

(Translation)

Minutes of the 1st Special Meeting of Sham Shui Po District Council (6th Term)
under the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Date: 5 February 2020 (Wednesday)

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Venue: Conference Room, Sham Shui Po District Council

Present

Chairman

Mr YEUNG Yuk

Members

Ms CHAU Yuen-man, Eunice

Ms CHOW Wing-heng, Zoé

Mr CHUM Tak-shing (Arrived at 2:35 p.m.)

Mr HO Kai-ming, Calvin

Mr HO Kwan-chau, Leo (Left at 4:15 p.m.)

Mr KONG Kwai-sang

Mr LAO Ka-hang, Andy

Ms LAU Pui-yuk, MH (Left at 4:15 p.m.)

Mr LAU Wai-chung, Lawrence

Mr LEE Hon-ting, Howard

Mr LEE Man-ho, Leos (Arrived at 2:35 p.m.)

Mr LI Chun-hei, Joshua

Mr LI Kwing, Richard

Mr LI Ting-fung, Jay

Mr MAK Wai-ming (Left at 2:32 p.m.)

Ms NG Mei, Carman

Ms NG Yuet-lan, Janet

Mr SIN Kam-ho, Jeffrey

Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, MH, JP

Mr TSUI Yat-hin, Ronald (Arrived at 2:45 pm.)

Mr WAI Woon-nam

Mr WONG Kit-long

Mr YUEN Hoi-man, Ramon

In Attendance

Mr LEE Kwok-hung, Damian, JP

Mr LEE Wai-yin, Brett

Miss LUI Hiu-wei, Michelle

Miss CHIN Wai-sheung, Doris

Miss LAU Sze-nga, Vivicia

Ms CHAN Siu-ping, Daphne

Mr TAM Kin-fai, Simon

Dr CHUI Tak-yi, JP

Dr THAM May-ked

Dr CHAN Vivian

Ms LEUNG Wai-ling, Betty

Mr LUK Chi-kwong

Ms LEE Shuk-ling, Agnes

Mr LIM Ying-lam

Ms LING Kuk-yi

Mr TSE Kong-wai, Eric

District Officer (Sham Shui Po)

Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 1

Assistant District Officer (Sham Shui Po) 2

Senior Liaison Officer 1, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 2, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 3, Sham Shui Po District Office

Senior Liaison Officer 4, Sham Shui Po District Office

Under Secretary for Food & Health

Senior Medical & Health Officer (Government Vaccination Programme), Department of Health

Senior Medical & Health Officer (Emergency Preparedness and District Relations)1, Department of Health

Assistant District Social Welfare Officer (Sham Shui Po)2, Social Welfare Department

Chief Leisure Manager (HKE), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

District Leisure Manager (Sham Shui Po), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Chief Health Inspector 3 (Sham Shui Po), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Chief Manager/M(KWS), Housing Department

Chief Transport Officer/Kowloon, Transport Department

Secretary

Ms HO Kam-ping, Jennifer

Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sham Shui Po District Office

Absent with apologies

Mr YAN Kai-wing

Opening Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members and representatives from government departments to the first special meeting of the Sham Shui Po District Council (“SSPDC”). To reduce the risk of the spread of the epidemic, he asked the attendees to check their temperatures and register their names before entering the Conference Room. He also said that the public gallery would not be open and the duration of meeting would be limited to four hours.

2. Members noted the leave application from Mr YAN Kai-wing.

Item 1: Matters for discussion

(a) Request for the District Council to hold a special meeting for discussing the requisition of Heritage Lodge in Mei Foo as an isolation camp of “Wuhan pneumonia” (SSPDC Paper 9/20)

3. Mr Joshua LI introduced Paper 9/20 and raised the following views: (i) it was noted that the Heritage Lodge in Mei Foo had requested guests to check out on 31 January. However, the Food and Health Bureau (“FHB”) only informed the Chairman of SSPDC on 1 February that the Heritage Lodge would be used as an isolation camp, and residents nearby as well as the District Council (“DC”) were not informed; (ii) the Heritage Lodge was very close to the residential buildings in Mei Foo and also near Lai Chi Kok Reception Centre and its quarters. If people undergoing quarantine left the isolation camp without permission, it might cause community transmission. The Government should rescind its decision at once; (iii) the Government should isolate the close contacts of patients in scantily populated places; (iv) the Government should stop the source of disease by closing all border crossings in order to avoid the community outbreak; (v) he invited Dr CHUI to meet with residents and explain to them directly the relevant arrangements for the isolation camp.

4. Ms Janet NG raised the following views: (i) the Government should not set up an isolation camp in a densely populated area, disregarding public opinion and residents’ health; (ii) she condemned the Government for not respecting the freedom of speech, using excessive force on people who expressed their views and arresting them.

5. Ms Eunice CHAU raised the following views: (i) the Government did not conduct consultation in respect of the requisition of the Heritage Lodge. The information acquired by the public and DC was very limited; (ii) she hoped that the Bureau would

meet with the residents in order to allay their concerns; (iii) the Bureau should consult DC Members and residents first if there were similar arrangements in the future.

