

(Translation)

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

Date : 25 May 2020 (Monday)
Time : 10:30 a.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Present

Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine (Chairman)
Ms WONG Chau-ping (Vice-Chairman)
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, MH, JP
Mr WONG Man-hon (Arrived at around 10:50 a.m.)
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH (Left at around 1:10 p.m.)
Mr YUNG Chi-ming, BBS, MH (Left at around 1:05 p.m.)
Mr CHAN Lin-wai, MH
Mr WONG Hon-kuen
Mr HO Chun-fai
Mr HO Siu-kei
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Mr TSUI Sang-hung, Sammy (Arrived at around 11:00 a.m.)
Mr FONG Lung-fei
Ms LAU Shun-ting
Mr LEE Ka-ho
Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho

In Attendance

Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David	District Leisure Manager (Islands), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms LAU Hoi-shan, Nelly	Dep District Leisure Manager (Islands)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Dr Jeffrey HUNG	Senior Manager, Policy Research and Advocacy, Friends of the Earth (HK)
Ms Natalie SUM	Community Engagement Officer II, Friends of the Earth (HK)
Ms Eunice YAM	Programme Officer I, Friends of the Earth (HK)
Mr CHEUNG King-man	Senior Engineer/L, Drainage Services Department
Mr TANG Yung-fong	Mechanical Inspector/Sewage Treatment 2/3, Drainage Services Department

Dr CHAN Kwok-kuen, Ivan	Marine Parks Officer (Development)2,
Ms CHAN Yuen-man, Stephy	Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Facilities Development & Planning)13, Environmental Protection Department

In Attendance

Mr LI Ho, Thomas	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Ms LEUNG Tin-yee, Christy	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 KAO Hsi-chiang	Chief Health Inspector (Islands)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr TSANG Wai-man	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Ms CHAN Ho-yan, Louisa	Assistant District Commander Lantau District (Administration), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms KWOK Sze-wai, Venus	Police Community Relations Officer (Lantau District), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LEONG Seong-iam, Sammy	Police Community Relations Officer (Marine Port District), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms SIN Kai-wai, Marie	Senior Transport Officer/Islands2, Transport Department
Mr LI Kim-man	Senior Environment Protection Officer (Regional South)5, Environmental Protection Department
Mr CHOW Man-lung, Andrew	Engineer/HK(Distribution 6), Water Supplies Department
Mr PEI Nien-jen, Gordon	Senior Engineer/6 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr WU Tip-ming, Wilson	Senior Field Officer (Agricultural Extension), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Mr TANG Wing-kai, Ricky	Fisheries Officer (Enforcement) 1, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Ms Anthea CHAU	New World First Ferry Services Limited

Secretary

Ms TANG Yuen-shan, Serena	Executive Officer (District Council)2, Islands District Office
---------------------------	--

Absent with Apology

Mr Benny CHAN	Representative, New Lantao Bus Co., (1973) Ltd.
---------------	---

Absent

Mr WONG Chun-yeung	
--------------------	--

Welcoming remarks

The Chairman welcomed representatives from government departments and organisations as well as Members to the first meeting of the Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee (TAFEHCCC) under the Islands District Council (IDC) of the current term.

2. Members noted that Mr Benny CHAN, representative of New Lantao Bus Co., (1973) Ltd. was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

3. The Chairman said that Hong Kong Observatory and Hong Kong Tourism Board were unable to designate representatives in attendance at TAFEHCCC meetings, but would attend meetings at the invitation of TAFEHCCC in the case of discussion on items involving the relevant departments in future.

I. Market Management Consultative Committees of Public Markets under the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (Paper TAFEHCCC 18/2020)

4. The Chairman welcomed Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)² of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to the meeting to present the paper.

5. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang presented the paper.

6. The Chairman invited Members to consider and nominate one District Council (DC) Member to the Market Management Consultative Committee (MMCC) of Peng Chau Market (Peng Chau MMCC), one DC Member to MMCC of Mui Wo Market, Mui Wo Cooked Food Market and Tai O Market (Mui Wo and Tai O MMCC), as well as two DC Members to MMCC of Cheung Chau Market and Cheung Chau Cooked Food Market (Cheung Chau MMCC).

7. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho noticed that two seats were open to DC Members in Cheung Chau MMCC and nominated Mr YUNG Chi-ming to fill the seat because he belonged to Cheung Chau Constituency.

8. Mr YUNG Chi-ming indicated that he had assumed the post in the past and accepted the nomination.

9. Mr Ken WONG nominated Mr HO Chun-fai to be a member of Cheung Chau MMCC because it was learnt that residents of Mr HO Chun-fai's constituency mostly bought food in Cheung Chau Market.

10. Mr HO Chun-fai accepted the nomination.

11. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho did not understand why Mr YUNG Chi-ming, who was a MMCC member, was not included in the list. He asked FEHD and Mr YUNG Chi-ming to give an explanation.
12. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang said that Cheung Chau MMCC used to have three seats which were taken up by DC Members of the constituency and Mr YUNG Chi-ming.
13. Mr Randy YU nominated Mr WONG Man-hon to be a member of Mui Wo and Tai O MMCC because there were more stalls in Tai O Market than Mui Wo Market.
14. Mr Ken WONG nominated himself to serve on Peng Chau MMCC.
15. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho considered FEHD's paper confusing. The paper stated that the MMCC comprised respective DC Members without specifying the inclusion of the chairmen of various rural committees (RCs). As he suggested, the relevant paper in future should specify that the MMCC membership included the chairmen of various RCs to avoid misunderstanding.
16. The Chairman asked FEHD to take note of Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho's views.
17. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang said that FEHD noted Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho's views.
18. Mr FONG Lung-fei enquired how the situation would be dealt with if Mr WONG Man-hon refused to accept nomination since he was not present at the meeting then.
19. The Chairman replied that the relevant procedure would be dealt with in due course.
20. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho enquired whether he could nominate himself to be a member of Cheung Chau MMCC.
21. The Chairman said that he was already a member of the MMCC concerned.
22. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they agreed that Mr Ken WONG served on Peng Chau MMCC.
23. Members voted by a show of hands and endorsed that Mr Ken WONG served on Peng Chau MMCC with 13 votes in favour and two abstentions.

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

24. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they agreed that Mr YUNG Chi-ming served on Cheung Chau MMCC.

25. Members voted by a show of hands and endorsed that Mr YUNG Chi-ming served on Cheung Chau MMCC with 13 votes in favour and two abstentions.

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

26. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they that Mr HO Chun-fai served on Cheung Chau MMCC.

27. Members voted by a show of hands and endorsed that Mr HO Chun-fai served on Cheung Chau MMCC with 12 votes in favour, one against and two abstentions.

(Members voted for included: The Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr YUNG Chi-ming, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho voted against. The Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG and Ms Amy YUNG abstained.)

28. The Chairman enquired whether Mr WONG Man-hon accepted the nomination.

29. Mr WONG Man-hon accepted the nomination.

30. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they agreed that Mr WONG Man-hon served on Mui Wo and Tai O MMCC.

31. Members voted by a show of hands and endorsed that Mr WONG Man-hon served on Mui Wo and Tai O MMCC with 12 votes in favour and four abstentions.

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

(Mr WONG Man-hon joined the meeting at around 10:50 a.m.)

II. Food and Environmental Hygiene Department District Action Plan
(Paper TAFEHCCC 19/2020)

32. The Chairman welcomed Ms LAI Wing-sau, Winsy, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)² of FEHD to the meeting to present the paper.

33. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang briefly presented the paper.

34. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho thanked FEHD for striving for improving environmental hygiene, and requested the Secretariat to put on record.

35. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that, as recently reflected by a resident of Yat Tung Estate, more than 10 rodents were caught at home. According to his observation, there were over 100 rodents in the refuse room of the estate. He enquired whether FEHD would consider the use of cats in rodent control, preventing rodents which had taken baits from dying everywhere including residential premises.

36. Ms Winsy LAI said that based on past experience, the most effective way of rodent control was to eliminate the fundamental survival conditions of rodents, namely food, harbourage and passages. The use of cats in rodent control would not be introduced at this stage. FEHD had taken note of Mr FONG Lung-fei's views and would convey to the relevant section as appropriate.

37. Mr Eric KWOK concurred with Mr FONG Lung-fei in rodent control with natural methods. He pointed out that humans had been using cats for rodent control prior to the invention of bait trap, which could help maintain the ecological balance. As he understood, some poisoned dead dogs and sparrows were found in Ma Wan Chung Tsuen the year before last. It was initially suspected that someone had deliberately poisoned the dogs but was later discovered that FEHD's contractor had placed rodent baits at inappropriate places, reflecting that the use of baits for rodent control might generate other problems. It was learnt that some communities in Japan had a department called "Natural Control" which carried out anti-rodent work by using rodents' predators. This method would not cause pollution to the environment because cats would eat and poop at specific locations. Therefore, he urged FEHD to take note of and consider Members' views and explore the feasibility of introducing cat as a means of rodent control at housing estates, thereby tackling the problem of rodent infestation through biological checks and balances.

38. Mr Ken WONG concurred with Mr FONG Lung-fei and Mr Eric KWOK. According to his observation, there were stray cats on the island with no rodents were in the vicinity; however, after two cats were killed by dogs later, rodents were often seen. Since the baits had failed to attract all rodents, FEHD should consider and explore new methods of rodent control. There were relatively fewer stray dogs in the urban area, so he believed that it would be relatively more effective to use cats for rodent control. He pointed out that at present the effectiveness of setting baits was not as expected. In addition, it was difficult for FEHD to deal with dead rodents which had taken baits and died at hidden places, thereby causing more environmental

hygiene problems.

39. Mr Randy YU said that, as mentioned in paragraph 2 of the Annex “District Action Plan of Islands District in 2020-21” to the Paper, FEHD was responsible for clearing up refuse in “grey areas” such as unallocated government lands and non-gazetted beaches. He pointed out that people often disposed of refuse on the roadside in Mui Wo and FEHD would assist in clearing up the refuse even if private land was involved. However, for some private lands without railings and fences installed, as the refuse was tidily placed inside, it might be meant for recycling. He understood that it was difficult for FEHD’s staff to decide whether such refuse should be removed. He proposed that, if the above situation which had negative impact on environmental hygiene was identified during inspection, FEHD and DC Member of the constituency concerned should work together to confirm with concerned landowners instead of taking action only after DC Members or village representatives had raised the issue.

40. Ms Winsy LAI thanked Members for their views. She stressed that FEHD has adopted multi-pronged strategies to eliminate the food, harbourage and passages of rodents instead of using baits. Regarding the arrangement of placing baits, a prior approval of FEHD’s Pest Control Advisory Section would be obtained before using baits, and notices would be displayed in relevant locations to alert the public after setting baits. FEHD would strengthen the monitoring of environmental hygiene in the district and review the effectiveness of the baits put in use from time to time. FEHD had taken note of Members’ proposal of enhanced interaction and Members were welcome to contact FEHD for facilitating follow-up action.

41. Ms Amy YUNG indicated that poor performance of property management companies (PMCs) or cleaning companies might also cause rodent infestation. She thanked FEHD for deploying staff to help solve environmental hygiene problems at scene even in private place after it had received complaints lodged by Members. She hoped that FEHD would continue to adopt such a proactive working attitude and take anti-rodent measures in response to complaints received.

(Mr Sammy TSUI joined the meeting at around 11:00 a.m.)

- III. Question on anti-mosquito measures taken for prevention of dengue fever
(Paper TAFEHCCC 21/2020)
- IV. Question on various measures of mosquito control
(Paper TAFEHCCC 27/2020)
- V. Question on effectiveness of new mosquito trap
(Paper TAFEHCCC 25/2020)
- VI. Motion on request for provision of additional new mosquito traps in Islands District
(Paper TAFEHCCC 26/2020)

42. The Chairman proposed to discuss Items III to VI together due to relevant contents of these items. She welcomed Ms Winsy LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector

(Islands)2 of FEHD, as well as Mr KWAN Chung-wai, David, District Leisure Manager (Islands) and Ms LAU Hoi-shan, Nelly, Deputy District Leisure Manager (Islands)2 of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the meeting to respond to the questions. The written replies of FEHD and LCSD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting. The motion in Item VI was moved by Mr Sammy TSUI and seconded by Mr FONG Lung-fei.

43. Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr Sammy TSUI and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho briefly introduced the questions respectively.

44. Mr Sammy TSUI briefly introduced the motion.

45. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang expounded on FEHD's written reply.

46. Mr David KWAN expounded on LCSD's written reply. He added that LCSD had not received any complaints about mosquito infestation up to early May 2020. Under contract requirements, LCSD's term contractors would provide staff with induction training upon appointment and refresher training on an annual basis afterwards. LCSD conducted monthly performance appraisal on cleaning contractors and the appraisals would be set out in the report on the management of LCSD's recreational and sports facilities in Islands District at meetings of District Facilities Management Committee.

