

(Translation)

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

Date : 30 May 2022 (Monday)
Time : 2:00 p.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Mr HO Siu-kei (Chairman)
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP
Mr WONG Man-hon, MH (Arrived at around 2:05 p.m.)
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken
Mr HO Chun-fai (Arrived at around 2:05 p.m.)
Ms WONG Chau-ping (Arrived at around 2:05 p.m.)
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting

Attendance by Invitation

Mr LAW Tak-chi, George	Chief Engineer/Fill Management, Civil Engineering & Development Department
Ms LI Kit-man	Senior Engineer/Strategy 1, Civil Engineering & Development Department
Mr CHIU Chung-ming, Vincent	Engineer/Strategy 5, Civil Engineering & Development Department
Mr CHOW Ming-him, Raymond	Principal Consultant, ERM-Hong Kong Limited
Mr LEUNG Yu-hin, Ivan	Consultant, ERM-Hong Kong Limited
Ms TANG Ho-yi	Acting Chief Health Inspector (Islands)1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr KAO Hsi-chiang	Chief Health Inspector (Islands)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

In Attendance

Ms WONG Ka-ming, Grace	Assistant District Officer (Islands)2, Islands District Office
Mr LI Ming-yau	Senior Inspector of Works, Islands District Office
Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy	District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr TSANG Wai-man	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr PEI Nien-jen, Gordon	Senior Engineer/6 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YAU Pak-lun, Esmond	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)5, Environmental Protection Department
Ms FUNG Sin-ye, Mini	Senior Transport Officer/Islands2, Transport Department
Ms LO Lai-ping, Rebecca	Acting Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension)1, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr HO Lee-yip	Manager District Relation, New Lantau Bus Company (1973) Limited
Ms YUEN Suk-ling, Sylvia	Representative, Sun Ferry Services Company Limited

Secretary

Ms NG Ching-sum, Rain	Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office
-----------------------	---

~~~~~

### **Welcoming Remarks**

The Chairman welcomed representatives from government departments and organisations as well as Members to the meeting.

#### **I. Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2022**

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

3. The captioned minutes were confirmed unanimously without further amendments proposed by Members.

(Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr HO Chun-fai and Ms WONG Chau-ping arrived at around 2:05 p.m.)

II. Public Works Programme Item No.: 5824CL/B Dredging, Management, and Capping of Contaminated Sediment Disposal Facility at West of Lamma Island  
(Paper TAFEHCCC 16/2022)

4. The Chairman welcomed Mr George LAW, Chief Engineer/Fill Management of Civil Engineering & Development Department (CEDD), Ms LI Kit-man, Senior Engineer/Strategy 1 of CEDD, Mr Vincent CHIU, Engineer/Strategy 5 of CEDD, Mr Raymond CHOW, Principal Consultant of ERM-Hong Kong Limited and Mr Ivan LEUNG, Consultant of ERM-Hong Kong Limited to meeting to present the paper.

5. Mr George LAW, Ms LI Kit-man and Mr Raymond CHOW briefed the meeting on the paper with the aid of PowerPoint.

6. Ms LAU Shun-ting made the following comments:

- (a) She would like to know the definition of “acceptable level of impact” in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report. Though CEDD claimed that the works would not create unacceptable impact on the marine ecology, they should give details on the level of impact. She pointed out that fish might ingest the metallic substances in the contaminated sediment, which would subsequently affect the health of people who consumed the seafood.
- (b) She said she had meetings with fisherman groups of Lamma Island and the industry on 10 and 27 May respectively, which CEDD representatives attended as well. All stakeholders unanimously opposed the site selection of the project, saying that it would damage fish farms, fish rafts and fishing areas, etc. and would have far-reaching impacts on the industry and fishermen’s livelihoods. The EIA conducted by CEDD could barely show the actual impact of the project on the environment and fishermen. She requested that CEDD should take the opinions of the industry and fisherman groups seriously. She also urged the Government to protect marine ecology and reconsider the disposal method of contaminated sediments and the site selection.