6. Dr CHUI gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The Government had all along been very concerned about the development of the Novel Coronavirus (“COVID-19”) epidemic;
- (ii) Regarding the strategy to address and prevent the spread of COVID-19, the close contacts of confirmed patients would receive medical surveillance in a quarantine centre for 14 days. The Government would consider various factors when identifying sites to serve as quarantine centres, including the layout of the facility, sanitary equipment, ventilation, impact on the people nearby and whether the facility could be used on time, etc. At present, the Government had used the MacLehose Holiday Village, the Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village and Po Leung Kuk Jockey Club Pak Tam Chung Holiday Camp as quarantine centres, providing 97 units in total. The provision of units had become insufficient as 80 units had been in use so far;
- (iii) Hong Kong people returning from Hubei Province also needed to undergo compulsory home quarantine for 14 days. Staff of the Department of Health (“DH”) would conduct medical checks, give hygiene instructions and make telephone calls regularly;
- (iv) The close contacts or Hong Kong people returning from Hubei Province were not confirmed nor suspected patients of COVID-19. If people staying at quarantine centres had any symptoms, the Government would arrange medical staff to accompany them to hospitals for examination by coaches;
- (v) There were medical staff and law enforcement officers stationed at quarantine centres round the clock. Under quarantine orders, people leaving the quarantine facility without permission would be penalised;
- (vi) When evaluating whether the facility could be used as a quarantine center, the Government would consider the risk of transmission. The main modes of transmission of COVID-19 were through droplets, direct and indirect contact, including touching secretions, etc.;
- (vii) The authorities opined that the Heritage Lodge was relatively far away from residential buildings and had good ventilation, which was suitable for use as a quarantine centre. Professional staff would accompany people

undergoing quarantine to enter or leave the quarantine centre.

7. Ms Janet NG raised the following enquiries: (i) why the Government did not requisition the remaining 20-odd holiday camps in Hong Kong; (ii) why the amusement parks which had already been closed were not requisitioned as quarantine centres; (iii) if people undergoing quarantine left the isolation facility without permission, how the Police would locate them.

8. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he invited Dr CHUI again to attend the residents' meeting later for explaining the relevant arrangements of the isolation camp; (ii) the punishment for leaving the isolation facility without permission was mild. Besides, the area around the Heritage Lodge was easily accessible. He enquired how the Police would trace the people leaving the isolation facility without permission; (iii) Hong Kong had many facilities which were more distant from the residential buildings than the Heritage Lodge, making them more suitable for use as quarantine centres; (iv) the Bureau should step up its efforts in explaining and consulting DC Members and residents.

9. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views: (i) regarding the Heritage Lodge being requisitioned by the Government, the residents and DC Members had not been informed all along. The Government should increase its transparency of handling the incident if there were similar cases in the future; (ii) since the residents strongly opposed the proposal, he, together with the DC Members of the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood, would oppose the use of the Heritage Lodge as an isolation camp.

10. Ms Zoé CHOW raised the following views: (i) she only heard from the news that the Heritage Lodge was being requisitioned. She was dissatisfied that the Government did not inform the DC and the public of the proposal in advance; (ii) the Heritage Lodge was very close to the community. Residents nearby and people in other districts were concerned about it. She besieged the Government to withdraw the proposal.

11. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) the Bureau had a series of strategies on anti-epidemic, but there was no coordination during implementation; (ii) the Government did not make use of the platform of 18 DCs to explain the proposal to DC, nor explain the relevant proposal to the public in advance; (iii) he suggested the Bureau talk to the residents directly.

12. Ms Eunice CHAU raised the following views: (i) the Government did not consult

DC Members on the requisition of the Heritage Lodge in advance, which was disrespectful; (ii) members of the public had doubts about the Government's policy on anti-epidemic. The Government should be transparent about its decision making in order to allay public concerns and distrust; (iii) she invited Dr CHUI to talk to residents directly.

13. Dr CHUI gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) He thanked SSPDO for fighting the virus together with the Government;
- (ii) Apart from other factors, the Heritage Lodge was formerly a hospital and suitable for use as a quarantine centre;
- (iii) The purpose of setting up quarantine centres was to provide medical surveillance service. Therefore, the quarantine centres were not provided just for a particular type of persons. People staying at the quarantine centres came from all walks of life and different districts, including members of the public, medical staff and residents in the district, etc.;
- (iv) The close contacts of COVID-19 patients already had certain risks of transmission. The purpose of setting up quarantine centres was to handle this kind of people in one place. Arranging them to stay at the quarantine centres would not increase the risk of transmission;
- (v) There were medical staff and law enforcement officers stationed at the quarantine centers round the clock. Under the quarantine orders, those people leaving the quarantine facilities without permission would be punishable. The Government could use various means to find the people who left the quarantine facilities;
- (vi) The Global Positioning System was used to verify whether the people undergoing home quarantine were staying at the area they claimed. The quarantine centres did not need to use such system as they were being monitored 24 hours a day;
- (vii) People entering or leaving the quarantine centres were accompanied by professional staff and would not take public transport.

14. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) she understood the Government's urgency and difficulties in setting up a quarantine centre. However, the Government did

not make good use of DC as a consultative platform. She suggested the Government inform DC as soon as possible when handling special issue; (ii) the Government should value residents' views in the district when making decision on a particular issue and strengthen communication in order to allay public concerns.

15. Mr Kalvin HO raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Government should announce the details as soon as possible when handling sensitive issue such as setting up a quarantine centre. It should talk to the residents directly to allay their concerns; (ii) FHB's paper did not have a clear definition of what constituted a "suspected person". He enquired who would need to stay at the quarantine centre; (iii) the Heritage Lodge was very close to the residential buildings in Mei Foo. It was also easily accessible and unsuitable for use as a quarantine centre. He asked why the Government did not choose other facilities which were more distant from residential buildings; (iv) the Government should close all border crossings as soon as possible in order to stop the source of disease.

