

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)475/00-01  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PS/2/00/1

**Legislative Council**  
**Panel on Transport**

**Subcommittee on matters relating to the  
implementation of railway development projects**

**Meeting on**  
**Thursday, 4 January 2001, at 10:45 am**  
**in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP (Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP  
Hon CHAN Kwok-keung  
Hon LAU Kong-wah  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

**Members absent** : Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo

**Non-Subcommittee** : Hon WONG Sing-chi  
**Member attending**

**Public officers** : **Agenda Item II**  
**attending**

Transport Bureau

Mr William SHIU  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (4)

Mr M L WAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (7)

Highways Department

Mr John CHAI  
Principal Government Engineer/Railway Development

Mr L T MA  
Government Engineer/Railway Development

Transport Department

Mr Harry CHAN  
Chief Engineer/Strategic Roads

**Attendance by invitation :** **Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation**

Mr K K LEE  
Director, East Rail Extensions

Mr Hugh WU  
General Manager, Construction (ERE)

Mr Thomas TAM  
Project Manager (MOS)

**Clerk in attendance :** Mr Andy LAU  
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)2

**Staff in attendance :** Ms Alice AU  
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)5

---

Action

**I Election of Chairman**

Ir Dr Raymond HO, the member who had the highest precedence in the Council among members of the Subcommittee, invited nominations for the chairmanship. Mr Albert CHAN nominated Mrs Miriam LAU and the nomination was seconded by Ir Dr Raymond HO. Mrs LAU accepted the nomination. There being no other nominations, Mrs LAU was elected Chairman of the Subcommittee and took over the Chair.

Action

**II Ma On Shan to Tai Wai Rail Link and Kowloon-Canton Railway Extension from Hung Hom to Tsim Sha Tsui - Essential Public Infrastructure Works**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)304/00-01 - Information paper provided by the Administration)

2. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (4) (PAS for T(4)) briefed members on the scope of essential public infrastructure works (EPIW) required for the Ma On Shan to Tai Wai Rail Link (MOS Rail) and Kowloon-Canton Railway (KCR) Extension from Hung Hom to Tsim Sha Tsui (TST Extension) and the costs of these works, as set out in the information paper provided by the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)304/00-01). Subject to members' views, the Administration planned to submit to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) for upgrading part of the EPIW for the MOS Rail comprising four subways and a footbridge and the EPIW for the TST Extension to Category A on 17 January 2001. Subject to PWSC's endorsement, the proposal would then be submitted to the Finance Committee for consideration in February 2001.

3. With the aid of PowerPoint, the Government Engineer/Railway Development (GE/RD) presented members with detailed plans on the various items of EPIW for the MOS Rail and TST Extension.

TST Extension

*On-cost for entrusted EPIW*

4. Referring to the 16.5% on-cost payable to the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) and the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) respectively for undertaking the technical studies, design and construction supervision of the EPIW, Mr Abraham SHEK queried the rationale for the Government to shoulder such costs as the subway network was built solely for the railway companies. In reply, PAS for T(4) clarified that apart from connecting the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) station and the new KCR East TST station, the pedestrian subway network would provide 24-hour access for the public and also serve to minimize conflict between pedestrians and road traffic and help smooth the traffic flows in a very busy district. The EPIW were in fact public works of the Government despite the fact that the two railway corporations would be entrusted with the relevant design and construction works.

5. GE/RD also explained that in broad terms, such on-cost would only cover design fee, staff costs for construction supervision and other recurrent expenditure. The rate of 16.5% was a standard rate agreed by the Government and the two railway corporations for all entrustment projects. However, Mr SHEK was not convinced that a standard rate should apply to all entrustment projects given that each project was different in its own right and a profit margin might be built in incidentally. As MTRCL was no longer a public corporation, he considered that it was necessary to review the basis of charging a standard 16.5% on-cost for entrustment projects. In

Action

Admin. response, PAS for T(4) said that he would relay the member's suggestion to the Finance Bureau and relevant departments for consideration and revert back to the Subcommittee in due course.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

*Pedestrian subway network*

6. Members in general welcomed the provision of pedestrian subways to connect the new KCR East TST station with the MTR TST station. However, both Ir Dr Raymond HO and Mr Albert CHAN queried why no subway was proposed along Nathan Road connecting the existing MTR TST station with the Middle Road subway which would then lead directly to the KCR East TST station.