7. Mr Eric KWOK provided the following opinions:

- (a) It seemed CEDD had drawn predetermined conclusions for the EIA areas such as the impact on marine ecology, fishing industry and harm on health, air quality and so on. He wondered why the impact assessment on water quality was done only by a computer simulation system instead of an on-site water quality survey. The results were hardly convincing. Paragraph 9 of the paper, detailing the impact of the facility concerned on water quality and marine ecology, stated that the impacts of the project were temporary in nature and the project area was not the main occurrence habitat for finless porpoises. It therefore

claimed that unacceptable impacts to nearby water quality sensitive receivers, such as beaches, fish farming areas and marine ecology, were not expected. Nonetheless, as stated in the paper, the whole facility was expected to have a service life of around 20 years. He hence cast doubt on the basis of the conclusion that the impacts were temporary in nature. Furthermore, he stressed that even if the species of the coral and benthic communities found within the project area were common, they should not be destroyed arbitrarily.

- (b) The press reported that CEDD applied for an EIA study brief for the same project in 2019. It was reported at that time that the toxic heavy metal-contaminated sediment, with the flow of water, would affect the fishing areas around Lamma Island and Cheung Chau. The dredging works would also affect the water quality of Hung Shing Yeh Beach and Lo So Shing Beach on Lamma Island. If the toxic fishery products caught by fishermen were supplied to wholesale markets or diners on Lamma Island, Cheung Chau and even Aberdeen, patrons might suffer from food poisoning. However, CEDD claimed in the paper that all the impacts were temporary in nature or would not cause unacceptable impacts.
- (c) He asked CEDD whether they had conducted any ecological baseline surveys. He pointed out that CEDD's report in 2019 had indicated that the area concerned was an occurrence habitat for finless porpoises. The EIA also covered the impacts on marine mammals during various stages of the works. Finless porpoise was an endangered species under protection. The Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society (the Society) had been regularly conducting site observations of dolphin occurrences for the past two decades. In 2019, the Society recorded 11 groups of finless porpoises every 100 km in the waters west of Lamma Island. Assuming there were three dolphins in each group, there were about 33 finless porpoises. Furthermore, since finless porpoises were accustomed to nocturnal activities, the number recorded at night was estimated to be three or four times higher than that in daytime. It showed that the waters concerned was a main occurrence habitat of finless porpoises. He asked CEDD why they did not conduct the survey at night and remarked that the data provided by CEDD might be of little reference value. He questioned why the two reports had different findings.

8. Mr YUNG Chi-ming said he had met the fisherman groups of Cheung Chau on 18 May and was told that the waters west of Lamma Island was a fish spawning area. The works in that area would drive the fish away and they might not return after years. Coupled with the sediments-contaminated seafood at the fishing rafts nearby, fishermen's livelihoods would likely be jeopardised. He asked CEDD why it was not feasible to expand the existing contaminated sediment disposal facility or dispose the contaminated sediments on land so as to minimise the impact on fishermen. He

suggested that CEDD invite Mr HO Chun-yin, Steven, BBS, JP, the Legislative Council Member representing the Agriculture and Fisheries Constituency and the fisherman groups affected to a meeting for a detailed discussion of a feasible solution.

9. Mr CHAN Lin-wai supported the suggestion of Mr YUNG Chi-ming to expand the current contaminated sediment disposal facility in the waters east of Sha Chau. He remarked that the water area of the proposed facility was about 100 hectares between Cheung Chau and Lamma Island. He opined that CEDD did not take the impact of the works on villages along the shore into consideration. In addition to about ten villages, the west coast of Lamma Island also had many beaches and beautiful coastlines, which attracted many visitors. Beaches on Lamma Island were susceptible to major weather impacts. Every time after typhoons, various changes could be spotted on the beaches. He was worried that the works would damage the landscape of the island. In summary, the residents on Lamma Island were opposed to the works.

10. Mr Randy YU made the following comments:

- (a) The proposed facility was located near the route of high-speed ferries. If the contaminated sediments leaked to the water surface and at the same time the high-speed ferry passed by, the affected area would expand further. The proposed facility was two nautical miles away from the shores of Cheung Chau and Lamma Island. One might have a false impression that the affected areas were limited, but in fact, many fishermen from Peng Chau and Mui Wo fished in these waters. Such drift disposal method was nothing different from pouring a skip of soil from height. It was easy to imagine how the contaminated sediments spread or float in water. It was uncertain whether the contaminated sediments could be dissolved in the water. The situation was inevitably worrying.
- (b) Marine works by the Government were underway in the waters off various islands, including the reclamation for the construction of an incinerator at Shek Kwu Chau and the works at Hei Ling Chau. Many fishermen reported that their year-on-year fish catches were decreasing in the waters concerned and the size of seafood was also smaller. The paper by CEDD stated that the works would have no impact on the fishing industry but such remark was not supported by scientific data. He held the view that both quantitative and qualitative impacts should be covered in the assessment.