16. Mr Leos LEE raised the following views and enquiries: (i) a suspected COVID-19 patient left the hospital which was guarded by police officers without permission earlier. Therefore, the 24-hour security measures at the quarantine centre might not be completely effective; (ii) he enquired about the Government's backup plan if, for any reason, the Heritage Lodge could not be used as a quarantine centre.

17. Mr Jay LI raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Government should strengthen its work on listening to public views when implementing anti-epidemic measures; (ii) he enquired who would need to stay at the quarantine centre and the guidelines; (iii) whether the Government had assessed the number of places required for isolation purpose.

18. Mr Jeffrey SIN raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Paper showed that the Government's use of the Heritage Lodge as a quarantine centre was supported by leading experts. He enquired about the identities of these experts; (ii) whether the Government had plans to requisition other facilities as isolation centres apart from the Heritage Lodge; (iii) if there were any isolation cases of COVID-19, the authorities should inform the DC Members of the constituencies concerned as soon as possible in order to make quick arrangements for disinfection and cleansing work; (iv) whether the authorities would make reference to the practice of foreign countries by adopting "isolation onboard the cruise ships" to handle the cruise ships docking in Hong Kong.

19. Mr WAI Woon-nam raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Government

should first consult 18 DCs and DC Members of the constituencies concerned before implementing anti-epidemic strategies; (ii) the Heritage Lodge was adjacent to a densely populated residential area named Mei Foo Sun Chuen and thus was unsuitable for use as a quarantine centre. He enquired whether the Government would consider other facilities which were more distant from the residential area.

20. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Government should immediately update and release the building list on the first day of a person undergoing home confinement; (ii) the Government should increase the transparency of the anti-epidemic work to ease residents' concerns; (iii) he enquired about the details of the operation of home confinement, including the frequency of checks and meal arrangements, etc.

21. Mr Ramon YUEN raised the following views: (i) the Government's work on coordinating anti-epidemic supplies, control of border crossings, etc. was far from satisfactory; (ii) the Government should close all border crossings as soon as possible.

22. Dr CHUI gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The definitions and arrangements for confirmed patients, suspected patients and close contacts were different. Confirmed patients were persons who had tested positive for the virus. They had to receive medical treatment and be isolated in proper hospital wards. According to the reporting criteria of DH, people with symptoms would be classified as suspected patients and had to receive testing for the virus in hospitals. People who had close contact with confirmed patients would be classified as the close contacts, e.g. people who were living with confirmed patients, sitting in front of or behind the confirmed patients on means of transport, etc. They would undergo quarantine at a specific quarantine centre;
- (ii) The work of the police officers stationed at public hospitals was not to monitor patients and visitors entering or leaving the hospital. However, the quarantine centres had law enforcement officers stationed at the entrances/exits 24 hours a day, ensuring that the people staying at the centres could not leave the premises without permission by themselves. Therefore, the relevant security risks could not be compared with those of public hospitals;
- (iii) Both the Government and the community had proposed various suggestions on quarantine centres. DH had to assess the actual environment and

specifications of each facility independently;

- (iv) The Heritage Lodge could vacate rooms within a short period of time and was formerly a hospital. It complied with the requirements to be used as a quarantine centre in terms of readiness, hygiene and environment;
- (v) There was a set of guidelines for home quarantine arrangements. Apart from the medical services provided by DH, other government departments would also provide relevant support services;
- (vi) People undergoing home quarantine were mostly Hong Kong people who had visited Hubei Province within 14 days. Their dates of arrival were different, and their completion dates of home quarantine were different as well.

23. Ms Janet NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the Heritage Lodge was too close to the residential buildings, coupled with the fact that it was easily accessible, making it unsuitable for use as a quarantine centre; (ii) there were 20-odd holiday camps in the territory. She enquired why these camps were not being requisitioned.

24. Dr CHUI responded as follows: (i) the Government noted the views of the community on the sites for use as quarantine centres, but it needed time to inspect the environment. The occupancy of the three quarantine centres which were currently operating had almost reached their maximum capacity. The Government urgently needed to find another place, and thus the Heritage Lodge was requisitioned; (ii) the authorities would continue to actively examine the sites suitable for use as quarantine centres; (iii) more places were being constructed with precast components at the said three holiday camps, but the works were just an intermediate measure and could not solve the shortage problem of places at quarantine centres within a short period of time.

25. The Chairman enquired whether there was a lack of communication among the Bureau, DC and residents before the requisition of Heritage Lodge.

26. Dr CHUI responded as follows: (i) the authorities understood that residents were not healthcare professionals and might have misunderstanding about the environmental hygiene of the quarantine centre; (ii) the process of evaluating the sites to serve as quarantine centres was complicated and involved lots of work. Therefore, it must be conducted in tandem with consultation.

27. Mr Ramon YUEN enquired whether the Bureau would consider using Hong Kong

Central Hospital (“HKCH”), the site reserved for the Hong Kong Disneyland (“HKDL”) and barracks of the Chinese People's Liberation Army as the sites for quarantine centres.

28. Dr CHUI responded that the Bureau had inspected HKCH, but the hospital had been deserted for years and could not provide places within a short period of time.

29. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views: (i) the Heritage Lodge was formerly a hospital and had stopped operation for more than 40 years. He questioned whether it could still be suitable for use as a quarantine centre; (ii) as HKCH had not been deserted for a long time, he enquired whether it would be more suitable for use as a quarantine centre.

30. Mr WONG Kit-long enquired why the Bureau did not release the full building list on the first day of a person undergoing home quarantine.