7. In response, GE/RD explained that as far as interchanging between the two stations was concerned, the platform to platform distance of the two routes, i.e. via Mody Road or Middle Road, was more or less the same. Under the present proposal, the route along Blenheim Avenue and Mody Road had been chosen as the interchange subway and the Middle Road subway was only supplementary in terms of interchanging passengers. He also advised that while it was the Administration's intention to propose strictly essential EPIW to cater for the operational needs of TST Extension at this stage, an extension to the subway system as suggested by members and further integration of the subway network with other underground passages in the area would be considered in the next stage of development.

8. Ir Dr Raymond HO however disagreed that this subway section should be deferred until the next stage. Given the crowding of the TST area, he considered that the provision of a subway connecting the MTR TST station along Middle Road was justified as a safe and convenient access would be available for pedestrians and passengers of other public transport modes as well. Hence, he urged the Administration to include this subway section under its present proposal so as to avoid creating unnecessary inconvenience and disturbance to the local residents and shop operators in future. Both the Chairman and Mr Albert CHAN shared his views. In response, PAS for T(4) assured members that while the EPIW had included a direct interchange between the two stations via the Mody Road subway, the need for a second interchange subway was being considered by the Administration together with the two railway corporations. In that case, Ir Dr HO opined that the final decision should be made by the Administration, rather than by the two railway corporations.

9. Responding to Ir Dr Raymond HO's further enquiry, GE/RD confirmed that access to the carpark in Middle Road would be maintained at all times during the construction and implementation stages of the EPIW.

Action

*Provision of travelators*

10. Concerning about the long transit distance and the need to facilitate interchange for the disabled, Ir Dr Raymond HO suggested that two-directional travelators should be installed where possible for the convenience of the pedestrians. Sharing his view, the Chairman opined that two-directional travelators should at least be provided in the Mody Road subway which was the widest of all. Given that the subways were built underground, Mr Albert CHAN also questioned about the constraints on the width of the subways which precluded the installation of an additional travelator.

11. As regards the width constraints of the subways, GE/RD explained that the subways had already been designed to take up all the available space within the width of the carriageway. Illustrating this point with the Mody Road subway, he said that while the dual carriageway in Mody Road was about 10-m wide, the outer structures of the subway would take up 3.3 m leaving the clear width of the subway at 6.7 m. Any further widening of the subways by encroaching upon the pavement would not be feasible taking into account various technical and engineering considerations, such as the public utilities ducting underground and the potential impact on the structural safety of nearby buildings. In the Middle Road section where an entrance would be provided, the installation of travelators was technically not possible due to site constraints. Existing telephone chambers, stormwater culverts and MTR tunnels presented further technical problems.

12. GE/RD also advised that the installation of two-directional travelators had in fact been considered but was decided against due to considerations in the control of passenger flow and possible future connections to the developments of the Land Development Corporation. Although the interchange subway in Mody Road had a clear width of 6.7 m, 4.5 m would be taken up for the installation of two-directional travelators, leaving 2.2 m. Taking into account the need to provide extra clearance for the pedestrians from the travelators, only a narrow passageway would be left. Except by operating both travelators in the same direction, it would not be inadequate to cope with the estimated flow of about 15 000 passengers interchanging from KCR East TST station to MTR TST station in the morning peak. Serious problems in crowd management might occur if any travelators failed to operate and urgent maintenance was required. In response to members' request, PAS for T(4) agreed to provide estimated figures for the flow of interchanging passengers between the two stations.

Admin.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

13. Given the busy interchange between the two railway systems, Ir Dr Raymond HO opined that there were all the more reasons to facilitate access by the disabled during the peak periods through the provision of travelators and it was high time for the Administration to start embracing the idea of providing adequate and suitable facilities for the disabled in its public infrastructure works. In reply, PAS for T(4)

Action

said that subject to site constraints and advice from the departments concerned, the Administration and KCRC would further consider how to meet the needs of the disabled.

