whether EPD could encourage the people to bring their own containers for purchases as the older generations did in the past, thereby reducing waste like plastic and glass products. He understood that this proposal might need to comply with the requirements of the relevant legislation on public health, but the packing of goods sold in supermarkets had generated a large quantity of refuse indeed.
79. Ms Amy YUNG said that it was impossible for the society to go back to the way it was in the past. Owing to the continuous economic development, businesses were no longer focusing on such small businesses. During the epidemic, suppliers were even more reluctant to accept used containers. Nevertheless, she thought consumers could change their shopping habits and choose products with less packaging. She also suggested that the management of supermarkets should reduce the packing of goods. She knew that many organisations and people had developed this shopping habit. For example, the small-scale supermarket in Discovery Bay allowed people to bring their own containers for shopping and buy the quantity of products they wanted. She opined that if the shopping mode was well received by consumers, it would help encourage other supermarkets to follow.
80. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that many supermarkets in foreign countries at present encouraged customers to bring their own containers for shopping. He recalled that people would reuse plastic bags before the use of these bags had become popular. He held that waste reduction at source should be implemented by promoting recycling

among the public, thereby contributing to the protection of the global environment.

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

- (a) The “deposit system” mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK was being followed up and studied by EPD, and the supplementary information on the progress of this item could be provided after the meeting.
- (b) He had taken note of Members’ suggestions of bringing own containers for shopping and reducing product packaging. He would also relay them to the staff responsible for policy formulation and implementation.
- (c) EPD had been providing recycling services in a systematic way. Apart from the “GREEN@ISLANDS” provided in Tung Chung, the “GREEN@Mui Wo” and recycling spots operating at regular locations and schedules were also available for use, altogether forming a recycling network in Islands District.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had relayed the suggestions to the responsible groups after the meeting and provided Members with the relevant information for reference.)

VII. Question on villagers burning weeds and miscellaneous objects in Nim Shue Wan
(Paper TAFEHCCC 16/2021)

82. The Chairman welcomed Mr YIU Men-yeung, Division Commander (Marine and Diving) of the Fire Services Department (FSD) and Mr LAW Hoi-ming, District Commander Lantau District (Administration) of HKPF to the meeting to respond to the question.

83. Ms Amy YUNG briefly introduced the question.

84. Mr YIU Men-yeung said that FSD had only received one reported case of fire at Nim Shue Wan in 2019 and 2020. However, it had received five reported cases during the first quarter of this year, one of which was a small-scale hillfire occurred at Nim Shue Wan Village, which was put out expeditiously. Besides, two reported cases involved burning of weeds and miscellaneous objects by villagers on private land at hillside areas. However, the source of the smoke could not be identified after the firemen had arrived at scene. In case a hillfire was identified, the firemen would refer the case to the Police for follow up after putting out the fire or after advising the residents to put the fire out themselves. Under the existing legislation, the FSD had no power to regulate activities concerning the burning of weeds and miscellaneous objects on private land, but it could only give advice. Every year, the FSD would arrange fire drills at Nim Shue Wan Village, distribute promotional leaflets to and call on villagers to avoid burning weeds and miscellaneous objects on private land.

85. Mr LAW Hoi-ming said that the Police would conduct an anti-crime patrol at Discovery Bay and would step up inspection at Nim Shue Wan in the future. The Police would work with the FSD to strengthen the education and publicity to enhance the public awareness of fire prevention.

86. Ms Amy YUNG said that, as shown in FSD's data, there had been many similar incidents this year. Although the areas involved in these cases of hillfire were small, nearby residential premises might have been victimised if there was a spread of fire. If the locations concerned could not be accessed by fire engines, the consequences would be disastrous. She understood that the behaviour in question was not a criminal offence. She thanked the FSD and the Police for their advice to the concerned parties upon receipt of complaints. She hoped the authorities would explore solutions to prevent recurrence of such behaviour.

87. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that the urban and rural areas of Lantau Island were integrated, and many aged farmers continued to make their living by farming. He understood it was difficult to decompose weeds and miscellaneous objects, which would therefore hinder farming. Hence, most farmers would prefer to burn them, releasing a lot of smoke and affecting nearby residents. The same problem also occurred in Yat Tung Estate. He had advised the farmers nearby to burn weeds and miscellaneous objects after they had been accumulated to a considerable amount. However, it was reported that some farmers would collect the ashes as fertiliser and might not accept the suggestion. He proposed that the Police should collaborate with FSD to advise farmers to reduce the frequency of burning weeds and miscellaneous objects, or burn an appropriate amount of them each time, and dispose of the ashes properly, thereby reducing the nuisance to the nearby residents. He believed that farmers were reasonable, and improvement was seen after residents of villages situating below Yat Tung Estate had been advised earlier. He hoped to balance the interests of all parties and solve the problem as soon as possible.

(Mr YUNG Chi-ming left the meeting at around 12:40 p.m.)

(Post-meeting note: The Police had taken note of Members' concerns and had strengthened inspection at areas around Nim Shue Wan and Yat Tung Estate.)

VIII. Question on organising large-scale events during the epidemic (Paper TAFEHCCC 17/2021)

88. The Chairman said that the HKR International Limited (HKRI) did not send representatives to attend the meeting, but had submitted a written reply to Members for perusal before the meeting.

89. Ms Amy YUNG briefly introduced the question.

90. Ms Amy YUNG said that HKRI, as always, did not send representatives to

attend the meeting. She was discontented with the company for evading to answer all the questions raised, and its written reply failed to provide effective responses to the questions. HKRI had organised large-scale events at Discovery Bay Plaza in the past two weeks and consequently, she received complaints lodged by many residents over the weekend, saying that some participants interacted without wearing masks, causing them to worry that it would result in a local outbreak of the epidemic. Besides, the activities had caused nuisance to nearby residents because Discovery Bay Plaza was in the vicinity of residential premises. As she had repeatedly reflected, a large number of visitors would be attracted to Discovery Bay whenever there were activities held in holidays. They would use the bus service for residents. There were occasions in which residents had to wait for a few hours but still failed to board the bus for home. She requested to put her views on record and said that she would remind residents to directly lodge complaints to HKRI so as to prevent her from receiving complaints about this. She criticised HKRI for being irresponsible in this matter.

IX. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects
(Paper TAFEHCCC 18/2021)

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

92. Ms Christy LEUNG briefly presented the report and invited Members to note the content of it. She added that the allocation of \$7,025,000 to TAFEHCCC in the financial year 2020/2021 had been fully utilised.

93. The Chairman invited Members to note the report.

(a) Improvement to the footpath at Shing Cheong Lane and No. 68-106, San Hing Street, Cheung Chau (IS-DMW562)

94. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that despite the funding approval was granted to the project in 2009/10, the tender invitation had not commenced yet. As discussion and coordination regarding the project had been underway in the past ten years, he enquired whether the issues of private land were involved. He noted that the tender invitation for the project “Construction of drainage channel at Luk Tei Tong Village, Mui Wo (IS-DMW556)”, the funding application of which was granted at the same time of the above project, was about to take place in mid-2021. So, he enquired whether IsDO would need his assistance in the coordination to expedite the works progress. He requested IsDO to clearly explain the procedure of and time required for general works, and whether it would take more than ten years to implement a project, thereby facilitating him to give an explanation to the public. He requested IsDO to actively follow it up because residents would easily trip over if the surface of footpath was uneven.

(b) Construction of pavilion near jetty at Sha Lo Wan, Tai O (IS-DMW678)

95. Mr Eric KWOK said that at the last meeting he had proposed to install solar panels in the pavilion so as to provide power supply for electric lights and mobile phones charging facilities. However, his proposal was rejected by IsDO, which responded that the pavilion was close to the sea and susceptible to the exposure to salt spray. He said that he had seen the architectural drawings of a pier in Tung Chung at a meeting of the Traffic and Transport Committee and noted that installation of solar facilities was planned in the pavilion to be constructed there. He therefore enquired IsDO whether it was feasible to provide additional solar facilities in the project.

