立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 2070/01-02
(These minutes have been seen by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PL/EA/1

LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of special meeting held on Friday, 19 April 2002, at 10:45 am in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present	**:**	Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman) Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung Dr Hon LO Wing-lok Hon LAU Ping-cheung
Members absent	**:**	Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Deputy Chairman) Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP Hon SIN Chung-kai Hon WONG Yung-kan Hon LAU Kong-wah Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Public officers attending	**:**	Civil Engineering Department Dr C K LAU Director Mr W K TAM Deputy Director/Special Duties

Mr P D MORGAN
Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Simon HUI
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Assessment & Audit)

Labour Department

Dr W K LO
Occupational Health Consultant

Mr CHEUNG Hon-chung
Senior Occupation Hygienist

Department of Health

Dr Thomas CHUNG
Principal Medical and Health Officer

Antiquities and Monuments Office, Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr H W CHAU
Curator (Archaeology)

Tourism Commission

Miss Winnie HO
Assistant Commissioner for Tourism

Environment and Food Bureau

Ms Annie CHOI
Principal Assistant Secretary

Works Bureau

Mr C L Ng
Chief Assistant Secretary (Programme Management)

Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited

Mr Dickson LO
Executive Director

Mr Eric MA
Associate

Maunsell Environmental Management Consultants Limited

Mr Matthew KO
Associate

Hong Kong Baptist University

Professor Jonathan WONG

Attendance by invitation : The Conservancy Association

Dr Gordon NG
Chief Executive

Ms Kate CHOY
Campaign Officer

Friends of the Earth (Hong Kong)

Mrs Mei NG
Director

Greenpeace

Ms Miranda YIP
Campaigner

Mr Allen CHAN
Campaigner

Green Island Cement Company Limited

Mr Gary S L YU
Managing Director

Mr Peter C C LEUNG
General Manager (Environmental and Engineering)

Dr Ludwig B RAIBLE
Technical Director (Process Engineering)

Kwai Tsing District Council

Mr WONG Bing-kuen
District Councillor

Mr Simon CHAN Siu-man
District Councillor

Mr AU Cheong-wa
District Councillor

Islands District Council

Ms CHAU Chuen-heung, MH
Vice-Chairman

Ms LEE Kwai-chun
District Councillor

Chinese University of Hong Kong

Dr YU Tak-sun, Ignatius
Associate Professor

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

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

In the absence of a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, members agreed that the meeting be proceeded as an informal meeting. A quorum was subsequently reached at 11:20 am.

I Effect of dioxin and removal of dioxin-contaminated soil at Penny's Bay

Meeting with deputations

Dr YU Tak-sun, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

2. Dr YU Tak-sun remarked that while dioxin was classified by the International Agency Research for Cancer as Class 1 carcinogen, there was no bio-marker to determine the cancer risk in relation to exposure to dioxin. In assessing the health impact of dioxin on former workers of Cheoy Lee Shipyard (CLS), information which included the number of workers involved, degree of exposure to the dioxin and whether medical examination had been conducted when these workers were working at CLS should be provided. Consideration should also be given to the practicability and efficacy of recalling these workers for medical examination. He pointed out that medical examination would not be of much help to those who had developed cancer. As for workers who were engaged in the remediation project, there was a need to conduct a health surveillance programme and to adopt sufficient precautionary measures. Apart from dioxin, heavy metals present in the contaminated soil was another cause for concern to health. Unlike the non-specific effect of dioxin, the toxicological effect of exposure to heavy metals could be remedied by detoxification methods. Therefore, if former CLS workers were to be recalled for medical examination, they should be tested for the presence of heavy metals so that some illnesses such as mental disorders resulting from contamination by heavy metals could be treated. In this connection, a risk assessment would have to be conducted and the types of medical examination required would need to be worked out. The cost incurred should be borne by CLS since as the employer, it had the responsibility to ensure the occupational safety of its workers.