31. Mr Jay LI enquired whether the Bureau would provide a written reply to the questions that could not be answered at the meeting later.

32. Dr CHUI gave a consolidated response as follows: (i) the authorities were willing to provide supplementary information in written form after the meeting; (ii) the building list of the people undergoing home quarantine had been uploaded onto DH’s website so that residents nearby could make preventive measures in advance; (iii) people undergoing home quarantine had a lower risk of transmission than the confirmed patients of COVID-19.

33. Ms Janet NG introduced Provisional Motion 1, which read as follows: “The Council opposes the Government’s requisition of Jao Tsung-I Academy's Heritage Lodge as an isolation facility, and requests the Government to close all border crossings at once (i.e. forbidding non-Hong Kong residents to enter Hong Kong from the Mainland China) in order to stop the source of disease.”

34. Mr Joshua LI seconded.

35. Ms LAU Pui-yuk raised the following views: (i) there was insufficient consultation on the Government’s requisition of the Heritage Lodge, making it hard to allay residents’ concerns. Therefore, she opposed the Government’s practice; (ii) the Government should not close all border crossings at this stage as it had to consider various factors and members of the public also had different views.

36. The meeting voted on Provisional Motion 1.

37. The Secretary announced the voting result: 22 Members voted for it, 0 Member voted against it and 2 Members abstained. The Chairman declared that Provisional Motion 1 was carried.

38. Mr Calvin HO introduced Provisional Motion 2, which read as follows: “In view of the rampant outbreak of ‘Wuhan pneumonia’, the Council requests the Special Administrative Region Government to prioritise the use of barracks of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (e.g. Shek Kong Barracks), the site reserved for the expansion of Hong Kong Disneyland, hotels of the two theme parks etc. as quarantine centres when identifying sites for the said purpose in order to prevent the spread of the virus in a densely populated community.”

39. Mr Howard LEE seconded.

40. Ms LAU Pui-yuk said that apart from the barracks of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army, Shek Kong Barracks, the site reserved for the expansion of HKDL, and hotels of the two theme parks, the Government should also consider using other facilities in Hong Kong as quarantine centres in an objective manner as long as the use of facilities complied with relevant guidelines and residents were consulted on such use.

41. The meeting voted on Provisional Motion 2.

42. The Secretary announced the voting result: 22 Members voted for it, 0 Member voted against it and 2 Members abstained. The Chairman declared that Provisional Motion 2 was carried.

43. The Chairman concluded that (i) it was hoped that FHB would respect the views of DC and consult the residents on the Heritage Lodge’s requisition as soon as possible; (ii) he thanked the Under Secretary for Food & Health, Mr CHUI Tak-yi, for attending the meeting.

(b) The public should take precautions immediately amid the rampant outbreak of “Wuhan pneumonia” (SSPDC Paper 10/20)

(c) Concern over the precautions and emergency measures taken by the Hong Kong Government in response to the virus infection of “Wuhan pneumonia” (SSPDC Paper 11/20)

44. The Chairman said that as Papers 10/20 and 11/20 were similar in nature, he suggested discussing the two items together. Members had no objection.

45. The Chairman said that before the meeting, the Secretariat had invited the representatives of the Hospital Authority and DH to attend the meeting. He regretted that the parties concerned could not send representatives to the meeting as they were busy with the anti-epidemic work. He then asked Members to refer to the written response of DH (Paper 25/20).

46. Mr Howard LEE said that he regretted that the departments could not send representatives to the meeting. He then introduced Paper 10/20.

47. Ms Eunice CHAU and Ms Janet NG introduced Paper 11/20.

48. Mr LIM Ying-lam responded that in order to effectively prevent the novel infectious disease, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) had stepped up the cleaning of its facilities, including public markets, cooked food centres, hawker bazaars, public toilets, refuse collection points, etc., and would carry out disinfection using 1:99 or 1:49 diluted household bleach when necessary in order to keep the said public places clean.

49. Mr LUK Chi-kwong responded as follows:

- (i) To prevent people from gathering and reduce the risk of community transmission, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) temporarily closed numerous leisure and cultural facilities starting from 29 January this year as well as cancelling the recreational, sports and cultural activities during this period.
- (ii) The Department also provided information to the staff of its facilities about prevention of spread of the novel infectious disease, stepped up the routine cleaning, prosecuted people who littered, as well as disinfected places dirtied by respiratory secretions, vomit or excreta using 1:49 diluted household bleach.

50. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded as follows:

- (i) The Housing Department (“HD”) had stepped up the routine cleaning and disinfection of the public places with more foot traffic in housing estates, which included cleaning building gates, lift buttons and control boards, etc., with 1:99 diluted household bleach, as well as placing alcoholic hand

sanitisers, disinfectant mats, etc., at the ground floor lift lobbies of buildings. It also encouraged residents to maintain good hygiene habits and took enforcement actions against irregularities related to hygiene.

- (ii) To reduce the risk of community transmission, the Department had temporarily closed most of its recreational and sports facilities and cancelled the major activities in this period.
- (iii) The Department had also sent staff to step up disinfection and cleaning at the housing estate buildings where people in compulsory home quarantine lived in the district.

51. Mr Eric TSE responded as follows:

- (i) The Transport Department (“TD”) provided the transport industry with information about prevention of infectious diseases on public vehicles and ferries, as well as requesting operators of public traffic and transport facilities to step up cleaning of public facilities, air conditioning filters and employees’ resting rooms, etc.
- (ii) The Department also issued guidelines on health to staff through the industry to raise staff’s awareness of personal hygiene, as well as providing passengers with information related to the epidemic through notice boards, announcements, etc.
- (iii) The Department would maintain close liaison with the industry and release updated guidelines on health in light of the development of the epidemic. It would also monitor the anti-epidemic work and preventive measures of the operators concerned.

