

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1519/01-02  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PL/EA/1

**LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting held on  
Monday, 25 February 2002, at 2:30 pm  
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman)  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Deputy Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP  
Hon SIN Chung-kai  
Hon WONG Yung-kan  
Hon LAU Kong-wah  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP  
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

**Members absent** : Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP  
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS  
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

**Public officers  
attending** : **For item IV**

Environment and Food Bureau

Mr Donald TONG  
Deputy Secretary (B)

Ms Annie CHOI  
Principal Assistant Secretary (B)2

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Benny WONG  
Assistant Director (Waste and Water)

Mr Conrad LAM  
Principal Environmental Protection Officer  
(Waste Facilities)

Department of Health

Mr K M CHENG  
Senior Physicist

**For item V**

Environment and Food Bureau

Mr Donald TONG  
Deputy Secretary (B)

Ms Annie CHOI  
Principal Assistant Secretary (B)2

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Rob LAW  
Director of Environmental Protection

Dr Ellen CHAN  
Assistant Director (Waste Facilities)

**Clerk in attendance :** Miss Becky YU  
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)1

**Staff in attendance :** Mrs Mary TANG  
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)2

---

**I Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1120/01-02 — Minutes of the joint meeting with the Transport Panel held on 15 January 2002
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1121/01-02 — Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2002)

The minutes of the meetings held on 15 and 28 January 2002 were confirmed.

**II Information paper issued since last meeting**

2. Members noted the following information papers which had been issued since last meeting-

- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1000/01-02 — A copy of an e-mail from a member of public expressing concern about an allegation on the tendering of particulate reduction devices by the Government as raised by Mr Jake van der Kamp in an article published in the South China Morning Post on 23 January 2002
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1108/01-02 — Administration's response to LC Paper No. CB(1) 1000/01-02
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1064/01-02 — A letter from Hon Audrey EU to the Director of Environmental Protection regarding an allegation made against the tendering procedure of particulate reduction devices and relevant press reports on the background of the subject
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1119/01-02 — Administration's response to LC Paper No. CB(1) 1064/01-02
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 1109/01-02 — Referral from Duty Roster Members regarding the concern raised by a Ms WONG Wai-king on the impact of the proposed construction of anchorage and re-planting of mangroves at Tai O on its natural and built heritage

### III Date of next meeting and items for discussion

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1122/01-02(01) — List of follow-up actions arising from discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1122/01-02(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

3. As the Special Finance Committee meetings had been advanced to be held from 25 to 27 March 2002, members agreed that the next regular meeting originally scheduled for 25 March 2002 be rescheduled to 20 March 2002 at 8:30 am.

4. Miss CHAN Yuen-han considered that there was urgency in discussing the impact of the proposed construction of anchorage and re-planting of mangroves at Tai O on its natural and built heritage and suggested that the subject be included in the agenda for the next meeting. Ms Miriam LAU was of the view that the subject, which appeared to be more of a district issue, should be dealt with at a case conference. Her views were shared by Mr WONG Yung-kan. Ms Cyd HO however pointed out that there were policy issues involved in the relocation of mangroves to make way for development projects. She nevertheless agreed that the subject need not be discussed at the next meeting but at a later stage by both the Environmental Affairs Panel and the Home Affairs Panel. The Chairman decided that the subject should first be dealt at a case conference and where necessary be followed up by the Panels, and that the Duty Roster Members handling the case should be duly informed.

5. Members agreed to discuss the following subjects at the next regular meeting on 20 March 2002 -

- (a) Injection of funding into the Environment and Conservation Fund
- (b) Outcome of consultation on the Clinical Waste Control Scheme

*(Post meeting note: At the request of the Administration and with the concurrence of the Chairman, the agenda item on “Injection of funding into the Environment and Conservation Fund” had been replaced by “Progress of trials and studies on the way forward for the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme”.)*

6. In view of the recent controversy over the removal of dioxin-contaminated soil at Penny’s Bay, members considered it necessary to hold a special joint meeting with the Planning, Lands and Works Panel and the Economic Services Panel to discuss the subject. The Chairman added that green groups should also be invited to express their views on the effect of dioxin. Subject to the agreement of the Chairmen of the other two Panels, the joint meeting would be held on 12 March 2002.