47. Mr Sammy TSUI expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thanked FEHD for arranging a site inspection for him and Mr LEE Ka-ho last week. He, together with FEHD, had paid district visits many times for understanding the anti-mosquito work. In recent months, many residents had complained about the serious mosquito problem in both public and private housing estates, and the problem was particularly serious above the 18th floor in Century Link and The Visionary. According to his understanding and observation, the frontline staff of FEHD had carried out weeding and poured mosquito larvicidal oil into the drains. There was strong smell of engine oil at locations where mosquito larvicidal oil had been sprayed, which might cause nuisance to residents of lower or even upper floors. He was also worried that mosquito larvicidal oil might also put butterflies or other animals to death.
- (b) He opined that mosquito trapping devices were effective in mosquito control, but there were only 10 mosquito trapping devices between Ying Tung Estate and Caribbean Coast and the number was too small. Understanding that there might be no changes to the contracts of this year, he hoped that FEHD would consider providing additional mosquito trapping devices for more effective anti-mosquito work.

- (c) He noticed that mosquito trapping devices were protected by metal cages in some public housing estates to prevent mosquito trapping devices from being damaged.

48. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thanked FEHD for implementing proactive measures for rodent and mosquito control. However, he thought that the effectiveness was limited, and FEHD's efforts might sometimes become futile due to rain. He was also opposed to the use of pesticide because other beneficial insects would also be affected. He supported the use of mosquito trapping devices with new design by FEHD, but there were only 26 devices installed in the entire area of Tung Chung. He proposed that FEHD should install additional mosquito trapping devices because a large number of mosquitoes died after the installation.
- (b) He and FEHD had explored the application of mosquito larvicidal oil at the new town and implemented the anti-mosquito work within the housing estates. However, as the new town was surrounded by villages, the difficulty of mosquito control was thus increased. The environmental hygiene of many villages was poor. For example, the private agricultural land beside Yat Tung Estate was full of water pools and weeds, and the planters on Yu Tung Road were also overgrown with weeds. The Highways Department (HyD) and LCSD were responsible for following up on the planters and FEHD would take further follow-up action after removal of weeds. He requested the Islands District Office (IsDO) to liaise with these three departments for tackling the mosquito problem and to assist in liaising with respective DC Members of the rural area to jointly solve the problem.

49. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that mosquito infestation in Yat Tung Estate was serious. Citing Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site as an example, some people started doing exercise at 4:00 a.m. at the site where large mosquitoes were found. The refuse bin provided there was not cleared for one whole week. The storm water accumulated in the plastic bag inside the rubbish bin would easily cause breeding of mosquitoes and insects. He urged the departments concerned to promptly follow up lest the site should become a source of infection for dengue fever.

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

- (a) He recognised the government departments' efforts in anti-mosquito work and held that the implementation of mosquito control measures at areas around Man Tung Road and the park was good. As there were many construction sites in Tung Chung, he enquired how FEHD would monitor the anti-mosquito work in these sites, and requested FEHD to provide data on inspection and prosecution. Regarding penalties, since site works such as excavation of sewers might last for a few months and the responsible units of construction sites might ignore the

warning letters issued by FEHD, he enquired whether the responsible units of construction sites had to bear the relevant responsibilities.

- (b) As gravid traps and mosquito trapping devices were mentioned in LCSD's written reply, he requested FEHD to provide detailed information for understanding the effectiveness in mosquito control and the comparison with new mosquito trapping devices in terms of effectiveness. He enquired whether FEHD's written reply had provided any information on the LPG mosquito traps installed in Tung Chung North Park.

51. Mr HO Siu-kei said that he had explored with FEHD the provision of mosquito trapping devices last year. Residents who were relaxing in park or waterfront promenade used to suffer from mosquito bites frequently in the past, but residents' complaints had substantially decreased during the wet season this year, showing that mosquito control was effective. Tung Chung town centre was previously a rural area near the sea with many hills and trees, and later more buildings had been completed. In his opinion, breeding of mosquitoes and insects could be prevented by keeping the environment clean and avoiding accumulation of miscellaneous items.

52. Ms Amy YUNG said that there were a lot of mosquitoes in the entire Islands District (including new towns and rural areas). She pointed out that FEHD was not responsible for the management of private premises such as the private areas in Discovery Bay. She proposed that FEHD should provide management offices of private places and cleaning companies with information on mosquito trapping devices and update them with the latest methods and strategies of mosquito control. Besides, as there was no notice board erected in her area, she disseminated information to residents mainly through her web page in the social networking site Facebook and by email. She therefore requested FEHD to provide the electronic files of the relevant information and posters to her for informing the residents the methods of mosquito control.

53. Ms WONG Chau-ping indicated that Tung Chung was an urban area surrounded by villages, thus having a more serious mosquito problem than other areas. There were altogether 19 old villages in Tung Chung, but only 26 mosquito trapping devices were provided in the whole area. She enquired of FEHD about the effectiveness of mosquito trapping devices and, if the effectiveness was significant, whether additional mosquito trapping devices would be provided in Tung Chung. Since basins, open channels and woodland in villages were mosquito breeding sites, she reminded FEHD of paying attention to the geographical environment of villages and strengthening the anti-mosquito work accordingly.

54. Mr Sammy TSUI said that the carrying out of anti-mosquito work by FEHD alone might not suffice. To his understanding, some works were in progress beside The Visionary. He had liaised with the company concerned and observed that some of its staff carried sprayers at their back for applying mosquito larvicidal oil. He queried if such method was effective. He proposed that IsDO and FEHD should

write to private housing estates, PMCs, owners' corporations, owners' committees, schools and construction companies, requesting them to step up mosquito control and recommending effective tools or facilities for mosquito control to them. He indicated that if the anti-mosquito work was implemented on government land only, there was still room for movement of mosquitoes to hiding places. In this connection, he suggested that IsDO should assist in liaising with management offices of private and public housing estates for conducting anti-mosquito operations to further enhance the effectiveness of mosquito control.

55. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that the old villages in Tung Chung occupied a vast area. If mosquito trapping devices were to be provided in the area, she suggested that concerned departments should co-operate and discuss a desirable distribution of mosquito trapping devices. Mosquitoes would die after entering the mosquito trapping devices and touching the water therein. If the mosquitoes did not die, she enquired whether the food contaminated by those mosquitoes would be harmful to people.

56. Ms Winsy LAI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) FEHD would monitor the use of pesticide, including the dosage of pesticide used each time and frequency of usage. Before using pesticide, FEHD would conduct site visit to proposed locations to assess the suitability of using pesticide thereat (including new mosquito trapping devices) and would put up notices.
- (b) Regarding anti-mosquito measures, FEHD had invited Members to inspect fogging operations, during which, supervisors were present at scene to ensure that the public would not approach the fogging area. In response to some Members' concern over the impact of fogging operation on residents of lower floors, she stressed that FEHD would pay attention to the wind direction and minimise the impact of the operation on residents as much as possible.
- (c) She understood that Members were desirous of providing additional new mosquito trapping devices, but stressed that it was of utmost importance to remove stagnant water and called on the public to take precautions against the mosquito problem. There were some limitations on using the new mosquito trapping devices. Firstly, the water inside the mosquito trapping devices had to reach a certain level so that mosquitoes could reach the water and lay eggs inside the devices. Secondly, the new mosquito trapping devices were large in size and had to be placed on flat places. Thirdly, the devices had to be placed at locations without direct sunlight. Lastly, mosquito trapping devices could only kill female mosquitoes but not male ones. FEHD would not rely on specific mosquito control methods because different kinds of pesticides might be used depending on circumstances. FEHD would apply pesticide in prudent manner.

- (d) FEHD supported the inter-departmental mosquito operations launched by Pest Control Steering Committee (PCSC). If Members considered it necessary for IsDO to assume the co-ordinating role, FEHD was willing to render full support.
- (e) Regarding posters and promotional leaflets, she thought that in the light of the experience in the previous year, FEHD might provide the relevant information to IsDO for distribution to various housing estates by mail. FEHD had uploaded a lot of information on mosquito control to its website including the Anti-mosquito Weekly Inspection Programmes. She would provide Ms Amy YUNG with the relevant hyperlinks after the meeting to facilitate reading by the public.
- (f) She would provide Mr LEE Ka-ho with prosecution figures of individual areas after the meeting.
- (g) As regards Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site mentioned by Mr FONG Lung-fei, she understood that the location was a picnic site and would discuss with Mr FONG after the meeting. She would also liaise with other departments for follow-up and site inspection when necessary.

(Post-meeting note: In the first half of 2020, FEHD had instituted two prosecutions involving mosquito problem in construction site in Islands District.)

57. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that regarding Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site, some people would burn incense for worshipping beside the big tree at the picnic site and he had advised them not to do so. He hoped that FEHD would put up notices and pay close attention to the situation.

58. Mr Sammy TSUI indicated that FEHD had not given a formal response to whether additional new mosquito trapping devices would be provided. He did not object to FEHD for adopting a two-pronged approach for mosquito control, including application of mosquito larvicidal oil, weeding and fogging operation, as well as putting in place new mosquito trapping devices. The new mosquito trapping devices were still functional to mosquito control although they could eliminate female mosquitoes only. It was a daily routine to remove stagnant water. However, although there was no stagnant water on walkways, mosquito infestation was serious in Yat Tung (II) Estate. He did not know from where the mosquitoes came. In his opinion, many locations such as planters were suitable for placing new mosquito trapping devices, which would not occupy much space. He suggested that FEHD should draw reference from the practice of the Housing Department (HD) to cover mosquito trapping devices with hoods. As he understood that there was resource constraint for FEHD, he did not request FEHD for providing 100 or 200 additional new mosquito trapping devices within this year. He only hoped that FEHD would consider Members' views and explore provision of additional new mosquito trapping devices to enhance the effectiveness of the anti-mosquito work.

59. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that refuse would also cause breeding of mosquitoes in addition to water pools. Since a lot of abandoned construction waste had been piled up on a road section at Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site, she had liaised with the relevant departments for this, but had no idea whether it should be followed up by FEHD, IsDO or the District Lands Office (DLO). She requested the relevant departments to take note of Members' views and expeditiously follow up on the matter.

60. Mr FONG Lung-fei said that as he understood, there was a banyan tree in Yat Tung Estate, and the trunk of which had many small holes. When the holes were filled with storm water, there would be breeding of mosquitoes. He pointed out that there were many banyan trees in the surrounding area of Yat Tung Estate which might become the black spots of mosquito problem.

61. The Chairman enquired whether FEHD would explore with departments such as HD and LCSD for using the same model of mosquito trapping devices, increasing the number of mosquito trapping devices and extending their coverage.

62. Ms Winsy LAI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She stressed that FEHD did not deny the importance of new mosquito trapping devices which would be widely used. As regards the 2 700 mosquito trapping devices mentioned in the written reply, FEHD had placed 1 300 devices throughout the territory and the remaining 1 400 devices were provided by other departments. Since Mosquito trapping devices were only effective within a specific area, an even distribution would achieve more desirable results. For private housing estates which had procured mosquito trapping devices on their own, FEHD's devices would be placed at a certain distance from them. FEHD noted the proposal of IsDO being the lead department and would discuss and study with the relevant departments.
- (b) FEHD started using the new mosquito trapping devices on a pilot basis in May 2019. After a three-month trial, FEHD recommended these devices for use by other departments in view of the efficacy. In view of the positive response from other departments after the trial use of the mosquito trapping devices, FEHD recommended them to three bureaux and 21 departments present at a PCSC meeting this year. He hoped that the departments concerned and Members would co-operate with FEHD's anti-mosquito work. FEHD was conducting a baseline study of the new mosquito trapping devices, which would last for about three to four months to check their effectiveness during the rainy season, thereby understanding whether they were placed at suitable locations. FEHD would generally choose relatively flat and hidden locations to minimise external interference. If a mosquito trapping device was placed at a location with frequent movement of small animals, it might be overturned and its effectiveness would be affected. FEHD would

consider increasing the number of mosquito trapping devices after identifying suitable locations and reaching consensus with other departments.

- (c) Regarding offering of sacrifices at Wong Lung Hang Picnic Site, it was learnt that the activities would not have impact on environmental hygiene. For this reason, FEHD might not display warning notices but would check whether the locations concerned were within the ambit of FEHD.
- (d) As regards the issue of construction waste raised by Ms WONG Chau-ping, she pointed out that matters related to construction waste were outside the purview of FEHD. FEHD would conduct a site inspection with the department concerned after the meeting.