52. Ms Betty LEUNG responded as follows:

- (i) The Social Welfare Department (“SWD”) notified government-subsidised service units of the response level of the public health response plan and the anti-epidemic measures concerned, especially information about prevention of spread of infectious diseases in residential care homes. On 23 January this year, the Department released a special allowance to all units operating subvented or subsidised services for purchasing anti-epidemic equipment and supplies.
- (ii) The Department had announced the arrangements for the welfare services

subsidised by SWD after the Chinese New Year holiday. Except for residential care services, all aided child care centres, day care centres for the elderly, sheltered workshops, integrated vocational rehabilitation services centres and day activity centres would suspend their service. These centres would, however, remain open to the service users in need. As for other services subsidised by the Department, essential services would be maintained while other services would be provided to a limited scale, depending on the service category.

- (iii) The Department would call residential care service units to ask about the situations in the residential care homes and see if assistance was needed. It would also remind them to step up the routine cleaning and disinfection, as well as notifying relevant organisations to suspend or postpone any visits or voluntary services.
- (iv) The Department would provide support to people undergoing quarantine at home or in a centre.

53. Mr Ramon YUEN enquired whether relevant departments would take appropriate measures concerning the maintenance of drainage pipes and U-traps of buildings.

54. Mr WONG Kit-long raised the following enquiries: (i) he enquired whether HD had requested its contractors to provide adequate personal protective equipment (“PPE”) to staff; (ii) he was concerned about the cleaning work for Kowloon Green Minibus route no. 75 and enquired whether TD had issued guidelines and provided assistance concerning the anti-epidemic measures on public transport.

55. Mr Ronald TSUI raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he enquired whether HD would provide masks to outsourced staff; (ii) he had written to HD to ask if it would request the staff members who had travelled outside Hong Kong during the Chinese New Year period to undergo quarantine at home for 14 days so as to reduce the risk of the disease being spread in the community, but no replies had been received yet.

56. Mr Jeffrey SIN raised the following views: (i) it was mandatory for employers to ensure employees’ safety and health during their execution of duties; (ii) he requested HD to provide adequate PPE to outsourced staff and remind them to wear a mask; (iii) he hoped that FEHD would step up street cleansing.

57. Mr MAK Wai-ming raised the following views and enquiries: (i) the security guards and cleaners of Un Chau Estate said that they needed to bring their own masks to work. He enquired whether HD would provide assistance; (ii) he enquired whether the

government department representatives attending the meeting had collected masks manufactured by the Correctional Services Department (“CSI masks”).

58. The District Officer gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The Sham Shui Po District Office (“SSPDO”) would provide assistance to the three-nil buildings in need and, when practical and necessary, contact people in home quarantine in the district to understand their needs and forward their requests to relevant departments.
- (ii) Regarding the collection of CSI masks, as the department representatives might not have the information concerned, hence no responses could be provided.

59. Ms LING Kuk-yi gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) HD had posted notices to remind residents that they should inspect indoor drainage pipes and associated sanitary fittings regularly and, when damage or blockage was found, carry out repairs as soon as possible or contact estate offices for follow up; they should also pour water into U-traps frequently to ensure that there was adequate water inside U-traps all the time to prevent the leaking of foul smells from drainage pipes to indoor areas; if residents had any enquiries, they could contact estate offices, which would take appropriate follow-up actions.
- (ii) The Department’s contractors were required to follow the relevant guidelines issued by the Government on staying at home and quarantine and were requested to provide adequate PPE to staff. The Department would also provide assistance to the staff members in need.
- (iii) Regarding the matter of contractors requesting staff to bring their own masks to work, the Department would seek more information about it and give them instructions after the meeting.

60. Mr LUK Chi-kwong responded that LCSD had requested its contractors to provide adequate PPE to staff and would closely monitor the situation, as well as providing assistance to relevant staff members when necessary.

61. The Chairman enquired why the approaches adopted by LCSD and HD to the closure of their recreational and sports facilities were different.

62. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded that to prevent people from gathering, HD had recently enforced a temporary closure of most of its recreational and community facilities.

63. Mr Eric TSE responded that TD would contact the public transport operators concerned after the meeting to understand their cleaning work and provide assistance. Also, he pointed out that the operators had successfully implemented a series of enhancement measures to prevent the spread of the epidemic.

64. Mr LIM Ying-lam gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) In the contracts between FEHD and its contractors, it was stipulated that the contractors were required to provide adequate PPE to staff. It was understood that the contractors of this district had an adequate supply of masks at the moment.
- (ii) To maintain environmental hygiene, the Department had requested its contractors to step up street cleansing, including handling discarded masks properly and sending more staff after midnight to clear the refuse accumulated in the public places with more three-nil buildings.

65. Mr Jay LI raised the following enquiries: (i) he enquired how to address the problem of inadequate mask supply for security guards of private buildings; (ii) many parents sent their children to private tutorial centres during the class suspension period. However, the Government had yet to issue guidelines on anti-epidemic measures to institutions of this category. He enquired which department was responsible for this; (iii) he enquired how the Government helped the stranded Hong Kong people in the Mainland.