Green Island Cement Company (GICC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1451/01-02(01) -- Treatment of dioxin-contaminated soil at CLS, Penny's Bay proposed by GICC
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1468/01-02(02) -- Submission from GICC
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(04) -- Further submission from GICC)

3. Mr Gary YU said that GICC first came to know the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study for the decommissioning of CLS through the internet. After examining the EIA study, GICC held the view that an on-site treatment option would be more desirable to reduce the transportation risk. To this end, an alternative one-step high temperature thermal treatment was recommended not only to eliminate the need for transportation but also to dispense with the need for secondary treatment of condensate at the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre (CWTC) in Tsing Yi.

4. Referring to Annex 3 to the submission of GICC, Dr Ludwig RAIBLE said that there was extensive experience with thermal treatment processes for hazardous waste in Germany and other European countries. These treatment plants were in operation for many years and were able to meet the new stringent emission standards in

Western Europe. A typical thermal treatment plant would consist of a rotary kiln, a secondary combustion chamber of high temperature up to 1200 ^{o}C and a flue gas treatment process. The high temperature thermal treatment process provided for a complete removal of organics and heavy metals from the soil in one location and no transportation of residue was required. From an environmental point of view, this method had an obvious advantage over others including thermal desorption process. It was therefore recommended that the option of high temperature thermal treatment process be considered in the tendering for the treatment of contaminated soil at CLS.

Kwai Tsing District Council (KTDC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1420/01-02 -- Motion passed by KTDC
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(05) -- Submission from KTDC)

5. Mr WONG Bing-kuen said that KTDC members were dissatisfied that there had been no prior consultation with KTDC on the Administration's proposal to transport the toxic residue from To Kau Wan (TKW) to CWTC for incineration. Despite that the proposal was announced in February 2002, KTDC members were only briefed on the proposal in March 2002 when representatives from the Civil Engineering Department were invited to attend KTDC meeting. KTDC members were concerned that it would become a practice for the Administration to treat all kinds of hazardous waste at CWTC which was the only waste treatment centre in Hong Kong.

6. As regards the incineration process, Mr WONG noted that there were divergent views in this respect. On the one hand, the public were told that there was no foolproof method to prevent the generation of dioxin during incineration. However, the Administration on the other had been advocating the imposition of the most stringent emission standards at CWTC to allay public concerns about the health impact of dioxin. As such, there might be a need to invite experts in the field of dioxin to further discuss the issue. Meanwhile, residents in Tsing Yi should be given a choice and should not be forced to accept the incineration of hazardous waste in CWTC in the long run. He stressed that the well-being of residents in Kwai Tsing should not be compromised for the sake of expediency.

Islands District Council (IDC)

7. Ms CHAU Chuen-heung said that IDC members were made aware of the proposal at the last IDC meeting through an Administration's paper submitted to the IDC. She said that IDC members would like to know more about the recommended treatment option and the health impact of dioxin on residents.

Conservancy Association (CA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1271/01-02(01) -- Submission from CA
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(01) -- Further submission from CA)

8. Dr Gordon NG said that said that CA had no further comments to make but would like to know the Administration's latest position.

Friends of the Earth (FOE)
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1271/01-02(02) -- Submission from FOE
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(02) -- Further submission from FOE)

9. Mrs Mei NG said that FOE was of the view that the proposed remediation plan was not the best option with the lowest environmental and health risk to the public. FOE therefore urged the Administration to further explore other on-site treatment options to minimize the risk in relation to the transport of the contaminated soil. She pointed out that there were promising chemical dechlorination technologies, including solvated electron technology and base catalytic dechlorination (BCD), which had a high dioxin destruction efficiency. The Government should invite interested parties to submit proposals for the decommissioning project and to conduct a thorough comparative study of different proposals. She also expressed concern about the liability for land contamination since it appeared that polluters were not required to bear the remediation cost. She considered that the Government should uphold the spirit of the EIA Ordinance given the impending massive infrastructure development.

Greenpeace
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1271/01-02(04) -- Submission from Greenpeace
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1322/01-02(02) -- Second submission from Greenpeace
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(03) -- Third submission from Greenpeace)

10. Referring to LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(03), Mr Allen CHAN clarified that the word "unbiased" as appeared in the first sentence of the third paragraph of section 2 should read "biased".