63. Mr Thomas LI said that after cases of dengue fever occurred in mid-April, the Government's PCSC had convened meetings to urge departments concerned to step up the anti-mosquito work. IsDO had all along been actively participating in mosquito control work such as allocation of funds to departments such as HD, FEHD and LCSD through the District-led Actions Scheme (DAS) for implementing the work. A dedicated working group comprising members from departments such as FEHD, HyD and IsDO was formed in the district, which would convene meetings on a regular basis for discussion of prevention and control of mosquito infestation. The frequency of carrying out anti-mosquito work by concerned departments mostly ranged from once a week to one to two times a month on average. He thanked Members for suggesting more black spots of mosquito infestation, and assisting in promoting anti-mosquito messages at places of higher indices of mosquito problem such as Cheung Chau. IsDO would continue the collaboration with other departments to step up the anti-mosquito work in the rainy season.

64. Mr Eric KWOK said that the areas for mosquito control covered abandoned agricultural land and private land, involving weeding and removal of refuse, construction waste and stagnant water which required the co-operation of various departments including HyD, LandsD and FEHD and LCSD. In this connection, he suggested that IsDO should take the lead to organise inter-departmental anti-mosquito operation at an interval of about three months, thus resolving the problem of lacking co-ordination among departments.

65. Mr CHAN Lin-wai concurred with Mr Eric KWOK, but remarked that the situation would become more complicated if private land was involved. He pointed out that when people lodged complaints about the problems of dense vegetation or stagnant water on land in the vicinity, they might not be able to know whether it was private or government land. Therefore, most of them would write to IsDO which would refer the cases to LandsD. If the cases concerned were found to be involving private land, LandsD could only write to respective owners according to procedure, requesting them to remove stagnant water or dense vegetation. If the location concerned was uninhabited, the complaint would simply be left unsettled. To his understanding, similar problems frequently occurred in Lamma Island, he was thus

afraid that it would be difficult to put Mr Eric KWOK's suggestion into action.

66. Mr YUNG Chi-ming said that when cases of dengue fever were identified last year, government departments collaborated to conduct anti-mosquito work and the result was satisfactory. He said that various government departments often referred cases to other departments on grounds that the locations concerned fell outside their ambit. Therefore, he hoped that IsDO could take up the leading role to co-ordinate all parties concerned to carry out the anti-mosquito work even at private lands.

67. Mr Randy YU agreed to the suggestions of Mr YUNG Chi-ming and Mr Eric KWOK and proposed that IsDO should give further consideration. Noting that DAS included routine anti-mosquito work, he proposed that IsDO should regularly conduct inter-departmental anti-mosquito operations when resources permitted and report the details and effectiveness of operations at TAFEHCCC meetings. Assistance from Members might also be sought when necessary. He would propose amendments to the motion in due course.

68. The Chairman enquired whether Members had any amendments or other comments regarding the motion moved by Mr Sammy TSUI.

69. Mr Randy YU said that with the rapid development of technology, he was worried that after the motion was passed and the procurement process had commenced, the new mosquito trap "In2CareTrap" might not be the latest model. To address the problem of mosquito infestation in the district and allow for flexibility in procurement, he proposed to amend the motion as follows: "I request FEHD to provide additional new mosquito trapping devices (with the specifications equivalent to or higher than that of "In2CareTrap") in Islands District to tackle the mosquito problem in the district."

70. The Chairman pointed out that if a Member proposed amendments to a motion, Members should first vote on whether they agreed to the proposed amendments before voting on the motion.

71. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho thought that after Members had endorsed the motion, FEHD might take follow-up action within a short time. Therefore, it was not necessary to amend the motion. Since the mosquito trapping devices currently in use were highly effective, he believed that FEHD recommended departments for extensive use of the devices only after it had received sufficient feedback.

72. Mr Sammy TSUI concurred with Mr Randy YU's proposal. He enquired of FEHD how long it would take to procure mosquito trapping devices. He was concerned that if it would take two to three years for procurement, newer models of mosquito trapping devices might have come out during this period and the procurement would be subject to FEHD's resources availability at that time.

73. Ms Winsy LAI said that FEHD was open-minded about providing additional mosquito trapping devices, but it needed to identify suitable locations for

their placement at first. Therefore, FEHD mainly focused on the baseline study at this stage. According to the experience last year, the study would take about two to three months spanning cross the rainy season. Staff of FEHD would conduct weekly inspection to ensure that the locations concerned would not be affected by external disturbance. If the study findings revealed that the locations were suitable, FEHD would take forward the proposal as soon as possible. FEHD shared the experience in mosquito control with various departments every month and had provided the relevant information to various departments, private housing estates, public housing estates and schools to promote anti-mosquito messages. She said that FEHD generally would not use mosquito trapping devices of specific brands, but would ensure that the performance of the devices used was up to standard.

74. Ms WONG Chau-ping concurred with Mr Randy YU's justification of amending the motion to include the requirement of "choosing a device with equivalent or better quality" to avoid the possible limitations on procuring new mosquito trapping devices.

75. Mr Thomas LI indicated that IsDO would promptly liaise with Members after the meeting to collect information on black spots of mosquito infestation, and then follow up with the departments concerned.

76. Mr Ken WONG opined that the view of Mr Sammy TSUI should be sought because Mr Randy YU had just enquired of Mr Sammy TSUI if he agreed to the amendment. He pointed out that the amendment could ensure enhanced flexibility of FEHD in procurement of new mosquito trapping devices.

77. The Chairman enquired whether Mr Sammy TSUI agreed to the amendment.

78. Mr Sammy TSUI agreed to the amendment.

79. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on the proposed amendment raised by Mr Randy YU.

80. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 16 votes in favour, one against and no abstention. The amendment was endorsed.

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

81. The Chairman invited Mr Randy YU to read out the amended motion.

82. Mr Randy YU read out the amended motion as follows:

“When compared with pesticide, the new mosquito trap ‘In2CareTrap’ has less impact on the environment and human body. The principle is to use insect growth regulator which will prevent the adult mosquitoes from laying eggs and kill adult mosquitoes within a few days. The Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had carried out a field testing in country parks in 2019, the results of which showed that the mosquito trapping devices are very effective. It is believed that the mosquito trapping devices will be suitable for use in Islands District which is widely covered with trees and other vegetation. Therefore, I move to request FEHD to provide additional new mosquito trapping devices (with the specifications equivalent to or higher than that of ‘In2CareTrap’) in Islands District to tackle the mosquito problem in the district.” The above amended motion was seconded by Ms WONG Chau-ping.

83. Mr HO Chun-fai said that after the buffaloes trod on the farmland in Pui O, water puddles were formed, causing serious problem of stagnant water. As a result, there was silting in the watercourses in the area, leading to frequent flooding and inundated farmland when it rained. He suggested that when IsDO discussed with other departments the solutions in future, it should avoid asking the landowners to clear the puddles as they would certainly refuse.

84. Mr Thomas LI reiterated that IsDO would promptly liaise with Members to learn about the black spots of mosquito infestation in Islands District after the meeting and would explore solutions.

85. Mr HO Chun-fai requested IsDO to give a detailed explanation to Members and relevant departments at the meeting to avoid misunderstanding. He proposed that a balance should be struck among the interests of all parties concerned when working out solutions.

86. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that there were some big trees growing in the abandoned private land in the district while the branches of some of these trees might have extended beyond the area of private land. IsDO and LandsD had pointed out that if the roots of a tree were located on private land, the Government could not deal with such branches even if they had posed potential hazard to the residents. At present, there were many dead trees in the rural area seriously endangering the safety of pedestrians. She would follow up on the problem with IsDO after the meeting, and was discontented with the relevant departments for shirking their responsibility onto one another.

87. Mr Thomas LI said that IsDO would closely follow up.

88. Mr Randy YU reminded the Chairman of voting on the amended motion according to the Standing Orders although the proposed amendment had just been endorsed.

89. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that he had previously proposed at a meeting to take voting for an amended motion twice. However, some Members said that it was

IDC's established practice of voting once only. Members might check the minutes of the meeting if necessary. He was concerned that the voting results in the past might become invalid if the amended motion currently involved two rounds of voting.

90. Mr Randy YU believed that it was necessary to first clarify the Standing Orders. As he recalled, the amendment to the Standing Orders had not yet been completed at the time Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho raised the question. Members agreed to vote only once for the amended motion then. Nevertheless, at two subsequent meetings chaired by him, when a Member proposed amendment to a motion, the amendment had to be endorsed before putting the amended motion to vote. The same practice was also adopted at the previous Traffic and Transport Committee (T&TC) meeting. Should any Members considered it necessary to make amendment to the provision of the Standing Orders in this respect, they had to first obtain the consent of other Members.

91. Mr Eric KWOK said that Mr Randy YU had a correct understanding of the Standing Orders. Members should first endorse the amendment and then vote on the amended motion.

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

93. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 16 votes in favour, no against and one abstention. The amended motion was endorsed.

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

94. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said paragraph 28 of the minutes of the IDC meeting on 2 March 2020 stated that: "Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that a vote should be taken on whether the provisional motion should be processed first having regard to the experience at the previous meeting. If over half of the Members voted in favour, the provisional motion should be accepted." He also said the minutes of the T&TC meeting on 23 March 2020 stated that: "Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho hoped that the motion could be passed at this meeting and proposed amendments to the motion". As he understood at that time, Members needed to vote only once on the amended motion. Worrying that there might be misunderstanding, he asked the Chairman to make clarification. He further cited the above minutes of meeting which stated that: 'The Chairman said that according to procedures, the amended motion had to be dealt with first and needed to be seconded by a Member. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho proposed that the motion be amended as 'IDC proposed that TD should start formulating rules to regulate village vehicles in Cheung Chau, Lamma Island and Peng Chau'. The Chairman said that the amended motion moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho was seconded by Mr LEE Ka-ho. He asked Members to vote on the amended motion by

a show of hands. Members voted on the motion by a show of hands. There were six voted for, no against and eight abstaining. (Members voted for included: the Chairman Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung. Members abstained included: the Vice-Chairman Mr HO Siu-kei, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr HO Chun-fai, Ms WONG Chau-ping and Ms LAU Shun-ting.) The Chairman said that Section 1(7) of the IDC Standing Orders stipulated that, 'In the Standing Orders, an absolute majority of votes means more than half of the valid votes cast excluding abstentions. A simple majority vote means the highest number of valid votes exceeds the second highest number of valid votes'. He announced that the motion was passed." The agenda item was closed afterwards. He pointed out that it was the practice of IDC to deal with two matters by undergoing the voting procedure for one time.

95. Mr Eric KWOK clarified that Members (including Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho) agreed at the T&TC meeting on 23 March 2020 that the agenda item concerning village vehicles be dealt with by the T&TC Working Group. Therefore, it was not necessary to vote on Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho's amendment.

96. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said that the focus of the current discussion was on whether one or two rounds of voting on an amended motion was required. He was worried that the voting results in the past might become invalid if Members had different understanding of the issue.

VII. Question on monitoring of used clothes collection bin near 21 Yung Shue Wan Main Street, Lamma Island
(Paper TAFEHCCC 22/2020)

97. The Chairman welcomed Dr Jeffrey HUNG, Senior Manager, Policy Research and Advocacy; Ms Natalie SUM, Community Engagement Officer II; and Ms Eunice YAM, Programme Officer I of Friends of the Earth (HK) to the meeting to give response. The written replies of the Home Affairs Department (HAD) and Friends of the Earth (HK) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

98. Ms LAU Shun-ting briefly introduced the question.

99. Dr Jeffrey HUNG briefly introduced the written reply.

100. Ms LAU Shun-ting said that, as she learnt, a used clothes collection bin would be provided in Sok Kwu Wan of Lamma Island. She proposed that the design of the old collection bins should be improved.

101. Dr Jeffrey HUNG said that clothes were often stolen from collection bins in Wan Chai District for resale and there were about 10 theft cases every two to three months on an average. He opined that the problem should be addressed according to the circumstances. For used clothes collection bins placed at secluded places,

anti-theft and security board was useful to a certain extent. The more effective anti-theft methods were to increase the frequency of collecting clothes from collection bins and encourage people to put clothes into the bins one by one. For collection bins placed at conspicuous locations (such as at the entrance of Cheung Chau Market), the anti-theft and security board might be removed so that clothes could be put inside the collection bin more easily.

102. Ms LAU Shun-ting believed that it was not common for people to steal clothes from the used clothes collection bin in Yung Shue Wan of Lamma Island because it was placed at a conspicuous location. She enquired whether Friends of the Earth (HK) could adopt the way of dealing with collection bins in Cheung Chau. Besides, she thanked FEHD for assisting in clearing up moldy clothes and spraying anti-mosquito liquid near collection bins to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. She said that when used clothes collection bins were full, she and the RC concerned would notify Friends of the Earth (HK) by telephone, urging it to closely monitor the situation.

103. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho suggested Friends of the Earth (HK) re-design the used clothes collection bins. As he observed, some women were unable to pull open the collection bin and could only put the clothes beside the bin. Besides, the location of the used clothes collection bin in Cheung Chau was undesirable because it was placed adjacent to a refuse collection point and the market exit where there was always stagnant water on the ground. He had reflected this to Friends of the Earth (HK) and would follow up with the organisation after the meeting.

104. Dr Jeffrey HUNG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The existing used clothes collection bin was designed by HAD and focused on the anti-theft feature. The four participating non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were using this kind of collection bins throughout the territory. Since these collection bins were put to use for just three years, it would be a wastage to replace them all. Friends of the Earth (HK) would negotiate with HAD for improving the valve design of the collection bins.
- (b) He understood that the used clothes collection bin in Cheung Chau was situated in front of the market entrance and there were a lot of refuse piled up in the vicinity all the time, making it difficult to differentiate refuse from used clothes. He had liaised with HAD and LCSD for identifying a more convenient location with better environmental hygiene for relocation of the used clothes collection bin. Nevertheless, LCSD replied that no location was available for relocation.
- (c) As regards the used clothes collection bin in Lamma Island, if Members considered that the existing location was suitable and less susceptible to theft, the organisation might arrange to remove the anti-theft board. He stressed that co-operation of the public was also needed and called

on people to put used clothes into the collection bin one by one instead of placing them beside the collection bin. He also invited DC Members to help with the publicity and call the organisation's hotline when the collection bins were almost full for collection of clothes within 24 to 48 hours.

105. Mr CHAN Lin-wai pointed out that when used clothes collection bins were first introduced, Friends of the Earth (HK) undertook to ensure that they would not have impact on the environment in concerned areas. He was discontented that the collection bins were often full, the hygiene condition was poor in the vicinity, and the miscellaneous items piled up by shop operators or hawkers beside the collection bins were not cleared. As RC had received many related complaints and the workload of FEHD and LandsD had been increased, he requested Friends of the Earth (HK) to make improvement as soon as possible.

VIII. Question on setting up District Health Centre
(Paper TAFEHCCC 23/2020)

106. The Chairman said that the written reply of the Food and Health Bureau (FHB) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

107. Ms WONG Chau-ping briefly introduced the question.

108. The Chairman said that as FHB did not attend the meeting to respond to the question, the Secretariat would take down Members' enquiries in the minutes of meeting for follow-up.

109. Mr LEE Ka-ho was disappointed with FHB and the Department of Health for not attending the meeting to respond to enquiries, hoping the Secretariat to put it on record in the minutes of meeting. He had raised a similar question at another meeting earlier and FHB also did not attend the meeting to give response. He said, as stated in FHB's written reply, the Government expected that invitation for proposals from NGOs for operation of District Health Centre (DHC) Express would be made in the third quarter of 2020. He enquired whether FHB had identified the locations for operating DHC Express since open invitation for application by organisations was to be made. He believed that all Members had grave concern over the timetable for the completion of DHC Express and the location. He pointed out that the situation of Islands District was special in that the areas were scattered, thus Members were particularly concerned about the location of DHC Express in Islands District. For example, if locating in Tung Chung, it could not cater for the needs of residents in other outlying islands. He urged FHB to take into account the scattering characteristic of Islands District when identifying suitable site so as to meet the needs of various areas. He thought that FHB's written reply had not provided the information that people wanted and hoped that the Secretariat would follow up.

110. Ms LAU Shun-ting said that since FHB did not attend the meeting to respond to the question, she requested the Secretariat to record her views in the

minutes of the meeting. She pointed out that FHB was promoting DHC and DHC Express only through a website at present. However, there were many elderly persons in Islands District who might not be able to get the information via the website. She proposed that FHB should step up publicity such as displaying posters or holding seminars, so that more residents could learn the details of DHC and DHC Express.

111. Mr Eric KWOK proposed that FHB be invited to attend the next meeting to explain the details of DHC and DHC Express. He concurred with Mr LEE Ka-ho that the geographical environment of Islands District was special as the areas were scattered. For example, Peng Chau, Lamma Island, Cheung Chau, Lantau Island, Tung Chung, Mui Wo and Tai O were very far apart from each other geographically. He proposed that the Secretariat should write to FHB requesting it to attend the meeting to explain the details of the scheme and listen to Members' views. He also proposed that FHB should consider the special circumstances of Islands District and set up several DHCs in various areas to meet the need of Islands District residents.

112. Ms WONG Chau-ping was disappointed with FHB for not attending the meeting to respond to the question. She cited FHB's written reply as follows: "In a bid to shift the emphasis of the present healthcare system and people's mindset from treatment-oriented to prevention-focused, the Government is committed to enhancing district-based primary healthcare services by setting up DHCs in 18 districts progressively". She considered this very important. She proposed that the Secretariat should write to FHB requesting a detailed explanation of "from treatment-oriented to prevention-focused". Besides, as raised in the third point of the question, she enquired whether substations under DHC Express in Islands District would be provided due to the scattered areas/outlying islands. However, as FHB's written reply did not mention about provision of substations in Islands District, she requested the Secretariat to write to FHB requesting for a reply.

113. Mr Randy YU believed that all Members were in favour of establishing DHC Express. As other Members were, he was discontented with FHB for providing a written reply only without attending the meeting. He considered FHB's written reply impractical and discontented that it did not reply to the third point in the question. He wanted FHB to explain where DHC Express would be set up and whether substations would be provided. He also wanted FHB to attend the meeting for explaining the details and listening to Members' views for further consideration of resource allocation. Members had just pointed out that the various areas in Islands District were far apart from each other, FHB had to consider the need of residents in various areas of Islands District when identifying the service location. He pointed out that if it was provided in Tung Chung which had more population, then how residents in Cheung Chau, Lamma Island and South Lantau could use the service. While residents of South Lantau might travel to Tung Chung by car, residents of Lamma Island would need to travel a long way to and from Tung Chung and might find it difficult to make transport arrangement. He really could not understand how the relevant parties could come up with the idea. Since all Members agreed that the scheme was very important in alleviating the burden on the healthcare system, he opined that FHB might be invited once again to give a detailed reply or attend the next meeting to give response.

114. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to FHB requesting it to attend the next meeting for giving detailed answers to enquiries raised by Members.

(Post-meeting note: The IDC Secretariat had relayed the views of the Committee to FHB.)

IX. Question on sewers at waterfront of Lamma Island
(Paper TAFEHCCC 24/2020)

115. The Chairman welcomed Ms Winsy LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector (Islands)² of FEHD; Mr CHEUNG King-man, Senior Engineer/L and Mr TANG Yung-fong, Mechanical Inspector/Sewage Treatment ²/₃ of the Drainage Services Department (DSD); as well as Mr LI Kim-man, Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional South)⁵ of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of FEHD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

116. Mr Eric KWOK briefly introduced the question.

117. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang expounded on FEHD's written reply.

118. Mr CHEUNG King-man said that DSD had implemented sewerage works in Lamma Island, installing sewers to collect sewage of villages and coastal restaurants, which would be transported to sewage treatment works (STW) in Yung Shue Wan and Sok Kwu Wan for treatment, and then be discharged into the sea through submarine outfalls. The sewers were installed far away from the coastal restaurants. He invited Mr TANG Yung-fong to explain the sewage treatment procedure of STW.

119. Mr TANG Yung-fong said that DSD had provided secondary sewage treatment plants (biological treatment) in Yung Shue Wan and Sok Kwu Wan respectively. Sewage would first undergo primary treatment, including screening and removal of large solid waste with machinery, enhanced treatment at grit channels and grease traps, and biological and chemical treatment with membrane bioreactors mainly for decomposition of organic materials, and then be discharged into the sea. The quality of treated sewage discharged into the sea was in compliance with the licensing requirement of EPD's Water Pollution Control Ordinance, including the levels of suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand and E. coli.

120. Mr LI Kim-man said that pursuant to the Water Pollution Control Ordinance, venues that would create sewage (such as food establishments) were required to first treat sewage properly before discharging it into storm water drains or waters of Hong Kong unless sewage was discharged into communal sewers. Moreover, sewage discharged could not exceed the standards of discharges stipulated under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance. During inspection, EPD's law

enforcement officers would take sewage samples for testing if necessary. Enforcement action would certainly be taken if sewage disposal was found to have exceeded the standard. Apart from the person who discharged sewage, any person who caused or permitted to discharge polluting matter into waters in a water control zone also committed an offence. Upon conviction, such persons were liable to a fine of \$200,000 and imprisonment for six months for a first offence, a fine of \$400,000 for a second or subsequent offence, and if the offence was a continuing offence, to a fine of \$10,000 for each day during the offence had continued. Effluent discharge just mentioned by the representative of DSD referred to discharge through submarine outfalls. According to the monitoring data collected by EPD, no effluent discharge exceeding the relevant standards had been detected.

121. Ms LAU Shun-ting expressed her views as follows:

- (a) Sewerage works were carried out in Yung Shue Wan and Sok Kwu Wan of Lamma Island respectively. Lamma Island (South) RC, Lamma Island (North) RC and IDC Members had been in liaison with departments such as DSD, FEHD and EPD since works commencement. Being a relatively large project in Lamma Island, it had all along been receiving attention.
- (b) Two chairpersons of RCs and the village representatives had all along been monitoring the progress of the project. Most of the phase one works would be carried out at main streets at coastal area, i.e. the location to which Mr Eric KWOK's question referred, whereas the first part of the phase two in the villages. The phase one works at Sok Kwu Wan had been completed. Regarding the first part of the phase two works, i.e., the drainage works of various villages in Yung Shue Wan, DSD, FEHD and EPD had always been in liaison with concerned village representatives to follow up on the works progress and monitor the water quality at open coastal waters.
- (c) Members and village representatives would from time to time conduct inspection. They, together with the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and the Marine Department, would also monitor the pollution level of seawater to examine whether the water quality at mariculture rafts and open coastal waters would be affected.

122. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) As mentioned in the written reply of FEHD, "operators were required to install grease traps that were compliant with the design standards and connect the grease traps to an appropriate sewerage system". He requested FEHD to provide the number of cases involving connection problems.

- (b) As stated in the written reply of FEHD, “grease traps were operating properly on the whole”. He considered the reply too vague. He enquired whether FEHD had indicated that problems with grease traps had occurred, and therefore wanted FEHD to provide the relevant information. He also enquired what FEHD would do if grease traps were not functioning properly, were operating over capacity or having other problems.
- (c) The representative of DSD had just indicated that sewage would be discharged to the sea after decomposition of organic materials at STW. He enquired of EPD whether the treated sewage could be discharged into the sea only when the water quality had met all the relevant standards. He continued to enquire of EPD when it would monitor the water quality of sewage which DSD claimed to be complying with the discharge standards and would be discharged into the sea, and when it would conduct spot check of the quality of seawater at the two beaches mentioned and publish the relevant report.

123. Ms Winsy LAI said that according to records, FEHD had not received any complaint about sewage discharged from food establishments in the past 12 months. As regards the written reply which stated that “grease traps were operating properly on the whole”, it was an observation from a holistic and macro perspective. After sewage passed through the H-shaped pipe inside a grease trap, the grease trapped would float on the water surface and most of the grease contained in sewage had been basically removed then. The surface of a grease trap would be cleared up regularly, or else the performance would be affected. If FEHD staff identified that the grease on grease traps had not been cleared up regularly, they would require the person-in-charge of the food establishment concerned to take action in accordance with the licensing conditions and would issue warning if deemed necessary. FEHD would take further action if the irregularity had not been rectified by the deadline. She reiterated that FEHD had received no such complaints, and that grease traps were operating properly on the whole as observed during inspection with no verbal warning issued so far. She stressed that FEHD would continue to conduct regular spot check and take follow-up action when irregularities were identified.

124. Mr CHEUNG King-man said that regarding the quality of effluent treated by STW, DSD would regularly and randomly take water samples for tests to ensure the compliance of treated effluent with licence requirement. DSD would maintain close liaison with EPD and ensure that the water quality had met the standard.

125. Mr LI Kim-man responded as follows:

- (a) EPD monitored the water quality of the waters and beaches of Hong Kong on a regular basis. Regarding the waters of Hong Kong, there were two main gazetted beaches in Sok Kwu Wan and Yung Shue Wan of Lamma Island respectively, namely Lo So Shing Beach and Hung Shing Yeh Beach. EPD conducted regular monitoring of the water quality of the two beaches and, as shown in the latest monitoring data

of beaches, the water quality of the two beaches was rated “good”. Regarding water quality, EPD monitored the marine water quality every month at the waters off Sok Kwu Wan, the power station and beach at Yung Shue Wan. The water quality at the three monitoring stations were in compliance with the water quality objectives.

- (b) Regarding installation of sewers, the sewerage system of most food establishments in Yung Shue Wan and Sok Kwu Wan had been connected to sewers and the connection rate had exceeded 90%, thereby substantially reducing the volume of sewage directly discharged into the waters of or storm water drains in Hong Kong.