66. Mr Richard LI raised the following views and enquiries: (i) members of the public said that the work-from-home arrangements for civil servants had affected public services; (ii) he enquired how SWD supported people in home quarantine and how HD enhanced the anti-epidemic measures in housing estates; (iii) he enquired about the number of cleaners and security guards of HD who had been to the Mainland during the Chinese New Year period and how the Department handled this; (iv) he enquired when the supply of masks would become steady again.

67. Mr Howard LEE raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he suggested HD review the guidelines on cleaning of housing estates and update them in a timely manner, as well as checking if there was an adequate supply of masks for cleaners and security guards in the estates; (ii) he requested HD to provide lidded litter bins in housing estates;

(iii) he enquired about the progress on the matter of the Government requesting the State Council to supply masks to Hong Kong.

68. Ms Eunice CHAU raised the following views: (i) she requested DH to inform Members of matters related to home quarantine as early as possible and keep information transparent; (ii) she requested the Government to maintain close liaison with the Mainland to obtain the latest information on the epidemic.

69. Mr KONG Kwai-sang raised the following views: (i) he requested relevant departments to announce the information to residents as soon as possible when they received suspected cases so as to ease the public's concerns; (ii) he suggested the Government draw up measures for purchasing masks on a real-name basis to ease the demand for masks.

70. Ms LING Kuk-yi gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) HD would request its contractors to provide frontline staff with adequate PPE and ensure staff had taken appropriate protective measures.
- (ii) Under the work-from-home arrangements for civil servants, the cleaning and security services in housing estates were still provided as usual. The Department had also posted notices to provide the opening hours of estate offices. If there was an emergency and assistance was needed, residents could contact the staff of control rooms, which were manned round the clock.
- (iii) After being notified that a resident needed to undergo quarantine at home, the Department would immediately carry out comprehensive cleaning and disinfection at the housing estate building concerned.
- (iv) The Department would inspect the environmental hygiene conditions in housing estates, and if environmental hygiene was affected due to the use of unlidded litter bins, the Department would definitely follow up.
- (v) If the Department received the latest information about the epidemic, it would share with residents as soon as possible.

71. The Chairman enquired if HD would allocate additional resources to the cleaning of housing estates, so as to reduce the workload of frontline cleaners.

72. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded that in addition to routine cleaning, if contractors had

done work that exceeded the specifications in the contract, they could request the contract manager to increase the number of contract work hours and workers accordingly and apply for collection of additional fees.

73. Ms Betty LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) The core service projects under SWD were still providing services to a limited scale. If members of the public had a service need, they could contact relevant units first and then make arrangements for meetings.
- (ii) The Department would provide people in home quarantine with basic daily necessities, food and psychological counselling, etc.

74. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) some restaurant staff did not wear masks. He requested FEHD to follow up; (ii) he hoped that HD would urge its contractors to provide adequate PPE to frontline cleaners and security guards; (iii) he requested HD and SWD to take care of the needs of the elderly living alone in housing estates, including providing food and anti-epidemic supplies; (iv) the work-from-home arrangements for civil servants had severely affected public services. He hoped the Government would handle this properly.

75. Ms Zoé CHOW raised the following enquiries: (i) whether the Government had issued guidelines on anti-epidemic measures and quarantine to universities and the Home Ownership Scheme estates; (ii) whether the number of cleaners in housing estates was adequate and enquired about the frequencies of routine cleaning and disinfection in housing estates; (iii) whether HD would combat the illegal disposal of food waste by restaurants in housing estates rigorously to maintain environmental hygiene.

76. Mr CHUM Tak-shing raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he requested government departments to provide automatic hand sanitiser dispensers in their facilities, including parks, markets, etc.; (ii) he hoped that SSPDO would appeal to district organisations not to donate masks to the Mainland so as to ensure a steady supply of masks in Hong Kong; (iii) he requested FEHD to increase the number of cleaners and ensure that its contractors provided adequate masks to cleaners; (iv) he enquired whether TD had issued guidelines on cleaning to public transport operators and monitored them.

77. Ms Carman NG raised the following views and enquiries: (i) she requested HD to provide more support to the elderly living alone, as well as sending staff regularly to check if the drainage pipes and U-traps in vacant units were damaged; (ii) she enquired whether the cleaning and disinfection of lift lobbies in housing estates had been stepped up; (iii) she requested suspension of the lift repair works in Chak On Estate to prevent

too many residents from waiting the lifts at the same time; (iv) she suggested LCSD and HD consider opening some facilities for people in need; (v) she enquired whether the DC-funded activities that had been cancelled recently could be announced in the website of DC and how the expenses paid would be dealt with.

78. Mr Joshua LI raised the following views: (i) to reduce the number of imported cases and the risk of an outbreak in the community, he requested the Government to enhance the anti-epidemic measures at borders and provide DC with written responses; (ii) he suggested that the Government set up an inter-departmental group to step up publicity and public education, educating the public on hygiene habits such as wearing masks correctly, etc.

79. Ms Janet NG said that she requested the Government to impose purchase restrictions on masks, enhance the anti-epidemic measures at borders and reopen some of the public facilities for people in need.

80. The Chairman said that some of the social welfare organisations that offered residential services had an inadequate mask supply, which affected the residents' daily lives. He enquired whether SWD would provide assistance.

81. Mr Jeffrey SIN said that DH had announced only yesterday that there was a home quarantine case in Block 44 in Shek Kip Mei Estate and its quarantine period would end today. He enquired why the Department had not made public the case immediately.