(*Post meeting note:* After consultation with the Chairmen of the Planning, Lands and Works Panel and the Economic Services Panel, it was decided that the Environmental Affairs Panel would hold a special meeting on 12 March 2002 at 9:30 am to discuss the effect of dioxin and the removal of dioxin-contaminated soil at Penny's Bay. Non-Panel members and green groups would be invited to attend the meeting.)

#### **IV Long-term management of low-level radioactive waste**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 801/00-01(08) — Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1412/00-01 — Extracts from the minutes of the meeting of the Environmental Affairs Panel held on 19 March 2001

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1122/01-02(03)— Information paper provided by the Administration)

7. The Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (B) (DSEF(B)) briefed members on the Government's plan regarding the long-term management of low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) in Hong Kong by highlighting the salient points of the information paper.

#### The Mainland option

8. Ir Dr Raymond HO declared interest as the Deputy Chairman of the Guangdong Daya Bay Nuclear Plant Nuclear Plant Safety Consultative Committee. He held the view that instead of building a long-term storage facility for LLRW in Siu A Chau (SAC), it would be more efficient to make use of the existing facilities in the Mainland. According to his understanding, the cost for storage and disposal of the existing LLRW in Hong Kong using the same storage facility for Daya Bay Nuclear Plant should not be as high as RMBY 316 million. He asked if the Administration had negotiated with the Guangdong authorities direct on the cost and whether a comparison on the technical aspects of the Mainland option and the SAC option had been conducted.

9. DSEF(B) responded that after examining the nature of LLRW in Hong Kong and the facilities in the Mainland, the Guangdong City Radioactive Waste Storage Facility (GD City Facility) was identified by the Mainland authorities as the appropriate reception facility for storing the LLRW in Hong Kong. The Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (B) 2 (PAS/EF(B)2) also clarified that the GD City Facility was not the same facility for storing nuclear waste from the Daya Bay Nuclear Plant, although both were situated in Beilong. The operation of GD City Facility was under the purview of the Guangdong Environmental Protection Bureau (GDEPB). Since then, the Administration had been in direct contact with GDEPB and a number of meetings had been held to discuss the feasibility of storing the LLRW in the GD City Facility. On the cost of RMBY 316 million, DSEF(B)

advised that this was the cost estimate provided by GDEPB for cross-boundary transportation, storage and ultimate disposal of the existing LLRW at Wanchai but this did not include the cost for transportation, storage and disposal of future LLRW. He added that cost was not the only consideration in deciding the option to be chosen. Compared with the Mainland option, having its own long-term storage facility at SAC would allow the Government greater flexibility and enable it to respond more readily in managing future LLRW.

#### The Siu A Chau option

10. Mr LAU Kong-wah questioned whether the cost estimate of HK\$89 million of the SAC option was realistic since it was still lower than the tender price of HK\$106 million of the only valid bid for the obsolete proposal of a similar facility in 1995. DSEF(B) advised that consequent upon a review of the contract specifications of the obsolete proposal to remove items which were not essential for storage of the LLRW had been removed and, the cost estimate of the SAC option was revised to around HK\$89 million at September 2001 prices. Besides, the current situation in the construction sector was very much different from the time when the last tender was invited in 1995. The Administration was confident that the cost estimate of HK\$89 million would suffice for the SAC option. As the SAC facility would be operated by a specialist contractor under a Design-Build-Operate contract, the estimated annual recurrent cost for operating the facility was HK\$2.8million. To expedite completion of the SAC facility for early relocation of LLRW, the Administration intended to initiate tender exercise as soon as possible. Subject to the tendering outcome fully meeting the Government's requirements, the application for funding of the project would be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee and Finance Committee for approval.