11. Mr CHAN pointed out that while the Administration had claimed that no time restriction would be imposed on the completion of the decommissioning project, the need to meet the opening of the International Theme Park (ITP) had been used as the only reason for opting out the less risky treatment options. Greenpeace considered that this was unacceptable, and that the Administration should work out the best remediation measures. He also queried if any of the thermal desorption projects in the United States listed in Annex A to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1434/01-02(02)) were associated with the treatment of dioxin since Greenpeace was not aware of any proven experience in the secondary treatment of the oily residue from thermal desorption process. There was a need for the Administration to conduct a more thorough study on the treatment options before deciding on the selected option.

Meeting with the Administration

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1271/01-02(05) -- Information paper provided by the Administration (issued for the special meeting on 12 March 2002)

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1434/01-02(01) -- List of questions raised by members at the meeting on 12 March 2002 (issued for the meeting on 10 April 2002)

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1434/01-02(02) -- Administration's response to CB(1) 1434/01-02(01) (issued for the meeting on 10 April 2002)

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1468/01-02(01) -- Power-point presentation materials provided by the Administration)(issued for the meeting on 10 April 2002)

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(08) -- List of questions raised by members at the meeting on 10 April 2002

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1523/01-02(09) -- Administration's response to CB(1) 1523/01-02(08))

12. With the consent of the Chairman, the Director of Civil Engineering (DCE) took the opportunity to respond to some of the points raised by the deputations. He reiterated that the Administration did not impose any time restrictions on the completion of the decommissioning project. The purpose of the EIA study was to identify a treatment option which was best in terms of cost-effectiveness and timeliness. After a thorough analysis of all feasible technologies, or combination of these technologies, the EIA consultants recommended treating the dioxin-contaminated soil by thermal desorption followed by incineration of treatment residue at CWTC.

13. On ***consultation with District Councils***, DCE explained that under the EIA Ordinance, EIA reports could only be released for public consultation after approval had been given by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP). He added that CWTC was identified by the EIA consultants for treating the oily residue because it was the only available facility in South East Asia capable of treating hazardous waste. The Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Audit) (PEPO(AA)) also confirmed that CWTC was designed to handle chemical waste including dioxin containing wastes to an acceptable standard.

14. Mrs Mei NG held the view that the use of CWTC to treat the oily residue was proposed with a view to making up the drop in the amount of waste to be treated at CWTC resulting from the relocation of industries to the Mainland in recent years. She expressed concern that if this trend was to be continued, CWTC would be used to treat all hazardous waste generated from other shipyards and polluting industries, thereby affecting the public health and safety of residents in Tsing Yi.

15. Ms Emily LAU asked how the Administration could allay residents' concerns about incineration. Professor Jonathan WONG/Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) advised that with the advancement in technology, incineration had become a

very effective method in the destruction and removal of dioxins. CWTC was well equipped to treat hazardous waste in an environmentally acceptable manner and was able to meet international emission standards. He agreed that residents had every right to object to the incineration of waste at CWTC if air quality monitoring results indicated that dioxin emissions had exceeded the acceptable level. However, in the absence of such evidence, the operation of CWTC should be allowed to continue.

16. On ***information regarding thermal desorption projects in the United States*** (US), Mr Eric MA/Maunsell Consultants Limited (MCA) advised that the relevant information was obtained from the Remediation Technology Cost Compendium-Year 2000. He also tabled for members' reference a summary of US private thermal desorption projects treating dioxins. According to the information provided by the US authorities, the residue from the thermal desorption plant at Coleman Evans, Jacksonville was transported to Texas for incineration in accordance with the transport requirements stipulated by the US Department of Transport. Reference had been made to these requirements in setting the guidelines for the transportation of residue to CWTC. Additional precautionary measures, including speed control and escort, would also be adopted to minimize the transportation risk.

(*Post-meeting note*: The summary was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1551/01-02.)

17. In response to Dr LO Wing-lok's enquiry on the rationale for transporting the residue from Jacksonville, Florida to Texas for incineration, Mr Eric MA/MCA advised that it was a commercial decision. Mr Simon CHAN/KTDC however opined that the need for transportation might arise as a result of opposition from residents concerned. He pointed out that residents in Tsing Yi were also gravely concerned about dioxin emissions from incineration, particularly after they learnt that the effects of dioxin could not be remedied. He also doubted the effectiveness of the thermal desorption process which was not well tried out except for a period of four months at a plant in Jacksonville.