82. Ms LING Kuk-yi gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) HD would request its contractors to remind cleaners and security guards on duty to wear mask and provide them with adequate PPE. Provision of information about special situations, if any, to the Department was welcome.
- (ii) The Department would review the situations in individual housing estates and request its contractors to arrange adequate manpower to perform duties.
- (iii) The guidelines on routine cleaning and disinfection were also applicable to the estates having the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HKHA") as the manager of the deed of mutual covenant in the Home Ownership Scheme and the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme.
- (iv) The Department did not close all of its facilities. Some sitting-out areas of parks were still open to residents and the cleaning and disinfection of these areas would be stepped up.

- (v) If any traders in housing estates were found to dispose of refuse illegally, the Department would follow up.

83. The Chairman said that the approaches adopted by HD and LCSD to the closure of their playground facilities were not the same and he requested HD to reopen some of the facilities to residents.

84. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded that the views would be conveyed to the headquarters, but as housing estates were densely populated, temporary closure of most of the recreational and community facilities of HD could help reduce the risk of community outbreak.

85. Ms Carman NG requested HD to inspect the sitting-out areas of parks that had been temporarily closed in Chak On Estate.

86. Mr LIM Ying-lam gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) When conducting routine inspections, health inspectors of FEHD would request restaurants to remind staff to wear mask, with a view to safeguarding the public's health.
- (ii) The Department would review the existing manpower and make use of specialised vehicles to provide cleaning services, with a view to enhancing the prevention and control measures.
- (iii) The contractors of this district would give a suitable number of masks to staff every day to ensure that they performed duties in safe conditions.

87. Mr LUK Chi-kwong responded that in view of the latest situation concerning COVID-19, LCSD had temporarily closed some of its recreational and sports facilities, while free outdoor venues, including parks, playgrounds, 7-a-side soccer pitches, etc., were not affected.

88. Ms Betty LEUNG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) Social service units would call service users (such as the elderly and the disabled) to understand their situations and educate them on anti-epidemic measures. Members could also refer cases in need to the Department for follow up.
- (ii) Regarding the problem of having an inadequate mask supply, for some

large-scale social welfare organisations, the problem could usually be solved successfully by resources diversion. If social welfare organisations needed assistance, the Department would provide it as far as possible.

89. Mr Eric TSE responded that TD had requested operators to step up disinfection, including using 1:99 diluted household bleach to clean the inside and outside of vehicles, facilities that came into frequent contact with passengers in stations and staff resting rooms, as well as providing alcohol hand sanitisers in interchange stations with more foot traffic, with a view to safeguarding the health of passengers and staff.

90. Mr MAK Wai-ming said that he requested government departments to purchase masks for their contractors in a unified manner to safeguard the health of frontline contract staff.

91. Mr Richard LI enquired how residents could directly contact staff of HD under the work-from-home arrangements for civil servants and whether lidded litter bins could be provided in lift lobbies of housing estates for residents to dispose of masks.

92. Mr Jay LI said that he requested government departments to follow up on the mask supply problems faced by security guards of private buildings and the anti-epidemic guidelines for private places.

93. Mr Ronald TSUI said that employers had the responsibility to provide PPE to staff on duty and therefore he requested government departments to provide adequate masks to staff.

94. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu raised the following views: (i) he hoped that SSPDO would consolidate Members' views and pass them to relevant government departments; (ii) HKHA's contractors provided public services that covered a wider area and should provide masks to frontline staff; (iii) he requested the Government to properly follow up on the matter of purchasing masks globally; (iv) he requested SWD and other relevant departments to provide additional support to the underprivileged living in private buildings, helping them to fight against the epidemic.

95. The District Officer gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) SSPDO was pleased to know that district organisations were making arrangements to distribute masks to the grassroots in this district and it would try its best to provide assistance.
- (ii) According to the Guidelines on the Use of Sham Shui Po District Council

Funds for Community Involvement Projects, if an approved activity ended early during the preparation or implementation stage, where appropriate, DC could approve the reimbursement of the expenses incurred during the preparation or implementation stage to the organisation concerned.

96. Ms LING Kuk-yi responded that HD would closely monitor whether security guards and cleaners wore a mask when performing duties. Also, if environmental hygiene was affected due to the use of unlidded litter bins, the Department would definitely follow up.

97. Ms Betty LEUNG responded that the problem of social welfare organisations running low on anti-epidemic supplies including masks had been conveyed to the headquarters.

(d) High concern over the follow-up measures taken by the authorities after a suspected case of ‘Wuhan pneumonia’ was reported at the City University of Hong Kong (SSPDC Paper 12/20)

98. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu introduced Paper 12/20.

99. Mr Lawrence LAU raised the following views: (i) classes were suspended at the City University of Hong Kong at the moment. Mainlanders studying in Hong Kong would normally stay at dormitories, which might increase the risk of the spread of the disease in the dormitories; (ii) he opined that the management of the university should explain to other stakeholders in the community how the dormitories would handle the situation and make arrangements for students.

Item 2: Any other business

100. The Chairman invited Members to introduce Provisional Motions.

101. Mr Ramon YUEN introduced Provisional Motion 3, which read as follows:

“The poor performance of the Government in handling the epidemic has caused great distress to members of the public amid the rampant outbreak of ‘Wuhan pneumonia’. Members of the public are concerned about the virus being transmitted to Hong Kong endlessly from China. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to close all border crossings. The Council deeply understands that it was not easy for the healthcare workers to make the decision of going on strike, and knows that they did it to fight for closing all border crossings for the

wellbeing of Hong Kong. The Council supports the healthcare workers to go on strike and will stand with them in the fight for closing all border crossings at once.”