- (c) The first phase of the construction works of the sludge incinerator in Tuen Mun was completed. It had been operating for years and proven to be harmless to the environment. The facility could also transform waste into energy. The incinerated sludge would shrink to around 10% of its original volume while the resulting toxin levels were very low, enabling it to be disposed of in the landfills directly. CEDD could use the planning for food waste incinerator as reference and commence the

second phase of sludge incinerator construction. The dredging works for contaminated mud pits would then be no longer necessary. If CEDD followed the result-oriented approach of the new HKSAR Government, it should be able to finish building the second phase of sludge incinerator after the disposal area in Sha Chau was saturated in 2027. In the long run, there would be limited space for sludge disposal. This approach would not tackle the root cause. CEDD should therefore come up with sustainable and radical solutions to the problem.

11. Mr FONG Lung-fei made the following comments:

- (a) He used to live in Telegraph Bay (now Cyber Port), so he witnessed the dredging work by the barge in the waters off Residence Bel-air that polluted the entire waters. Fish caught from the waters had sludge in its gills. Diving in the waters south of Telegraph Bay near Wah Fu Estate, one would find marine life on the seabed covered with sludge. Moreover, the noise generated by the construction equipment would inevitably frighten fish away from the waters and thus affect the fish catch. He hence had doubts about the paper's assessment that there would be no unacceptable impacts on marine ecological resources. Even years after the development of Cyber Port, the chances of catching fish in that area were very slim. It was therefore difficult to estimate whether the fish would return to its original habitat.
- (b) He asked how responsibilities would be delineated if fry in the fishing rafts died during the works and whether fishermen could ask for compensation from CEDD. Furthermore, CEDD should provide a solution on how to handle the coral reef. Members of the public and the industry could hardly be convinced merely by CEDD's remark that there was no impact. Many fishermen were still catching fish around Lamma Island and Cheung Chau. If they were forced out of their profession, the seafood supply of the city would be affected. Furthermore, fish absorbing the heavy metals from the works would lead to ciguatera fish poisoning in the consumption of seafood. CEDD should consider more effective proposals, such as the proposal by Members to expand the existing contaminated sediment disposal facility in the waters east of Sha Chau.

12. Mr Ken WONG provided opinions as follows:

- (a) The proposed facility was close to the ferry route and the pollutants could affect a vast area in the waters nearby. Besides, there were various government projects underway in the waters concerned at the same time, including the advance works like ground investigations of Lantau Tomorrow, reclamation at Peng Chau, construction of wind power generation facilities, etc. He asked whether departments had coordinated among themselves to gauge the impacts of concurrent

works on seafood. During the season when southwesterly wind was prevalent, it was very common to see strong waves at sea. There were also routes of large seagoing vessels in the waters concerned. The uncovered sludge might be spread by the waves created by the large vessels to other waters.

- (b) The entire facility was expected to have a service life as long as 20 years. CEDD's remark that the impacts were temporary in nature was unconvincing. He believed it would take longer time for the ecology to recover. He requested CEDD to provide more information and data regarding the above issues and to consider expanding the existing contaminated sediment disposal facility in Sha Chau.

13. Ms LAU Shun-ting reiterated that the Government should strive to propose a policy to protect the sea, instead of carrying out works that would pollute the sea. She urged CEDD to take other feasible solutions into consideration.

14. Mr HO Chun-fai remarked that Lamma Island was known for its tranquility, and every year, sea turtles would lay eggs on its beaches. Considering the extensive scope involved in the works, it would unavoidably reduce the number of tourists on Lamma Island and have a far-reaching impact. He requested CEDD to pay attention to the natural environment and protect it.

15. Mr CHOW Yuk-tong expressed concern over the site selection of the proposed facility. He hoped CEDD would study various proposals in detail and provide a few more selections to the District Council for consideration. Otherwise, it would be difficult to gain stakeholders' support.