14. Highlighting the potential safety risks created by large crowds of people and the problems associated with the breakdown of travelators, Mr LAU Ping-cheung expressed reservation about the installation of travelators in such a busy subway network. In response, PAS for T(4) stated that when the matter was previously discussed by the Transport Panel of the previous term, the majority view was that travelators should be provided for public convenience. Working towards this direction, the Administration hoped that with the present proposal, travelators would be provided as far as possible within site constraints and safety considerations to facilitate access by pedestrians. He also assured members that special attention would be paid by relevant departments to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the travelators. In that case, Mr LAU Ping-cheung considered that more entrances/exits should be provided and requested additional information from the Administration.

Admin. GE/RD agreed that a detailed plan showing the proposed entrances/exits of the subway network would be provided to members after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

MOS Rail

Admin. & KCRC 15. In order to facilitate members' understanding on the technical details of the project, Mr Albert CHAN requested that copies of the Final EIA Study Report and Feasibility Study Report of the MOS Rail project be provided to members for reference.

*(Post-meeting note: The said reports had been deposited in the Library of the Legislative Council.)*

*Public transport interchanges*

16. Referring to the two covered public transport interchanges (PTIs) under the proposed EPIW for MOS Rail, Mr LAU Ping-cheung opined that these PTIs should be properly designed to allow for natural ventilation and lighting. In addition, suitable measures should be put in place to deal with potential traffic congestion problems in the vicinity of the PTIs. Taking note of the member's views, PAS for T(4) advised that the design of the PTIs would take these considerations into account and further consultation would be conducted pending the completion of the detailed design.

*Noise impact*

17. Citing the grave concerns of residents in Shatin on the significant noise impact to be created inevitably by the construction and operation of MOS Rail, especially the

Action

Heng On station and City One station where existing schools were just about 10 m away, Mr LAU Kong-wah enquired about the safeguards to be put in place to address the concerns of local residents, school authorities and parents, and to ensure that domestic premises (including Sha Kok Estate, City One Shatin and Ma On Shan Centre) and local schools within close proximity of the railway alignment would not be adversely affected. In this connection, he sought information on how the effectiveness of the new noise barriers to be installed along the railway alignment compared with the existing noise barriers along the East Rail.

18. In reply, PAS for T(4) advised that MOS Rail was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499), and KCRC was required to adopt appropriate measures to minimize the nuisance of noise caused by the project and to ensure that stringent conditions under the environmental permit would be complied with.

19. To supplement, Mr K K LEE, the Director, East Rail Extensions of KCRC (D/ERE of KCRC) explained that unlike the East Rail which relied on noise barriers to mitigate operation noise, the MOS Rail was better designed and engineered to reduce railway noise at source. He also pointed out that all mitigation measures proposed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Study were designed for the operation of an eight-car train every two minutes during peak period, and KCRC was confident that the impact of railway noise in nearby areas of the MOS Rail would be kept within the statutory limit. During its initial operation, four-car trains at a two-and-a-half-minute interval would be deployed, hence providing further margin.

20. However, Mr LAU Kong-wah considered that KCRC should adopt effective mitigation measures in the light of actual circumstances, as railway noise would still create nuisance to local residents, especially to schools located in the vicinity, even though the noise levels were kept within the limit set out in the EIA Study. D/ERE of KCRC replied that in accordance with the statutory requirements and the data obtained from modelling in the EIA Study, the noise levels should be kept under 55 dB(A).

21. Regarding the response given by KCRC, Mr LAU Kong-wah queried whether there were any measures that could keep railway noise down to a level that was comparable with ordinary traffic noise. D/ERE of KCRC explained that firstly, a multi-plenum noise attenuation system would be adopted for the MOS Rail. Trains would have side skirts and underbody noise absorption lining to trap and absorb noise caused by contact between train wheels and tracks, and railway tracks would be laid on a resilient base plate and floating slabs on rubber mountings to absorb the vibration noise. Secondly, airborne noise would be further blocked by the parapets of the viaduct structures, which were built with allowance for further increase of the height of the parapets from the existing 1.2 m to 4 m. He assured members that notwithstanding the increase in noise levels in areas along the railway alignment as a result of railway operation, KCRC was confident that with the implementation of the two sets of measures as mentioned above, most of the areas along the MOS Rail