18. As regards cases of accidents in the US arising from transportation of residue from thermal desorption plants, Mr Eric MA/MCA advised that the US Environmental Protection Agency did not have record in this respect. A further research using the US Department of Transportation Hazardous Material Incident Database indicated that no record of incidents associated with dioxins was found.

19. On ***GICC's option versus the recommended option***, Ir Dr Raymond HO noted that the high temperature thermal treatment proposed by GICC could achieve a zero discharge by incorporating an additional environmental feature of upstream flue gas pretreatment with lime so that ash could be recycled back into the process instead of disposing at landfill. He enquired about the advantage of the pretreatment and how it compared with the recommended treatment option. Dr Ludwig RAIBLE/GICC explained that the proposed pretreatment of flue gas with limestone would remove sulphur dioxide. The ash from the process could be removed and recycled into the

rotary kiln, thereby dispensing with the need for disposal of the ash except for a small amount of dust coming from the flue gas. The residue would go through a second-step treatment which would include spray-dry and baghouse filter. Ir Dr HO asked if the high temperature thermal treatment could achieve a destruction and removal efficiency of over 99.9999% for dioxins and other organic contaminants. As it was difficult to measure dioxin given its trace quantities, Dr RAIBLE said that it made no sense to define efficiency by percentage. He nevertheless assured members that the proposed treatment process was able to comply with the stringent emission standards, including that of 0.1 ng I-TEQ/m^3 for dioxins.

20. Noting that Professor Jonathan WONG/HKBU was acting as an independent consultant to the Administration, Ir Dr HO sought his views on GICC's proposal and how it compared with the recommended option in terms of emission and effectiveness. Professor WONG clarified that he was an independent consultant employed by MCA to give advice on the EIA for the decommissioning of CLS. As an independent consultant, he gave his own independent advice based on his knowledge of the latest technological developments in the treatment of dioxin. While welcoming the clarification, the Chairman pointed out that at the last meeting on 10 April 2002, members did have the impression that Professor WONG was an independent consultant. Ms Emily LAU opined that members would like to seek advice from someone who were independent of both the Administration and EIA consultants. Ms Miranda YIP/Greenpeace also questioned the independence of the advice given by Professor WONG given his close tie with the EIA consultant.

21. In response to Ir Dr HO's question on GICC's proposal, Professor WONG said a more detailed study would be required to ascertain its technical feasibility. There was also a need to assess the risk between the recommended option and GICC's proposal in terms of dioxin emission. He pointed out that if GICC's proposal were to be adopted, a separate incinerator with a combustion chamber of high temperature of 1 200 ^oC would have to be built at TKW for complete incineration of the 30 000 cubic metres (m^3) of dioxin-contaminated soil. The inherent risk of dioxin emission of GICC's proposal was higher than that of the recommended option under which only 600 m^3 of residue from thermal desorption would have to be incinerated. Besides, residents in TKW might not welcome the construction of an incinerator in their vicinity as was the case with residents in Tsing Yi.

22. As regards the risk of dioxin emission related to the thermal desorption process, Professor WONG explained that the process was in fact a separation process in which indirect heat was applied to the contaminated soil. Upon indirect heating, the contaminants would be evaporated into gaseous phase, trapped and subsequently condensed for further treatment. With the presence of a flue gas removal system, the thermal desorption process had an destruction efficiency of 99.9999% which was comparable to that of incineration. As such, the dioxin concentration in the flue gas was well below the permitted level of 0.1 ng I-TEQ/m^3. While agreeing that all the organic pollutants in the soil could be destroyed at 800 ^oC, Mr Peter LEUNG/GICC pointed out that the temperature of the thermal desorption process could only reach

540°C instead of 800 °C as claimed by the EIA consultants. He further pointed out that the high temperature thermal treatment proposed by GICC was not new and had been adopted by many overseas countries.