16. Mr George LAW gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) CEDD appreciated the opinions from Members. He clarified that the project profile (Note: not EIA report) was submitted when CEDD applied for the EIA study brief in 2019. The content of the project was in line with the paper. He remarked that it was under the EIA Ordinance that the project profile be submitted to the Environmental Protection Department to provide background information of the project. Yet, detailed studies had not been conducted at that time. CEDD provided preliminary information at that time that the project might have potential impact to the surrounding areas, such as finless porpoises were found in the waters at the west of Lamma Island with reference to some papers. Nonetheless, CEDD found that it was not a key occurrence habitat for the finless porpoises after studying in depth for three years. During the detailed studies, CEDD had made reference to relevant academic papers and the marine mammal surveys regularly conducted in Hong Kong waters by the Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) in the past two decades. Besides, CEDD had appointed experts to carry out detailed investigations for six

months, the method of which had been agreed by relevant departments beforehand. During the investigation, finless porpoises were observed twice in the waters at the west of Lama Island, and a total of six finless porpoises observed. As for the occurrence of finless porpoises in the nighttime, the consultant of CEDD, based on detailed researches conducted by an academic institute from 2018 to 2020, found that the number of finless porpoises in the waters at the west of Lamma Island was lower than that in the key occurrence habitats around Soko Islands and Tai A Chau. The above finding was consistent with that of the studies conducted by CEDD.

- (b) Regarding the site selection, CEDD had conducted a thorough analysis on various waters of Hong Kong before proposing the current location. The existing contaminated sediment disposal facility at the east of Sha Chau had been in operation for years and it was anticipated that the mud pits would be exhausted in 2027. Considering its proximity to the site of the airport runway extension and Sha Chau Marine Park, its expansion was difficult. In addition, the northwest waters of Hong Kong had strong currents and were close to the busy Urmston Road; there were already plans for a few marine parks in the southwest waters; east waters were deeper and more susceptible to monsoon winds, and their ecological value was relatively high. All in all, the above waters were not suitable for the development of the proposed facility.
- (c) Regarding Members' concern on the impact to the marine environment (including water quality and marine ecology) during the operation of the disposal facility, CEDD made reference to the current operation of the facility at the east of Sha Chau that there were only three to four vessels on average carrying out disposal works at different time per day. The service life of each contaminated mud pit was about three years and a new mud pit would be used only after the exhaustion of the previous one. The exhausted mud pit would then be capped with uncontaminated sediment. Experience from the existing disposal facilities at the east of Sha Chau and the south of The Brothers as well as the on-going monitoring results indicated that the original conditions of the seabed would be gradually restored to that similar to the surrounding waters environment within two to three years after the capping works. The existing facility at the east of Sha Chau had been in operation for years and CEDD had been conducting regular environmental monitoring including different levels of water quality monitoring in the waters near Sha Chau. The on-going environmental monitoring results showed that the facility did not result in unacceptable impact to the surrounding environment.
- (d) The conclusion in the paper was drawn after meticulous researches and with reference to the experience and prolonged environmental monitoring results of the operation of the existing contaminated



sediment disposal facility. CEDD would be willing to continue listen to opinions from the Members. If necessary, more detailed information could be provided.

17. Mr Eric KWOK gave the following comments:

- (a) It was stated in the project profile submitted for the application of EIA survey brief by CEDD in December 2019 that the proposed facility might affect the environment, which seemed inconsistent with the paper. Furthermore, the paper did not mention the impact of the works on the water quality of Hung Shing Yeh Beach and Lo So Shing Beach on Lamma Island.
- (b) He asked CEDD whether it had conducted surveys during the occurrence peak of finless porpoises (from every December to May in the following year) to record their activities. The World Wildlife Fund – Hong Kong recommended using hydrophone and a system that detected the population density of finless porpoises for surveys and statistics of occurrence of the species. The survey result indicated that the number of their occurrence in the waters west of Lamma Island was at the medium level. He asked AFCD whether researches were conducted at night and what the survey approach was.
- (c) Sham Wan on Lamma Island was a nesting ground for Green Turtles and was listed as a site of Special Scientific Interest. It would create profound impact if Green Turtles no longer lay eggs there because of the water quality issue.
- (d) CEDD claimed in the paper that relevant fisherman groups and environmental groups had been consulted and their opinions had been taken into account. However, no detail in this regard was illustrated. He requested CEDD to take Members' suggestions into consideration. They included the use of incinerator or other site selections for contaminated sediment disposal facility, such as the Deep Bay.

18. Mr Randy YU provided the following opinions:

- (a) He suggested that CEDD provide various work site selections for consideration. In addition to explaining the pros and cons of the individual site selection, site visits could also be arranged for Members if necessary so as to gain insights about the surrounding environment and ecology.
- (b) He also requested for information that could be easily understood by laymen. To the general public, the volume of contaminated sediments by three or four vessels a day might be daunting enough. He doubted if CEDD had any scientific proof for the remark that the above-

mentioned volume of contaminated sediments would not do harm to the marine ecology.