126. Mr Eric KWOK requested DSD to use diagrams to show the specific location of all sewers at waterfront after the meeting. As EPD had just mentioned that the water quality of beaches was monitored on a regular basis, he enquired how often “regular” meant and requested EPD to provide the relevant data.

127. Mr LI Kim-man said that the relevant information was not available at hand and would be provided after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had replied to Mr Eric KWOK concerning the frequency of sampling and provided the relevant water quality report after the meeting.)

(Mr YUNG Chi-ming left the meeting at around 1:05 p.m. Mr CHOW Yuk-tong left the meeting at around 1:10 p.m.)

X. Motion on request for relevant government departments to take proactive actions as appropriate to address dog fouling problem
(Paper TAFEHCCC 28/2020)

128. The Chairman welcomed Ms Winsy LAI, District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Islands) and Mr KAO Hsi-chiang, Chief Health Inspector (Islands) of FEHD to the meeting to respond to enquiries. The Chairman said that the motion was moved by Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and seconded by Mr LEE Ka-ho.

129. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho briefly introduced the motion. He said that it was undoubtedly very important to address the dog fouling problem through education, but FEHD also needed to step up law enforcement for enhanced deterrence.

130. Mr Eric KWOK pointed out that dog fouling frequently occurred at the walkway and footbridge in the rear part of Yu Tung Road in Yat Tung Estate due to irresponsible dog owners. He urged FEHD to step up law enforcement and issue fixed penalty notices (FPNs) to offenders.

131. Ms WONG Chau-ping said that as she observed, dog owners in rural areas would in general properly wrap dog excrement up for disposal into dog excreta

collection bins. She enquired of FEHD whether it was proper to do so. As there was no dog excreta collection bin provided in the old villages in Tung Chung, she enquired how people should do with dog excrement.

132. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that dog fouling problem also occurred in Tung Chung North. He opined that the problem should be addressed through education. It was learnt that FEHD staff issued FPNs to offending dog owners only during inspection, while no monitoring was conducted outside the period of inspection, hence difficult to achieve deterrent effect. He enquired whether FEHD would consider stepping up law enforcement to impose deserved penalties on offenders.

133. Mr WONG Man-hon said that the problem had been in existence in Mui Wo for many years. It was commonly see that a dog owner simultaneously walked four to five dogs with leashes. Some of them were large dogs, which were not fitted with muzzle and fouled everywhere. He enquired whether such acts were regulated by existing legislation. Apart from providing more dog excreta collection bins in the district, he expected that FEHD would explore long-term solutions such as setting up dog gardens to provide more space for dog movement. Besides, some dog owners walked dogs about 10:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. and allow their dogs fouling everywhere since FEHD staff had gone off work then.

134. The Chairman said that the problem of dog fouling was very serious in various areas of Islands District. Although uniformed staff of FEHD conducted inspection during fixed periods at present, she opined that it was not effective. She therefore proposed that surprise inspection be conducted by plain-clothes officers who could directly issue FPNs to offending dog owners without prior warning. She believed that it would make dog owners clear up dog excreta by themselves.

135. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) FEHD had instigated a total of three prosecutions in the past year. It would seek Members' view on the time and location of inspection in due course and make appropriate adjustment.
- (b) FEHD would conduct inspections to the black spots mentioned by Members and would take law enforcement action against contraventions if identified.
- (c) FEHD had been encouraging dog owners to properly wrap up dog excrement for disposal into dog excreta collection bin at all times. Regarding Ms WONG Chau-ping's comment on inadequate provision of dog excreta collection bins, FEHD would provide additional dog excreta collection bins at appropriate locations without causing obstruction to pedestrians.
- (d) As regards education mentioned by Mr LEE Ka-ho, FEHD had all along been distributing handbills and reminding dog owners of clearing up dog excreta at popular locations of walking dogs. FEHD would

step up efforts in educating dog owners to exercise self-discipline and would continue to make prosecutions at the same time.

- (e) Regarding Mr WONG Man-hon's suggestion of imposing restriction on the number of dogs accompanying a person, FEHD did not have such regulation for the time being but undertook to provide additional dog excreta collection bins at appropriate locations.
- (f) FEHD would conduct surprise inspection at the Chairman's request. Plain-clothes officers would also be deployed to perform duty where possible.

136. Ms WONG Chau-ping said it was learnt that dog excreta collection bin had never been provided in the rural area of Tung Chung. Dog owners usually wrapped dog excrement up with newspapers and then disposed it into refuse bins, thus causing serious environmental and hygiene problem. She urged FEHD to consider providing the facilities and conduct site inspection with Members as soon as possible.

137. Mr KAO Hsi-chiang said that he would arrange a site inspection with Ms WONG Chau-ping after the meeting and take follow-up action.

138. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on the motion.

139. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the motion.

(Post-meeting note: After studies, FEHD had provided dog excreta collection bins at the corresponding locations.)

XI. Question on super incinerator on Shek Kwu Chau
(Paper TAFEHCCC 29/2020)

140. The Chairman welcomed Ms CHAN Yuen-man, Stepby, Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Facilities and Development & Planning)¹³ of EPD and Dr CHAN Kwok-kuen, Ivan, Marine Parks Officer (Development)² of AFCD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of EPD, AFCD and the Planning Department had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

141. Ms Amy YUNG briefly introduced the question.

142. Ms Stepby CHAN expounded on EPD's written reply.

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

- (a) South Lantau RC had always been closely monitoring the situation of the super incinerator on Shek Kwu Chau (SKC). Despite local residents' discontent with the provision of the incinerator in South Lantau, the Government still decided to construct the incinerator on

SKC at last. Therefore, proper monitoring was the only thing that could be done at present. The contractor regularly held meetings with concerned departments and DC Members and submitted reports. A number of representatives of the RC attended the meetings to reflect their views to the contractor. He indicated that the fourth meeting was about to be held shortly and the RC would continue to follow up on the matters and spare no efforts to monitor the contractor.

- (b) He enquired about the commencement date and completion date of the construction works of the incinerator, and whether any incidents had occurred during the construction period and caused delay in the works and, if yes, for how long.
- (c) He enquired whether EPD had found during the monitoring that the contractor had altered the original design of the facility which therefore had affected the original data.
- (d) EPD set up air quality monitoring stations (AQMSs) at Cheung Sha, Pui O and Mui Wo. He learnt that one of the AQMSs was set up at the roof of Bui O Public School where solar energy facilities would be constructed in the near future. He enquired about the anticipated commencement date and completion date and whether the monitoring of air quality would be affected.

144. Dr Ivan CHAN expounded on AFCD's written reply.

145. Ms Amy YUNG said AFCD's written reply indicated that the relevant procedures of the South Lantau Marine Park (SLMP) would commence within this year which included preparation of maps. She enquired whether AFCD could provide the preliminary maps to give Members a rough idea of the coverage area. Regarding taking measures to protect fish catches and endangered species, she requested AFCD to provide the number of fish catches and endangered species (such as Chinese white dolphin and finless porpoise) before works commencement and during the current works period so that Members could understand the actual situation and assess whether measures for protection of endangered species should be enhanced.

146. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) AFCD's written reply stated that the area of SLMP exceeded 2 000 hectares. He was glad that EPD deployed artificial reefs and released fish fry in the core area but, as anticipated, it was most likely that Mainland fishing vessels would be attracted to SLMP for illegal fishing activities in future. He enquired whether AFCD would collaborate with Mainland fisheries authorities to crackdown on the illegal entry of Mainland fishing vessels upon the commencement of the Marine Parks Ordinance. He continued to ask whether AFCD would discuss with the Marine Police or other units for strengthened law enforcement such

as stepping up patrol by marine police launches and setting up monitoring stations at Tai A Chau and Siu A Chau.

- (b) AFCD had indicated that it would monitor the vessel speed to avoid causing impact on Chinese white dolphins and finless porpoises. He enquired how the monitoring could be conducted and whether the automatic monitoring system adopted by Airport Authority would be used.
- (c) EPDs' reply indicated that Islands District Liaison Group and Community Liaison Group (CLG) uploaded the minutes of meetings and papers onto the website on a regular basis. Nevertheless, he had not yet learnt about the relevant information. He requested EPD to provide the website for Members' inspection.
- (d) Regarding the problem of air pollution, EPD said that 24-hour AQMSs would be set up on SKC, Cheung Chau and South Lantau for monitoring the discharge of poisonous gases such as dioxin. He indicated that the number of AQMSs in South Lantau seemed to be small. As Mr HO Chun-fai had just indicated, solar energy facilities would be set up at the roof of Bui O Public School. He enquired of EPD whether the AQMS installed there would be affected. Since the operation of the incinerator would be carried out at high temperature, he enquired how the hot water would be discharged and how the entire system would be cooled off, as well as how EPD would monitor the discharge of hot water into nearby waters.
- (e) He indicated that two dead finless porpoises were found on Pui O Beach in the end of 2018 and in early 2019 respectively. He requested the department to provide the figures of dead Chinese white dolphins and finless porpoises as well as explain how it would monitor the contractors during reclamation works to avoid affecting endangered species.
- (f) He queried that the establishment of an incinerator at SKC would become a self-defeating initiative. He learnt that the Government planned to deliver the waste collected in the 18 districts to SKC, which included the transportation of 3000 tonnes of ash and 200 tonnes of non-recyclable waste to landfills. He enquired whether the Government had taken the barge cost and air pollution into consideration.
- (g) The written reply of EPD indicated that the project cost was \$19.2 billion. However, he learnt that EPD submitted a funding request for \$31.4 billion to the Legislative Council (LegCo) in 2018. He enquired whether the project cost was \$19.2 billion rather than \$31.4 billion.

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

- (a) Regarding the issue of finless porpoise, AFCD indicated that different methods of conservation would be used during the works period and upon completion of works. However, it was reported in 2018 that the number of finless porpoises in nearby waters had been reduced to near zero after works commencement. He was worried that finless porpoises might have already vanished upon works completion, and that it would be meaningless to conduct conservation work at that time. He enquired how AFCD could ensure that the marine ecology would not be damaged.
- (b) Regarding the issue of funding, Mr Eric KWOK had just mentioned that the preliminary project estimate was \$19.2 billion, which was substantially increased to \$31.4 billion when the funding application was submitted to LegCo. He queried whether cost overrun would recur in future.
- (c) Regarding the pollution problem, it might not have much negative impact on persons who had inhaled the pollutants for a few times only. However, residents in vicinities, especially those residing on Cheung Chau and South Lantau, might inhale the pollutants every day. He was afraid that it would have serious impact on the health of residents and requested EPD to give response.
- (d) Since SKC was an island, he enquired how EPD could deliver the waste to the incinerator, whether it was practical and practicable to use barges, and what the locations would be for unloading waste onto barges for delivering to SKC in future.
- (e) He was aware that Hong Kong needed incinerators for waste treatment. It was learnt that the landfills in Hong Kong were nearing their full capacities, and there would be no way to dispose of the waste if no additional landfills were constructed. While the technology used by the incinerator was regarded as the latest one in 2008, he enquired whether the technology was able to handle the amount of waste in Hong Kong since it was now 2020.

148. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Both he and Mr Eric KWOK were concerned about the methods of delivering waste. As the waste of many districts would be delivered to the same incinerator, he was worried that it would create a considerable level of carbon emission and requested the department concerned to give response about it.
- (b) While Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) Phase 1 could process 3 000 tonnes of waste, he was worried that it could not cope with all the waste in Hong Kong which amounted to over 10 000 tonnes

per day. He noted that ENB implemented various promotional programmes with a view to reducing the per capita disposal rate of municipal solid waste (MSW). However, as revealed in ENB's data, the per capita disposal rate of MSW was ever-increasing since the roll-out of the programmes. He enquired whether EPD had reviewed the effectiveness of publicity and whether there were some other ways to tackle the problem of waste. He indicated that people in countries like Japan and Taiwan would separate waste in kitchens for disposal, and that most families in Hong Kong would only separate plastic bottles and glasses at best without the knowledge of proper disposal of food waste. At present, IWMP Phase 1 could only handle industrial food waste, i.e. food trimmings disposed of by large workshops but not domestic ones. He opined that it was most desirable to follow the practice of Japan to provide food waste composting plants near residential premises. They did not need to be large in size and it could be considered satisfactory if they were able to handle 500 tonnes of food waste.