23. Noting that an Environmental Permit (EP) had to be sought from DEP for the decommissioning project, Ir Dr Raymond HO asked if consensus had been reached between CED and the Environmental Protection Department on the recommended option. Given that the recommended option would involve the transportation of residue from TKW to CWTC, he considered it necessary for DEP to spell out the specific transport requirements in the EP concerned. Otherwise, it would pose considerable difficulties to the tenderers if they were not given guidance on such requirements. DCE affirmed that the transport requirements had already been set out in the EIA study. PEPO(AA) added that while public consultation on the EIA report for the decommissioning of CLS had been completed and the recommended option had been endorsed by the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE), DEP was still in the process of deciding on the approval of the EIA report and the issuance of an EP within the statutory timeframe. However, if it was subsequently decided that an alternative technology was to be adopted, the project proponent would have to apply to DEP for a change of conditions and a separate EIA might need to be conducted.

24. Noting that the CLS site fell within the area designated for the construction of roads leading to ITP, Mr LAW Chi-kwong asked if consideration would be given to aligning a temporary by-pass to the Park so that the contaminated soil could be treated on site at CLS on the one hand while avoiding delay in the opening of ITP on the other. Upon completion of the decommissioning project, the CLS site could be re-opened for the construction of permanent roads leading to the Park. Given the topographical location of the CLS site, DCE considered Mr LAW's suggestion not feasible. He pointed out that the site was located on a narrow strip of land adjacent to a hilly coast, it was therefore both difficult and expensive to align a temporary by-pass to ITP.

25. On ***flexibility in the tendering exercise to accommodate other treatment technologies apart from thermal desorption***, DCE advised that pursuant to members' request, the Administration was prepared to consider other proven alternatives apart from the recommended option for the treatment of dioxin-contaminated soil as might be proposed by tenderers. While welcoming the Administration's decision, Ms Emily LAU enquired about the extent of flexibility and whether one-stop on-site treatment options at TKW would be considered. DCE affirmed that both off-site and on-site alternative treatment options would be considered. However, these alternatives ought to be proven to be more cost-effective and conform to the technical and programming requirements of the project. They also needed to comply with the statutory requirements specified under the EIA Ordinance. Ms LAU expressed concern that the proposed flexibility might lead to uncertainty. DCE remarked that there would not be much uncertainty since the major options would include the recommended option; thermal desorption followed by BCD as in the case of the decontamination project of the Sydney 2000 Olympic site at Homebush Bay; or direct incineration where a separate incinerator would be required at TKW. The cost of the

decommissioning project would vary with the type of treatment proposed.

26. Ms LAU enquired about the timeframe for the tendering and treatment processes and whether the latter would interfere with the normal operation of ITP. Referring to the submission from FOE, the Chairman stressed that the Administration should be open and transparent in selecting a remediation plan that would best suit the interest of the public. DCE affirmed that the Administration had all along been adopting an open and transparent approach and this explained why it had agreed to amend the tender specifications to accommodate alternatives for treatment of the contaminated soil as might be proposed by tenderers. He added that the recommended option was put forward with a view to achieving a win-win situation which would allow for the treatment of contaminated soil without delaying the opening of ITP. In view of the long duration of the decommissioning project, it was decided that two separate completion schedules would be worked out, one for the civil engineering works and another for the treatment of contaminated soil, so that more time could be allowed for the treatment process. He assured members that sufficient time would be given for tenderers to submit their proposals and to conduct supplementary EIA studies where necessary.

27. Ms Kate CHOY/CA enquired about the criteria for the selection of tenders and whether there would be public participation in the tendering process. Through the chair, DCE advised that the tendering procedures were governed by the Central Tender Board and details were available on the internet.

28. On ***emission standards***, Mrs Mei NG/FOE opined that in order to assess the efficacy of various treatment options, there was a need for the Administration to draw up its own statutory safety limits for dioxin emission rather than copying those adopted in US. PEPO(AA) said that the EIA study had recommended a set of clean-up standards for dioxin and this had been accepted by the Director of Environmental Protection. The recommended clean-up standards for dioxin-contaminated soil were 1 part per billion (ppb) for soils that would be covered with a minimum of 3 metres of clean soil, and 0.1 ppb for surface soils.