- (c) CEDD claimed that the volume of sea products and fish health were unaffected. He asked CEDD whether they monitored the situation every day and how they came up with such a conclusion. Fishermen from Mui Wo went fishing in the sea every day and found the volume of their fish catch and the size of the fish were both declining. Besides, he asked CEDD to check if there were other works in the waters nearby, instead of focusing only on a particular work when collecting data. This was because the impact arising from concurrent works in the waters of the Island District could be tremendous. A two-decade works could cause long-term environmental impacts. Furthermore, the traditional fishing industry was in gradual decline. The Government should help protect its sustainable growth, rather than throttle the room for survival.

19. Mr Ken WONG asked CEDD how they would handle the sediments on the seabed of vessel routes when space for disposal exhausted after two decades. He opined that an incinerator could be an ideal solution for contaminated mud and he compared the case with the daily handling of the huge amount of sludge from Pearl River Delta by the Macao SAR Government in the past century. He agreed it was a complicated issue and a sustainable solution was crucial for the sustainable development of Hong Kong. Meanwhile, the livelihood of fishermen should also be taken into account.

20. Ms WONG Chau-ping said various works taking place concurrently would further expand the affected area. In recent years, fishermen of the waters concerned found their fish catch declining because of the works in the area. Not even the fry hatched during the fishing moratorium could survive. The site selection of the proposed facility was close to Peng Chau, Mui Wo, Chi Ma Wan, Cheung Chau, etc., where fishermen frequently worked. She asked CEDD whether they had considered the impact on the industry. In view of CEDD's remark that the existing disposal facility in Sha Chau could not be expanded because of its proximity to the marine park, she pointed out that there were also a few natural marine parks on the islands to the west of Lamma Island and they should also be taken into consideration. At last, she hoped that CEDD would uphold the principle of the Government to support for environmental protection and care for the nature by seeking opinions from local groups and stakeholders and selecting another more suitable site.

21. Mr HO Chun-fai said it was a wise decision to select Sha Chau as the site for the contaminated sediment disposal facility, considering the relatively mild impact of typhoons there while Discovery Bay, Mui Wo, Peng Chau, Chi Ma Wan, Cheung Chau, Tsing Yi and Kap Shui Mun received more direct blow from the stormy waves. As contaminated mud pits would be capped with uncontaminated sediments only after three years, he was worried that typhoons would wash the pollutants away from the area. He asked CEDD what measures were in place to prevent the dispersal of pollutants during inclement weather.

22. Mr FONG Lung-fei said the toxin in the food chain would accumulate and the process took time. The heavy metals might accumulate on coral for a while before being consumed by sea creatures. The size of fish with ciguatera fish poison was usually larger in the past. Even if the toxin could not be found in the sea products caught during the surveys, CEDD should not exclude the possibility. He asked CEDD whether they would select sea products by their sizes for tests and whether they knew about the length of time that the sea products were exposed to waters with heavy metals, in order to obtain reliable data. Furthermore, before the proper capping of the contaminated mud pits, the toxic substances might float with water and spread to nearby waters. He was concerned about the hazard to health when members of the public consumed those substances by accident. He suggested that CEDD explore other ways to deal with the contaminated sediments, such as using it for the production of eco-blocks.

23. Mr WONG Man-hon remarked that there were indeed various works in progress in the waters of Islands District and the impact of the works was far-reaching. He suggested that CEDD reconsider expanding the existing facility in Sha Chau and keeping the polluting works away from residential areas and vessel routes as far as possible.

24. The Chairman requested CEDD to note Members' opinions. He opined that this might not be the right time to implement the proposed works and said the agenda item had been discussed for a long time. He then asked CEDD for a brief conclusion.

25. Mr George LAW understood Members' concerns and noted their valuable opinions. He pointed out that in the EIA, detailed studies and analyses had been conducted on various areas, including the water quality, fishing industry, marine ecology and so on. In the PowerPoint presentation and responses just now, they had tried their best to explain the site selection, the content and the considerations of the EIA as much as possible. Owing to the time constraints, they could not explain to Members in further detail. However, they would endeavor to follow up on this project.

26. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they supported "Public Works Programme Item No.: 5824CL/B Dredging, Management, and Capping of Contaminated Sediment Disposal Facility at West of Lamma Island".

27. Members voted by a show of hands. The voting result was 0 voted for and 11 voted against. The Chairman announced that the project was not supported.