102. Mr Howard LEE introduced Provisional Motion 4, which read as follows:

“The Council requests the Special Administrative Region Government to provide frontline staff of the public hospitals with enough protective personal equipment, including high quality surgical masks, eye shields, goggles, disposable gowns, in order to ensure that frontline healthcare workers have enough protective equipment while at work.”

103. Mr Ronald TSUI introduced Provisional Motion 5, which read as follows:

“There is a lack of support for elderly singletons and elderly doubletons in the community, which makes it harder for them to buy surgical masks than other members of the public, resulting in some elders not having enough protection against the disease. The Council requests the Hong Kong Housing Authority to provide elderly singletons and elderly doubletons living in the public housing estates in Sham Shui Po with surgical masks, ensuring that the elders have enough protection while walking around in the community and attending medical appointments in hospitals.”

104. The Chairman asked Members to vote on the motion in Paper 11/20, which was moved by Ms Janaet NG and seconded by Ms Carman NG.

105. The meeting voted on the motion by open ballot and the result was as follows:

For	Mr YEUNG Yuk, Ms Janet NG, Ms Eunice CHAU, Ms Zoé CHOW, Mr CHUM Tak-shing, Mr KONG Kwai-sang, Mr Andy LAO, Mr Lawrence LAU, Mr Howard LEE, Mr Leos LEE, Mr Joshua LI, Mr Richard LI, Mr Jay LI, Mr MAK Wai-ming, Ms Carman NG, Mr Jeffrey SIN, Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, Mr Ronald TSUI, Mr WAI Woon-nam, Mr WONG Kit-long, Mr Ramon YUEN (21)
-----	---

Against	(0)
---------	-----

Abstain:	(0)
----------	-----

106. The Secretary announced the voting result: 21 Members voted for it, 0 Member voted against it and 0 Member abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

107. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Provisional Motion 3, which was moved by Mr Ramon YUEN and seconded by Ms Carman NG.

108. Since no Member voted against the motion or abstained from voting, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried unanimously by the Members present at the meeting.

109. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Provisional Motion 4, which was moved by Mr Howard LEE and seconded by Mr KONG Kwai-sang.

110. Since no Member voted against the motion or abstained from voting, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried unanimously by the Members present at the meeting.

111. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Provisional Motion 5, which was moved by Mr Ronald TSUI and seconded by Mr Richard LI.

112. Mr TAM Kwok-kiu suggested deleting the word “Sham Shui Po” in the motion.

113. Mr Ronald TSUI agreed with the said revision.

114. Since no Member voted against the motion or abstained from voting, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried unanimously by the Members present at the meeting.

115. The Chairman said that he hoped that departments could accept the views of DC and fight the epidemic together.

116. Mr Lawrence LAU proposed an agenda item for discussion as follows: “Discussing the clashes between the Police and members of the public in the early hours of 31 January and 1 February at Mei Foo Sun Chuen, and the arrest of the Vice-chairman of the Council, Ms Janet NG”.

117. The Chairman said that according to Order 13(2) of the Sham Shui Po District Council Standing Orders, the Chairman should approve the adding of an agenda item or

changing order of the agenda items before or during the meeting if the consent of more than half of the Members of the Council present at the meeting was obtained.

118. The District Officer raised the following views: (i) at the beginning of the meeting, the Chairman had said that the duration of the meeting would be limited to four hours. He hoped that Members could cooperate as far as possible in order to reduce the risk of the spread of the epidemic; (ii) he hoped that the agenda items for discussion could be related to the epidemic as far as possible, whereas other agenda items could be discussed after the epidemic was under control; (iii) as the Police was investigating the said case, Members should avoid discussing the content of the case in order to avoid legal liability.

119. The Chairman announced that the agenda item was approved to be added to the agenda as all Members present at the meeting unanimously agreed with the arrangement.

120. Ms Janet NG introduced Provisional Motion 6, which read as follows:

“The Council strongly requests:

1. the Police to report the number of operations, the number of arrestees and the reasons for their arrests on the website of the Hong Kong Police Force periodically, provided that the privacy of the relevant parties are protected.
2. the Police to clarify the guidelines on law enforcement, in particular the guidelines on entering private premises to take law enforcement actions, and the rationale behind people being prosecuted for unlawful assembly after attending a gathering in private premises.
3. the Police to stop making any indiscriminate arrests and taking unnecessary law enforcement actions, e.g. the attacks on heads and unnecessary verbal insults. The Police should announce specific and clear guidelines on the use of force, and conduct an independent investigation on the use of violence by the Police, take disciplinary action against the police officers involved and prosecute them for the crimes committed.
4. the Police to seriously review if there were any abuse of power and indiscriminate arrests in the two operations, hold the police officers accountable and give an account to the public.
5. the Government to respect the reasonable demands made by residents in Mei Foo, and not to dispatch police officers to interfere in peaceful protests.”

121. Mr Lawrence LAU said that he had written to the Regional Commander of the Kowloon West Regional Headquarters of the Hong Kong Police Force. The Regional Commander replied that he could not attend the meeting as the case was under investigation.

122. The Chairman asked Members to vote on Provisional Motion 6, which was moved by Ms Janet NG and seconded by Mr Joshua LI.

123. Since no Member voted against the motion or abstained from voting, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried unanimously by the Members present at the meeting. He continued to ask the Secretariat to forward the said motion to the Police.

124. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:30 p.m.

District Council Secretariat
Sham Shui Po District Office
April 2020