29. On ***medical examination for former workers of CLS***, Ms Emily LAU sought the Administration's views on the need to recall workers to check the presence of heavy metal in their bodies. The Occupational Health Consultant/Labour Department (OHC/LD) said that symptoms relating to poisoning by heavy metals would usually surface within a short period of time. If no symptom was observed after two years, it was unlikely that remedial treatment was required since the heavy metals should have been excreted from the body on cessation of further occupational exposure. He added that as there was no single test capable of detecting dioxin-induced cancer, it would not serve a useful purpose to recall former workers for medical examination. A manhunt of these workers would only raise their anxiety and do more harm to them. The Principal Medical and Health Officer/Department of Health concurred that medical examination for former workers of CLS would not be necessary, particularly when there was no feasible means to document the level of exposure of these workers.

30. Dr LO Wing-lok invited Dr YU Tak-sun of the Chinese University of Hong Kong to comment on the Administration's response regarding the toxic effect of heavy metals. Dr YU said that as some of the heavy metals could be assimilated in the body, it was unlikely that these could be excreted from the body in two years' time. While symptoms associated with exposure to heavy metals were non-specific and could sometimes be overlooked, there had been incidents where patients who were exposed to heavy metals had manifested symptoms of mental disorders. If a risk assessment revealed that former workers of CLS had been exposed to high concentrations of heavy metals for an extended period of time, there might be a need to take suitable curative actions to remedy the toxic effect of heavy metals.

31. In reply to Dr LO's question on the need for risk assessment, OHC/LD confirmed that risk assessments had been conducted on the operation of CLS. In fact, a total of 16 visits had been made in the past ten years. Apart from convictions in relation to occupational safety, there had been no record of large-scale use of heavy metals because the CLS only manufactured fibre-glass ships. While there might be possible exposure to heavy metals resulting from the use of paints in the shipbuilding process, it was unlikely that former workers of CLS had been exposed to high concentrations of heavy metal in a continuous manner. The use of detoxification treatment to hasten the excretion of heavy metals from the body was not necessary, particularly when the former workers were no longer exposed to heavy metals for a long period of time. Given the lapse of time, it might not serve any meaningful purpose to recall former workers of CLS for medical examination. Members requested and the Administration undertook to provide information on the past site visits to CLS.

Admin

32. On ***liability for land contamination***, Ms Emily LAU made reference to the letter from Mr Bill LEVERETT of Hong Kong Dolphinwatch Ltd (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1468/01-02(03)) alleging that the Administration should have been aware of the extent of contamination as some of the aerial photographs in the original EIA study for ITP had revealed evidence of burning and burial of waste. She enquired about the progress of investigation by the Administration. PEPO(AA) said that DEP was examining the aerial photographs and would be providing members with a written response in due course. He noted, however, that the original EIA did conclude that there was potential land contamination problem at CLS and hence the carrying out of the present EIA. DCE added that as dioxin-contaminated soil was not commonly found in shipyards, the extent of contamination found at CLS deviated from what would normally have been expected.

Way forward

33. Mrs Mei NG/FOE remained of the view that in the absence of comprehensive information, it was risky to approve the current EIA report for the decommissioning project. Ms Emily LAU however noted that ACE which was represented by green groups had already endorsed the EIA report. Declaring herself as a member of ACE,

Mrs NG explained that the remit of ACE was only confined to assess the technical feasibility of projects. It was obliged to approve projects which met the technical requirements. In the case of CLS, Mrs NG pointed out that ACE members were not experts in the field of dioxin and there were no independent consultants to whom they could seek advice. Besides, the decision was also constrained by the need to adhere to the opening of ITP. Mrs NG added that while the EIA report was subsequently approved by ACE, she was the only ACE member who had voted against it.

34. Noting that the funding proposal for the decommissioning project would be submitted for consideration by the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) shortly, the Chairman urged the Administration to include more details in the relevant information paper. Ms Emily LAU also requested the Clerk to prepare a paper summarizing the deliberations at the meetings held by the Environmental Affairs Panel and the Economic Services Panel for reference by PWSC.

(*Post-meeting note*: A background information paper prepared by the Clerk was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC109/01-02.)

II Any other business

35. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:13 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
20 June 2002