11. Mr SIN Chung-kai said that as a matter of principle and from an environmental point of view, he agreed that instead of exporting LLRW for storage and disposal in the Mainland, Hong Kong should build its own storage facility in the long run. Ms Emily LAU echoed that Hong Kong should not export its LLRW to other places. She also pointed out that the Mainland option might give rise to problems such as over reliance on the Mainland for storage and disposal of LLRW as well as possible conflicts in the process of cost negotiation. Given that the cost incurred from the Mainland option was higher than that from the SAC option, it made sense for the provision of a purpose-built storage facility for LLRW in Hong Kong.

12. While SAC was uninhabited, Mr SIN Chung-kai remained concerned about the possibility of breaking-in or trespassing the storage facility. Mr WONG Yung-kan echoed that the island would likely be visited by the public as the surrounding area would be developed into a marine park in future. Ms Emily LAU also expressed worries that the commissioning of the SAC facility might result in the closure of the island, thereby preventing public access to the scenic beach at SAC. DSEF(B) clarified that the Administration had no plans to ban public access to SAC as the storage facility would not pose threat to public health or safety. Moreover, as SAC

could only be accessible by vessels, the chances of trespassing the facility were slim. Notwithstanding, contract specifications for the SAC option had provided for tight security control measures such as alarm and closed circuit television systems. These security and monitoring devices were directly connected to a round-the-clock remote control centre. Moreover, signs would be put up to warn against trespassing and the Marine Police would be requested to step up surveillance in the area.

13. The Chairman asked if consideration could be given to building the facility underground lest it might not be able to integrate into the natural surrounding environment which would become part of the marine park. DSEF(B) affirmed that the subject had been considered in the Environmental Impact and Safety Assessment study report for the proposed facility in 1995. The facility would be a low-rise structure, and that natural building materials would be used so that the facility would not have an adverse aesthetical impact on the natural environment and would not undermine the use of surrounding area as a marine park.

#### Storage and disposal of LLRW

14. Noting that an average of 0.3 cubic metres (m<sup>3</sup>) of LLRW would be generated each year in Hong Kong, Mr LAU Kong-wah expressed concern about the rate of generation which was not low as compared to the 55 m<sup>3</sup> of LLRW stored in the disused air-raid tunnel at Queen's Road East. As the SAC facility would require a lead time of 26 months to complete, he enquired about the Administration's plan for storage of future LLRW pending the completion of the SAC facility. DSEF(B) said that the disused air-raid tunnel at Queen's Road East had been used to store LLRW since 1965, but no additional LLRW had been placed in the tunnel after 1990. Besides, the waste inside the tunnel had very low radioactivity and were properly packaged in accordance with international standards to ensure safety. Moreover, monitoring devices had been installed in the vicinity of the tunnel and records indicated that the radiation level of the surrounding area was within the range of background radiation levels in Hong Kong. While LLRW did not pose any danger or health hazards to the neighbourhood, the Government considered that this should be stored in a purpose-built facility in the long run as the tunnel was not built for storage of LLRW.

15. Ms Emily LAU sought clarification on the storage arrangements for LLRW generated after 1990 and plans for future disposal of LLRW. DSEF(B) advised that the amount of radioactive waste had been substantially reduced consequent upon the use of radioactive substances with a shorter half-life. Upon the expiry of these half-lives, they could then be disposed of as normal waste. For radioactive substances with a longer half-life, including some 40% of the LLRW stored in the air-raid tunnel which had a half-life of over 25 years, they would have to be stored until better disposal methods had been developed. He added that there were established guidelines under the Radiation Ordinance (Cap. 303) governing the disposal of radioactive wastes. Importers of radioactive substances were normally required by law to arrange for the return of these substances to the source manufacturers concerned when these were no longer in use. The Senior Physicist, Department of Health

(SP/DH) affirmed that the majority of radioactive substances currently in use had very short half-lives. They could be disposed of as normal waste after a short period of storage. With the reduction in industrial activities, the amount of LLRW generated had been very low. Some of the longer half-life substance that could not be disposed of after storage or returned to the overseas producers were being kept by the users at licensed storage premises. PAS/EF(B)(2) added that while there was no increase in the amount of LLRW stored at the air-raid tunnel since 1990, long-term arrangements had to be worked out to take account of possible generation of LLRW in future.