Action

KCRC alignment, including the school situated near the railway track in City One Shatin, would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding 55 dB(A) as specified by the Technical Memorandum of the Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400). At the Chairman's request, D/ERE of KCRC agreed to provide detailed information on the future noise levels of areas along the whole MOS Rail alignment.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

Admin. 22. Mr Albert CHAN asked about the remedial measures to be taken should the noise level could not be kept at 55 dB(A) or below as promised and whether compensation would be paid to the affected residents. In reply, PAS for T(4) emphasized that MOS Rail was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499) and stringent conditions had been imposed on its construction and operation under the environmental permit granted by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). In case of non-compliance, construction work would be suspended until suitable remedial measures were taken. In this connection, KCRC was required to employ professionals to monitor and audit the environmental impacts of the project to ensure that noise nuisance would be kept to a minimum. In order to address members' concerns, he undertook to confirm with EPD the permissible noise limits for the relevant educational institutions under the environmental permit.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

*Overcrowding in Tai Wai station*

23. In response to members' concern about the overcrowding situation in Tai Wai station, D/ERE of KCRC said that KCRC had been closely monitoring the demand-capacity of the critical Tai Wai to Kowloon Tong section. In anticipation of the additional loads generated from MOS Rail, measures were being taken to increase the passenger handling capacity, including refurbishment of train compartments and upgrading of signalling system. By the time all improvement measures were completed in 2003, East Rail would be able to operate up to 27 trains per hour during the peak period handling close to 100 000 passengers.

24. Mr WONG Sing-chi however opined that KCRC's projections might have failed to take into account the additional passengers attracted to the East Rail by extended service to TST. In reply, D/ERE of KCRC advised that in order to cope with the passenger demand generated by the MOS Rail, the interchange facilities at Tai Wai station would be designed in such a way so that passengers would be diverted to the front-end or back-end of the platform where train compartments had more spare capacity. Moreover, with the signalling system upgrade in 2003, it would be possible to deploy more empty despatches from Fo Tan to relieve the bottleneck in Tai Wai station if necessary. In that case, Mr WONG requested that the same flexible



Action

arrangement be made to relieve the demand in Fanling station.

25. Mr LAU Kong-wah pointed out that the crux of the problem lied in the fact that after 2003, nothing more could be done by KCRC to further increase the capacity of East Rail. In view of the continuous growth of population in the New Territories, he was unconvinced that without a second rail connection from Tai Wai to Kowloon, the East Rail would be able to cope with the passenger demand up to 2011 and Tai Wai station would not be overloaded to an unacceptable extent. In response, D/ERE of KCRC stressed that with the committed expansion and upgrading measures, the East Rail would have capacity to handle 100 000 passengers per hour vis-à-vis the projected demand of 80 000 passengers in 2011. He undertook to provide members with projections on passenger demand and train service of the East Rail up to 2011 for information.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

26. Re-iterating his grave concerns about further aggravation of the overcrowding situation in Tai Wai station by the interchange from the MOS Rail, Mr LAU Kong-wah requested that a firm undertaking be made by KCRC to MOS Rail passengers that they would be able to board on the first train to Kowloon at the Tai Wai Interchange during the morning peak period. In response, D/ERE of KCRC agreed to give this undertaking subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Trains were under normal operation;
- (b) The passengers did not choose to board a particular compartment of the train, specifically the middle section of the train for easy access to exits when alighting; and
- (c) The undertaking did not apply during "peak of the peak", i.e. the ten minutes or so from 8:30 am.

Regarding the above conditions imposed by KCRC, Mr LAU Kong-wah said that they should not create much difficulties. First of all, normal operation of trains would certainly be a pre-requisite. Secondly, regarding the problem of passengers choosing to board a particular compartment of the train, KCRC had undertaken to adopt improvement measures in Kowloon Tong Station accordingly, and to design the interchange facilities at Tai Wai Station in such a way that passengers would be diverted to the front-end or back-end of the platform. Thirdly, the undertaking required from KCRC should apply generally in the morning peak period, and not specifically during "peak of the peak". Mr LAU Kong-wah requested that the undertaking made by KCRC at the meeting be put on record. He said that if KCRC failed to honour its promise, D/ERE of KCRC should be held responsible.