- (c) He recalled that during the negotiation on constructing an incinerator in South Lantau, residents of South Lantau and Cheung Chau agreed to the construction of incinerator in the spirit of sacrificing themselves for the interest of the public". He was discontented with the Government for failing to honour its pledges made to the residents. EPD's written reply stated that the CLG convened meetings at least once every six months since 2018. Nevertheless, Mr HO Chun-fai just indicated that the fourth meeting would be held soon. He enquired why only the fourth meeting was to be held during a period of almost three years and queried whether EPD had urged the contractor to properly manage the CLG. Besides, during the period of consultation, Members had requested for the provision of hydrotherapy facilities at SKC like that in T-Park. However, he learnt that the plan of providing hydrotherapy facilities had been cancelled and was discontented with the cancellation. Some Members had just mentioned about the treatment of the hot water generated during operation. As he thought, the best way of dealing with the hot water was to use it for hydrotherapy facilities which could help promote the development of local community economy. For example, boat people of South Lantau might take people to SKC for enjoying hydrotherapy service with their vessels.
- (d) As it was learnt, the Ocean Park Conservation Foundation Hong Kong (OPCFHK) had subsidised the conservation work of the Brothers Marine Park. He enquired whether OPCFHK would subsidise the conservation work of SLMP, and was concerned about whether the conservation programme would be adversely affected because Ocean Park was unable to fend for itself.

(Post-meeting note: AFCD replied to Mr Randy YU by email on 18 August 2020, indicating that OPCFHK was a NGO which had been

implementing the conservation and education work of marine species and mammals. Nevertheless, according to AFCD's information, OPCFHK had not subsidised the conservation work of the proposed SLMP.)

149. Mr Ken WONG enquired how AFCD would manage SLMP. He was worried that, instead of bringing benefits to the local capture fisheries, AFCD's deployment of artificial reefs would be counter-productive as Mainland fishing vessels would be attracted to the concerned waters for fishing prior to the fishing moratorium each year. He cited the Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park as an example, indicating that although smuggling of frozen meat by vessels took place every night at present, the Government of Hong Kong failed to effectively take law enforcement and manage the situation. He enquired whether AFCD had explored solutions such as deploying additional vessels or co-ordinating with concerned departments for enforcement action. He pointed out that smuggling was serious in South Lantau. Dozens of boats related to smuggling activities were active there every night, but the Hong Kong Government could not do anything about it. He criticised that AFCD's plan of deploying a lot of artificial reefs was nothing more than providing fish catches for others. The Government would first construct the incinerator on SKC and then set up SLMP, undertaking that it would implement the conservation work properly. However, all these would actually put finless porpoises and dolphins to death, and result in aggravated illegal fishing activities.

150. Mr HO Siu-kei said that Members had concern over the management of SLMP. AFCD's release of fish fry would encourage illegal fishing and the fishing gear used would put marine species to death. Even if residents had identified fishing boats suspected of engaging in illegal activities and reported to the Police, the Marine Police would only arrive at scene and patrol for a few hours. The operations would then be completed without arresting any suspects, thus there was "all thunder but no rain". He urged AFCD to formulate policies or to protect SLMP according to the relevant legislation after the establishment of the marine park, instead of making superficial efforts simply for getting the job done.

151. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was concerned about illegal fishing by Mainland fishing vessels, saying that at a meeting with green groups earlier, he learnt that the boundary between the waters of Hong Kong and the waters of the Mainland was unclear, thus making it difficult for the Hong Kong Police to take law enforcement action. As he understood, some Hong Kong fishermen had reported illegal entry of Mainland fishing vessels to the Police. After the Marine Police had arrived at scene, the suspected fishing vessels immediately returned to the waters of the Mainland. Marine Police launches could only follow closely behind them without taking enforcement. After the Marine Police had left, such Mainland fishing vessels entered the waters of Hong Kong again. Such being the case, he opined that the Hong Kong Police should

explore with the Mainland Police on how to co-operate to take law enforcement action.

- (b) The fishing gear used by Mainland fishing vessels would seriously affect the ecosystem. As he understood, one kind of fishing gear called “snake cage” would damage the seabed. He urged the Hong Kong Police and AFCD to step up law enforcement, conduct study and gather information with a view to understanding the usual time of Mainland fishing vessels conducting illegal fishing activities and facilitating the Police to immediately arrest suspects after arriving at scene. Although crew members of Mainland fishing vessels were not Hong Kong residents, since they committed an offence in Hong Kong, he deemed that law enforcement should be taken first and then other issues be dealt with later. He stressed that illegal entry of Mainland fishing vessels to the waters of Hong Kong for illegal fishing had been in existence for many years, not only affecting the livelihood of local fishermen but also damaging the marine ecosystem. If no solutions could not be found, it would be meaningless for establishing a marine park for conservation.

152. Ms Stephy CHAN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The previous meeting of the CLG was held in January 2020. Meeting of the CLG was held about biannually, depending on the availability of the majority of the CLG members. As there were about 30-odd members, it was difficult to schedule for a meeting date. The next meeting should be held during the summer holiday.
- (b) In the light of the works progress, the incinerator would be completed in 2025. EPD had printed booklets on IWMF earlier and, in case of any changes, would update Members with the latest information. There was no major incident concerning the project to report to Members for the moment.
- (c) When selecting the location of AQMSs, various factors had to be considered, including wind direction as well as distance between AQMSs and the incinerator, so as to obtain objective assessment of air quality objectives. Having considered the relevant factors, EPD set up an AQMS on Cheung Chau, South Lantau and SKC respectively. EPD also needed to consider whether the structure of the building could withstand the installation of the air monitoring equipment, whether there was an unobstructed area of at least 270 degree at the installation site to facilitate data collection by the instrument, and the prevailing wind direction in various seasons. The roof at Bui O Public School in South Lantau was tentatively selected as the location of installing the equipment. As regards whether the equipment would be affected by solar energy facilities to be installed in future, EPD was unable to

respond at the meeting for the time being and might give an explanation at the fourth meeting of the CLG.

- (d) According to contract requirement, collection of test data of AQMSs had to commence at least one year before the testing and commissioning of IWMF Phase 1. The public was welcome to visit the website of the project at www.iwmfhk.com, which did not only provide the information on the CLG but also the environmental monitoring data since works commencement in June 2018, including the monitoring data on water quality, noise, finless porpoises and coral. Members were welcome to inspect the information which was open and transparent.
- (e) Hot water would not be discharged during operation of IWMF which would use air-cooled system instead of water-cooled system, hence cooling of the equipment would be carried out with several large air-cooled devices. The environmental permit had also specified that discharge of wastewater effluent from the facilities into the waters nearby was prohibited. EPD had clearly set out the requirement in the project contract and the contractor was aware of the restrictions, thus Members needed not worry about it.
- (f) Regarding Mr Eric KWOK stating that 3 000 tonnes of ash would be delivered to the landfill, she clarified that 3 000 tonnes referred to the daily maximum treatment capacity of MSW by the incineration facilities, i.e. a maximum amount of 3 000 tonnes of MSW could be incinerated per day. As restricted by the environmental permit, IWMF could receive a daily maximum of 200 tonnes of MSW for mechanical sorting and recycling. After the treatment processes, there would be residue, bottom ash and fly ash. Based on the experience of other incineration facilities in the past, about 10% waste volume would become residue, bottom ash and fly ash after incineration, which would then be delivered to West New Territories (WENT) Landfill at Nim Wan by vessels. The vessels used for transportation were not large barges and vessels of that size were very common in the waters of Hong Kong. For example, about 2 700 tonnes of MSW was delivered to WENT Landfill at Nim Wan via West Kowloon Transfer Station by such vessels every day.
- (g) On marine transportation, the consultancy study report estimated that about 440 000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emission could be curtailed per year after the commissioning of IWMF. At present, MSW was delivered to WENT Landfill at Nim Wan by vessels via the West Kowloon Transfer Station and the two refuse transfer stations on Hong Kong Island. She stressed that there was not much difference between the mode of marine transportation of waste in future and the existing one, although the destination had changed.

- (h) The project would be implemented using a design-build-operate contract form. The contract which valued at \$31.4 billion was awarded to a contractor to carry out the design, construction and operation of the IWMF for 15 years. The funding of \$19.2037 billion approved by LegCo was allocated for the costs of project design and construction only. According to EPD's estimation at present, there would be no budget overrun.

153. Dr Ivan CHAN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The map of SLMP was provided in Annex 1 to the written reply. The marine park would be divided into two parts, one near the waters of SKC and the other surrounding the waters of Tai A Chau and Siu A Chau.
- (b) Regarding the issue of finless porpoise, as SLMP had not been formally established at present, the related management and ecological monitoring could be implemented only after the establishment of SLMP.
- (c) Regarding the problems of illegal fishing and transboundary fishing, AFCD could carry out patrol and make prosecution according to the Marine Parks Ordinance only after SLMP had been established. At present, staff of AFCD's Fisheries Branch were responsible for combating such illegal activities according to the Fisheries Protection Ordinance. Upon the establishment of SLMP, AFCD would set up new teams, recruit staff and deploy additional vessels to patrol the marine park. AFCD's staff could then take enforcement action pursuant to the aforesaid two ordinances and would strengthen the collaboration with the Marine Police and relevant mainland fisheries authorities in Guangdong Province to combat illegal entry of Mainland vessels into the waters of SLMP for illegal fishing in particular.

154. Mr HO Siu-kei enquired of AFCD whether fishing permit would be issued to registered fishermen in the territory in future for fishing in the waters near Tai A Chau, Siu A Chau and the Airport.

155. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He remarked that bottom ash was an extremely toxic substance. He was worried that a marine disaster would occur if there was an accident during the transportation of bottom ash from IWMF to WENT Landfill at Nim Wan by vessels. He therefore urged EPD to work out crisis management measures and give response.
- (b) He was concerned about AQMSs because it was learnt that toxic substances such as dioxin could have a significant impact on male babies. Accumulation of such substances in the body could lead to

impotence and male infertility after the babies had become male adults, and the consequences would be serious. He enquired, apart from Bui O Public School, whether AQMS could be provided between Shui Hau and Cheung Sha as such provision was necessary.

- (c) Despite the profound impact of constructing the super incinerator at SKC on residents of various areas of Islands District and the possible effect of toxic substances on male residents of Islands District, the concerned parties did not provide electricity tariff rebate to residents of Islands District. He was discontented with this, thinking that it was unfair to the residents.
- (d) As indicated by EPD, the waste treatment capacity of the super incinerator was 3 000 tonnes per day. However, as revealed in the data of 2018, there was an average of 10 345 tonnes of MSW generated in Hong Kong per day. He queried EPD spent more than \$30 billion (including operating expenditure) for treatment of only 3 000 tonnes of waste per day, which was a drop in the bucket. He learnt that the total operating expenditure of all landfills in Hong Kong was more than \$0.7 billion per annum only. He was discontented with the Government for spending more than \$30 billion on the construction of a super incinerator from which many problems had come out.
- (e) He enquired whether AFCD would, apart from taking law enforcement pursuant to the Marine Parks Ordinance, collaborate with the relevant mainland fisheries authorities in Guangdong Province and further enhance the whole monitoring system.

156. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Regarding the installation of solar panels at the roof of Bui O Public School, he clarified that Mr HO Chun-fai's concern was whether the installation of AQMS would be obstructed after the relevant location had been occupied by the solar panels. He requested EPD to follow up. He noted that Members had requested for installation of several AQMSs during consultation. At that time, EPD replied that it was open minded to the request, and that three AQMSs would first be installed for the moment while additional AQMSs would be provided if necessary. He requested EPD to check the relevant documents for follow-up.
- (b) Regarding the CLG, he criticised EPD for avoiding the important and dwelling on the trivial in making response. Members opined that the CLG had held too few meetings, but EPD responded that a meeting was held in January this year and the next meeting would be held in August. Members requested for increasing the number of meetings because they thought that it was not enough by holding two meetings a year only. Besides, only four meetings were held from 2018 to August 2020,

failing to meet the minimum requirement of holding a meeting every six months. In his opinion, given the current size of the meeting, a meeting should be held about every three months, so that when there were emergencies such as the epidemic which prevented meetings from being convened, there were still two to three meetings a year.

- (c) He remarked that EPD had not yet responded to the following two questions. Firstly, regarding the overall policy on waste reduction, he requested ENB to provide a written reply, and attend the meeting for giving response when Members raised relevant questions for discussion. At earlier times, ENB had expressed its expectation of reducing the per capita disposal rate of MSW in Hong Kong to a certain level. He recalled that the rate had dropped one year but rebounded significantly at present. Secondly, given that Hong Kong created over 10 000 tonnes of MSW daily and that the maximum treatment capacity of the super incinerator was only 3 000 tonnes upon completion, he enquired what long-term plans EPD had in mind.
- (d) It was learnt that during consultation, EPD had undertaken to provide hydrotherapy facilities with warm water supply for free use by residents of South Lantau, to organise the related training courses in the light of the hydrotherapy facilities with warm water supply, and to invite students of primary and secondary schools to visit the facilities. The nature of the facilities was similar to that of Hong Kong UNESCO Global Geopark, aiming to promote the development of local community economy and facilitate small companies to operate the business of carrying visitors with vessels. He opined that since residents of South Lantau were “willing to sacrifice themselves for the interest of the public”, they should at least be allowed to make a living with the facilities. He requested EPD to reply whether the plan had been cancelled.