16. On Mr LAU Kong-wah's enquiry on the radiation levels, SP/DH remarked that at the meeting on 19 March 2001, the Panel had invited views from three experts in the field of radiological protection who had generally concurred with the Administration's assessment that the risks of the LLRW stored at the air-raid tunnel was very low. Besides, the LLRW had been re-packaged in March 2002 using double-lined stainless steel containers. As the walls of the tunnel provided an extremely effective shielding of radiation from the waste, the storage of LLRW at the tunnel would not pose any safety hazard to the surrounding environment. Monitoring results indicated that the radiation levels of the surrounding area was the same as the normal background levels.

17. Having regard to the views expressed at the meeting, the Chairman concluded that members were in general supportive of the Government's plan regarding the long-term management of LLRW in Hong Kong. DSEF(B) said the Government would invite tender for the facility in May 2002.

## **V Inviting expressions of interest in providing integrated waste treatment facility(ies)**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1122/01-02(04) - Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1122/01-02(05)- Information paper provided by the Administration

18. DSEF(B) briefed members on the Administration's plan to invite expressions of interest (EoI) from local and international waste management industry in providing integrated waste treatment facility(ies) (IWTF) in Hong Kong by highlighting the salient points of the information paper.

### The EoI exercise and the provision of IWTF

19. Noting that those taking part in the EoI exercise would not be given any advantage or preferential treatment in any subsequent procurement or tender exercise, the Chairman was concerned that there would not be any incentive for participation in the exercise, particularly when proponents were expected to provide detailed information on their proposed technologies which might involve revelation of confidential business information. DSEF(B) informed members that this was not the



first time that the Administration had embarked on an EoI exercise. In fact, EoI exercises on the recycling of glass bottles, waste tyres as well as construction and organic waste had been conducted in the past few months and quite a number of submissions had been received. Proponents were keen to introduce their new and innovative technologies to the Government. Subject to members' agreement, the Administration would invite EoI in April 2002 in developing IWTF in Hong Kong. The Panel would be informed of the outcome of the EoI exercise and the technical assessment. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) added that a number of consultancies and companies in Hong Kong had expressed interest in the EoI exercise. They were aware of the way the exercise would be carried out and were keen to participate. On the concern about possible leakage of commercially sensitive information, DEP assured members that the Administration would put in place measures to ensure that this would not happen. He added that an Advisory Group would be set up to increase transparency and assist the Government in considering the EoI submissions. Mr LAW Chi-kwong expressed support for the EoI exercise as it would bring about new technologies to Hong Kong. He also hoped that the Administration would adopt different types of new technologies in Hong Kong.

20. On Ms Emily LAU's enquiry about the cost of IWTF, DSEF(B) said that this would depend on the choice of technology to be adopted and the size and number of IWTF sites. The Administration would be in a better position to provide a cost estimate of IWTF upon completion of the EoI exercise and assessment of the options since IWTF might also perform waste recovery and recycling which might generate revenue. PAS/EF(B2) added that once a decision was reached on the technology(ies) to be adopted, the Administration would then consider the possible location(s) to site the facility(ies), assess the engineering, environmental and economic viability of the site(s) concerned, and carry out public consultation on the propose location(s).

21. Ms LAU expressed disappointment at the long time taken to develop IWTF. DEP said that while the Administration was also keen to have IWTF in place at the earliest possible time, consultation had to be conducted before reaching a consensus on the choice of site. It would also take time to carry out the statutory Environmental Impact Assessment and the tendering process to ensure that public money was well spent. He nevertheless assured members that the Administration would endeavour to have IWTF in place as soon as practicable.