Action

General concerns

Admin. 27. Regarding the two undertakings made by KCRC that most of the areas along the MOS Rail alignment, including the school in City One Shatin, would not be exposed to noise levels exceeding 55 dB(A), and that MOS Rail passengers would be able to board on the first train to Kowloon at the Tai Wai Interchange during the morning peak period, Mr LAU Kong-wah enquired about the actions to be taken by the Transport Bureau (TB) if those undertakings did not stand. In reply, PAS for T(4) advised that the Administration would closely monitor KCRC's compliance with the requirements stipulated under the environmental permit of the MOS Rail project. If KCRC was in breach of any statutory requirements, penalty would be incurred. He undertook to provide relevant information to members after the meeting. As regards the second undertaking, he said that as a responsible public corporation, KCRC should stand by its word. The Government would ensure that a safe, efficient and reliable service was provided by KCRC under the relevant legislation.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

28. Responding to Mr LAU Kong-wah's enquiry about the second rail connection from Tai Wai to Kowloon, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (7) (PAS for T(7)) advised that this rail connection from Tai Wai to Diamond Hill together with the Fourth Rail Harbour Crossing and the East Kowloon Line had been grouped into the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) project under the Railway Development Strategy 2000 as part of the next phase of railway network expansion. Bids for the project would be invited from the two railway corporations in early 2001. During tender evaluation, higher marks would be given if the corporation concerned had the ability to complete the whole or part of the project within a shorter time-frame.

29. Mr Albert CHAN expressed serious concerns about the ability of TB to oversee the implementation of the MOS Rail and TST Extension projects. Citing controversies arising from the construction of West Rail such as the floodings in Yuen Long and Tun Mun which caused serious property damage to many villagers, he pointed out that under the existing arrangements, the affected residents would have to hire professionals to prove their claims and sue KCRC for compensation if responsibility was denied by the corporation. Without the financial resources, many affected residents were forced to give up their cases. As such, he sought assurance from the Administration that KCRC would be held responsible for the damages caused by its railway works to private citizens and that the rights of those residents affected by the construction works would be properly safeguarded by allowing them to claim compensation more easily.

30. In response, PAS for T(4) assured members that every effort would be made by the Government to ensure that construction works of railway projects would not cause undue disturbance. As far as the MOS Rail and TST Extension were concerned, inter-departmental meetings were being held under the established mechanism to

Action

discuss issues related to KCRC's traffic management schemes, site activities and environmental protection measure so that the disturbances created by construction works could be minimized. To supplement, GE/RD said that specifically, Site Liaison Groups would be established to consider the temporary traffic management schemes put forward by KCRC. The Groups would include representatives from the Highways Department, the Transport Department, the Police and the local District Offices. Moreover, KCRC was required to have dedicated teams of staff for site supervision and environmental monitoring and auditing. In order to ensure a speedy response to community concern on the railway projects, community liaison offices and community liaison groups, with representatives from the relevant District Councils and local concern groups would also be set up by KCRC and the public views collected would be relayed to the Administration for consideration, action and monitoring purposes. In this connection, Ir Dr Raymond HO opined that special arrangements should be made for the transportation of pre-fabricated parts for the construction of viaducts of MOS Rail project to ensure that local traffic would not be disrupted.

31. Given that the West Rail project was also placed under similar monitoring mechanism, Mr Albert CHAN had serious doubts over its efficacy and he was not at all convinced that livelihood problems caused by railway works could thus be prevented. He strongly requested that in order to restore public confidence on the Government's ability to safeguard their interests impartially and righteously, an independent panel should be established to hear and arbitrate the claims put forward by affected residents.

32. In response, PAS for T(4) stressed that an established mechanism had already been provided under the Railways Ordinance (Cap. 519) for those affected by the construction of railways to claim compensation for losses thus caused and the Administration would continue to work within the statutory requirements in accordance with law. As regards the proposed EPIW for MOS Rail and TST Extension, both the Government and KCRC were confident that the projects would be taken forward in a satisfactory manner and that inconvenience caused to individuals and the community as a whole would be kept to a minimum. Expressing utmost disappointment with the reply, Mr Albert CHAN opined that the Administration would clearly fail to perform its monitoring role by adopting such a bureaucratic approach.