(Members voted against included: the Chairman Mr HO Siu-kei, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Mr CHAN Lin-wai had left the meeting.)

III. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department District Action Plan  
(Paper TAFEHCCC 17/2022)

28. The Chairman welcomed Ms Winsy LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands), Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)<sup>2</sup> and Ms TANG Ho-yi, Acting Chief Health Inspector (Islands)<sup>1</sup> of Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), to the meeting to present the paper.

29. Ms TANG Ho-yi briefed the meeting on the content of the paper.

30. Mr Ken WONG gave opinions as follows:

- (a) He asked when the improvement works of Peng Chau Public Toilet would commence. Sewage overflow from the drain outside that toilet once every other month and fouled the whole street. He urged FEHD to follow up on this perennial problem.
- (b) There was a very serious rodent nuisance in the refuse collection point located at the corner of the Water Supplies Department and the Peng Chau Municipal Services Building near the main street of Peng Chau. As there were many restaurants in the vicinity, many rodents were attracted to search for food. They were as big as a kitten and even came out during daytime and at dawn, making it a worrying situation. He urged FEHD to follow up on the matter and place rodent traps.

31. Mr Eric KWOK made the following comments:

- (a) He commended the work of the FEHD and remarked that maintaining environmental hygiene was a challenging task. He noted that there had been a lot of rubbish at Pui O Beach recently and staff members of FEHD had been clearing it efficiently.
- (b) As the rainy season was just around the corner, mosquito infestation was on the rise. He did not support the use of spray to eliminate the pest as it was poisonous. In addition, complaints about mosquito infestation from residents in Yat Tung Estate was frequent. From time to time, he found stagnant water at farmland nearby which could not be cleared, causing nuisance to the residents in the area. He requested FEHD to follow up on the issue.
- (c) He was aware that FEHD had been conducting trial use of a new technology (thermal camera) to detect rodent traces. Since many cooked food stalls at the Amphitheatre at Yat Tung Estate operated till late at night, causing a large number of rodents, he asked FEHD whether the new equipment could be used there. In addition, due to the high toxicity of rodenticides, there had been incidents in Ma Wan Chung Village and Hau Wong Temple where dogs and birds died after

swallowing rodenticides by accident. He requested that FEHD should provide training and professional guidance to staff members for the use of poison baits.

32. Mr YUNG Chi-ming extended gratitude to the cleaners of FEHD for their frequent street cleaning and staying on duty in the refuse collection points diligently to maintain the environmental hygiene of Cheung Chau. The street cleanliness of Cheung Chau had been widely praised by tourists. However, many residents reported that the rodent infestation near Cheung Chau harbour front was serious. He requested FEHD to follow up on the anti-rodent operation and fill rat holes to eliminate the rodent infestation.

33. Mr FONG Lung-fei hoped the FEHD could work with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to combat the rodent infestation near Yat Tung Estate. He said many rodents lived on the lawn near the Estate and foraged in the Estate. Since the weed on the lawn might cover the garbage, the cleaners might not aware of it, making it easy for mosquitoes to breed and rats to hide. Similar incident happened on Chung Yan Road but the situation improved a lot after staff members of the LCSD cleared the weed and filled the rat holes. He urged FEHD to clear the weed near the Estates in the future, as it would reduce the use of pesticides and protect the ecological environment.

34. Ms WONG Chau-ping provided opinions as follows:

- (a) The renovation work at Ha Ling Pei public toilet was satisfactory. However, the steps in front of the toilet were steep and no handrail along them was installed. Accidents might happen when seniors were going up and down. She requested FEHD to install handrails beside the steps to prevent accidents. Furthermore, the Hau Wong Temple public toilet looked pleasant after renovation but there was often sand in the washbasins outside the toilet, blocking the drains. It might be caused by many users playing with sand or digging clams at the beach. She hoped FEHD would take follow up actions, such as posting notices to remind users to pay attention.
- (b) She complimented FEHD on its work, especially during the fifth wave of the epidemic when the hygiene condition of villages in Tung Chung was worrying and many residents were tested positive for COVID-19. She appreciated the swift assistance rendered by the fearless staff members of FEHD, who assisted residents in dealing with hygiene problems, such as disinfection for the homes of confirmed patients. Their service were highly commendable.