#### Target recycling rate

22. Referring to paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper, the Chairman considered that the target recycling rate of 40% by 2007 was too conservative. Her concern was shared by Ms Emily LAU. DSEF(B) advised that the target was set in 1998 and efforts were being made to achieve such a target. DEP supplemented that at present, the overall recovery rate in Hong Kong was about 35% which was comparable to most developed countries. In fact, Hong Kong had surpassed most cities like London and Tokyo in terms of waste recovery. He added that comparisons with other countries would only be meaningful if these were made on a like-to-like

basis. By way of illustration, countries like Denmark which was said to have a recovery rate of over 60% had included the recycling of construction and demolition (C&D) waste. If C&D waste were to be included, Hong Kong would have already achieved a recycling rate of 66%. He also pointed out that some countries regarded avoidance from disposal at landfills as waste recovery and hence waste incinerated would be taken as waste recovered. Other countries such as the United States and Australia had waste components like garden clippings which could easily be re-used as compost, thereby resulting in high recovery rates.

23. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the manner in which the four million tonnes of unrecyclable wastes would be handled, DSEF(B) said that IWTF would help reduce the volume of unrecyclable waste while landfills would serve as the final repositories for the waste. The Administration maintained an open mind on the technologies to be adopted in IWTF. Meanwhile, a study on the possible extension of existing landfills and development of new landfills was underway and the results would be presented to the Panel early next year.

#### Landfill Charging Scheme

24. Ms Emily LAU expressed support for the imposition of landfill charges and considered it necessary that the public be educated on the need to extend the life span of landfills through reduction of waste. She also agreed with the Administration that the Landfill Charging Scheme (the Scheme) should apply to all C&D waste producers with no exemption for small C&D waste producers. As regards waste haulers' concern on the charging arrangement, Ms LAU opined that measures could be worked out to address their concern but this should not impede the implementation of the Scheme. She further enquired whether additional space would be made available for sorting of waste after the Scheme had come into operation.

25. DSEF(B) advised that at present, C&D sorting facilities were made available in Tuen Mun and Tseung Kwan O. He added that the Administration was aware of the need for providing more sorting facilities to assist in the recycling of waste and would continue to identify suitable sites for this purpose. PAS/EF(B2) supplemented that consideration would be given to earmarking land near to landfills for sorting purpose. The detailed arrangements would be worked out.

26. Ms Cyd HO opined that landfill charges should not be regarded as a source of revenue but should be used in the development of waste recovery industries and facilities. Besides, the proposed charge of \$125 per tonne would not be able to recoup the waste treatment cost of over \$900 per tonne nor compensate the loss of precious landfill space. As such, efforts should be made to foster the recycling industry which would assist in the avoidance of waste at landfills. While affirming that landfill charges would form part of public revenue, DSEF(B) stressed that these were not aimed at generating revenue but served as an economic incentive to reduce waste. Moreover, the public funding required for the development of waste treatment facilities would far exceed the landfill charges collected. He nevertheless agreed to

relay Ms HO's suggestion of using landfill charges to subsidize recycling activities to relevant bureau for consideration. In response to the Chairman, DSEF(B) confirmed that landfill charges would also apply to Government departments and public organizations.

27. Noting that the main obstacle in implementing the Scheme was the opposition from waste haulers who refused to pay/handle the charge on behalf of small C&D waste producers, Mr LAW Chi-kwong asked if consideration could be given to introducing a permit system requiring small C&D waste producers to apply for permits prior to commencement of renovation works. DEP advised that in countries with a landfill charging system, waste haulers were required to settle payment at the entrance of landfills. However, waste haulers in Hong Kong were reluctant to participate in the Scheme in any way and had maintained their opposition. They expressed concern that instead of charging individual waste producers for the C&D waste being handled, waste haulers would be required under the Scheme to charge the waste producers the additional landfill charges payable to the Government. This might give rise to problems such as bad debt which would hamper their business. While the concerns of waste haulers were not well founded, they had taken a very strong position and had blockaded the landfills when the Administration intended to implement landfill charges a few years ago. To this end, a direct settlement system would be established under the current proposal so that major C&D waste producers would pay the landfill charges direct to the Government, thereby obviating the need for waste haulers to collect/handle these charges. As it would be administratively difficult and extremely expensive to apply the same to more than 300 000 potential small C&D waste producers involved in renovation works and minor construction sites, it was recommended that landfill charges arising from these ad hoc construction works be handled by waste haulers. To allay the concern on cash flow problems, waste haulers would be billed on a monthly basis and given a credit period. In the event of disputes arising from collection of landfill charges from waste producers, waste haulers could lodge their claims to the Small Claims Tribunal and action would be taken to suspend the recovery of charges. However, after repeated negotiations, the waste haulers remained opposed to any form of participation in the Scheme. On the number of waste haulers involved, DEP advised that it was estimated to be in the region of two to three thousand. To facilitate members' understanding, the Administration undertook to provide the collection arrangements for landfill charges adopted by other countries.