33. Dissatisfied with the dismissive way KCRC had handled previous claims put forward by residents affected by its railway works, Mr Albert CHAN suggested that KCRC should consider setting up an independent panel to deal with any future claims, such as those arising out of the EPIW under the present proposal. In response, D/ERE of KCRC said that he could not concur with the member's view that KCRC had disregarded the rights of the affected residents in the past. He stressed that under the existing arrangement, independent professionals had been/would be engaged to conduct pre-construction surveys and every claim would be considered carefully by independent loss adjusters. As a public corporation, KCRC would have to ensure that any compensation payable were justified. In terms of the proposed EPIW, he assured members that care would be exercised to ensure that disturbances to residents

Action

would be kept to a minimum. Unconvinced by KCRC's reply, Mr Albert CHAN said that in order to safeguard the interests of the affected residents, he would consider adding this condition to the funding request for the EPIW when the item was submitted to PWSC for approval.

KCRC 34. Notwithstanding KCRC's explanation, the Chairman pointed out that the affected residents would have no other recourse if their claims were rejected by KCRC. As many of them could not afford the money to hire professionals to refute KCRC's decision and pursue their claims through legal action, they were left in a very difficult position. In view of members' concerns, D/ERE of KCRC agreed to consider Mr Albert CHAN's suggestion.

*(Post-meeting note: KCRC's response was circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)467/00-01 and CB(1)469/00-01.)*

35. Responding to Mr Albert CHAN's concern about land resumption arrangements for the MOS Rail and TST Extension, PAS for T(4) confirmed that no resumption of land was required for the two railway projects.

36. Referring to paragraph 17 of the Chinese version of the paper, Mr LAU Kong-wah took the view that the statement “(沙田)區議員並沒有就這些工程提出異議” was misleading and did not reflect the many views and suggestions put forward by Sha Tin District Council (STDC) members on the MOS Rail project when they were consulted by the Administration. In fact, some of those concerns had been relayed to KCRC for consideration. As such, Mr LAU requested that the Administration should retract this statement in its paper. Moreover, he suggested that all the concerns expressed by STDC members should be listed out in the discussion paper to be submitted to PWSC so that Members could have a clear understanding on the views of the local community. His suggestion was supported by the Chairman.

Admin. 37. In response, PAS for T(4) clarified that there was no intention whatsoever to mislead Members and he referred members to the English version of the paper which stated that “Members of the Sha Tin District Council did not raise any adverse comments on the EPIW”. While the subject matter was the EPIW, the statement simply pinpointed the fact that no objection had been raised by STDC members on the EPIW. Nevertheless, he undertook to provide members with a summary of the views put forward by STDC members on the EPIW.

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)482/00-01.)*

38. On behalf of the Members of the Democratic Party, Mr Albert CHAN expressed reservation on the funding proposal.

39. Mr Abraham SHEK expressed support for the proposed EPIW but requested that information on the 16.5% on-cost be provided to members before the item was

Action

submitted to PWSC.

40. Mr LAU Kong-wah requested that all the information he had requested from the Administration and KCRC be provided before the item was submitted to PWSC.

41. The Chairman invited the Administration to note the views and suggestions put forward by members at the meeting.

### **III Way forward**

42. In order to provide a focus for the Subcommittee's work, Mr Albert CHAN suggested that future discussion on railway development projects could cover the following areas:

- (a) Overall planning;
- (b) Provision of supporting public infrastructure;
- (c) Construction supervision;
- (d) Land resumption and compensation;
- (e) Environmental impact and assessment; and
- (f) Progress update on on-going railway development projects.

As not too many members were still present at the meeting, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the Clerk be requested to draw up a proposed terms of reference of the Subcommittee for members' consideration at the next meeting, taking into account the suggestion raised by Mr Albert CHAN.

43. At the Chairman's suggestion, members agreed that the Administration and MTRCL should be invited to brief the Subcommittee on the progress update of the Tseung Kwan O Extension.

### **IV Any other business**

44. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:50 pm.