35. Mr Randy YU gave comments as follows:

- (a) He highly commended the FEHD for its work in Islands District over the past two years. FEHD had spared no effort in rendering assistance

whenever a confirmed case was reported. In the past waves of the epidemic, FEHD maintained their services in the district including Tai O, Mui Wo and Pui O San Wai Tsuen. Despite the raging pandemic, the frontline staff of FEHD provided street cleaning service diligently and fearlessly. He expressed special gratitude to Mr KAO Hsi-chiang and his colleagues for their staunch support. Though it was late at night when Members notified FEHD of confirmed cases, FEHD was able to arrange disinfection and cleaning service by the contractor the next morning. The outstanding management efficiency impressed him a lot and won his compliment.

- (b) He had been following up on the refuse collection work in Tai O with FEHD. Currently, the refuse in Tai O would be transported to the large refuse collection point in Lung Tin Estate, pending for the second transfer by dump trucks. He recognised the good practice of FEHD to remove the refuse at 9 p.m. every day to avoid the smell caused by the garbage left overnight. He would like to know the details about the relocation work of the large refuse collection point.
- (c) He requested FEHD to seek the opinions from the Chairman Mr HO Siu-kei and the relevant stakeholders on the small refuse collection point at the end of Kat Hing Street near Sun Ki Bridge, so as to review and improve the facility.

36. Mr Ken WONG added that the work of FEHD in Islands District had been satisfactory, as agreed by Members and the general public. Nonetheless, some refuse collection points might look pleasant on the outside after renovation while their facilities were yet to be improved. He pointed out that many of the refuse collection points in Peng Chau were still not equipped with water supply systems. Staff members had to collect water from the pier and push the trolley back to the refuse collection point for use or for street cleaning, which was very inconvenient. At present, only the refuse collection point at Kiu King Street was equipped with a water main, which, however, needed repairs by the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) for leakage, a problem that had been going on for a year without improvement. While all refuse collection points in Cheung Chau were equipped with water mains, the condition of those in Peng Chau was far from satisfactory. He prompted FEHD to provide basic facilities such as water mains. FEHD should also follow up the drainage issue outside the Peng Chau public toilet in collaboration with relevant departments, otherwise it would be a waste of the frontline effort.

37. Ms LAU Shun-ting raised comments as follows:

- (a) Members of the Islands District Council (IsDC) highly appreciated the work of the FEHD in the district. She suggested writing an appreciation letter on behalf of IsDC to recognise their performance.
- (b) Residents on Lamma Island extended gratitude to the staff members of

FEHD for handling cases swiftly in the area, including the rodent infestation and the sewage issue. She pointed out that the rodent infestation had become more severe in the past two years and the entire territory was facing the same issue. Sok Kwu Wan and Yung Shue Wan on Lamma Island were no exception. She then requested follow-up actions by FEHD. As for the sewage issue at the Sok Kwu Wan public toilet, she believed FEHD was working with the ArchSD and hoped the issue could be resolved the soonest possible.

38. Mr HO Chun-fai commended FEHD on its work on behalf of residents of Lantau South. Since the outbreak of the epidemic, he had received compliments on the environmental hygiene work of the Islands District from other districts from time to time. FEHD had been acting swiftly and deployed members to perform cleaning duties one or two days upon notification. Moreover, FEHD had endeavored to maintain cleanliness outside the “mouse house” of the owner Ms CHAN, which was widely reported by the media. As far as he knew, the problem was resolved after repeated mediation with Ms CHAN and assistance rendered by various departments.

39. Ms WONG Chau-ping said it was difficult to take on the responsibility of environmental hygiene around the clock. However, FEHD acted promptly and appropriately. Impressed by the meticulousness of the FEHD’s staff, she once again praised the staff members in charge of the environmental hygiene of Tung Chung district and extended her gratitude for their hard work. Though the epidemic situation had subsided, it was not time to be off-guard. As it was getting warmer, the drainage channels with gully gratings might emit bad smell if they were not cleared properly. She requested the FEHD to help clear the main drainage channels in the 19 villages in Tung Chung so as to improve the environmental hygiene and minimise the risks of virus transmission.

40. Mr WONG Man-hon commended FEHD for its close co-operation with Members over years. He hoped FEHD would follow up on the situation of the two refuse loading places outside the watchtower on Tung Chung Road and Lo Wai Village in South Lantau. There were no lay-bys at the mentioned spots, and the tail lift of a truck had to be lowered during the loading of refuse, it would be disastrous if accidents happened. He therefore urged FEHD to follow up on the issue.