Admin

28. Given that the subject had been dragged on for a long time, Ms Emily LAU considered it necessary for the Administration to finalize its proposals for the Scheme. She said that in the light of the proposals, the Panel could then invite views from waste haulers and the affected trades. DSEF(B) said that the main proposals of the Scheme were set out in the information paper provided. The Administration would again consult the waste haulers associations, the construction industry and other affected trades on these proposals. Based on the outcome of consultation, the Administration would decide on the way forward for the Scheme. He welcomed members' views in this respect. To enable the Panel to gauge views from the

affected parties, the Chairman requested the Administration to provide within this legislative session implementation details of the Scheme, including charging arrangement, timetable, availability of sorting facilities etc. In this way, the outcome of consultation on the Scheme would be able to tie in with the outcome of the EoI exercise in July 2002. Noting that waste haulers were not opposed to the implementation of the Scheme but were more concerned about the requirement for them to pay/handle the landfill charges on behalf of small C&D waste producers, Ms Cyd HO considered it useful to invite them to make suggestions on how the problem could best be resolved.

#### Progress on waste recycling initiatives

29. On *enhancing public education and community involvement*, Ms Cyd HO supported the proposed capital injection of \$100 million to the Environmental and Conservation Fund for use by community-based recycling projects. She however expressed concern that the provision of IWTF with large-scale sorting facilities on site would compromise the survival of smaller waste recycling businesses. DSEF(B) said that the Advisory Group set up to assess EoI submissions would look into the social impact of IWTF which included community perception and employment opportunities.

30. On *recycling bins and collection service for recyclables*, PAS/EF(B)(2) advised that the effect of the increased provision of recycling bins in public places, private housing estates and schools had yet to be seen as these were only put in place in mid-December 2001. However, there had been an increase in the number of recycled plastic bottles consequent upon the launching of publicity campaigns. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Facilities) (ADEP(WF)) added that the Environmental Protection Department had embarked on a pilot collection scheme for plastic bottles in 252 public/private housing estates. The bulk of plastic bottles collected had increased from 10 000 kilograms (kg) in September 2001 to 14 000 kg in October 2001 and 17 000 kg in November 2001. These figures revealed that there had been active public participation in the waste recycling initiatives. In addition, the Housing Department had launched a trial scheme of putting in place recycling bins on every floor of Chun Shek Estate in Shatin and Chak On Estate in Sham Shui Po with a view to encouraging waste recycling. Members would be informed of the outcome of the waste recycling initiatives in due course.

31. On *government leadership*, the Chairman asked if the procurement guidelines for Government departments to use green products would apply despite the higher cost of these products. DSEF(B) advised that a Working Group had been set up within the Government to advise on the procurement of environmental friendly products. Guidelines in this respect had been issued and preference would be given to the use of green products where appropriate. The higher cost of green products would be absorbed through environmental practices such as economizing the use of paper and reducing the number of circulation copies. Good cooperation had been achieved within Government departments.

32. On *other new initiatives*, the Chairman enquired about the progress of the establishment of a composting plant at Ngau Tam Mei. ADEP(WF) advised that an EoI exercise had been conducted on the recycling of organic waste in the composting plant and about seven or eight submissions had been received. The Administration would be inviting tenders in the next few months. The organic waste to be recycled as compost would mainly include food scraps from restaurants and food manufacturing industries. Other organic waste such as garden clippings would also be recycled.

**VI Any other business**

33. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

18 April 2002