96. Mr LI Ming-yau made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) As a lot of private land fell within the works limit of Project No. IS-DMW562, IsDO had been making efforts to obtain the signed copies of “Owner’s Consent” from the landowners concerned over the years for works commencement. In addition, as the works limit covered many busy streets, IsDO had to consider the impact of the works on nearby residents and shop operators, and therefore needed to discuss with the stakeholders the suitable locations and plans. Since IsDO had reached a consensus with the stakeholders earlier, the preparation of the detailed works design was in progress.
- (b) He clarified that the project discussed at the previous meetings should be the “Construction of pavilion near pier at Fan Lau, Tai O (IS-DMW680)”. IsDO had decided to adopt Members’ views by providing additional solar charging facilities and the tender invitation for the project was anticipated to take place in early 2021. Regarding the works of Project No. IS-DMW678, IsDO would consider Members’ suggestions subject to the result of the pilot scheme of operating solar charging facilities at the pier at Fan Lau.

97. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho queried whether the Project No. IS-DMW562 was not feasible since the project had been under discussion for ten years. He said that the works would inevitably affect the stakeholders, regardless of the site selected. Citing Mong Kok as an example, he indicated that the district was of high pedestrian patronage, where there were many shops as well. He then enquired whether it needed to study a project in the district for 20 to 30 years before the works could be launched. He enquired what difficulties were encountered by IsDO, saying that he and Mr YUNG Chi-ming might assist in the coordination. He reiterated that he only aimed to find a solution to expeditiously commence the works and give an explanation to the public, but not deliberately making things difficult for IsDO.

98. Mr LI Ming-yau said that IsDO had basically solved the problem of site selection and would seek assistance from the DC Member of the constituency concerned when necessary.

99. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho enquired how long the project would normally take

and requested IsDO to respond whether it was reasonable to spend ten years in site selection.

100. Ms Christy LEUNG said that the time required for a project generally depended on its complexity or the problems involved. Since the site selected for this project involved private land, IsDO was obliged to seek consent from the landowners before the commencement of works. The progress of the project would be affected by when the landowners could submit the signed consent. Moreover, since IsDO had received objections during district consultation, it needed to explain the project to the stakeholders and make adjustments to the implementation details. Generally speaking, if IsDO was unable to contact individual landowners for obtaining the signed consent or residents had raised different views on the project, it might discuss with Members accordingly.

X. Report by Working Group

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

101. The Chairman said that the report of the Working Group had been distributed to Members for perusal by email before the meeting (see Paper 1) and Members were welcomed to comment on the report.

102. Members had raised no comments.

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

103. Mr Randy YU said that the report of the Working Group had been distributed to Members for perusal by fax or email before the meeting (see Paper 2) and Members were welcomed to comment on the report. He requested Members to endorse whether DC would become a supporting organisation of the 12th “Quit to Win” Smoke-free Community Campaign organised by the Hong Kong Council on Smoking and Health in the capacity of Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group, and whether OIWA Limited would become the partner organisation of the district.

104. The Chairman invited Members to note the report of the working group. She also invited Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the above report including the proposed activities of the 12th “Quit to Win” Smoke-free Community Campaign.

105. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was 13 votes in favour and one abstention. The report of the working group and the proposed activities were endorsed.

(Members voted in favour included: Ms Josephine TSANG (Chairman), Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman), Mr Randy YU, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr CHAN Lin-wai,

Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Ms Amy YUNG abstained.)

106. Mr Eric KWOK enquired whether Item 4 “Tung Chung Care Action - Community Love and Care during the Epidemic”, which was set out in the report of the Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group, had been completed. If so, he requested the Secretariat to provide supplementary information, so as to keep Members informed of the results of the activities.

107. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to follow up on Mr Eric KWOK’s request.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had distributed the activity report to Members for perusal after the meeting.)

XI. Any Other Business

108. There was no other business.

XII. Date of Next Meeting

109. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 10:30 a.m. on 24 May 2021 (Monday).

-END-