(Post-meeting note: EPD had provided a written reply to Mr Randy YU in August 2020 regarding the matter stated in paragraph 156(d) above.)

157. Mr LEE Ka-ho enquired of EPD whether the waste treatment capacity of the super incinerator would be able to meet the daily need in Hong Kong. As shown in EPD’s data, the landfills in Hong Kong would be saturated by 2030 while the super incinerator would be commissioned only in 2025. Moreover, as Hong Kong created over 10 000 tonnes of waste daily and the maximum treatment capacity of the super incinerator was 3 000 tonnes only, it was obvious that IWMF would not be able to meet the need. He enquired of ENB or EPD whether other waste treatment measures could be improved such as promoting the recycling industry. The recycling industry in Hong Kong had been the subject of criticism because most of the waste that people disposed of into the 3-coloured recycling bins were usually transported to the landfills in the end. EPD always said that upstream recyclers were forced to cease operation due to lack of subsidy from the Government, thus the recyclables were turned into refuse. He urged the Government to face up to the problem squarely and seriously,

or the problem could never be tackled even the second and third super incinerators were to be constructed in future after the completion of the first one.

158. Ms Stephy CHAN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding bottom ash and fly ash mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK, she clarified that fly ash was poisonous rather than bottom ash. Prior to being transported to the landfill at Nim Wan, fly ash had to undergo the treatment of solidification and stabilisation, as well as the tests of “incineration residue pollution control limits” and “leachate standards”. Only treated fly ash passing the above two tests could be delivered to the landfill at Nim Wan. She said that EPD would conduct the relevant tests to bottom ash and ensure that it had complied with the relevant standards of the environmental permit before disposal. EPD had attended IDC meetings in 2018 to respond to Members’ enquiries on the project. It was currently exploring with the contractor the feasibility of using bottom ash for other purposes instead of disposing it as waste.
- (b) Regarding the monitoring of dioxin by AQMSs, EPD had prescribed in the contract the requirement of monitoring dioxin in the air. Regarding Mr Randy YU’s enquiry, the relevant contract had covered three AQMSs and EPD would explore the feasibility of increasing the number of AQMSs in future.
- (c) Regarding the long-term impact of dioxin on human health, the chapter on public health of EPD’s Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report included the assessment on whether the accumulation of such substance would cause adverse effect on human. The findings of the EIA Report revealed that IWMPF would not impose any unacceptable adverse impact on health.
- (d) As regards the need of setting up additional AQMSs between Shui Hau and Cheung Sha, she explained that three tiers of air monitoring would be implemented. EPD deemed that the monitoring of flue gas emission from chimneys was most important. Firstly, EPD would carry out continuous monitoring of gas emission from chimneys. If the emission level of the chimneys exceeded 95% of the emission cap, the contractor would be required to cease to feed MSW to the facilities for incineration. The second tier of monitoring was carried out by setting up an AQMS on Cheung Chau, South Lantau and SKC respectively. The data provided would be used as objective air quality objectives of the local areas and studied by EPD. The third tier was a comprehensive and extensive air monitoring, which was carried out by the 16 AQMSs installed throughout the territory. She stressed that EPD would assess the operation of IWMPF through the monitoring of air quality at three different levels instead of solely relying on the data

collected by AQMSs installed on Cheung Chau, South Lantau and SKC.

- (e) Regarding the installation of solar panels in Bui O Public School, she would follow up with the responsible persons after the meeting. EPD would discuss with the stakeholders of Pui O at the next meeting of the CLG.
- (f) Regarding the frequency of meetings of the CLG, she would discuss with concerned persons after the meeting and relayed the expectation of relevant stakeholders in that the CLG should hold meetings at least once every six months.
- (g) Regarding hydrotherapy facilities, there was no relevant requirement prescribed in the contract. Should Members have any suggestions on public education, they might raise to the CLG for discussion because one of the objectives of establishing the CLG was to enhance IWMF in the aspects of education and eco-tourism.
- (h) Regarding the issue of waste treatment policies or subsidy on electricity tariff, they fell within the purview of ENB and EPD was not in the position to give response on behalf of ENB. EPD would relay Members' enquiries concerning waste reduction, waste treatment and subsidy on electricity tariff to ENB and request for follow-up.

159. Dr Ivan CHAN said that regarding the issue of fishing permit, pursuant to the Fisheries Protection Ordinance (Cap. 171), fishermen operating registered local fishing vessels might apply for fishing permit for fishing in SLMP. However, fishing in the waters of the core area between Tai A Chau and Siu A Chau would be prohibited as the core area would be used for fisheries enhancement measures including deployment of artificial reefs and release of fish fry.

160. Mr Randy YU noted that Ms Stephy CHAN would relay Members' proposal to ENB. He pointed out that when residents promised "to sacrifice themselves", EPD had undertaken to construct hydrotherapy facilities like that in "T-Park" for use by local residents and other visitors, educational purpose and promoting the development of local community economy. He wanted Ms Stephy CHAN to request ENB for checking the consultation records in the past and provide a written reply to Members who, if deemed necessary, would raise further enquiries.

161. Mr Eric KWOK was discontented with EPD's response. He anticipated that the project would encounter many problems, and therefore requested EPD to set up a crisis management team which would report to ENB. In response to EPD's reply given just now which stated that dioxin did not have any impact on humans (especially in sexual fertility), he cited the information of World Health Organization (WHO) for illustration, remarking that dioxin would cause damage to human's immune system, nervous system during development, endocrine system and sexual fertility. He queried why EPD said there was no problem, and requested EPD to

provide a written reply. If EPD really held that dioxin would have no impact on humans at all, he would reflect EPD's comments to the media and other concern groups in the light of the relevant document of WHO.

162. Ms Stephy CHAN clarified that she did not say dioxin had no effect on humans. She had just presented the assessment findings on health risks that might be due to IWMF set out in the EIA Report.

163. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho said EPD had just indicated that if the emission level of the chimneys reached 95%, the contractor would be required to cease to deliver waste for incineration. He enquired how long EPD anticipated it would take for the emission level to reach 95% of capacity. He was concerned about whether the expected effectiveness of the incinerator for waste treatment could be achieved if the emission level of the chimneys reached 95% of the emission cap for most of the time in a year.

164. Ms Stephy CHAN responded that the incinerator was equipped with emission control facilities. Under normal circumstances of operation, the waste treatment capacity of the incinerator was set at 3 000 tonnes per day and should not exceed the limit. If the emission level was found to be exceeding 95%, EPD would require the contractor to suspend the feeding of MSW to the facilities for incineration, and would examine why the emission level had reached 95% of the emission cap. However, she reiterated that the probability of such occurrences is not high.

165. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho understood that it was a very special situation for the emission level of the chimneys exceeding 95% of the emission cap. Nevertheless, if it really took place, the problem might not be tackled immediately. Therefore, as Mr Eric KWOK had said, it was necessary for EPD to form a crisis management team for dealing with the problem. He proposed that EPD should form a crisis management team early, otherwise, the incinerator might need to suspend operation and become futile in case any problems occurred.

166. Ms Amy YUNG said that, as pointed out by many Members just now, the CLG should at least hold a meeting every six months since 2018. She was discontented with EPD for failing to honour its undertaking. Moreover, EPD said that the discussion papers and relevant information of the CLG could be accessed on EPD's website, but Members failed to locate the relevant theme pages. She therefore requested EPD to provide the hyperlink of the website. She also criticised EPD for lacking transparency and failing to honour the pledges, requesting EPD to report on the progress of the project to Members at Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee meetings at least once a year, and soliciting Members' support for the proposal.

167. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on Ms Amy YUNG's proposal of "requesting EPD to report on the progress of the project to Members at Tourism, Agriculture, Fisheries, Environmental Hygiene and Climate Change Committee meetings at least once a year".

168. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the proposal.

XII. Question on re-opening of Discovery Bay Recreation Club and Club Siena
(Paper TAFEHCCC 30/2020)

169. The Chairman said that Discovery Bay Recreation Club (DBRC) had only submitted a written reply without attending the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting. If there were any enquiries raised by Members, they would be put to record for follow-up.

170. Ms Amy YUNG briefly introduced the question.

171. Ms Amy YUNG expressed regret over Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (HKRC) and its subsidiary company for not attending the meeting to respond to the question. As far as she knew, HKRC had arranged one representative to attend only the meetings of the Traffic and Transport Committee as an attendee. She was also discontented with the written reply for being too general, criticising that HKRC was irresponsible and did not respect the Council, Discovery Bay residents and club members. As she indicated, many residents complained that it did not answer their phone calls or reply their voice mails during the temporary closure of the clubhouses. They could not even receive a definite reply to their enquiries via email. She opined that HKRC's service attitude unacceptable, and that HKRC did not shoulder the corporate social responsibility of a listed company. As stated in DBRC's written reply, "DBRC also offered a rebate of one-month subscription fee as recreation and F&B credits". She remarked that the clubhouses had been temporarily closed for one to two months but DBRC only offered a rebate in the form of coupons amounting to one-month subscription fee. She also remarked that, as indicated by some members, they were given coupons for fitness centre service rather than food and beverages coupons. They could not enjoy the concession at all since they did not use the facilities. She queried whether DBRC wanted to make profit from the arrangement. Lastly, she hoped that DBRC would provide an English version of the written reply, and requested HKRC to provide further information and be responsible to members of the clubhouses.

172. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to take note of Ms Amy YUNG's views and follow up with HKRC.

173. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho indicated that HKRC responded to the questions in writing for most of the time. As the reply to this question was too general, he proposed that Members who were concerned about the matter should visit Discovery Bay in person for discussing with HKRC representatives, thus avoiding further delay of the issue. He also believed that more Members participating in the discussion might exert pressure on HKRC.

174. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to DBRC requesting it to arrange an interview with Members in response to Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho's views.

175. Ms Amy YUNG thanked Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho for his concern over the affairs of Discovery Bay. She suggested that the Secretariat should directly write to HKRC, which was the holding company of DBRC, requesting it to arrange an interview with Members.

176. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to request HKRC for following up on the above matter.

(Post-meeting note: IDC Secretariat had relayed Members' views to HKRC, which had provided a written reply to TAFEHCCC in June 2020 concerning the re-opening of DBRC and Club Siena.)

XIII. Progress report on DC-funded District Minor Works Projects
(Paper TAFEHCCC 17/2020)

177. 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.

178. Ms Christy LEUNG briefly presented the paper.

179. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the design of the project "Improvement to footpath leading from village office to waterfront at San Tau, Tai O (IS-DMW-615)" as set out in Annex 1 and an allocation of \$400,000 for implementing the project.

180. Mr HO Siu-kei declared interest that he was of the Elected Member of Tai O Constituency.

181. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 12 voted for and one abstaining. The project was endorsed.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting and Mr LEE Ka-ho. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho abstained.)

182. Mr Eric KWOK said that, as shown in the photos of Annex 2, the location of the proposed pavilion was in the immediate proximity of the coast. Having regard to the impact of Typhoon Mangkhut in 2018 and the anticipated huge waves that might be caused by the passage of typhoons in future, he enquired whether the design could withstand the impact of waves. During the last term of IDC, some Members had proposed to install solar panels at pavilions situating at open area, thus facilitating hikers and the public to charge their mobile phones when they were out of battery and

portable battery chargers were not available then. He suggested IsDO to consider the proposal.

183. Mr LI Ming-yau said that the pavilion beside the pier would be heightened, and that the project cost stated in the paper did not include the cost of installing solar panels. In this connection, the project would not include the installation of solar panels.

184. Mr Eric KWOK learnt that all pavilions in South Lantau were provided with solar panels and charging facilities. Since the works did not involve a high level of technology, he recommended IsDO for proactively considering the installation of solar panels at the proposed pavilion. He also learnt that the curved design of pavilion could weaken wave impact, hence he proposed that IsDO should exercise flexibility according to the geographical conditions and adopt special design for coping with special environment.

185. Mr Randy YU said that the rock-armoured bunds commonly constructed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department were able to withstand wave impact. If the proposed pavilion had already been raised, he suggested IsDO explore with engineers the need of further raising it. He also proposed that a rubble mound seawall should be provided at the coast to attenuate wave action and strengthen the pavilion. The project cost was currently estimated to be \$600,000, and he believed that the additional cost of providing the above facilities would not be significant. Regarding the provision of solar panels, he thought that Members might first vote on whether the project design and funding set out in Annex 2 should be endorsed. If Members considered necessary, they might further discuss Mr Eric KWOK's proposal of installing solar panels in due course, so that IsDO might further study the project details and estimate the costs of installing solar panels. Subsequently, voting might be conducted at the meeting in future. In his opinion, installation of solar panels was a simple project requiring only connection of power supply and provision of battery chargers.

186. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho estimated that the photos in Annex 2 to the paper were shot in rainy days. He recommended IsDO for implementing skid resistance works and noticing whether waves would crash onto the shore at the location. He also recommended IsDO for drawing reference from the practice in Yuen Long District. As he noted, many solar panel providers were offering discounts.

187. Mr LI Ming-yau said that the photos were taken after raining. There was no stagnant water on the ground at the location in normal circumstances. He said that the views of engineers would be sought afterwards. Solar panels might be installed in future if the proposed works were considered to be feasible. He indicated that it was necessary to first seek the views of the engineers on the construction of additional rock-armoured bunds which might lead to cost overrun.

188. Mr Eric KWOK proposed that IsDO should construct additional rock-armoured bunds to weaken wave impact and that construction of additional rock-armoured bunds could benefit many people. In addition to bringing

convenience to residents, the pavilion would also be strengthened and thus be less likely to be damaged during typhoon passage in future, putting the allocation of \$600,000 to wastage easily. He also proposed adoption of the curved design for constructing the pavilion for attenuated wave action, believing that Members would support the project and funding request if no much additional cost was incurred.

189. Mr LI Ming-yau said that IsDO had taken note of the relevant views.

190. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the design of the project “Construction of pavilion near pier at Fan Lau, Tai O (IS-DMW-680)” set out in Annex 2 and an allocation of \$600,000 for implementing the project.

191. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the project.

192. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that the paper had set out the projects proposed since 2009/2010. He understood that some projects could not be taken forward since private land was involved. However, he queried why the District Minor Works (DMW) Project “Provision of sitting benches near Peng Chau Municipal Services Building (IS-DMW-667)”, which was endorsed in 2016/2017, could commence only at present. He requested IsDO to explain why it took four years for providing sitting benches.

193. Mr LI Ming-yau said the main reason was that it was necessary to discuss the chair design with Members and works were implemented according to priority.

194. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the whole paper and funding for project implementation.

195. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 13 voted for and two abstaining. The proposal was endorsed.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho abstained.)

XIV. First Batch of Proposed Projects under District Minor Works for 2020/2021 (Paper TAFEHCCC 20/2020)

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

197. Ms Christy LEUNG briefly presented the paper.

198. Mr Randy YU considered it necessary to take forward the projects although he understood that the number of registered contractors on the Government's lists of approved contractors was limited. As it was learnt that some contractors did not clear up the grasses after weeding, he was worried that it would cause breeding of mosquitoes and even fire. He opined that the contractors concerned should be responsible for properly clearing up the venues after weeding because they had been awarded with the tenders and made money through the works. He urged IsDO to instruct concerned contractors for clearing up the grasses.

199. Mr Sammy TSUI agreed that grass removal should be done after weeding. Some residents had reflected to him that the hiking trail in the rear portion of Ngong Ping was covered with fallen leaves and overgrown with weeds. So, the trail would be very slippery when it rained, and hikers would easily slip and fall. He enquired how often weeding would be carried out and urged concerned departments to promptly follow up.

200. Mr LI Ming-yau said that, as prescribed in the contract, grasses should be cleared up immediately after weeding. In case irregularities were identified, Members might inform IsDO at once for following up with concerned contractors. He said that weeding would be carried out 10 times a year under DMW, and other departments would provide assistance to some of the locations.

201. Mr Sammy TSUI said that since the works area covered the hiking trail, clearing up by departments might not be possible. He pointed out that the steps were overgrown with weeds and were very slippery when it rained, thereby causing danger to hikers. He suggested that IsDO should step up weeding work in rainy season. As for the dry season, it would still be less hazardous even if the surface of the road was covered with fallen leaves. Therefore, IsDO could make slight adjustment in work arrangement.

202. Mr Randy YU said that he had all along been informing IsDO of problems in the district for timely follow-up and was ready to continue with the co-operation. He proposed that IsDO should prescribe the penalties in the contract. To ensure the quality of works, penalties had to be imposed on any contractor, who failed to provide service according to contract requirement, upon report by a third party with photos provided as evidence.

203. Ms WONG Chau-ping agreed that some contractors did not carry out weeding work properly. She cited the weeding work at the area between Lung Tseng Tau and Ha Ling Pei as an example. Members requested since the Lunar New Year the department concerned to monitor the progress of weeding, and subsequently found that the weeding work had been carried out for two to three times before completion due to unclear instruction given to the contractor by the department. As she believed, it was a fundamental procedure of clearing up the place after weeding, which should be incorporated into the established work procedure.

204. Mr Ken WONG said that some weeding works might be undertaken by contractors commissioned by LandsD and learnt that the past performance of some

contractors was not satisfactory. He understood that the weeding works undertaken by IsDO on Peng Chau did not have similar problems up to date.

205. The Chairman agreed that similar situation did occur on Peng Chau in the past. Similar problems occurred less frequently for projects undertaken by IsDO while the performance of DLO's contractors was often not satisfactory.

206. Mr Eric KWOK said that DMW projects involved public funds and enquired whether IsDO had conducted spot check of the projects.

207. Mr LI Ming-yau said that IsDO had prescribed the requirement of clearing up after weeding and the related penalties. If the performance of a contractor was poor, the chance of awarding tender to such contractor in the next tendering exercise would be adversely affected. As regards the frequency of weeding, there were ten times of weeding a year under DMW, which would be carried out more frequently in rainy season and at longer intervals in dry season. As regards the area between Lung Tseng Tau and Ha Ling Pei, he suggested that the location concerned was not under the management of IsDO. He would understand the exact location from Members after the meeting and arrange staff to conduct site inspection.

208. Mr Randy YU requested LandsD to instruct the relevant contractor to clear up the venues after weeding.

(Post-meeting note: DLO had contacted LandsD's Special Duties Task Force and relayed Mr YU's request for instructing the relevant contractor of LandsD to properly clear up the venues immediately after weeding.)

209. Mr TSANG Wai-man said that LandsD noted Members' views which would be relayed to the responsible team for follow-up.

210. Mr Eric KWOK proposed that IsDO should conduct surprise inspection to the works area.

211. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the paper and funding for project implementation.

212. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the proposal.

XV. Election of Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the Working Group and Report by Working Group

213. The Chairman said that the report of TAFEHCCC Working Group and the report of Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group were set out in Reference 1 and Reference 2 respectively. The proposed Terms of Reference and Membership of the Working Groups were set out in Annex which had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

214. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed the proposed Terms of Reference and Membership of the Working Groups.

215. Members voted by a show of hands and unanimously endorsed the proposed Terms of Reference and Membership of the Working Groups.

Election of Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the Working Groups

216. The Chairman asked Members to elect Convenor and Vice-Convenor of the two Working Groups respectively.

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

217. The Chairman said that only Members of the Working Group were eligible to vote and read out the Membership List of the Working Group as follows: Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Ms Josephine TSANG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho, Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.

218. The Chairman asked Members to consider and nominate a Member to be the Convenor.

219. Mr Eric KWOK nominated Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.

220. Ms WONG Chau-ping nominated the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG.

221. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho nominated Ms LAU Shun-ting.

222. Mr Eric KWOK said that since Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho had nominated a candidate, he would withdraw his nomination of Mr LEUNG.

223. The Chairman enquired whether Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho would accept the nomination.

224. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho accepted the nomination.

225. Mr Eric KWOK said that his nomination of Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho remained unchanged.

226. The Chairman said that she accepted the nomination and enquired whether Ms LAU Shun-ting would accept the nomination.

227. Ms LAU Shun-ting thanked Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho for his nomination and said that she could not accept the nomination since she was not able to cope with the duty for the time being.

228. The Chairman said that since Ms LAU Shun-ting did not accept the nomination, the existing nominees were Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho and she herself. Being one of the nominees, she asked the Vice-Chairman to preside over the meeting on behalf of her temporarily.

229. The Vice-Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands.

230. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was that Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho got six votes and Ms Josephine TSANG got eight votes. Ms Josephine TSANG was elected Convenor of the Working Group.

(Members voted for Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho to assume the post of Convenor included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Members voted for Ms Josephine TSANG to assume the post of Convenor included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei and Ms LAU Shun-ting.)

231. The Chairman asked Members to consider and nominate a Member to be the Vice-Convenor.

232. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho nominated Ms LAU Shun-ting, believing that she was capable to perform the duty since she was the Vice-Chairman of another Committee.

233. Ms LAU Shun-ting thanked Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho for his nomination and said that she could not accept the nomination since she needed time for adaptation after assuming the posts of the Vice-Chairman of another Committee and the Vice-Convenor of another Working Group.

234. Mr WONG Man-hon nominated Ms WONG Chau-ping.

235. The Chairman enquired whether Ms WONG Chau-ping would accept the nomination.

236. Ms WONG Chau-ping accepted the nomination.

237. Mr LEE Ka-ho nominated Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.

238. The Chairman enquired whether Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho would accept the nomination.

239. Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho accepted the nomination.

240. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands.

241. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was that Ms WONG Chau-ping got eight votes and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho got six votes. Ms WONG Chau-ping was elected Vice-Convenor of the Working Group.

(Members voted for Ms WONG Chau-ping to assume the post of Vice-Convenor included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Members voted for Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho to assume the post of Vice-Convenor included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.)

Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group

242. The Chairman said that only Members of the Working Group were eligible to vote and read out the Membership List of the Working Group as follows: Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms WONG Chau-ping, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr WONG Chun-yeung.

243. The Chairman asked Members to consider and nominate a Member to be the Convenor.

244. Ms WONG Chau-ping nominated Mr Randy YU.

245. The Chairman enquired whether Mr Randy YU would accept the nomination.

246. Mr Randy YU accepted the nomination.

247. Ms Amy YUNG nominated Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho.

248. The Chairman said that Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho was not a Member of the Working Group.

249. Ms Amy YUNG nominated Mr LEE Ka-ho.

250. Mr LEE Ka-ho accepted the nomination.

251. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands.

252. Members voted by a show of hands. The result was that Mr Randy YU got seven votes and Mr LEE Ka-ho got five votes. Mr Randy YU was elected Convenor of the Working Group.

(Members voted for Mr Randy YU to assume the post of Convenor included: The Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Members voted for Mr LEE Ka-ho to assume the post of Convenor included: Ms Amy YUNG, Mr

Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei and Mr LEE Ka-ho.)

253. The Chairman asked Members to consider and nominate a Member to be the Vice-Convenor.

254. Ms WONG Chau-ping nominated Mr LEE Ka-ho.

255. Mr LEE Ka-ho accepted the nomination.

256. The Chairman said that as only Mr LEE Ka-ho was nominated, she announced that Mr LEE Ka-ho would assume the post of Vice-Convenor of the Working Group.

XVI. Any Other Business

(i) Paper on “Quit to Win” Smoke-free Community Campaign

257. The Chairman said that the invitation letter of the Hong Kong Council on Smoking and Health (COSH) was tabled at the meeting for Members’ perusal. COSH sought the consent of IDC for permitting it to display the logo of IDC on the promotional materials (such as booklets, leaflets and banners, etc.) of the Campaign, as well as requested IDC to assign representatives to attend the launching activities and closing ceremony of the Campaign (with details to be confirmed). The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they endorsed that IDC would become a supporting organisation of the 11th “Quit to Win” Smoke-free Community Campaign organised by COSH in the capacity of Islands Healthy City and Age-friendly Community Working Group; and whether they agreed to permit COSH to display the logo of IDC on the promotional materials (such as booklets, leaflets and banners, etc.) of the Campaign and assign representatives to attend the launching activities and closing ceremony of the Campaign.

258. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 14 voted for and one abstaining. The proposal was endorsed.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei, Ms LAU Shun-ting, Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho. Mr CHAN Lin-wai abstained.)

259. The Chairman asked Members to vote by a show of hands on whether they agreed that the Working Group would send invitation letters to NGOs in Islands District for participating in the Campaign and becoming a partner organisation of the Islands District.

260. Members voted by a show of hands. There were 13 voted for and two abstaining. The proposal was endorsed.

(Members voted for included: the Chairman Ms Josephine TSANG, the Vice-Chairman Ms WONG Chau-ping, Mr Randy YU, Mr WONG Man-hon, Mr CHAN Lin-wai, Mr Ken WONG, Mr HO Chun-fai, Mr HO Siu-kei, Ms Amy YUNG, Mr Eric KWOK, Mr Sammy TSUI, Mr FONG Lung-fei and Ms LAU Shun-ting. Mr LEE Ka-ho and Mr LEUNG Kwok-ho abstained.)

(ii) 2020-21 District Minor Works Proposals

261. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had distributed the works proposal forms to Members earlier. Members were requested to submit the forms on or before the specified date.

XVII. Date of Next Meeting

262. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 10:30 a.m. on 27 July 2020 (Monday).

-END-