41. The Chairman said many tourists who visited Tai O considered that the streets of Tai O were clean and tidy, while Tai O preserved its attractiveness as a fishing village at the same time. Like other Members, he appreciated the work of FEHD in Islands District. Therefore, he suggested writing an appreciation letter to the Islands District Environmental Hygiene Office of the FEHD.

42. Mr Randy YU said the environmental and hygiene affairs were under the purview of this Committee, so he suggested that the letter should be sent to the Office on behalf of the Committee.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had emailed the appreciation letter to the Islands

District Environmental Hygiene Office of the FEHD.)

43. The Chairman agreed with Mr WONG Man-hon on the problem of vehicles handling refuse at the road side. He requested FEHD to follow up or build a refuse collection point to resolve the problem.

44. Ms Winsy LAI gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She thanked Members for their opinions and their recognition of the FEHD's effort, and said that FEHD adhered to the people-based principle in public services. She also extended appreciation to the staff of FEHD for working tirelessly to render assistance to Members around the clock during the epidemic, and to continue to carry out various projects. She would follow up with the relevant departments and address the comments made by Members. She thanked Members for their encouragement and tolerance, which enabled FEHD to make continuous progress.
- (b) FEHD had been installing solar energy equipment at suitable refuse collection points. She would give more details on the works progress after the meeting. As for Lung Tin Estate in Tai O, FEHD had obtained provision in this financial year for the improvement works of the refuse collection point and would conduct local consultation in a timely manner. In addition, FEHD had sent staff to the area to teach residents how to use the new refuse collection points and to adapt to the new technology. The approach had proved effective.

IV. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects  
(Paper TAFEHCCC 18/2022)

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

46. Ms Grace WONG briefly presented the paper and asked Members to note the paper.

47. Members' discussion on the various projects were as follows:

- (a) Construction of Rainshelters at Nam Bin Wai, Mui Wo (IS-DMW644)  
The Improvement works to the paving near the public toilets at Silvermine Bay Waterfall Garden, Mui Wo (Beautification works and landscaping near Silvermine Cave and Waterfall) (IS-DMW703)

48. Mr WONG Man-hon said the project IS-DMW644 was proposed by the former Chairman of Rural Committee a decade ago. He asked about the project



progress and requested the IsDO to closely follow up on the project IS-DMW703.

(b) Improvement to pavement near lamp post no. V4060, Peng Chau (IS-DMW693)

49. Mr Ken WONG asked for the details about the private lot involved in the project.

50. Mr LI Ming-yau gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) As for the project IS-DMW644, IsDO had prepared the work layout. But since the land allocation application had not been approved, the works had not yet been implemented.
- (b) As for the project IS-DMW703, IsDO had revised the area of the pavement. If the relevant departments had no other comments, the works was expected to be commenced this year.
- (c) As for the project IS-DMW693, the pavement was located at the well of a private lot. Since the written consent from the relevant party was still pending, the works could not be commenced yet.

51. Mr Randy YU asked the District Lands Office about the land allocation for the project IS-DMW644 and asked IsDO about the departments to be consulted for the project IS-DMW703. Members could provide assistance in coordination work.

52. Mr TSANG Wai-man replied that the information was not available for the time being but the District Lands Office would follow it up and proactively work with the IsDO to meet the needs of the projects.

(Post-meeting note: As for the construction of rainshelters at Nam Bin Wai, Mui Wo (IS-DMW644), the District Lands Office completed processing the application for land allocation submitted by IsDO on 7 June 2022 and allocated the site to the IsDO for the construction works.)

53. Mr LI Ming-yau said tree frogs were found within the site of the project IS-DMW703. IsDO was seeking advice from the AFCD.

54. Mr WONG Man-hon said that departments should make clearer explanation when replying about the application progress of land allocation in the future, including providing the relevant documents to avoid misunderstanding during the communication process.

55. Mr LI Ming-yau said IsDO would follow up on the application progress of the land allocation with the District Lands Office.

(Post-meeting note: The District Lands Office would continue to communicate with the IsDO and process the applications for the land allocation from the

IsDO in accordance with the established procedures.)

56. Mr Randy YU requested IsDO to keep Members updated about the application progress of land allocation in a timely manner.

V. Report by Working Group

57. Members noted the content of the work reports of the Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee Activities Working Group and that of Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group.

VI. Any Other Business

58. There was no other business.

VII. Date of Next Meeting

59. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for 2:00 p.m. on 25 July 2022 (Monday).

-END-